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This purpose of this research was to examine the impact on gendered racial microaggressions and bisexual microaggressions on the ability to access decent work for Black bisexual women. The mediation effect of proactive personality on the relationship between gendered racial microaggressions and bisexual microaggressions with decent work was explored in this study. The moderation effect of proactive personality on the relationship between gendered racial microaggressions and bisexual microaggressions with decent work was explored in this study as well. Gendered racial microaggressions was measured using the Gendered Racial Microaggression Scale (GRMS; Lewis & Neville, 2015). Bisexual microaggressions was measured by the Bisexual Microaggression Scale for Women (BMSW; Flanders et al., 2018). Decent work was measured using the Decent Work Scale (DWS; Duffy et al., 2017). Work volition was measured by the Work Volition Scale (WVS; Duffy et al., 2012) and proactive personality was measured using the Proactive Personality Scale ((PPS; Bateman & Crant, 1993). Participants were 299 Black bisexual women over the age of 18 from a community sample recruited through snowball sampling, Prolific, and MTurk.

Process Version 4.3 (Hayes, 2023) for IBM SPSS Statistics Version 28 was used for mediation and moderation analysis. The present study’s findings indicated that gendered racial microaggressions had a strong positive relationship with bisexual microaggressions. Thus, the
findings implied that Black bisexual women who reported higher appraisal of gendered racial microaggressions also reported a higher frequency of bisexual microaggressions. However, there was no relationship between gendered racial or bisexual microaggressions with decent work. Proactive personality did not act as a moderator and work volition did not act as a mediator for the relationship microaggression and decent. Limitations and implications for research, practice, and training/teaching of the present study are discussed.
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INTRODUCTION

The workforce is continuously diversifying in terms of race and gender (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2015). While much of the labor force consists of White Americans, there has been an increase in women and racial minorities entering the workforce and wage growth for racial and gender minorities within the last twenty years (Groshen & Holzer, 2021). Within this increase in gender and racial diversity, Black women have the highest labor force participation rate among women in the United States. Specifically, approximately 60% of Black women participated in the workforce even during the COVID pandemic (Current Population Survey, 2020). However, despite the number of Black women participating in the labor force, an increasing number of Black women are leaving the workforce. There is also an increasing number of Black women both facing unemployment and becoming entrepreneurs since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic (Bradley & Dove, 2021; Tucker, 2021). These trends are indicative of several differential work-related experiences for Black women.

Despite the diversification of the workforce and some increase in accessibility to particular careers, disenfranchised groups, such as Black women, continue to experience marginalization (i.e., racism, sexism, etc.) in the workplace. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2019), Black women accounted for most of the Black labor force from the 1970s to the present day and currently make up approximately 53% of the Black labor force in the United States. Regardless of their presence in the workforce and an increase in their educational attainment, Black women continue to earn less than Black men and White women on average (Bradford et al., 2001; Holder, 2013). As recent as 2017, Black women made 60% of the income earned by White men, while Black men made approximately 69% and White women 77% of the income earned by White men (Gould et al., 2018). Additionally, a significant number
of Black women are more likely than White women to occupy jobs with lower wages such as service positions (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2019; Holder, 2013). Black women also experience higher rates of unemployment compared to White women (Holder, 2013). In 2019, the unemployment rate was approximately 3% for White women and 5% for Black women (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2020). Taken together, these statistics reveal that while Black women have continued to enter the workforce at high rates, their occupational choices are still limited due to marginalization based on race and gender (Branch & Hanley, 2013).

The specific experiences of marginalization experienced by Black women in the workplace include racism and sexism. Although Black women are racialized and gendered in the workplace, these experiences of being racialized or gendered cannot be fully explored by a separate analysis of racism or sexism in the workplace. Specifically, race-related and gender-related experiences were thought to produce distress separately but, in fact, these experiences simultaneously produce distress (Moradi & Subich, 2003; Woods-Giscombé et al., 2008). Therefore, analyses explaining the simultaneous experiences of race and gender are needed to examine the experiences of race and gender of Black women in the workplace.

Since the separate analysis of race and gender does not account for the totality of experiences of Black women in the United States, it is important to examine Black women’s work experiences using an intersectional approach. Just as the concept of microaggressions was originally used to contextualize the daily lived experiences and impact of racism on people of color, the construct of gendered racial microaggression is used to contextualize the daily intersectional experience of racism and sexism. Gendered racial microaggressions are defined as daily behavioral, verbal, and environmental expressions of racial and gender oppression (Lewis et al., 2016; Lewis & Neville, 2015). Thus, gendered racial microaggressions include more subtle
forms of racism and sexism in which societal stereotypes and expectations of Black women are projected onto Black women in interpersonal and environmental interactions.

Gendered racial microaggressions can negatively impact workplace experiences for Black women. Since gendered racial microaggressions are associated with depression, anxiety, and psychological distress for Black women, it is necessary that they adequately cope with gendered racial microaggressions experienced in the workplace (Dale & Safren, 2020; Martins et al., 2020; Wright & Lewis, 2020). It has been found that Black women are likely to cope with gendered racial microaggressions in the workplace by using disengagement or avoidance strategies (Williams & Lewis, 2019). However, these strategies are not always conducive to productivity or survival in predominantly White workspaces (Hall et al., 2012).

Given that gendered racial microaggressions towards Black women often occur in predominantly White workplaces, dealing with gendered racial microaggressions impedes positive work-related outcomes (Lewis et al., 2016). This mistreatment in the workplace negatively influences how Black women interact with coworkers and their ability to network in professional spaces, limiting opportunities for career mobility in the workplace (Hall et al., 2012). Due to the limitations placed on Black women’s success in the workplace, it is imperative to further explore how gendered racial microaggressions impact all Black women in the workplace. Additionally, given the need for more empirical investigation into Black women’s work-related experiences, it is also important to explore these experiences for further marginalized subgroups such as Black women. It is especially necessary as there has not been any prior scholarly examination of gendered racial microaggressions for Black women. The current study seeks to fill this gap in the literature by focusing on gendered racial microaggressions for Black women in the workplace.
While it is important to examine the impact of gendered racial microaggressions on work experiences for Black women, Black women with other marginalized identities experience additional marginalization which is why it is particularly important to acknowledge groups like Black bisexual women. Recent data indicate that approximately 20% of Black women identify as bisexual (Bridges & Moore, 2019). Therefore, a considerable number of Black women in the workforce identify as bisexual. Black bisexual women not only face racial and gender-based marginalization like other Black women but they also experience marginalization based on their sexual identities. The marginalization experienced by Black bisexual women in the workplace can be even more complex as they experience multiple forms of marginalization. Black bisexual women face challenges not only dealing with gendered racism but must also navigate the stress of heterosexism and biphobia in the workplace (Greene, 2000).

Discrimination based on sexual orientation is also linked to limited career opportunities, alienation from social networks, and lower wages in the workplace (DeSouza et al., 2017; Velez & Moradi, 2012). However, despite the similarities in workplace experiences amongst the entire lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer (LGBQ) community, it is necessary to examine the experiences of Black bisexual women specifically. Research on the entire LGBQ community cannot be easily applied to those communities (i.e., lesbian, gay, or bisexual) separately as each group has different experiences from one another (Ghabriel & Ross, 2018). Also, research on the LGBQ community is less inclusive of bisexual persons (Movement Advancement Project, 2016). Furthermore, LGB research is even less inclusive of bisexual people of color. Thus, how heterosexism and racism impact the daily lives of bisexual people of color is also less investigated (Ghabriel & Ross, 2018). Thus, the experiences of bisexual persons of color such as Black bisexual women need to be further examined. As the workforce continues to diversify
regarding gender, race, and sexual identity, it is imperative to further understand and account for the differential treatment and experiences of Black bisexual women in the workplace.

For Black women who identify as bisexual, marginalization and oppression specific to their bisexual identity are very prevalent in the workforce (Movement Advancement Project, 2016). Bisexual forms of marginalization in the workplace occur similarly as with other contexts. Thus, since bisexual individuals face discrimination from heterosexual, lesbian, and gay communities, they are less likely to disclose their sexual identity in any context including the workplace (Arena & Jones, 2017). Discrimination faced by bisexuals includes experiencing invalidation of their sexual identity from monosexual (heterosexual, lesbian, or gay) communities in the workplace, resulting in bisexual erasure (Arena & Jones, 2017; Bostwick & Hequembourg, 2014). These anti-bisexual discriminatory experiences for bisexual women are expressed through daily slights, referred to as bisexual-specific microaggressions (Bostwick & Hequembourg, 2014; Flanders et al., 2019).

Bisexual-specific microaggressions can be defined as daily slights or insults that invalidate bisexual identity (Bostwick & Hequembourg, 2014). Forms of bisexual microaggressions include categories such as mistrust, denial/dismissal, social exclusion, and sexualizing. Bisexual microaggressions of mistrust refer to statements or messages received about bisexual persons not being trustworthy (Flanders et al., 2019). Denial of complexity might include questioning a person’s identity as bisexual based on their possession of other identities or qualities (Flanders et al., 2017). Dismissal includes invalidating a person’s identity as bisexual overall such as stating their identity is a phase. Social exclusion can include microaggressions in which bisexuals are excluded from spaces or dating. Bisexual microaggressions of sexualization
can include assumptions of promiscuity and sexual availability of bisexual persons (Flanders et al., 2017).

While previous literature has identified the negative impact of bisexual-specific microaggressions (Bostwick & Hequembourg, 2014; Flanders et al., 2019), bisexual-specific microaggressions have yet to be examined in the workplace for any group including Black bisexual women. Exploring bisexual-specific microaggressions for Black bisexual women could provide more insight into how this group experiences bisexual-specific marginalization in the workplace. This study aims to add to the literature on Black bisexual women’s experiences by including bisexual-specific microaggressions and examining gendered racial microaggressions for this group.

Black bisexual women’s experiences are also not often examined within the confines of traditional career models which do not consider the impact of marginalization on access to career opportunities. Due to the prevalence of marginalization toward Black bisexual women, the impact of marginalization on access to careers must be considered for this population which calls for an expansion of the traditional perspective of career development. Vocational theories have recently begun to expand to include more diverse as well as marginalized groups, such as Black people, and gender and sexual minorities (Blustein et al., 2019) when focused on the work experiences of diverse workers.

The psychology of working theory (PWT; Duffy et al., 2016) is a recently developed theory that articulates and examines the work experiences of marginalized individuals (Douglass et al., 2017; Duffy et al., 2018). The PWT includes consideration of social, historical, economic, and political factors for contemporary work experiences (Duffy et al., 2016). Therefore, the PWT
is useful for examining the work experiences of Black bisexual women who face marginalization in the form of gendered racial and bisexual-specific microaggressions.

The primary concern examined through the PWT is the access to decent work for individuals who have historically been marginalized and deal with social and economic constraints (Duffy et al., 2016). Decent work is an individual’s psychological experience of work based on several standards established by the International Labor Organization (Duffy et al., 2017). Due to the historical denigration of racial, gender, and sexual minorities in the United States, Black bisexual women have not always had access to decent work as evidenced by occupation segregation and wage gaps (Bacchus, 2008; Davis, 2013; McCluney & Rabelo, 2019). The PWT includes an expansion of traditional frameworks of work to consider inequity and the work experiences of persons without the privilege of choice or volition (Blustein, 2007; Duffy et al., 2016). Also, the PWT has been applied to examine the experiences of racially and ethnically diverse individuals and sexual minorities in the workplace (Douglass et al., 2017; Duffy et al., 2018).

Based on the PWT, decent work includes income, safety, values, time for free time and rest, and health care regarding work experiences, and is a central outcome variable of the PWT (Douglass et al., 2017; Duffy et al., 2016; Duffy et al., 2018). Discrimination against sexual minorities paired with a lack of policies to protect them in the workplace results in decreased job satisfaction and barriers to access to decent work (Mcfadden, 2015). Also, when considering racial and ethnic minorities, marginalization based on race can cause restraints related to career attainment, career mobility, and adequate compensation, as well as other core components of decent work (Rapa et al., 2018). Given that marginalization is a central aspect of the PWT, it is relevant to the career development of Black bisexual women who experience marginalization in
the form of sexism, racism, and heterosexism, thus impacting the capacity of Black bisexual women to attain and sustain decent work. While marginalization influences the access and sustainability of decent work (Duffy et al., 2016), marginalizing experiences and decent work have not been examined with Black bisexual women specifically. The current study seeks to add to the literature by exploring experiences of accessing decent work for Black bisexual women and linking these experiences to gendered racial and bisexual-specific microaggressions.

Work volition, a person’s perceived ability to make a choice (Diemer, 2012), is a construct that has been predicted to impact the accessibility of decent work (Duffy et al., 2012). Work volition is also correlated with self-evaluation and career-related locus of control (Duffy et al., 2012; Duffy et al., 2015). In past studies, work volition mediated the relationship between experiences of marginalization, constraints, and decent work for racial and ethnic minorities and sexual minorities (Douglass et al., 2017; Duffy et al., 2018). These studies highlighted the negative impact of marginalization on racially and sexually minoritized individuals in the workplace. These studies also found there to be a relationship between marginalization (i.e., employment discrimination and financial constraints) and work volition for racial and sexual minorities (Autin et al., 2017; Tebbe et al., 2019). However, the relation of either racial or heterosexist marginalization with work volition has only been examined separately for either racial or sexual minority groups and not multiple marginalized groups, such as Black bisexual women. In the prior examination of work volition, work volition was more associated with more covert and frequent marginalization and, therefore, could be connected to experiences of microaggressions (Tebbe et al., 2019). As Black bisexual women face microaggressions based on their gendered racial and bisexual identities, work volition may be impacted and, therefore, influence their perception of their access to decent work. The current study focuses on Black
bisexual women and work volition to better understand its connection with perceptions of access to decent work.

Black women also exhibit personality traits that are beneficial in managing oppressive experiences in the workplace such as higher self-reliance and the ability to cope with racialized events (Holder et al., 2015). Therefore, responses to microaggressions for Black bisexual women are particularly important in investigating potential variation in access to decent work among this population. A person’s tendency to take the initiative to influence their environment is a part of proactive personality. Proactive personality is another variable examined in the PWT (Duffy et al., 2016; Li et al., 2010). A proactive personality is an appropriate personality characteristic to examine for Black bisexual women because Black women are often seen as being resilient and able to resist experiences of oppression (Chance, 2022). Thus, since proactive personality traits are likely higher in those able to resist and have agency despite experiences of marginalization, Black women might have to be proactive in the workplace to resist experiences of marginalization in the workplace.

Proactive personality has been associated with increased job satisfaction, positive relationships with supervisors, organizational citizenship behavior, positive work performance, adjustment to the work environment, and job crafting (Bakker et al., 2012; Crant, 2000; Li et al., 2010). Individuals with proactive personalities, as opposed to passive personalities, are more likely to negotiate and actively initiate changes in their environment. Proactive personality has been associated with agency in the workplace, searching for work, and other workplace outcomes (Brown et al., 2006; Crant, 2000). Proactive individuals are more likely to advocate for themselves to access and sustain decent work. Thus, proactive personality may be useful for marginalized groups for counteracting discriminatory actions and marginalization in the
workplace (Douglas et al., 2019). Since proactive personality can predict positive work outcomes, marginalization in the workplace may have a less negative impact on work-related outcomes for those with proactive personalities (Spitzmuller et al., 2015). Therefore, since Black bisexual women have to compound marginalized identities, proactive personality should be examined with this population as it may be a buffer to negative work-related outcomes (i.e., gendered racial microaggressions and bisexual-specific microaggressions).

Additionally, prior studies have examined work volition as a mediator for the relationship between marginalization and decent work with sexual minorities and racially and ethnically diverse employees (Douglass et al., 2017; Duffy et al., 2018). However, the simultaneous investigation of proactive personality as a moderator and work volition as a mediator of the relationship between decent work and marginalization of sexual and racial minorities like Black bisexual women is limited. Work volition has been found to mediate the relationship between marginalization measured as heterosexist discrimination as well as decent work for sexual minorities or racially diverse individuals but not examined with individuals experiencing multiple forms of marginalization such as Black bisexual women. Based on the PWT, proactive personality is expected to influence the relationship between marginalization and decent work.

**Purpose of the Study**

The current study addresses the experiences of Black bisexual women in the workplace and thus renders them more visible in the existing literature. There has not been much research centered around this group of women, which has resulted in their relative invisibility in psychological research (Henderson, 2009; Wilson et al., 2011). More specifically, this study aims to examine the relationship between experiences of marginalization (assessed via gendered racial microaggressions and bisexual microaggressions) and decent work. Work volition was
examined as a mediator and proactive personality as a moderator for the relationship between these gendered racial microaggressions and decent work. The examination of work volition as a mediator and proactive personality as a moderator for the relationship between bisexual microaggressions and decent work was also conducted.

The findings from this study expand vocational research in the exploration of marginalized people's experiences. This study contributes to the research base by combining literature from microaggressions research, the psychology of working theory, and intersectional research to better understand how a multiplicity of marginalized experiences can impact groups, specifically Black bisexual women, in the workplace.
LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter provides an overview of relevant literature on the main concepts and variables relevant to the study. These concepts include gendered racial microaggressions, bisexual microaggressions, decent work, work volition, and proactive personality. The chapter begins with a brief overview of the history of work for Black women in the United States to contextualize the experiences of microaggressions and work for Black bisexual women. Since the study is framed around the experiences of Black women who identify as bisexual in the United States, prior theoretical approaches to understanding the lived experiences of Black women including an intersectional lens are reviewed. Next, foundational microaggression research in connection to gendered racial and bisexual-specific microaggression research is briefly reviewed. Specifically, an overview of relevant research for gendered racial and bisexual-specific microaggressions is provided. Lastly, there is an overview of research on central concepts within the psychology of working theory, including decent work, work volition, and proactive personality, and examine their connection with the intersecting forms of marginalization experienced by Black bisexual women. The chapter concludes by outlining the purpose of the study which is to examine gendered racial and bisexual-specific microaggressions within the psychology of working framework for Black bisexual women.

Historical Overview: Black Women in the United States

Black women, especially in the United States, live at the intersection of racial and gender oppression as racial and gender minorities (Lewis & Neville, 2015; Shorter-Goeden, 2004; Szymanski & Stewart, 2010). Black women are often gendered and racialized in oppressive ways across multiple contexts and situations. Considering Black women’s experiences of oppression, their experiences differ from other groups, such as White persons or men (Szymanski & Stewart,
2010). It is important to recognize the historical origins of their mistreatment to contextualize their contemporary experiences.

Based on gender, class, and race, Black women have historically occupied a social position where they were denigrated virtually since their arrival in the United States. The denigration of Black women began with the enslavement of Africans in the United States (Balfour, 2005). During this time, Africans were treated and referred to as animalistic and were vulnerable to assaults on their humanity. Although the dehumanization of slavery and White supremacy impacted all Black people during the antebellum period, some forms of degradation were reserved for Black women only (Balfour, 2005). For instance, while Black women labored like men in the fields, they still experienced increased vulnerability to rape and sexual assault, were used for breeding, economically exploited, and denied opportunities to grieve when separated from their children when they were sold away (Beale, 2008; Shorter-Gooden, 2004).

Thus, Black women’s experiences in the United States have always been distinctly different from enslaved Black men and all White women regardless of their social economic status.

Post-enslavement, Black women continued to experience denigration based on race and gender. Black women worked primarily as domestic workers as other economic opportunities were not accessible to them, and therefore, they continued to be vulnerable to abuse and sexual assault while working in White people’s homes (Yanick & Feagin, 1998). At a time when it was inappropriate for middle and upper-class White women to work outside the home, the vast majority of Black women worked outside their homes and predominantly worked in the homes of Whites. This work cannot be attributed to volition or choice, as Black women did so in response to persistent and pervasive economic oppression experienced by Black people in the United States. Even if Black people were able to obtain work, there were limited job
opportunities for them regardless of gender. Most of the work available consisted of low-wage
domestic or farm work on the land or in the homes of previous enslavers. Thus, Black women
had to work to contribute financially to their homes as a means of survival for themselves and
their families. This type of economic oppression based on sexism and racism persisted for Black
women even into the Civil Rights era (e.g., Adams & Lott, 2019; Duran, 2016).

During the Civil Rights era, Black women continued to be vulnerable to gendered racial
oppression, such as stereotyping, sexual assault, and economic oppression (Brodkin, 2014;
McGuire, 2011). Segregation in the workforce left Black women vulnerable to unlivable wages
and undefined work hours as domestic workers (Brodkin, 2014). In addition to economic
disadvantages faced by both Black women and men, Black women continued to be vulnerable to
sexual assault from White men at work and in their daily lives (Brodkin, 2014; McGuire, 2011).
Black women historians noted that despite these adverse experiences, Black women’s issues were
not a central focus in civil rights movements with Black men and White women (Harris-Perry,
2011).

The exclusion and separation of Black women’s issues from that of Black men and White
women are illustrated by the suffragist movement (Epps & Warren, 2020). Despite contributing
to the suffragist movement, much of the White women suffragist movement excluded issues
related to race and, therefore, also excluded Black women. Even when Black men obtained the
right to vote, Black women did not, as the 15th Amendment did not mention sex (Epps &

Furthermore, the exclusion of Black women from the suffragist and civil rights
movements is illustrated by the erasure, silencing, and overall treatment of prominent, well-
known Black women activists who made major contributions to several movements and events
in U.S. history. Among these activists was Ida B. Wells who contributed tremendously to work on African American civil rights and women’s suffrage. She was one of the co-founders of the National Association of Colored Women (NACW) and founded another organization focused solely on voting rights for Black women in 1913. Despite these major contributions, she experienced racial discrimination within the suffrage movement, as evidenced by being told to move to the back in the suffrage parade in Washington.

Other prominent Black women activists, such as Mary Churchill Terrell and Mary Mcleod Bethune, also made contributions arguing against racial inequity and promoting women’s rights (Epps & Warren, 2020). These activists made significant contributions and took leadership roles in organizations such as the National Association of Colored Women (NACW), a Black women's organization focused on civil rights and women’s suffrage. Mary Churchill Terrell was the only Black woman to be invited to speak on the struggle of women and women of color at the International Congress of Women in 1904. Additionally, Mary McLeod Bethune was the director of Negro Affairs of the National Youth Administration and became the president of the NAACP in 1940 (Epps & Warren, 2020). However, like activists prior, all these women, as well as countless others, had suffered the same fate, as they also experienced exclusion and were practically erased from many records of the history of women’s suffrage and African American civil rights (Conway, 2021).

During the same time, another Black women leader and activist in the Black Freedom Movement (BFM), Ella Baker, made major contributions to the BFM. Like other Black women in these movements, she was not acknowledged as were her male counterparts for her contributions to the BFM (Ransby, 2003). Ella Baker was a monumental figure who contributed significantly to the foundation of several Black Freedom organizations, including the Student
Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), the NAACP, and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) (Ransby, 2003).

Another prominent figure in women’s rights and civil rights, Dorothy Irene Height also made significant contributions to these movements and received less recognition than her male counterparts (Giardina, 2018). Height, who was mentored by Bethune, acted as the president of the National Council of Negro Women starting in the late 1950s (Williams, 2011). She also earned several awards for her activism including the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1994 and the Congressional Medal in 2004 (Williams, 2011). She was also known for bringing attention to the struggles of Black women through activism such as leading protests at the Bronx Slave Market (Giardina, 2018). As others mentioned previously, Height was also excluded from historical narratives of civil and women’s rights movements and major events (Williams, 2011). Notably, along with other Black women activists, she was not asked to speak at the March on Washington with her male counterparts despite her attendance, her position, and her impact on these movements (Williams, 2011). Overall, Height throughout her life made major contributions to racial and gender justice and liberation despite experiencing racism and sexism herself.

The Montgomery Bus Boycott further illustrates the exclusion of Black women activists from these movements or historical narratives. The famous Montgomery Bus Boycott was started by Black women which is not common knowledge. Following the removal and arrest of Rosa Parks, the Women's Political Council (WPC) led by Jo Ann Robinson (Gupta, 2016) was instrumental in the mobilization and organization of the Black community during this critical moment in Civil Rights history. Additionally, following the Montgomery Bus Boycott, several of the plaintiffs in the Browder vs Gayle case, the federal case to make bus segregation illegal, were Black women (Sexism and the Black community, 2014).
Despite the perpetual exclusion of Black women’s impact on significant historical events in the United States, they had a significant influence on civil rights movements for Black people and women. Despite the progress in bridging some economic and educational opportunities for racial and gender minorities since the Civil Rights Movement, gendered and racial oppression persists in the present-day lives of Black women in the United States. Specifically, Black women are negatively impacted by discrimination daily in most aspects of their lives.

The historical oppression of Black women is still vivid through the portrayal of Black women through stereotypical images in media and throughout society in which Black women’s relationship status, appearance, sexuality, and attitudes are presented stereotypically (Harris-Perry, 2011; Warren-Gordon & McMillan, 2022). These stereotypical perceptions of Black women inform the treatment of Black women across various contexts. Biased treatment of Black women is exhibited by criminal justice discrimination, discrimination in healthcare, educational settings, politics, and workplace discrimination (Harris-Perry, 2011; Thomas et al., 2011; Waldron, 2019). These contemporary issues facing Black women are reflective of the gender oppression imposed on them throughout US history and highlight the need for continued examination of their gendered racial experiences.

Theorizing Black Women’s Gendered Racial Experiences

The purpose of this section is to review the history and theoretical analysis of Black women and their unique gendered racial experiences. This section begins with an overview of the history of Black women in social movements and then proceed to review the history and importance of Black women scholars producing narratives about Black women’s daily existence in the United States. This section ends with a brief overview of gendered racism as it is relevant
To understand and contextualize the history of Black women in the United States, it is necessary to expose the erasure of Black women from important historical events and movements. Although Black women live at the intersection between racial and gendered oppression in a racist and sexist society, Black women were marginalized and excluded from both antiracist and feminist movements (Combahee River Collective, 1977). Excluding Black women prevented these movements from confronting racism and classism embedded in the feminist movement and sexism embedded in the antiracist movement. These movements excluded Black women as any attention towards the multilayered oppressions experienced by Black women was seen as threatening to the central ideals of the antiracist and feminist movements (Crenshaw, 2013). Therefore, Black women were not acknowledged for their pivotal roles in the antiracist and feminist movements. In response, Black women began to engage in discourse to redefine themselves and engage in the analysis of their gendered racial oppression.

Black women early on began articulating their experiences within the U.S. Evidence of this perspective includes abolitionist and women’s suffrage activist, Sojourner Truth's, famous speech, *Ain’t I A Woman*, in which she discussed the position of Black women in the United States during and post enslavement (Truth, 1851). She particularly discussed how Black women inherited the burden of enslavement and the restrictions imposed on womanhood while being denied any privileges allotted to Black men or White women (Truth, 1851). Truth’s work for racial equity was evident in her work during the Civil War with the Union Army and work with the newly freed people. Not only did Truth recruit Black troops for the Union Army but she worked for the National Freedman’s Relief Association where she worked with freedmen in
refugee camps (Hopkins et al., 2020). She even spoke on behalf of the Union Army. After the civil war, Truth continued to work on racial equity and women’s rights and even campaigned with the federal government to promote a new state for freedmen in the West (Hopkins et al., 2020).

Alongside Truth and other Black feminists throughout early US history, Harriet Tubman argued against racial and gender oppression. Tubman embodied Black feminism in her resistance to her oppression at the intersection of race and gender. Before the Civil War, Tubman conducted the underground railroad and made approximately nineteen trips, freeing hundreds of enslaved persons (Crewe, 2006; Hopkins et al., 2020). During the Civil War, Tubman worked in the Union Army as a cook, nurse, and spy. Significantly, she led the Black troops that freed over seven hundred persons in the Combahee River Raid (Harding, 2020).

During the Civil Rights era, some Black women activists added to the dialogue regarding the inclusion of Black women in politics and education, including Fannie Lou Hamer and Daisy Bates. Fannie Lou Hamer was another prominent activist in civil rights and electoral politics for Black persons in the United States (White, 2017). Hamer was an SNCC organizer in the 1960s and co-founded the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party (MFDP) (Gumbs, 2020). She famously started the Freedom Farm Cooperative (FFC) in the 1960s as well for Black people to own and work the land (White, 2017). Despite all her contributions, Hamer experienced being barred from being highlighted at larger civil rights events, and her role in the civil rights movement was minimized in historical recounts. Another prominent Black activist, Daisy Bates was not only co-founder of the Arkansas State Press newspaper, but she also was an advocate for school desegregation (Freeman & Roessner, 2022). Bates served as the President of the Arkansas chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) (Carter,
2015; Freeman & Roessner, 2022). During this time, she also was a media liaison for the NAACP regarding school desegregation and she strategized the integration of Central High School in Little Rock in the late 1950s (Carter, 2015; Freeman & Roessner, 2022). The legacy of these early Black feminists laid the foundation for later work by more contemporary Black feminists.

More recently, documentation of Black women’s analysis and production of work-centering narratives of their lives and oppression is evident in the Combahee River Collective (1977) statement. Through this statement, the Combahee River Collective (CRC) precipitated and laid the foundations for Black feminist and intersectional work. The activists that wrote the CRC statement, Barbara Smith, Beverly Smith, and Demita Frazier, coined the term identity politics and provided a way of organizing a critique of society in the United States and its impact on Black sexual minority women. Before this statement, there was no understanding of interlocking oppression that had been documented (Nayak, 2019). Therefore, this seminal work inspired a significant increase in theorizing and research on interlocking oppression experienced by many groups across the globe including intersectional work.

Following the Combahee River Collective, Black feminist scholars have continued to produce literature and scholarship on the needs and perceptions of Black women’s lives (e.g., Collins, 2000; Harris-Perry, 2011; hooks, 2014). Through their scholarship, Black women redefined femininity and their womanhood from how femininity and womanhood were traditionally defined by characteristics associated with middle-class White women (Beale, 2008). Black feminism has allowed Black women to voice their perspectives about their oppression and to challenge the dominating White masculinist epistemology (Collins, 2000). Black feminist
work, therefore, is connected to the overall survival and redefinition of Black womanhood despite dominant perceptions of Black women.

In addition to the survival and redefinition of Black womanhood, contemporary Black feminists are concerned about the intersecting politics of empowerment, social realities, and domination (Collins, 1989; Harris-Perry, 2011; hooks, 2014). Distinguishing features of Black feminism include resisting oppression, heterogeneous collectivity, and the distinction between ideas and experiences (Collins, 2000). Other distinct features of Black feminist work are the intellectual production and activism of African American women scholars and the change in practice and knowledge of Black feminist work to influence social conditions. Frameworks birthed from Black feminist thought extend upon these distinguishing features to address the social conditions, experiences, and oppression facing Black women (Adams & Lott, 2019).

Overall, Black feminism is used by scholars to address the matrix of domination that is experienced by Black women. Thus, the intellectual production of Black feminists created a foundation for the analysis of the intersections of race, gender, sexuality, and class among other distinctive identities (Hooks, 2007).

In more contemporary work, interlocking oppression has been addressed through the framework of intersectionality. Black feminist and critical race scholar, Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989) coined the term intersectionality to describe a framework for analyzing the interlocking forms of oppression experienced by Black women in various contexts. The intersectional framework began as a Black feminist critique of the limitations of the antidiscrimination doctrine as well as feminism and antiracist movements (Hooks, 2014). Black women were often excluded in the courts where discrimination based on both race and gender was not perceived to be plausible (Crenshaw, 1989). Therefore, intersectionality provides a theoretical foundation in
which to analyze and conceptualize Black womanhood across varying contexts including vocational and psychological domains.

Intersectionality has also been used to explore identity politics and variables such as race and gender in psychological research (Lewis et al., 2017). Previously, gender and race were referenced as unidimensional variables, however, researchers have found that single-axis investigation of race or gender may not encompass the experiences of Black women (Bowleg, 2008). Gender and race have also been researched additively (race + gender). However, based on the intersectional analysis, the interconnecting experience of gendered racial oppression is greater than the sum of racial and gender-based oppression (Crenshaw, 1991; Stevens-Watkins et al., 2014). Therefore, an analysis of sexism or racism separately cannot produce an accurate illustration of the oppressive experiences targeting Black women.

In addition to using an additive lens, Black women scholars have used a comparative lens to describe how oppression impacts various aspects of their life (Lewis et al., 2017). In a comparative lens, Black women’s experiences are compared to other groups who share racial or gender identities (i.e., Black men and White women) to highlight the differences in their experiences (Jones & Day, 2018). By using a comparative lens, Black women scholars attempt to assert the distinctiveness in the needs and identity of Black women separate from that of Black men and other women (Jones & Day, 2018). Black women scholars have investigated and presented the multidimensionality of Black women’s identity. Over time, however, to capture the simultaneous experiences of race and gender for Black women, scholars have used an intersectional lens. Black women scholars have taken an intersectional or additive approach to articulate how race, class, and gender inform Black women’s experiences in educational
In addition to the intersectional lens of race and gender, there have been other concepts and frameworks to account for the multilayered experiences of Black women. Double jeopardy and triple jeopardy refer to the multilayered oppression experienced by Black women and how racism has been gendered. The frameworks not only refer to the daily lived experience of Black women in various contexts but also refer to larger societal and structural sources of oppression.

Double jeopardy was developed by Frances Beale (1972) and is used to contextualize the lives of Black women. According to this framework, Black women experience double jeopardy in that they experience both racism and sexism that imposes sex roles that are informed by capitalism and White supremacy (Beale, 1972). Later scholars expanded the double jeopardy framework to incorporate sexual identity (Bowleg et al., 2003). This expansion refers to the triple jeopardy framework (named like the Third World Women’s Alliance newspaper, *Triple Jeopardy: Racism, Imperialism, Sexism*), describing the simultaneous experiences of racism, sexism, and heterosexism for Black sexual minority women (Bowleg et al., 2003). These frameworks are critical as they are heavily centered on Black women and are useful for the critique of the oppression faced by those with oppressed racial, gender, and sexual identities.

Another framework used to describe Black women’s experiences is the construct of gendered racism, which describes the simultaneous experiences of sexism and racism. Gendered racism is defined as the overlapping experience of sexism and racism (Essed, 1991). According to Essed (1991), racial domination interacts with class and gender domination over racial and gendered minorities like Black women. Thus, the concept of gendered racism further builds upon the historical legacy and prior work of Black women intellectuals and activists as this concept
was used to analyze and articulate the interlocking forms of oppression experienced by Black women.

Prior research has documented that gendered racism can be pervasively detrimental to the mental health and wellness of Black women (Spates et al., 2020; Syzmanski & Lewis, 2016; Young et al., 2021). Gendered racism is associated with stress, psychological distress, suicidal ideation, depressive symptoms, and reproductive health disparities, including mortality following childbirth among Black women in the United States (Perry et al., 2012; Rosenthal & Lobel, 2018; Williams & Lewis, 2019). Even when Black women have adequate coping and psychosocial resources, gendered racism is linked to increased levels of psychological distress, posttraumatic stress syndrome, low social self-esteem, and less social support (Baalbaki, 2019; Jones et al., 2021; Perry et al., 2012; Syzmanski & Lewis, 2016; Thomas et al., 2008).

Gendered racism can also negatively impact access to economic and psychosocial resources for Black women (Spates et al., 2020). A lack of resources and psychosocial resources is detrimental to Black women. For example, in a study examining psychosocial resources and suicidality with a community sample of 204 Black women from lower socioeconomic statuses, Perry and colleagues (2012) found that negative life appraisal as a condition of gendered racism was strongly associated with suicidality. However, this was only true amongst Black women with lower psychosocial resources and less active coping (Perry et al., 2012). This implies that psychosocial barriers, often influenced by experiences of systemic oppression, further exacerbate the aversive mental health outcomes of Black women.

Another systemic consequence of gendered racism in the lives of Black women is their experience of lack of access to adequate healthcare (Chinn et al., 2021; Spates et al., 2020). Black women have increased vulnerability to reproductive and cardiovascular health concerns.
(Chinn et al., 2021). In fact, according to the CDC, in 2019 Black women had a significantly higher rate of postpartum mortality and maternal morbidity than White or Hispanic women (Chinn, 2021; Hoyert, 2021). Black women’s experiences of gendered racism carry over to other sectors of their lives as well.

Another sector where gendered racism impacts Black women is the workplace. In the workplace, gendered racism often translates to stereotyping, lower wages, less upward mobility, and social isolation for Black women (Spates et al., 2020). Furthermore, the systemic impact of gendered racism is evident in the limited access to resources and the economic disparities for Black women working in the U.S. (Kim, 2020). As stated previously, the economic disparities for Black women are evident as Black women make lower wages than their male or White counterparts (Spates et al., 2020). To compensate for lower wages, in addition to working full time, Black women may have to find additional sources of income or work additional hours to support themselves and their families.

In addition to these concerns about lower wages, gendered racism is also harmful as it can manifest as negative perceptions White people, including White coworkers and employers, have of Black women (Essed, 1991; Lewis et al., 2016). These perceptions (i.e., stereotypes) shape how Black women are treated in predominantly White workspaces. Stereotypes are used as means to control and exploit Black women and often contribute to the mistreatment of Black women in the workplace. These stereotypes include archetypes such as the Mammy, Jezebel, Sapphire, Black superwoman, welfare queen, and Black matriarch (Waldron, 2019). For White coworkers who have limited contact with Black persons outside of the workplace, the perpetual portrayal and understanding of Black women as these stereotypes often influence the treatment of Black women in predominantly White workplaces. Therefore, even when issues of inequity
and inequality are acknowledged in workspaces they are often minimized. This is due to stereotypes of Black women being used to justify the exploitation of Black women in the workplace (Waldon, 2019). Thus, gendered racism in the workplace for Black women manifests as stereotyping, social alienation, poor treatment, and barriers to success in the workplace that have a clear interpersonal and systemic reality that impacts the quality of life.

In summary, Black women have not received recognition as contributors to racial and gender equity work, yet they have continued to use their voices to critique the interpersonal and systemic realities of oppression as evidenced by the frameworks and constructs mentioned previously (Carbado, 2013; Cole, 2020; Velez, 2019). One of these constructs, gendered racism, is based on the foundational work examining racial, gender, and sexual oppression to explore the impact on healthcare, mental health, the economy, and especially, the workplace. Research on the lived experiences of Black women and gendered racism is important as it has laid the groundwork for examining the connection between systems of oppression and interpersonal experiences of oppression in the form of gendered racial microaggressions.

**Microaggressions**

To provide context for understanding gendered racial microaggressions, it is important to start with a brief overview of their predecessor (i.e., racial microaggressions). Microaggressions research began with the exploration of racial microaggressions and later led to the examination of other forms of microaggressions (Sue, 2005; 2007). Much of how racial research was conducted is replicated with other forms of microaggressions. For example, gendered racial microaggressions and bisexual microaggressions research have expanded on the foundational knowledge and empirical knowledge on racial microaggressions. Thus, to understand the impact and the rationale of gendered racial and other forms of microaggressions (i.e., gendered racial
and bisexual microaggressions), it is important to understand the rationale and literature on racial microaggressions.

The term microaggressions were coined by Chester M. Pierce in the 1970s when he explored the interpersonal interactions between Black and White people and White people’s perpetuation of racism (Pierce et al., 1977). In a study conducted by Pierce and colleagues on the representation of Black persons in television commercials, they defined microaggressions as “subtle, stunning, often automatic, and nonverbal exchanges which are ‘put downs’ of Blacks by offenders” (p. 65). According to Pierce and colleagues, microaggressions are a primary mechanism by which racist ideology, such as the idea that Whites are superior to Black people, is communicated.

Pierce et al. (1977) especially noted how racist ideology was perpetuated on television when Black persons were more likely to be shown in subservient roles on television while White persons were in superior roles. Likewise, Pierce and colleagues (1977) also found a discrepancy in representation between White and Black women, with White women doing voiceovers, demonstrating generosity, and representing beauty/grooming. Black women, however, did not engage in any of these activities. Instead, Black women were overrepresented as hourly wage workers more often than men and White women (Pierce et al., 1977). Thus, it is not uncommon for these messages of racist ideology (i.e., ideas that racial minorities are inferior to White people) to resonate with White people who do not self-identify as White supremacists and who may also interact with persons of color regularly (Sue, 2005). Thus, while overt racism is less common, it is easier to identify than covert racism which has a lasting impact on its victims.

Building on the concept of microaggression coined by Pierce et al. (1970), Derald Wing Sue (2005; 2007) significantly expanded the literature on microaggressions and popularized the
use of the construct within both scholarly and popular media. Sue emphasized the importance of psychology considering the impact of racial microaggressions in his presidential address to the APA’s Division 17 (Sue, 2005). In his address, Sue (2005) urged the field of counseling psychology to intervene and attend to racism in the United States and he challenged the deception that racism was only perpetuated by White supremacists. He focused on the impact of “contemporary racism” and challenged White Americans to examine how they were implicated in perpetuating the legacy of White supremacy (Sue, 2005, pp. 109).

In 2007, Sue and colleagues expanded on the prior work on racial microaggressions by identifying three forms of racial microaggressions and providing implications for clinical practice for White clinicians working with people of color. These authors defined racial microaggressions as “brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, and environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative racial slights and insults to the target person or group” (Sue et al., 2007, p. 273).

Sue and colleagues (2007) identified three forms of racial microaggressions including microinsults, microinvalidations, and microassaults (Sue et al., 2007). Microinsults are defined as an act or comment that is subtle and shows disdain, rudeness, or insensitivity to someone based on their race. An example of this could be assuming someone got their job due to fulfilling a diversity quota rather than being qualified for the job. Microinvalidations are subtle communication exchanges in which the experiential reality of the person of color is negated. Microinvalidation could happen when someone repeatedly mistakes people of the same race for one another or makes comments about their intelligence based on racial stereotypes (Sue et al., 2007). Lastly, a microassault is a “verbal or nonverbal attack” meant to be derogatory toward a person of color, such as referring to someone with a racial epithet (Sue et al., 2007). These
authors argued that racial microaggressions manifest across various themes as assumptions of inferiority, criminality, visibility, second-class citizenship, and exoticizing (i.e., oversexualizing or being treated as exotic).

Themes of racial microaggressions identified in previous literature demonstrate how racial microaggressions can be experienced by racial minorities across contexts (Kalemba, 2022; Nadal, 2014; Nadal et al., 2014; Spanierman et al., 2021). For instance, assumptions of criminality might look like a Black person being followed around a store because it is assumed that they will steal. Assumptions of inferiority could include a White person complaining about how loud a Black person is because they assume this behavior is inferior or abnormal, while it might be normal in other cultures. The cumulative effect of these racial microaggressions can be harmful to Black people.

Given the connections made about the impact of racial microaggressions on historically marginalized populations, subsequent research has built on the foundational work on microaggressions created by Chester Pierce and Derald Wing Sue. Scholars have expanded their focus to other forms of microaggressions and have begun to examine the themes and impact of microaggressions that are specific to different groups. Since this study is examining the experiences of Black women with gendered racial microaggressions, the next section focuses specifically on literature concerning gendered racial microaggressions.

**Gendered Racial Microaggressions**

Gendered racial microaggressions (GRMs) are subtle acts of gendered racism that negatively impact Black women daily (Lewis et al., 2013). This concept, used to describe covert discrimination towards Black women based on race and gender, was developed from the foundational frameworks of racial microaggressions towards individuals of color (Pierce, 1970;
Sue et al., 2007) and gendered racism (Essed, 1991). Despite the prevalence of gendered racism in the lives of Black women, few researchers conducted quantitative examinations of these experiences until recently (Lewis & Nevil, 2015). As one way of capturing how gendered racism impacts the everyday lives of Black women, researchers have focused attention on gendered racial microaggressions (Lewis & Neville, 2015). Although the study of GRMs is more recent, it aligns with the legacy of Black feminists who explored the intersections of Black women’s experiences (Combahee River Collective, 1977; hooks, 2014).

GRMs are measured by the Gendered Racial Microaggression Scale (GRMS) which was developed by Lewis and Neville in 2015 based on Black women’s experiences. The GRMS measures subtle forms of gendered racism to account for the impact of subtle acts on the lives of Black women (Lewis & Neville, 2015). Lewis and Neville identified several commonly experienced gendered racial microaggressions. Some of these GRMs include assumptions of beauty that compare Black women to Eurocentric or White standards of beauty, and the stereotyping of Black women as Mammies, Welfare Queens, Jezebels, or Matriarchs (Lewis & Neville, 2015). GRMs also include silence and marginalization based on the marginalization and visibility of Black women (Lewis et al., 2016; Williams & Lewis, 2019). The development of the GRMS has contributed to an increase in attention to Black women’s experiences with gendered racial microaggressions.

To better understand available literature that has used Lewis and Neville’s (2015) GRMS, the following section provides an overview of extant studies focused on GRMs. Since the construction of the GRMS in 2015, 18 peer-reviewed studies were identified through the PsycINFO database on Black women and gendered racial microaggressions as measured by the
gendered racial microaggressions that have been published between 2015 and 2022, using search terms Black, Black women, and gendered racial microaggressions.

Among these 18 studies, four explored coping mechanisms for GRMs for Black women (Dale et al., 2019; Dale & Safren, 2020; Syzmanki & Lewis, 2016; Thomas & Dale, 2021) and nine examined the relationship between GRMs and mental health concerns (Baalbaki, 2019; Burton et al., 2022; Dale et al., 2019; Erving et al., 2022; Martins et al., 2019; Moody & Lewis, 2019; Sissoko et al., 2022; Williams & Lewis, 2019; Wright & Lewis, 2020). Four studies were exploring the link between GRMs and physical health (Lewis et al., 2017), body image (Dunn et al., 2019), and one study on GRMs with Black adolescent girls (Gadson & Lewis, 2022). Lastly, two studies associated GRMs with topics like the current study, one focued on sexual orientation with Black cisgender women (Matsuzaka et al., 2022), and another used the psychology of working framework to explore the work experiences of Asian American women (Choi et al., 2022). The next paragraphs provide more information regarding these studies on GRMs.

In the 6 studies on the relationship between GRMs and mental health, GRMs have been found to exacerbate mental health concerns such as psychological distress, depression, suicidality, anxiety, and trauma. For example, Martins and colleagues (2020) found that a higher frequency of GRMS was associated with worsened mental health and lower self-esteem for a sample of 76 Black women. Other studies found that psychological distress was predicted by GRMS for Black women who believed in the strong Black woman stereotype, a schema that describes Black women as independent, strong, and willing to sacrifice their needs for others (Baalbaki, 2019; Thomas et al., 2022; West et al., 2016). In one qualitative study with 249 Black women, Wright and Lewis (2020) found that higher levels of stress from experiencing GRMs
were associated with higher levels of anxious arousal for Black women. Taken together, these studies demonstrate the deleterious effects of GRMs on Black women’s mental health.

GRMs negatively affect Black women across the lifespan. For example, GRMs were associated with negative mental health outcomes for Black college women (Martins et al., 2020; Wright & Lewis, 2020). In addition to the connection between trauma and GRMs in Black women in general, negative mental health outcomes were associated with GRMs specifically for Black college women as well. Two studies were conducted on GRMs of Black college women, one at a historically Black college or university (HBCU) (Erving et al., 2022) and another at a predominantly White institution (PWI) (Burton et al., 2022). Erving and colleagues (2022) reported that the Angry Black Woman Stereotype of GRMs was associated with higher depressive symptoms amongst all forms of GRMs for their sample of over 200 Black women at an HBCU. The other study conducted at the PWI found a relationship between GRMs with depression and psychological distress (Burton et al., 2022). GRMs of being silenced and marginalized and the Strong Black Woman stereotype were the most strongly related to depression and psychological distress for Black college women attending the PWI. These studies indicate that GRMS harms the mental health of Black women in various settings.

The connection between GRMs and mental health for Black women was also studied by examining their impact on trauma. GRMs were found to have a significant relationship with trauma symptoms for Black women (Dale et al., 2019; Moody & Lewis, 2019; Sissoko et al., 2022). For example, Sissoko and colleagues (2022) examined the relationship between skin tone satisfaction with GRMs and traumatic stress for Black women. They found GRMs were associated with traumatic stress and skin tone satisfaction. Additionally, these authors showed that specific subscales of the GRMS, such as Assumptions of Beauty, Sexual Objectification, and
Silenced and Marginalized, predicted traumatic stress. These findings indicate that Black women may experience GRMS as a form of racial trauma that they must deal with in their daily lives.

Other studies examining GRMs and trauma have focused on Black women living with HIV. Three studies on GRMS and Black women have also been conducted on the links between GRMs and mental health for U.S.-based Black women living with HIV. Dale and colleagues (2019) found that for Black women living with HIV higher GRMs combined with either higher HIV-based discrimination or racial discrimination led to higher posttraumatic symptoms. In two other subsequent qualitative studies, GRMs were also linked to increased depressive symptoms and suicidality for Black women with HIV (Dale & Safren, 2020). Taken together, these studies also verify the connection between GRMs for a subset of Black women, which could be generalizable to other groups of Black women.

In the literature on GRMs and Black women, the influence of both gendered racial identity centrality (salience or importance of gendered racial identity) and coping on the GRMs-mental health link were examined. Coping, and gendered racial identity were explored as buffers against GRMs for Black women. Szymanski and Lewis (2016) studied the relationship between gendered racism, using the GRMS, with psychological distress while examining mediators of coping and identity centrality for a sample of two-hundred-twelve African American women college students. They found that disengagement (internalization/self-blame and detachment) coping mediated the relationship between psychological distress and gendered racism (measured by the GRMS). Essentially, disengagement coping with associated with less psychological distress. However, gendered racial identity centrality was not found to moderate the relationship between gendered racism and coping or gendered racism and psychological distress.
Additionally, in a survey-based study, Lewis and colleagues (2017) examined the relationship of GRMs with health outcomes and examined coping as a moderator and gendered racial identity centrality as a potential moderator. In this study, higher frequencies of GRMs were found to have a relationship with more disengagement coping and adverse health outcomes (mental and physical). Although these studies found that coping impacted Black women’s experience of mental or psychological health, gendered racial identity was not found to be a definite moderator. Since coping influenced the impact of GRMs on Black women while identity did not, rather than further explore the moderating effect of gendered racial identity, it is important to further explore how Black women’s responses to GRMs act as a buffer.

Moreover, while coping responses can influence the intensity of the impact GRMs have on mental health concerns, the type of coping or response Black women have to GRMs is important. For instance, physical activity as a coping mechanism did not act as a buffer against anxious arousal for Black women experiencing gendered racial microaggressions (Wright & Lewis, 2020). While coping mechanisms such as detachment and internalization influence the impact of GRMS, these forms of coping are often associated with worsening outcomes for Black women (Lewis et al., 2017; Syzmanski & Lewis, 2016). Meanwhile, engagement coping (resistance and education) was found to not influence the impact of GRMs on mental health at all (Lewis et al., 2012; Syzmanski & Lewis, 2016). With the discretion between what type of responses influence the impact of gendered racial microaggressions, it is imperative to further explore how responses to or coping with gendered racial microaggressions impact the lives of Black women.

Other research indicates that when combined with other stressors or discrimination, GRMs can exacerbate mental health concerns for Black women even further than experiencing
GRMs alone. For example, in a survey study on Black women, GRMs, and traumatic stress, Moody and Lewis (2019) found that sexual orientation was associated with trauma symptoms. Within their sample of 226 Black women, 27% (n = 41) identified as an LGBQ individual, and 7% identified as bisexual (n = 16). This study indicates that sexuality-based discrimination can also negatively impact mental health for Black women with other marginalized identities. Additionally, Sissoko and colleagues (2022) reported that sexual minority Black women participants endorsed higher levels of traumatic stress compared to heterosexual participants. Therefore, it is not only important to look at how Black women respond to GRMs but also to examine how other forms of discrimination, such as discrimination based on sexuality, influence the impact of GRMs. However, the existing literature is limited in its focus on GRMs that affect Black women with multiple marginalized identities. Additionally, it is critical to explore how various settings that Black women inhabit are shaped by their experiences of GRMs. The workplace is one of the primary settings where Black women must interact with others. Given the present study’s focus on Black women’s work experiences, the next section explores the literature on GRMs and Black women.

**Gendered Racial Microaggressions and Work**

Prior studies indicate that GRMs are frequent in the workplace (Dickens et al., 2019; Fredriksen-Goldsen et al., 2010; Kerr et al., 2013; Parker et al., 2022; Smith-Tran, 2022). As such, Black women are reduced by gendered racism in the workplace which occurs via the daily experience of GRMs (Lewis, 2013). In the workplace, GRMs can manifest in many ways and have an overall negative impact on the well-being and work-related outcomes of Black women. The most common forms of GRMs in the workplace include ways in which Black women are silenced (visibility) and marginalized (assumptions of aesthetics and stereotyping) (Lewis, 2013).
Lewis reported that Black women experience being silenced by way of being rendered invisible in the workplace. Silencing or being invisible often involves Black women being ignored in meetings, not being acknowledged for contributions or accomplishments, or others taking credit for their work. Regarding other common GRMs reported in the literature, Black women are marginalized through assumptions about physical appearance and communication style in the workplace and how individuals interact with them based on these assumptions (Dickens et al., 2019). For example, a co-worker may imitate stereotypical communication styles only when interacting with Black women. While silencing and marginalization are common forms of GRMs that occur daily in the workplace, there are other ways in which GRMs show up in the workplace.

In addition to being rendered silenced or invisible, Black women may also experience the feeling of being under a microscope in the workplace, thus being hypervisible (Settles et al., 2019). Black women are hypervisible in terms of being monitored or under heightened surveillance in the workplace (Dickens et al., 2019; Obasi, 2021). Hypervisibility also includes being seen as a representative and acting on behalf of entire racial and/or gender communities. Thus, this common form of GRM forces Black women to consider how they navigate visibility in the workplace.

Among the common forms of GRMs is the marginalization that occurs when Black women are stereotyped as “Mammy” in the workplace (Dickens et al., 2019; Hill, 2019). The pervasiveness of the Mammy stereotype in the workplace has been documented (Hills, 2019; Wingfield, 2007) but is under-researched in vocational literature. Mammy is a stereotypical archetype developed during slavery, where Black women were viewed as surrogate mother figures who willingly and happily sacrificed their all for the well-being of Whites (Hills, 2019).
In the context of the workplace, Black women are given higher work demands and expected to sacrifice their time and production for the well-being of the organization or business where they are employed (Reynolds-Dobbs, 2008). While this occurs, the effect of the Mammy stereotype is further perpetuated as Black women are still expected to present as nurturing based on racialized gender roles (Hills, 2019). Navigating stereotypes and expectations based on race and gender can negatively impact the interpersonal interactions Black women regularly have at work.

GRMs manifest in interpersonal interactions in the workplace and workplace policies. For instance, GRMs can take the form of policies restricting hairstyles that specifically single out Black women, such as restricting braids, hair coloring, or Afros (Greene, 2011). GRMs can also transpire through Black women being assigned to the least desirable work tasks (Dickens et al., 2019). GRMs are also often expressed in the exploitation and over-sexualization of Black women in workspaces (Mowatt et al., 2017; Wingfield, 2007). Thus, workplace policies and procedures offer Black women less protection and can be harmful.

Experiencing gendered racism in the form of GRMs is harmful as it can lead to several workplace challenges. Gendered racism has been found to impede workplace performance and mobility and contribute to social exclusion for Black women in the workplace (Wingfield, 2007). According to DeCuir-Gunby and Gunby (2016), racial microaggressions were found to be associated with lower job satisfaction and higher levels of detachment coping (avoidance and exclusion) for a community sample of 44 Black educators which consisted of Black women. Thus, experiencing GRMs in the workplace can contribute to worse outcomes for Black women.

As a way of coping with GRMs in the workplace, Black women learn to engage in identity shifting (Dicken et al., 2019; Dickens & Chavez, 2017). Identity shifting “is the conscious or unconscious process of shifting one's language, and/or cultural behaviors” (pp. 154,
Black women shift their identities at work for various reasons including as a form of protection against stereotypical perceptions, to overcome economic barriers, for career attainment and mobility, belonging, etc. (Dicken et al., 2019; Dickens & Chavez, 2017). Taken together, Black women will often engage in identity shifting as a way of protecting themselves or a way of expressing complexities in their own identity (McDowell & Carter-Francique, 2017).

While identity shifting is a way for Black women to protect themselves in the workplace, identity shifting does not buffer against the deleterious effects gendered racism has on mental health and there is also a cost to identity shifting (Dickens et al., 2019; Jones et al, 2021).

Taken together, these studies indicate that GRMs in the workplace are harmful to Black women. Therefore, studying GRMs within the workplace allows for the experiences of Black women to be highlighted and increases the potential for challenging the mistreatment of Black women in the workplace. The current study seeks to add to the literature by examining GRMs against Black women in the workplace. This effort to examine GRMs is particularly important since they affect all Black women, but they can be particularly harmful to Black women who hold multiple marginalized identities.

Furthermore, Black bisexual women are even less likely to be considered in the traditional vocational psychology literature (Fouad & Byars-Winston, 2005) or the existing literature on GRMs. Out of the studies conducted on Black women and GRMs, only two used a predominantly sexual minority sample of Black women (Matsuzaka et al., 2022; Moody & Lewis, 2019). For one of these studies, Matsuzaka and colleagues (2022) did a group comparison between Black sexual minority women and Black heterosexual women using the GRMS. Based on the scores, a higher stress appraisal of Beauty and Sexual Objectification was endorsed by Black sexual minority women compared to Black heterosexual women. Since most prior studies
used the GRMS with predominately Black heterosexual women, this study was important as it also validated the use of the GRMS with Black sexual minority women (Matsuzaka et al., 2022).

Taken together, the existing literature on GRMs among Black women indicates that more research is needed on the workplace experiences of Black sexual minority women. Although this literature has documented the deleterious effects of GRMs in multiple settings, including the workplace, gaps exist in available work. One clear gap in the GRM scholarship is the focus on Black women with multiple identities. More work is needed to integrate the experiences of Black women with multiple marginalized identities into the GRM literature. Thus, this study highlights the often-invisible work-related experiences of Black bisexual women. To expand further, the next section covers the experiences of bisexual women and then Black bisexual women.

**Bisexual Women**

As Black women in general experience GRMs that impact their daily lives, Black women who are sexual minorities are marginalized further as they are likely to experience heterosexism along with sexism and racism. This next section of the dissertation narrows its focus to examine the marginalization that Black bisexual women experience. It begins by describing the experiences of bisexual women to contextualize Black bisexual women’s experiences within the broader literature on sexual minorities. Next, the section covers contextual factors such as anti-bisexual discrimination. It then introduces bisexual-specific microaggressions (BSMs) and reports on a systematic literature review of available literature on BSMs. The section concludes by highlighting the links between BSMs and GRMs. The section following this section of the dissertation focuses on the experiences of Black bisexual women.

To understand Black bisexual women, it is necessary to consider the experiences of bisexual women. This information is important in the context of the U.S. as discrimination
against Black bisexual women includes intersectional, historical, and contemporary racial, sexual, and gender-based oppression (Bowleg et al., 2003; Bowleg, 2008; Chmielewski, 2017; Greene, 2000). For Black bisexual women, gendered racial discrimination intersects with discriminatory experiences targeting sexual minorities (Napier, 2015; Wilson et al., 2011). In addition to discrimination targeting sexual minorities, Black bisexual women also experience racial and sexist discrimination. Given that the impact of gendered racism has already been explored in this dissertation, this literature review now examines the experiences of bisexual individuals and then highlights the experiences of Black bisexual women.

Regarding the experiences of bisexuals, discrimination targeting bisexuals stems from biphobia, monosexism, and heterosexism (Flanders et al., 2019; Ross et al., 2010). Biphobia refers to negative attitudes toward bisexual individuals and can be displayed through harmful verbal statements about bisexual individuals (Bradford, 2004; Köllen, 2013; Obradors-Campos, 2011; Yost & Thomas, 2012). Monosexism refers to the privileges allotted to individuals who are attracted to or date people of one gender only (Roberts et al., 2015). Monosexism can manifest through the assumptions such as bisexual women are heterosexual and that bisexual men are gay (Flanders et al., 2019; Roberts et al., 2015; Yost & Thomas, 2012). Lastly, heterosexism refers to privileges provided to persons for identifying as heterosexual and dating a person considered to be the opposite gender or sex (Obradors-Campos, 2011). An example of heterosexism could be an employer offering health insurance for employees that would only cover the health care costs of opposite-sex partners or spouses. Biphobia, monosexism, and heterosexism are important when describing the experiences of bisexuals as these concepts describe larger contextual factors that contribute to the marginalization of bisexual individuals.
Larger contextual factors such as biphobia, monosexism, and heterosexism have been theorized as impacting mental and physical health. A framework often used to conceptualize the relationship between such contextual factors and the mental and physical impact on sexual minorities (i.e., bisexual persons) is the minority stress model (Meyer et al., 2021). When applying the minority stress framework, these contextual factors are referred to as social-environmental determinants that negatively impact the health of sexual minorities (Meyer et al., 2021). There has been prior evidence connecting these social environmental determinants to health for bisexual persons. Minority stress such as antibisexual stigma was found to be related to internalized biphobia and uncertainty about sexuality for bisexual women (Dyar & London, 2018). Thus, the minority stress model highlights how external or social environmental factors (i.e., antibisexual stigma and potentially bisexual microaggressions) negatively impact the psychological well-being and understanding of bisexual people.

Although bisexuals tend to be excluded from research on sexual minority health, bisexual women exhibit higher risks and rates of health disparities (Bostwick & Dodge, 2018). Bisexual women were found to experience several mental and physical health disparities compared to lesbian, gay, or heterosexual groups (Arbeit et al., 2016; Bostwick et al., 2015; Bostwick & Dodge, 2018). Bisexual women report higher rates of psychological distress, mental health concerns, and sexually transmitted infections compared to lesbian and heterosexual women (Bostwick et al., 2015; Bostwick & Dodge, 2018). A longitudinal study by Bostwick and colleagues (2015), conducted on a sample of 366 bisexual and lesbian women, highlighted several health disparities unique to bisexual women. According to this study, bisexual women have similar rates of substance use, depression, and health concerns (cancer, diabetes, hypertension, heart disease) as lesbians. However, bisexual women have higher rates of anxiety,
STIs, and cocaine use than lesbians. Bisexuals also tended to be younger and more likely to live in poverty (Bostwick et al., 2015). This study emphasized that bisexual women were found to have more negative health outcomes compared to lesbian women (Bostwick et al., 2015). Additionally, bisexual girls have reported barriers to adequate health care and sexual health care due to invisibility, bias, and stereotyping (Arbeit et al., 2016). Thus, not only are bisexual women experiencing significant disparities in health they may also experience disparities in receiving effective and adequate treatment.

Furthermore, bisexual women are also at heightened risk of exposure to violence which could exacerbate health concerns. Compared to lesbian and heterosexual peers, bisexual women are at higher risk for sexual assault, rape, and interpersonal violence (Anderson et al., 2021; Bermea et al., 2018). Bisexual women report also experiencing higher levels of severe violence, psychological abuse, and coercive control than heterosexual or lesbian women (Bermea et al., 2018). Some researchers have implied that experiences of discrimination influence experiences of disparities in health concerns and exposure to violence.

The connection made between discrimination and mental health is that discriminatory experiences exacerbate or increase risks for negative mental health concerns. In fact, in a Toronto study on bisexual stigma with a predominantly White sample, Flanders and colleagues (2017) found that bierasure and stereotyping led to bisexual women feeling pressure to modify their behavior, and when they did modify their behavior, this was linked to sexual and mental health disparities. Additionally, young bisexual women have also reported a tendency to experience psychological stress in response to microaggression as responding to and interpreting microaggressions require emotional labor (McClelland et al., 2016). Also, Sarno and Wright (2013) found that microaggressions negatively impact self-esteem and are linked to identity
confusion for bisexuals. Therefore, there is some evidence that there could be a link between discriminatory experiences and bisexual women’s health outcomes. However, within-group differences should be considered as bisexual women can consist of a diverse group of women across other identifying factors. Given that bisexual women are often also gender minorities and are racially diverse, it is important to consider an intersectional lens when considering bisexuals' experiences of discrimination and the impact of discrimination on overall mental health and well-being.

In addition to impacting mental and physical health, larger socio-contextual factors (i.e., racism, sexism, biphobia) inform and are reflected in interpersonal interactions thus adversely impacting the lives of bisexual persons (Rubinstein et al., 2013; Vaughn et al., 2017; Zivony & Saguy, 2018). For instance, bisexuals experience social exclusion from heterosexual, lesbian, and gay communities, thus limiting their opportunities for building community (Bradford, 2004). Negative perceptions and mistrust of bisexuals contribute to their social exclusion (Balsam & Mohr, 2007; Hayfield et al., 2014). These negative perceptions include the belief that bisexuality is illegitimate and the idea that bisexuals are confused or that they are lesbian or gay persons attempting to maintain heterosexual privilege (Bostwick & Hequembourg, 2014).

Additionally, bisexuals are perceived as oversexualized, promiscuous, and hypersexual by individuals within the monosexual community (Callis, 2013; Flanders et al., 2016). Not only does stigma and stereotyping of bisexuals contribute to the exclusion of bisexuals in broader social settings but to their exclusion within dating relationships. Dating exclusion occurs as potential romantic partners may believe bisexuals will leave the relationship or be disloyal to the relationship with a partner of another gender (Flanders et al., 2016). Stereotypic perceptions of
bisexuals as having an illegitimate sexual identity, being unable to trust, and/or being hypersexual influence how others interact with bisexual people.

Discrimination based on disclosure and belonging has been found to contribute to mental health concerns for bisexual women (Ross et al., 2010; Scandurra et al., 2020; Smout & Benotsch, 2022). Disclosure and belonging to the LGBTQ community contribute to mental health concerns for bisexual women as they might be more exposed to experiencing ostracism and discrimination from the LGBTQ community compared to other LGBTQ groups (Persson & Pfaus, 2015). Bisexual women also face numerous forms of discrimination.

Overt discrimination occurs frequently for bisexual women with some forms of discrimination occurring more often than others. Over sexualization, exclusion, and erasure are common forms of discrimination faced by bisexual women (Doan et al., 2018). Bisexuals reported difficulty finding an accepting community due to being stereotyped and their experiences of being oversexualized have been tied to their increased risks of sexual harassment and sexual discrimination (Doan et al., 2018). Another frequent form of discrimination against bisexual women is that bisexual women are often assumed to be lesbian or heterosexual, frequently based on the gender of their romantic partner (Nadal et al., 2011). Therefore, bisexuality is erased, and bisexual women are rendered invisible. Thus, discriminatory experiences for bisexual women are unique to this population, frequent, and suspected to be connected to mental health.

This belief in the illegitimacy of bisexuality is further encouraged by other stereotypic perceptions of bisexual persons. Another form of stereotypical belief about the illegitimacy of bisexuality includes the denial of the complexity of bisexual persons. Denial of complexity refers to the assumption that bisexual women are not bisexual based on their other identities,
intensifying bierasure, or the lack of visibility for bisexuals (Israel, 2018). The sexual identity of bisexuals is often assumed based on the gender of their romantic partner (Molina et al., 2015). Bisexual women are assumed to be heterosexual when dating a man and assumed to be lesbian when dating a woman. Additionally, assumptions about sexual identity are made based on the expression of gender and heteronormativity. Feminine bisexual women are assumed to be heterosexual sometimes even after disclosing their sexual identity. Thus, these stereotypic perceptions of bisexuals impact the interactions bisexuals have with others daily and are often manifested as bisexual microaggressions. Therefore, the next section specifically focuses to examine bisexual microaggressions.

**Bisexual Microaggressions**

It is important to note that the study of microaggressions experienced by bisexual persons is also based on the foundational work around microaggressions experienced by racial and ethnic minorities (Pierce, 1970; Sue, 2010). While the initial focus of microaggressions research was on racial and ethnic minorities, the concept of microaggressions was expanded to include other groups including sexual minorities (Platt & Lenzen, 2013). However, while the concept expanded to include microaggressions experienced by sexual minorities broadly (Nadel et al., 2011), sexual minority microaggressions failed to capture the nuanced microaggressive experiences faced by bisexual individuals.

The concept of bisexual microaggressions was developed to explore the nuanced microaggressive experiences of bisexual persons. Bisexual microaggressions are covert forms of discrimination targeting bisexuals that can occur across various contexts (e.g., family, work, community) (Bostwick & Hequembourg, 2014). They are defined as commonplace and daily insults and slights targeting bisexual persons that occur intentionally or are unintentional.
(Bostwick & Hequemborg, 2014; Flanders et al., 2019) and have been used to describe daily
discriminatory experiences for bisexuals and their impact on bisexual persons (McClelland et al.,
2016). Bisexual microaggressions have also been used to explain the distinct experiences and
mental health disparities among bisexual women (Bostwick & Hequemborg, 2014). Bisexual
people can experience bisexual microaggressions from their family, friends, romantic partners,
coworkers, or even strangers. These microaggressions can vary and range from negative
statements about bisexuality or physical violence targeting a bisexual person. Thus, bisexual
microaggressions are prominent and can vary.

Despite this reality, bisexual persons are also often rendered invisible in the literature on
sexuality and sexual minorities (Bostwick & Dodge, 2018; Bostwick & Hequemborg, 2014;
Roberts et al., 2015). Given that this dissertation is focused on microaggressions for Black
bisexual women, this section provides information on literature and scholarly knowledge on
bisexual women’s experiences of microaggressions.

In terms of measuring bisexual microaggressions, the instrument used for this study is the
Bisexual Specific Microaggression Scale for Women (BMS-W). The BMS-W was developed in
2018 by Flanders and colleagues to measure the distinctiveness of the experiences of bisexual
women. This scale measuring the experiences of bisexual women was necessary as studies
before the development of this scale reported differences in the experiences of bisexual women
and bisexual men (Flanders et al., 2018). Some of the differences that have been noted between
bisexual women and men are that bisexual women are more often seen as heterosexual, over-
sexualized, and tend to be viewed less negatively than bisexual men. Given the uniqueness of
bisexual women’s experiences, it is imperative to measure their experiences separately to get an
accurate account of their experiences.
Furthermore, experiences of microaggressions for bisexual women capture the complexity of their covert experiences in detail. However, bisexual experiences were initially measured and defined in a way that either did not include microaggressions or specify the experiences of bisexuals. For instance, the Anti-Bisexual Experiences Scale (ABES; Brewster & Moradi, 2010) was used to measure discrimination and perceived prejudices experienced by bisexual persons but does not examine microaggressive experiences (Dyar et al., 2019). The Sexual Orientation Microaggressions Scale (SOMS; Nadal et al., 2011) is another popular measure that was used to measure the experiences of sexual minorities but does not specifically examine bisexual experiences (Flanders et al., 2019). Therefore, to gain information on the experiences of covert marginalization for bisexual women, the BMS-W is a more appropriate scale as it measures the microaggressive experiences specifically for bisexual women.

Other than the one article detailing the recent development of the Bisexual Specific Microaggression Scale for Women (BMS-W), only three other articles that focused on bisexual microaggressions (e.g., Bostwick & Hequembourg, 2014; Bostwick et al., 2021; Legge et al., 2018) were identified in a database search. All these articles were published within the last decade. Overall, these articles focused on bisexual microaggressions including bisexual microaggression experiences for specific racial groups (Bostwick & Hequembourg, 2014; Bostwick et al., 2021; Legge et al., 2018), experiences of young bisexual persons, and the forms of bisexual microaggressions experienced by bisexual persons. Given the limited literature on bisexual microaggressions, the following paragraphs provide a detailed examination of these studies.

One of the three studies was a qualitative study using two focus groups (Bostwick and Hequembourg, 2014). Bostwick and Hequembourg identified several types of bisexual
microaggressions based on a sample of ten bisexual women. Nine of the participants identified as White and one identified as Multiracial; none of the participants were Black. In the present study, seven forms of bisexual microaggressions were identified as being commonly experienced by this group of bisexual women. These themes included hostility, denial/dismissal, unintelligibility, pressure to change, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender legitimacy, dating exclusion, and hypersexuality (Bostwick & Hequembourg, 2014). This study provides qualitative evidence that bisexual women have unique experiences of discrimination that occur frequently and covertly. One limitation of this study is the reliance on a majority White sample. Therefore, information related to this sample may not be transferable or applicable to a racial minority sample, including Black bisexual women.

While Bostwick & Hequembourg’s (2014) study provided insight into the types of commonly experienced bisexual microaggressions, another study provided more details about microaggressions experienced by young bisexual persons (Legge et al., 2018). Legge and colleagues used a 28-day daily diary to explore the negative identity experiences of 91 young bisexual people ages 18 to 30. The researchers did not identify the participants’ racial identities. They used a socioecological model to identify themes presented regarding the experiences of microaggressions young bisexuals have. Legge and colleagues found that young bisexual people experience bisexual microaggressions on institutional, interpersonal, and intrapersonal levels. The same themes were found on the institutional and interpersonal levels, which are erasure, stereotyping, and oppressive discourse.

On the institutional level, young bisexual persons experience microaggressions from institutions such as academic institutions which could include not having any bisexual representation in a sex education course. At the interpersonal level, young bisexual persons often
experience microaggressions from family, friends, coworkers, and other people within their social network. Themes presented at the intrapersonal level included internalized oppression, internalized stereotypes, and ambivalence about coming out (Legge, 2018). An example of this could include a young bisexual person experiencing identity confusion as they have internalized stereotypes about their sexuality being a “phase.” The findings of this study further emphasize themes presented in literature around bisexuals including experiencing antibisexual discrimination at work, from peers, family, and monosexual communities (Arbeit et al., 2016; Bermea et al., 2018; Legge et al., 2018). These findings also allude to the impact of bisexual microaggressions by identifying the internalization that occurs at the intrapersonal level.

Of the three available studies on bisexual microaggressions, Bostwick and colleagues (2021) provides insight into the experiences of sexual identity and intersectional microaggressions for a racially diverse group of bisexual women, including Black bisexual women. The sample of this study included 112 bisexual women, with approximately 25% of the sample being Black bisexual women. While there were no findings in this study specific to Black bisexual women, it provided information regarding experiences of sexual identity and intersectional microaggressions and health outcomes concerning race.

While sexual identity microaggressions apply to all bisexual women’s experiences, intersectional microaggressions are more specific to the experiences of bisexual women of color, including Black bisexual women. Specifically, bisexual women had a high frequency of microaggressions about their bisexuality being a “phase” (Bostwick et al., 2021). Meanwhile, bisexual women of color experienced a high frequency of intersectional microaggressions such as not feeling understood by others within their racial community. Furthermore, intersectional microaggressions were linked to poorer mental and physical health. In fact, in this study Black
bisexual women were less likely to report good physical health than White women. Based on these findings, it is evident that Black bisexual women have unique intersectional experiences that call for further exploration of how they experience bisexual microaggressions.

Considering that there are limited peer-reviewed studies published honing in on bisexual microaggressions, including only one that emphasizes the experiences of bisexual women of color, this focus on bisexual microaggressions is an understudied area. Therefore, a significant amount of information has yet to be explored regarding the impact of bisexual microaggressions. Furthermore, the studies published on both bisexuality and bisexual microaggressions typically consist of a predominantly White sample and few specify gender. Thus, most of what is known about bisexuality and bisexual microaggressions in psychology is mostly based on White bisexuals. Therefore, there is little knowledge about how bisexual people of color, more specifically Black bisexual women, experience bisexual microaggressions. Thus, the next section focuses on the experiences of Black bisexual women broadly.

**Black Bisexual Women**

Considering that the information about bisexual women is limited in psychological research, information about bisexual women of color is even more limited. Although research on bisexual women gives a clear illustration of the health disparities and experiences of discrimination for bisexual women, some researchers have implied there are health disparities amongst bisexual women when considering race (Bostwick et al., 2018; Dodge et al., 2018). Since the current study is on Black bisexual women, the next paragraphs mainly focus on what has been found in the literature regarding Black bisexual women.

In terms of Black bisexual women’s experiences, Black bisexual women experience discrimination based on sexuality and the intersection of race and experience health disparities
different from other groups of bisexual women. For instance, in a survey-based study on attitudes toward bisexuals, participants were asked about their experiences of attitudes towards bisexuality (Dodge et al., 2016). Black participants reported the highest levels of experiencing negative attitudes toward their bisexuality within a predominantly White sample (Dodge et al., 2016). In this same study, women also reported receiving lower levels of negative attitudes toward their bisexuality compared to men (Dodge et al., 2016). Thus, negative attitudes towards Black bisexual women differ from that of other bisexual women due to race.

Regarding health disparities, Bostwick and colleagues (2018) found that Black bisexual women were less likely to experience lifetime depression but more vulnerable to exposure to violence (i.e., intimate partner violence, adult victimization, and sexual victimization). Furthermore, approximately 89% of the Black bisexual women in their sample (n = 61) reported a history of childhood victimization. The findings from both studies suggest that Black bisexual women experience more discrimination and negative microaggressions compared to other groups of bisexual women. This implies that there is more to be explored regarding Black bisexual women’s experiences of discrimination, including microaggressions, as well as the impact discriminatory experiences have on their lives.

Black bisexual women are a less studied population than other groups of bisexuals, thus they are also even less visible in psychological literature. Although research implies some connection between discriminatory experiences and higher rates of health disparities, there has not been enough research to determine this connection, especially for Black bisexual women. Therefore, further investigation is needed to understand how discriminatory experiences are connected to negative mental, physical, and psychological health for Black bisexual women.
Thus, the present study adds to the literature by examining the experiences of bisexual microaggressions on Black bisexual women.

Given that this study is focused on Black women, it is the only study to solely focus on Black bisexuals given that most of the bisexual research has an overrepresentation of White bisexual persons and minimal representation of Black bisexuals (Nadal, 2019). The importance of addressing intersectional microaggressions has also been noted in LGB microaggression research (Nadal et al., 2016; Nadal, 2019). Lastly, the current study also contextualizes the bisexual microaggression experiences of Black bisexual women in the workplace. This study adds depth to this experience for Black bisexual women by examining the microaggressive experiences they face as bisexual women in the workplace.

**Bisexual Microaggressions and Work**

External factors such as workplace-related stress could potentially worsen psychological health concerns among bisexual women (Page, 2004). However, few studies have examined the experience of bisexual women in the workplace. Given that marginalization and bisexual microaggressions have been associated with psychological distress for bisexual persons broadly, it is necessary to further examine the impact of microaggressions in various contexts, including the workplace. The available literature on bisexual individuals shows that bisexual microaggressions result in negative psychological outcomes and since they persist in the workplace, further research is needed to determine if they impact work-related outcomes as well.

It is important to research experiences of bisexual microaggressions at work as experiences of marginalization influence work-related outcomes including job turnover, work performance, job satisfaction, and perception of the match between the person and the workplace.
for bisexual persons and Black bisexual women (Corrington et al., 2019; Köllen, 2013; Lyons et al., 2005). However, in addition to general experiences of antibisexual discrimination, the workplace experiences of Black bisexual women are also directly connected to systemic racism, sexism, and heterosexism (Bowleg et al., 2008). For example, Black bisexual women can be vulnerable to discrimination given disclosure of sexual identity in the workplace, feeling less valued in the workplace compared to men, and have trouble fitting into the culture of predominantly White workspaces (Buchanan & Settles, 2019; Button, 2004; Bowleg et al., 2008; Ragins, 2004). Therefore, critical analyses or discussions on the sociohistorical, cultural, and contemporary experiences of Black bisexual women in the workplace are often avoided.

Black bisexual women live at the intersection of racial and sexual identity oppression and are often the targets of microaggressions toward sexuality that occur simultaneously regardless of their environment (Weber et al., 2018). This means that Black bisexual women would face bisexual microaggressions at the same time they are experiencing gendered racial microaggressions in the workplace. These compounding experiences of oppression often influence the perceived severity of discrimination for those with historically marginalized identities, including Black bisexual women (Douglas et al., 2017; Swank et al., 2013). Despite this, the literature addressing the work-related concerns of Black bisexual women is almost nonexistent. While there are some studies on bisexual persons in the workplace with considerations for gender identity, there is not much emphasis on racial minorities (Israel, 2018; Muñoz-Laboy, 2019). Thus, Black bisexual women are an extremely understudied population in the psychology of work.

Despite the reality of persistent marginalization within the workplace, the literature on sexual minorities’ work experiences and Black women’s work experiences are separate (Bowleg
et al., 2008). Thus, Black bisexual women are even less likely to be considered in the traditional vocational psychology literature (Fouad & Byars-Winston, 2005) or the existing literature on GRMS (Gendered Racial Microaggression Scale). Out of the studies conducted on Black women and GRMs, only two used a predominantly sexual minority sample of Black women (Matsuzaka et al., 2022; Moody & Lewis, 2019). For one of these studies, Matsuzaka and colleagues (2022) did a group comparison between Black sexual minority women and Black heterosexual women using the GRMS. Based on the scores, a higher stress appraisal of Beauty and Sexual Objectification was endorsed by Black sexual minority women compared to Black heterosexual women. Since most prior studies used the GRMS with predominately Black heterosexual women, this study was important as it also validated the use of the GRMS with Black sexual minority women (Matsuzaka et al., 2022). Taken together, the existing literature on GRMs among Black women indicates that more research is needed on the workplace experiences of Black sexual minority women.

The simultaneous impact of gendered racial microaggressions and bisexual microaggressions for Black bisexual women makes their experience across contexts unique compared to other racial or sexually minoritized groups, thus making exploration of their experiences necessary. Although the literature has documented the deleterious effects of GRMs in multiple settings, including the workplace, gaps exist in available work. One clear gap in the GRM scholarship is the focus on Black women with multiple identities. More work is needed to integrate the experiences of Black women with multiple marginalized identities into the GRM literature. Thus, this study seeks to highlight the often-invisible work-related experiences of Black bisexual women. Therefore, this study adds to the literature on bisexual microaggressions by specifically looking at the experiences of Black bisexual women.
As marginalization and microaggressions have been examined and correlated to career outcomes, it is imperative to examine this information with Black bisexual women as even the information obtained about sexual minorities as well as racial minorities may not be generalizable to this group. Since the target population of this study is Black bisexual women, intersectional microaggression experiences should be explored beyond only gender and race to also include sexual identity. Therefore, the experiences of bisexual women and the relationship between gendered racial and bisexual microaggressions at work are also further elaborated on. Particularly this current study explores the intersectional relationship between bisexual microaggressions with gendered racial microaggressions for Black bisexual women. Considering that research on bisexual microaggressions is very recent, occurring within the last decade, and is also limited to mostly White samples, the current study adds to existing literature with its focus on Black bisexual women.

Since this study is focused on the work experiences of Black bisexual women, it is necessary to include theory, therefore the next section reviews the psychology of working theory. Using a psychology of working framework, the relationship between GRMs and decent work for Black bisexual women is be examined.

**The Psychology of Working Theory**

This section introduces the psychology of working theory framework (PWT). It starts by introducing the key components of the PWT. After introducing the key components of the PWT, the focus narrows to an exploration of decent work as a key factor in the work experiences of marginalized populations. Sociocultural factors that impact the accessibility of decent work for marginalized populations, including Black bisexual women, are reviewed. Lastly, predictors of decent work are introduced.
The goal of the PWT is the expansion of traditional theories to be more inclusive of how contextual factors impact work experiences (Blustein, 2013). The PWT addresses the influence of social class, choice, marginalization, and privilege on career choice and satisfaction (Blustein, 2016). Within this theory, sociocultural factors, such as social class and marginalization, are treated as essential to understanding career-related experiences.

The PWT proposes that sociocultural factors might influence a person’s ability to secure decent work (Blustein, 2006). Furthermore, those who are disenfranchised or have limited volition could have unique challenges (Blustein, 2006). In combination with PWT, intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1999) expands the understanding of how a singular factor or identity impacts securing work as well as how the intersections of identity influence the ability to secure decent work (Blustein, 2016). While social identities form a matrix of privilege or marginalization that influences whether a person secures decent work, other factors (e.g., financial constraints, proactive personality, and work volition) also impact a person’s ability to secure decent work.

The current study is based on the psychology of working theory which is based on the psychology of working framework that has a focus on the connection between predictors and the accessibility to decent work (Autin & Duffy, 2020). Specifically, some of the central predictors of decent work according to this theoretical model are marginalization based on race, gender, and sexuality as well as financial and economic constraints. According to the psychology of working framework, decent work is a basic human need that is promoted at the individual and systemic levels (Autin & Duffy, 2020). With this being stated, primary mediators between predictors tend to be systemic (marginalization and economic constraints) and decent work includes work volition, which happens to be based on the individual. Since decent work is the central
component of the psychology of working framework, the next section presents literature on decent work.

**Decent Work**

Decent work is the central component of the PWT (Blustein, 2001; Duffy et al., 2016). Decent work is a concept incorporating social justice to work globally and includes the work experiences of people with marginalized identities (Duffy et al., 2018). By accessing decent work, people can satisfy psychological needs, such as needs for survival and power as well as improve their well-being (Duffy et al., 2016). Components of decent work include the quality of working conditions such as safe working environments and adequate healthcare (Duffy et al., 2016, 2018). The interaction between contextual factors such as marginalization (i.e., microaggressions), and psychological factors, such as proactive personality and work volition, contribute to an individual's ability to secure decent work (Duffy et al., 2016). With consideration for decent work as a central component of the PWT, the following section presents a brief review of the literature on decent work.

Decent work as a concept was based on an initiative by the International Labor Organization (ILO) to address the accessibility of quality work to individuals seeking work globally (Blustein et al., 2016). Decent work is defined by the ILO based on global standards of acceptable work and the perception of work as a human right (Blustein et al., 2016, 2019, 2020). Based on the ILO, decent work is defined by several domains including promoting employment, maintaining social protection for workers, promoting social dialogue between worker organizations and amongst governments, and fulfilling the right to dignified and just work (Blustein et al., 2016, p. 3). In fact, according to the ILO, a lack of decent work is associated with negative societal outcomes including poverty, compromised safety at work, child labor, and
gender-based discrimination (Blustein et al., 2020; ILO, 2019). Thus, opportunities for decent work are important to the quality of life across global economies.

After the establishment of decent work as a concept approximately two decades ago by the ILO, the concept has been adopted by fields such as law, politics, philosophy, sociology, and economics (Pouyard, 2016). Decent work has recently been integrated into psychology (Blustein et al., 2016). Given that decent work was originally measured by global indicators (child labor laws, minimum wage, etc.), the political elements of decent work are difficult to conceptualize psychologically and apply to an individual. The development of the psychology of the working framework allowed for the psychological evaluation of decent work while keeping in mind the political elements of decent work (Blustein, 2006; Duffy et al., 2016).

The conceptual and operational definition of decent work has also been expanded in psychology. Researchers in psychology redefined and expanded the dimensions of decent work through the development and use of the Decent Work Scale, based on the PWT (Duffy et al., 2018). There are five dimensions of decent work through a psychological framework and the Decent Work Scale, like the dimensions identified by the ILO. These five dimensions consist of hours that allow free time and adequate rest; physically and interpersonally safe working conditions; adequate compensation; adequate healthcare; and organizational values that complement family and social values. Variations in the measurement and operationalization of decent work include similar or overlapping constructs such as values, hours working, and health and safety (Ferraro et al., 2018). Thus, decent work has been expanded to establish how researchers can evaluate to what extent work is considered decent work and how decent work can fulfill the needs of the individual.
According to the ILO, decent work can meet three major needs including the need for survival and power, social connection, and self-determination (Blustein et al., 2016). Higher levels of decent work have been linked to meeting the needs for survival and autonomy (Blustein et al., 2020). Decent work was also found to impact mental health through the ability to meet the needs of survival, social contribution, and self-determination. Decent work was found to impact physical health by way of meeting survival needs. Essentially, a person's ability to meet survival, social contribution, and self-determination needs through accessing decent work contributes to their mental and physical health (Duffy et al., 2019). In addition to mental and physical health outcomes, decent work has also been associated with positive work outcomes including higher levels of job satisfaction (Blustein et al., 2020). However, accessing decent work to meet needs is not guaranteed for all people. Some conditions create or alleviate barriers to decent work. There are common contextual and personality traits that predict or influence the chances of accessing decent work.

Common predictors of decent work, which are also core concepts of the PWT, include marginalization and economic constraints. The ability to access decent work is complicated by a lack of power and resources including social class, economic constraints, and marginalization such as workplace discrimination (Allan et al., 2019; Duffy et al., 2020). More research is also being conducted on the accessibility of decent work for various marginalized populations, specifically sexual, racial, and gender minorities.

Research examining the experiences of sexual minorities with decent work reveals more about the predictors that influence decent work for this population. Prior research indicates that sexual minorities experience limitations and barriers to securing decent work (Douglas et al., 2017). Barriers to decent work for sexual minorities include economic constraints,
microaggressions, and marginalization based on sexual identity and gender expression, which include workplace discrimination. For example, in a study examining decent work with a sample of majority White sexual minorities, Allan and colleagues (2019) examined predictors and outcomes of securing decent work for the sexual minority working adult population. In this study, decent work was negatively predicted by social class and positively predicted by work volition. Decent work was found to mediate the relationship between work volition and workplace climate and was found to predict meaningful work (Allan et al., 2019; Douglas et al., 2017).

In another study, Douglas and colleagues (2017) examined decent work as influenced by work volition, meaningful work, and career adaptability with sexual minorities. In this study, heterosexist discrimination, as measured by the Heterosexist Harassment, Rejection, and Discrimination Scale (HHRDS; Szymanski, 2006), and social class were found to have an indirect and negative impact on accessibility to decent work. Work volition influenced the relationship between marginalization and the ability to secure decent work for sexual minorities. In another study on gender and sexual minority employees, Smith and colleagues (2020), found that decent work was predicted by financial strain and psychological ownership and was predicted by an unsupportive LGBTQ+ work climate by way of psychological ownership, when a person has feelings of possession and ownership over their work, and work volition (Smith et al., 2020). Thus, these studies highlighted the relationship between marginalization and decent work for sexual minorities broadly.

Other studies have provided support for examining decent work with other marginalized populations, including racially diverse individuals. An examination of decent work with ethnically and racially diverse employees revealed that marginalization, measured by the
Workplace/School Microaggressions subscale of the Racial and Ethnic Microaggressions Scale (REMS; Nadal, 2011), predicted decent work for racially diverse persons as well (Duffy et al., 2018). Other variables such as work volition, psychological factors such as career adaptability, and economic resources were also examined and found to influence access to decent work (Duffy et al., 2018). Duffy and colleagues (2019) conducted another study examining the PWT with 287 racial and ethnically diverse employees. These authors found that marginalization, as measured by the Lifetime Experiences of Marginalization Scale (LEMS), was a significant predictor of decent work (Duffy et al., 2019). Therefore, these studies provide evidence of the relationship between the inaccessibility of decent work and the marginalization of racial and ethnic minorities.

Another relevant group with whom decent work has been examined includes gender minorities, specifically women. England and colleagues (2019) examined predictors for decent work for a sample of over 500 women. Several predictors were found for decent work including career adaptability, marginalization, and work volition. Economic constraints indirectly predicted decent work through work volition and marginalization also predicted decent work through work volition. Work volition, as measured by the Work Volition Scale, was examined as a mediator and predictor for decent work, as measured by the Decent Work Scale (England et al., 2019). Therefore, work volition has been shown to influence the impact of predictors of decent work, including marginalization, for women. Gender has also been considered in research on decent work focused on the impact gender norms have on what is considered decent work. Rai and colleagues (2019) discussed the distinction between valued and paid labor based on gender norms. Based on gender norms, labor typically associated with women such as social reproductive labor or household labor was considered work and was unpaid. Considering gender
when examining decent work is important to determine what is considered decent work as well as the experiences of decent work for women and other gender minorities such as Black bisexual women.

While these prior studies provide support for examining the link between decent work and various forms of marginalization for sexual minorities, racial and ethnic minorities, and women, it is important to understand how the PWT applies to individuals with multiple marginalized identities. The PWT was also examined in a study where race and gender were considered simultaneously with a racial and gender minority sample in the workplace. Kim and colleagues (2022) examined decent work for women of color, with much of their sample being Black women. Women of color experience higher levels of economic constraints and marginalization in the form of workplace discrimination or harassment, two prevalent predictors of decent work, compared to White women and men of color. Kim et al.’s (2022) findings were that marginalization, measured by the Lifetime Experiences of Marginalization Scale, and economic constraints predicted lower levels of decent work for women of color. Work volition also impacted the relationship between marginalization and economic constraints with decent work for this sample of women of color. Given that this study found significant relationships between decent work with marginalization and work volition for similar groups to that of the current study, this may hold with Black bisexual women.

Considering their shared social identities with the prior groups as gendered, racial, and sexual minorities (Duffy et al., 2019; England et al., 2019; Kim et al., 2022), Black bisexual women have difficulty accessing and securing decent work. However, there has not been any empirical investigation of Black bisexual women’s experiences with decent work. There has been a minimal examination of how decent work impacts multiple marginalized groups aside
from the previously mentioned study with women of color (Kim et al., 2022). Additionally, while decent work has been explored with other forms of marginalization facing racial, sexual, and gender minorities, it has not been examined directly with gendered racial and/or bisexual microaggressions. The current study addresses this gap in the literature by focusing on one multiply marginalized group (i.e., Black bisexual women) using two forms of marginalization that have not been assessed in the psychology of working literature (i.e., GRMs and BSMs).

Based on the psychology of working framework, marginalization acts as a barrier to decent work for marginalized groups including racial, gender, and sexual minorities. Therefore, it is likely this relationship is the same between decent work and GRMS as well as bisexual microaggressions for Black bisexual women based on this framework. In the current study the relationship between decent work with forms of marginalization not accessed before with this concept (gendered racial and bisexual microaggressions) for Black bisexual women is examined.

Personality characteristics associated with decent work, such as proactive personality and work volition, have rarely been examined together. Therefore, examining how personality characteristics influence the ability to secure decent work despite experiences of microaggressions might provide insight into protective factors for Black bisexual women seeking to secure decent work (Fabio & Kenny, 2016). The next two sections of this chapter focus on these two personality characteristics.

**Work Volition**

Vocational psychologists have become increasingly interested in the impact of volition and marginalization on a person’s career experiences (Brown & Lent, 2016). Thus, researchers have investigated work-related variables such as work volition. Work volition is defined as an individual’s perception of their agency in their career decision-making process despite
constraints (Autin et al., 2017; Duffy et al., 2012; Duffy et al., 2016). According to the PWT, work volition significantly impacts access to decent work and the ability of work to meet survival and psychological needs (Duffy et al., 2016). Work volition includes the perception and reality of career constraints and volition. Thus, work volition has been operationalized through the measure of volition and constraints (Duffy et al., 2012). These two components incorporate the interaction of personal factors with environmental variables. Volition is a person’s perception of their power to choose, and constraints include economic or structural constraints, such as racial and sex discrimination or financial constraints. Given the importance of work volition in the PWT, it is important to conduct a more detailed examination of the available literature on work volition.

A PsycINFO search identified approximately 60 articles published within the last decade in which work volition was a central focus. Approximately half of those studies were conducted within the United States. The other half were conducted in other countries and used different versions of the Work Volition Scale, in various languages, to assess work volition. Regarding the studies conducted in the United States, the majority examined work volition using the PWT. These studies covered common predictors and variables associated with work volition and work-related outcomes associated with work volition and examined work volition with marginalized groups, including sexual, racial, and gender minorities. No articles were identified that focused on Black bisexual women or other bisexual individuals. Therefore, this section presents a review of the general literature related to work volition U.S.-based research.

In U.S.-based research, work volition is associated with several variables and predictors across a variety of samples. Specifically, work volition was examined in a study with a sample of veterans and found to be connected to trauma and personality characteristics (Duffy et al., 2015).
In this study, work volition was indirectly related to PTSD (posttraumatic stress disorder) symptoms, neuroticism, and conscientiousness by way of locus of control with veterans.

Other predictors found to associate with work volition in U.S. research include economic background and health. At least two studies explored work volition with economic background (Allan et al., 2020; Autin et al., 2016). With a sample of college students, work volition, as measured by the Work Volition Scale-Student Version was also found to be partially predicted by economic deprivation (i.e., higher levels of economic deprivation were related to low levels of work volition) (Allan et al., 2020). Using a study with a predominantly White sample of over 300 working adults in the United States, 50% female and 8% African American, Autin et al. (2016) reported that work volition was predicted by social class with lower levels of work volition found among adults in lower social classes. Overall, these studies imply that work volition is influenced by economic background and that this needs further examination for populations like the one for the current study.

In addition to economic background, health was explored in other studies and found to be associated with work volition. For instance, U.S.-based studies revealed another predictor associated with work volition among college students is health (Bouchard & Nauta, 2018, 2021). In terms of work volition and health, prior research also identified an association between work volition and health symptomology and illness perceptions for college students (Bouchard & Nauta, 2021). In fact, in a separate study on college students and work volition with health, health was found to impact work volition which then predicted short-term career outcomes for college students (Bouchard & Nauta, 2018). As stated in the PWT, work volition is impacted by both economic and social constraints, such as economic deprivation, health, and social class.
Thus, individuals with higher levels of constraints might experience lower levels of work volition which in turn can impact their career outcomes.

Research has also revealed work volition to be a predictor for several career-related outcomes. Specifically, work volition is positively associated with career outcomes such as career maturity, career adaptability, job satisfaction, work autonomy, work self-efficacy, work locus of control, meaningful work, and career decision-making self-efficacy (Autin et al., 2016; Autin et al., 2017; Duffy et al., 2018; Duffy & Autin, 2013; Duffy et al., 2013; Duffy et al., 2015). Regarding work volition and career adaptability, Duffy and colleagues (2015) explored work volition as a mediator between career adaptability and academic satisfaction with a sample of undergraduate students 70% of whom identified as female and 5% as African American. They found that higher work volition was predicted by control, an aspect of career adaptability, meaning to perceive the ability to make one’s own decisions, and career decision self-efficacy.

In terms of job satisfaction, Duffy and colleagues (2015) explored mediators of the relationship between work volition and job satisfaction for a sample of employed adults, the majority of whom identified as female. Results indicated that work meaning, as measured by the Work as Meaning Inventory (Steger et al., 2012), mediated the relationship between work volition and job satisfaction. Higher levels of work volition predicted greater job satisfaction if the work was viewed as meaningful. Work volition was also found to predict work meaning, work that individuals find to be meaningful, and person-environment fit (Duffy et al., 2015). Therefore, higher levels of work volition can influence a person’s experience, perception, choice of, and accessibility of quality work (Jadidian & Duffy, 2012).

Work volition is a common predictor of work outcomes central to the PWT. Work volition has been found to predict decent work, which refers to the quality of work (Autin, 2019).
For example, work volition has been commonly found to predict decent work or mediate the relationship between decent work and other variables across various populations (England et al., 2019). Particularly, the relationship between work volition and decent work has been examined with marginalized groups such as racial minorities, women, and sexual minorities. For example, in a sample of Spanish-speaking Latinx workers in the United States, work volition was found to predict decent work and mediate the relationship between marginalization and decent work (Autin et al., 2021). Higher levels of work volition reduced the adverse impact of marginalization on the perception of decent work (Autin et al., 2021). Work volition was found to mediate the relationship between economic constraints as well as marginalization and decent work for a sample of employed women (England et al., 2019). For sexual minorities, work volition was found to act as a mediator for predictors of decent work such as social class and workplace climate (Allan et al., 2019). Taken together, the results of these studies indicate that there is a relationship between work volition and decent work for racial, sexual, and gender minorities.

A few U.S.-based studies have further explored work volition with sexual minorities and women of color. Research exploring work volition amongst working adult sexual minorities in the United States has also confirmed the positive connection between work volition and workplace outcomes including decent work (Smith et al., 2020). In a study by Smith and colleagues on gender and sexual minority employees examining the PWT, work volition was strongly and positively associated with psychological ownership, a feeling of possessiveness or ownership of work, and was found to predict decent work. They also found that work volition was negatively influenced by financial strain, or stress about finances, and an unsupportive LGBTQ+ work climate, a negative work environment that negatively impacts LGBTQ+ people’s
work experiences. Lastly, they found work volition reduced the impact of financial strain and unsupportive LGBTQ+ work climate on the accessibility of decent work (Smith et al., 2020).

In another study on sexual minorities and the PWT, work volition predicted decent work and mediated the relationship between marginalization (heterosexist discrimination) and decent work (Douglass et al., 2017). Allan and colleagues (2019) also found work volition to be associated with social class, workplace climate, and decent work with sexual minorities in which approximately 50% of the sample identified as female, 40% as bisexual, and 10% as African American. In this study, work volition was found to predict decent work and was predicted by social class and workplace climate. Decent work also mediated the relationship between work volition and workplace climate and the relationship between work Volition and workplace climate for that study (Allan et al., 2019). In another US-based study, focused on employed, sexual-minority adults, work volition was positively related to career adaptability (Douglass et al., 2017). According to Douglass and colleagues (2017), higher work volition was linked to the attainment of decent work, and marginalization impacted the level of work volition for sexual minorities. Therefore, work volition has more specifically been found to influence the relationship between marginalization and decent work for sexual minorities.

Work volition has also been examined with individuals who identify as both racial and gender minorities. With a sample of racially and ethnically diverse employed adults of whom over 30% identified as African American and 51% as female, Duffy and colleagues (2018) examined work volition as a mediator between economic resources with decent work and marginalization with decent work and/or career adaptability. Work volition was found to be higher for individuals with higher economic resources and lower for individuals who experienced higher marginalization (as measured by the REMS which measures racial
microaggressions) (Nadal, 2011). Work volition was directly associated with higher career adaptability and decent work in this study. Additionally, work volition also mediated the relationship between economic resources and marginalization with decent work (Duffy et al., 2018). Thus, work volition is predicted by experiences of constraints and marginalization. Work volition has been found to predict greater work-related outcomes including the accessibility of decent work for racially minoritized women. In another study, Kim and colleagues (2022) examined the PWT for women of color, whom the majority identified as African American, and found work volition to be negatively associated with economic constraints. They also found that work volition mediated the relationship between decent work with marginalization and decent work with economic constraints (Kim et al., 2022). Thus, for women who identify as racial and ethnic minorities, work volition was also found to significantly relate to marginalization and decent work as predicted by the PWT.

When considering the workplace experiences of sexual minorities that are also racial minorities, it should be considered that work volition impacts the ability to access decent work for racial minorities as well (Douglass et al., 2020). Therefore, racial discrimination acts as a potential barrier to securing decent work as evidenced by the economic disparities between racial minorities and Whites. However, the perception of barriers and psychological variables mediate the relationship between constraints and decent work (Douglass et al., 2020). Thus, individuals who perceive fewer barriers to decent work might be more likely to access decent work regardless of whether they are marginalized based on race (Autin et al., 2021). However, there should be additional considerations regarding the impact of work volition on the work experiences of those facing multiple forms of marginalization like Black bisexual women.
Facing multiple forms of barriers to occupational choice might increase the influence of marginalization on the relationships between constraints and decent work. For Black bisexual women who experience multiple forms of marginalization, their perception and appraisal of varying experiences of marginalization might differ. For instance, Black sexual minority women perceive experiences related to race, gender, and sexuality as additive or intersectional (Bowleg, 2008). To elaborate further, a microaggression or marginalizing event might be attributed to racism rather than racism combined with heterosexism and sexism. Thus, while the limited literature on sexual minorities and racially diverse employees can be useful in its application to groups like Black bisexual women, it does not offer a complete understanding of how work volition influences their access to decent work. As there has been no prior examination of work volition with individuals who identify as both racial, gender, and sexual minorities, it is necessary to examine how multiple forms of marginalization may influence work volition among Black bisexual women.

Therefore, this study examines whether work volition mediates the relationship between gendered racial microaggressions and bisexual microaggressions and decent work for Black bisexual women. Black bisexual women are potentially more vulnerable to more barriers to decent work due to their multiple marginalized identities. As such, higher work volition may increase the likelihood that they perceive themselves as having obtained decent work. Since there are no studies on Black bisexual women or Black women and decent work, this study can provide insight into contributing factors to securing decent work for Black bisexual women.

Moreover, work volition has been found to positively influence the relationship between forms of marginalization (i.e., heterosexist discrimination or racial discrimination) and decent work for racial, sexual, and gender minorities. Based on the psychology of working theory, work
volition influences the relationship between marginalization (i.e., gendered racial and bisexual microaggressions) and decent work. Thus, based on this theoretical lens, it is proposed in the current study that work volition mediates the relationship between decent work and analogously gendered racial and bisexual microaggressions for Black bisexual women.

Overall, based on these prior studies, it is demonstrated that personality traits, such as work volition, impact the work experiences of marginalized persons, and therefore, further examination is needed on personality traits and marginalized groups. Thus, this study adds to the literature on PWT regarding the connection between personality traits in accessing decent work. While the PWT integrates work volition as a key personality characteristic in accessing decent work, it also identifies proactive personality as another important variable to consider. Thus, the next section of the dissertation focuses on proactive personality.

Proactive Personality

Another factor examined in the PWT, and the present study is proactive personality. Proactive personality refers to a personality trait that involves an individual’s tendency to be oriented to change their environment rather than adapt to their environment (Bateman & Crant, 1993). Proactive individuals are more likely to seek opportunities and alter their environment to meet their needs. Proactivity is theorized to influence the ability to respond to the environment despite experiences of marginalization (Bateman & Crant, 1993). Thus, a proactive personality could be helpful to Black bisexual women experiencing gendered racial and bisexual microaggressions in the workplace. Thus, proactive personality is used as a moderator in the current study and this section reviews the extant literature on proactive personality.

A literature search on proactive personality was conducted using the PsycINFO database. The search revealed 486 journal articles, dissertations, books, and book chapters published on
proactive personality. Of these publications, 418 were scholarly journal articles. To reduce the number of articles reviewed and include the most recent literature, the search was narrowed by publication date to see what has been published within the last decade (2012-2022).

Approximately 388 journal articles, dissertations, books, and book chapters were published in the last decade. Of these publications, 340 consisted of peer-reviewed journal articles on proactive personality published between 2012-2022. Studies conducted within the last ten years in the United States with similar samples (i.e., racial and gender minorities) were reviewed specifically. Broadly speaking, studies within the past ten years have focused on the relationship between proactive personality and other variables including but not limited to career adaptability, coping in the workplace, job performance, job satisfaction, academic self-efficacy, entrepreneurial intention, and work engagement, and organizational commitment (e.g., Bergeron, 2014; McCormick et al., 2019; Spitzmuller et al., 2015).

Prior research has connected proactive personality to career-related outcomes (Cai et al., 2015; Jiang, 2017; Tolentino et al., 2014). According to Shabir and colleagues (2013), individuals with proactive personalities are more likely to be active in career decision-making and career management. Proactive individuals are more likely to obtain support for their careers, engage in career planning, seek job-related information, and overcome obstacles in their careers (Fuller et al., 2010; Gerhardt et al., 2009). Proactive personality is also associated with job performance, work-related motivation, entrepreneurial vocational interests, career exploration, and job search success (Brown et al., 2006; Major et al., 2006). Thus, a proactive personality relates to and likely impacts work-related behaviors and perceptions of work (Neneh, 2019; Shabir et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2014).
In addition to individual career outcomes, proactive personality is also associated with environmental factors in the workplace. Environmental factors such as feedback and treatment can influence proactivity in the workplace (Wang et al., 2017). For instance, negative feedback or treatment from leaders and supervisors can either promote proactivity for some or discourage proactivity for others (Yang et al., 2017). The proactivity of leaders and supervisors can influence the proactivity of supervisees and workers as well. If proactivity is encouraged, proactive employees are more likely to be engaged in the place of work, thus leading to positive work outcomes, such as career support and positive evaluations from coworkers and supervisors (Yang et al., 2017). Proactivity is not only influenced by environmental factors but also influences environmental factors. In the case of supervisory relationships, proactivity positively influences perceptions and evaluations as proactive employees are often perceived as highly motivated (Bakker et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2017). Thus, proactive individuals have the capacity to not only adapt to their environments, but also alter their environments.

While proactive employees expect to change their work environment to fit their needs, environmental factors or negative events also impact career outcomes and perceptions of the work environment. Given that proactive individuals influence and expect to influence their environment, many of these negative events such as job insecurity or receiving negative feedback can be avoided, however, other negative events are not as avoidable (Lin et al., 2018). When negative events occur, proactive individuals are more vulnerable to negative work experiences.

An example of this is that the negative effect of job insecurity is more intense for proactive individuals (Lin et al., 2018). This is partially due to proactive individuals no longer feeling in control of their environment which can diminish feelings of competency and agency in
the workplace. Proactive individuals want positive feedback and might feel devalued and inadequate when they are not provided positive feedback and evaluations at work (Lin et al., 2018). This can influence work performance for employees. Specifically, Black women were more likely to report that they allowed others’ perceptions of them to impact their work performance (McCluney & Rabelo, 2019). When considering that negative events at work can include marginalization such as microaggressions, similar effects may occur. When microaggressions are directed toward marginalized identities, minority employees may feel devalued regardless of their level of proactiveness in the workplace (McCluney & Rabelo, 2019).

Although the literature search using PsycINFO revealed that there has not been any research on proactive personality for Black bisexual women or LGBT individuals, there has been some research on proactive personality that has focused on gender and race separately. In studies on gender and proactive personality, gender and sex were often used interchangeably in several studies, appearing to refer to cisgender (identity and gender align with sex assigned at birth according to societal norms; Aultman, 2014) women and/or cisgender men. In studies on gender and sex, proactive personality has been found to influence voice behaviors (i.e., employees’ verbal communication used to improve work-related issues) (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998; Wijaya, 2019) in sex-dissimilar supervisory relationships (Wijaya, 2019). Other research has found that the use of proactive personality by women in the workplace can impact the evaluation of women and their work performance (Bohlmann, & Zacher, 2020). These studies on proactive personality and gender indicate that there is a link between proactivity in the workplace and the perception and treatment of women in the workplace.

In addition to gender and sex, studies on proactive personality with race have revealed information on the relationship between race and proactiveness. Regarding research on proactive
personality and race, there has been some contradictory evidence on racial differences in proactive personality. In a meta-analytic study on proactive personality in the organizational literature, Spitzmuller and colleagues (2015) found no racial differences in the level of proactiveness between Black and White individuals. In contrast, Prieto (2011) found African Americans to have higher levels of proactive personality than Whites when looking at the influences of proactive personality on social entrepreneurial intentions for African American and Hispanic persons. These limited studies on proactivity and race indicate a need for more exploration regarding proactive personality for Black persons as proactiveness might be a method in which they respond to and manage responses to discrimination in the workplace.

In addition to racial differences, proactive personality has been explored simultaneously with race and gender. There is limited research on proactive personality and racial minorities, especially those occupying multiple minoritized identities. Only one study exploring women of color and proactive personality was identified. Park and Rottinghaus (2022) conducted a study on the academic satisfaction, discrimination, and proactive personality of women of color in STEM with a sample that was approximately 29% Black women and 17% bisexual. Results of this study showed that for Black women, proactive personality was found to be associated with barrier-coping self-efficacy (perception about the ability to cope with barriers) and therefore had an indirect relationship with outcome expectations (agreement with positive outcomes), goal progress (perceived progress towards academic goals), and academic satisfaction. Proactive personality was found to contribute to academic satisfaction for Black women.

Given the limited prior literature, further investigation is needed to explore how proactive personality might affect the work-related experiences of Black women, specifically Black bisexual women. Additionally, since there is limited research on proactivity in the workplace, the
psychology of working theory is be referenced to demonstrate how proactive personality theoretically interacts with marginalization and accessing decent work. Further examination is needed to examine whether microaggressions would impact proactivity in the workplace for Black bisexual women. Since there is limited research on proactivity in the workplace, the psychology of working theory was referenced to demonstrate how proactive personality theoretically interacts with marginalization and accessing decent work.

**Proactive Personality and Psychology of Working Theory**

PWT theorists propose that a proactive personality buffers the effects of marginalization and constraints on work volition (Duffy et al., 2016). PWT theorists also propose that proactive personality buffers the aversive impact of marginalization and constraints while an individual pursues decent work. Proactive individuals are more likely to act to ensure their environments meet their needs of survival, self-determination, and social connection (Greguras & Diefendorff, 2010; Prabhu, 2013). Proactive individuals are active in overcoming work-related constraints as they attempt to find solutions when presented with constraints. Employees with proactive personalities likely have higher work volition compared to passive individuals who adapt to the work environment. Those with highly proactive personalities, like those with high work volition, tend to perceive constraints as within their control and see themselves as able to change situations in the workplace. Thus, individuals with a higher proactive personality are expected to score higher on work volition.

As proactive individuals are likely to have higher work volition, they are also likely to perceive themselves as able to obtain decent work. Dimensions of decent work are obtainable through proactiveness as proactive individuals anticipate change, generate change, seek social resources, and seek out opportunities in the workplace. A proactive personality is associated with
higher salaries, promotions, and career satisfaction which are relevant to aspects of decent work such as compensation and equity (Li et al., 2010; Fuller & Marler, 2009; Prabhu, 2007). However, it is also possible that when decent work is not secured and need outcomes are not met, proactive people are strongly impacted and are less likely to act proactively in the workplace. Therefore, it is necessary to explore proactive personality and the contribution of proactiveness in securing decent work. In the current study gendered racial microaggressions and bisexual microaggressions along with proactive personality (moderator) and decent work is examined.

In the current study, personality characteristics, such as proactive personality and work volition, are examined as a moderator (proactive personality) and a mediator (work volition) between microaggressions and decent work. As these factors contribute to sexual and racial minorities access to decent work when examined separately, it is likely that work volition and proactively personality have the same impact on Black bisexual women.

Although proactive personality applies to marginalized groups (based on race, gender, and sexuality), career outcomes related to proactive personalities have been studied with predominantly White and male samples, restricting the generalizability of findings on proactive personality to marginalized groups. Relevant information on how proactive personalities alter the workplace experiences of Black sexual minorities, specifically Black bisexual women, is not available. The current study can fill this gap in the available literature. It is important to address this gap in the literature as the social positionality of Black bisexual women makes them highly vulnerable to overt and covert forms of marginalization which means there are likely significant challenges to securing decent work (Spates et al., 2020; Wingfield, 2021). Thus, this current
study assesses whether proactive personality moderates the relationship between gendered racial and bisexual microaggressions and decent work for Black bisexual women.

**Purpose of the Study**

Aligning with the historical legacy of Black women researchers and theorists who emphasize the value of addressing the multiple identities of Black women (Bowleg, 2003; Crenshaw, 2013; Lewis et al., 2017), the current study aims to explore the work experiences of Black bisexual women. Furthermore, in the current study, access to decent work for Black bisexual women is examined. In addition, work volition and proactive personality are explored as a mediator and a moderator.

In the literature review, the foundational knowledge of GRMs and BSMs is reviewed, specifically prior literature on intersectionality, microaggressions, and bisexuality is reviewed. Since Black women have continuously experienced denigration and marginalization based on race and gender in terms of labor or work in the United States, Black women continue to experience this oppression in the workplace. Additionally, Black women who are bisexual also experience anti-bisexual oppression in addition to racial and gender-based oppression. Specifically, the multilayered oppression, GRMs and BSMs, hinders Black bisexual women from accessing decent work. The impact of marginalization, specifically on the mental and physical health of Black bisexual women is also discussed in the literature review as well as workplace experiences for Black women, bisexuals, and Black bisexual women. Then the psychology of working framework is explained to clarify the hypothesized relationship between GRMs, BSMs, and decent work. Therefore, the connection between this relationship and other components of the psychology of working framework, work volition, and proactive personality, were also
reviewed. Thus, this study adds to the existing literature given the dearth of work exploring the relationship between GRMs and BSMs.

The current study also adds to the PWT as marginalization, a primary predictor and contributor to the accessibility of decent work, is being examined as GRMs and BSMs for Black bisexual women. The relationship between these forms of microaggressions, the frequency and appraisal of gendered racial microaggressions, and the frequency of bisexual-specific microaggression for women, was also explored. Thus, the relationship between both forms of microaggressions with decent work was examined together and separately. Proactive personality was explored as a moderator and work volition as a potential mediator in the relationship between marginalization and decent work. Work volition has been explored as a mediating variable for other forms of marginalization and decent work but not specifically with gendered racial or bisexual-specific microaggression. Also, work volition has not been explored with Black bisexual women. Additionally, proactive personality has been theorized as a moderating variable between marginalization and decent work. Proactive personality has also not been examined with Black bisexual women or the specific variables being examined in this study. Therefore, by exploring these variables with Black bisexual women, the present study addresses several gaps in the literature.

This study also contributes knowledge to fill the gaps in the literature as it covers the workplace experiences of Black bisexual women who represent a population that has not been centered in much research. Forms of marginalization that impact Black bisexual women such as gendered racial bisexual-specific microaggressions are also not highlighted much in career or vocational research. Moreover, it is expected that gendered racial and bisexual-specific
microaggressions impacts the accessibility of decent work as perceived and reported by Black bisexual women.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

The following research questions and hypotheses are proposed for the current study:

1. Is there a relationship between gendered racial microaggressions and bisexual microaggressions for Black bisexual women?
2. Is there a relationship between gendered racial microaggressions and decent work for Black bisexual women?
3. Is there a relationship between experiences of bisexual specific microaggressions and decent work for Black bisexual women?
4. Will work volition mediate the relationship between experiences of gendered racial microaggressions and decent work for Black bisexual women?
5. Will work volition mediate the relationship between experiences of bisexual specific microaggressions and decent work for Black bisexual women?
6. Will proactive personality moderate the relationship between gendered racial microaggressions and decent work for Black bisexual women?
7. Will proactive personality moderate the relationship between bisexual specific microaggressions and decent work for Black bisexual women?
METHOD

Participants

An a priori power analysis was conducted to determine the sample size needed to have adequate statistical power to detect statistically significant differences for the current study (Faul et al., 2009). The power analysis was conducted with an effect size of 0.03, an alpha level of 0.05, and power of 0.95. Based on this power analysis, the minimum sample size required to detect an effect using multiple regression was 134 participants (Frazier et al., 2004). The total number of participants that completed the survey was 379. During data cleaning, 76 participants were removed from the study due to not completing the study or not meeting demographic requirements for the study (i.e., Black bisexual women). Two participants were removed for completing less than 80% of the survey. One additional participant was removed from the analysis due to not consenting to participate in the study on the informed consent. After the data was cleaned, 299 participants were left.

Thus, participants were 299 Black bisexual women over the age of 18 that were recruited for the current study. Regarding race, participants identified as Black (93%; n = 279) and mixed race (1.3%; n=4). In terms of participants who identified as mixed race identified as Black and another race or ethnicity such as Filipino or White, (1.3%; n = 4). Regarding ethnicity, participants also identified as Afro Latina (1%; n = 3), African decent (i.e., Haitian, Kenyan) (1.3%; n = 4), or African American or Black American (5.3%; n = 16). Participants also identified as women (99.33%; n = 297) or nonbinary (0.67%; n = 2). In terms of sexual orientation, participants identified as bisexual (98.33%; n = 294), pansexual (1%; n = 3), or queer (0.67%; n = 2). Participants' ages ranged from 18 to 77 years old, with the average sample age being 29 years old. Lastly, the sample predominantly consisted of employed persons (99.3%; n =
297) and fewer unemployed individuals (9.4%; n = 28). Descriptive statistics, including means, and standard deviations were computed for all variables of interest. A summary of the descriptive statistics for the study is presented in table 1 and variable statistics in table 2.

Table 1

Descriptives of Race, Sexual Identity, Gender, Employment, Household Income, Marital Status, and Educational Attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Race</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pansexual</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>99.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman/Nonbinary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonbinary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-12,000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,000-20,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21,000-35,000</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36,000-45,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000-65,000</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75,000+ Unreported</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Finish High School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED/High School Diploma</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate Degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
Descriptive Table of Age, DWS, BMS, GRM, and WVS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>29.36</td>
<td>8.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWS</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>105.00</td>
<td>66.9866</td>
<td>14.32812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMS</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>3.9220</td>
<td>1.94282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>53.5284</td>
<td>12.33434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRM</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>3.8978</td>
<td>.96492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WVS</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>91.00</td>
<td>52.5385</td>
<td>13.81497</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: DWS = Decent Work. BMS = Bisexual Microaggressions. PPS = Proactive Personality. GRM = Gendered Racial Microaggressions. WVS = Work Volition.

Measures

**Demographic questionnaire.** A demographic questionnaire gathered information on age, gender, race, sexual identity, job title, geographic region, marital status, employment status, educational attainment, parental educational attainment, and family household income.

**Gendered Racial Microaggressions Scale.** The Gendered Racism Microaggressions Scale (GRMS; Lewis & Neville, 2015; Appendix B) is a 40-item scale used to assess microaggressions that include verbal, nonverbal, and behavioral slights targeting race and gender experienced by Black women. Each item response is based on the frequency and stress appraisal of nonverbal, verbal, and behavioral negative racial and gender slights experienced by Black women. Frequency is rated by how often participants experience each item in their lifetime from 1 (never to once) to 6 (once per week or more). Stress appraisal is rated from 1 (not all stressful) to 6 (extremely stressful). A 6-point Likert scale is used for each item. Participants are to report the frequency and appraisal of each item based on the Likert scale. A sample item includes,
“Someone accused me of being angry when speaking calm.” The items are scored so that higher scores indicate the higher frequency and higher stress of gendered racial microaggressions separately (Lewis & Neville, 2015).

Lewis and Neville (2015) provided evidence supporting the reliability of the GRMS. In their study with 210 Black women in a community setting, the reliability coefficients for scores on the GRMS were .92 for frequency and .93 for stress appraisal scores (Lewis & Neville, 2015). The internal reliability for this measure was strong for the current study as the Cronbach alpha is .97. Other forms of reliability were not provided for this measure, including test-retest reliability.

Evidence of the validity of the GRMS was also provided (Lewis & Neville, 2015). As evidence of construct validity, the authors conducted a confirmatory factor analysis to assess the four-factor model and found it to be an acceptable-to-good fit to the data. The comparative fit index and the goodness-of-fit index were greater than .90 and the RMSEA was less than .08 (Lewis & Neville, 2015). As evidence of convergent validity, GRMS total and subscale scores were significantly related to racial and ethnic microaggressions as measured by the Racial and Ethnic Microaggressions Scale for a community sample totaling 473 Black women in two separate samples (Lewis & Neville, 2015). In this same study, the GRMS total and subscale scores were also significantly related to perceived sexist events as measured by the Schedule of Sexist Events. To demonstrate evidence of discriminant validity, Lewis and Neville (2015) reported that the GRMS and the Perceived Sexist Events are conceptually distinct which is demonstrated by correlation coefficients ranging from .27 to .64.

Bisexual Microaggression Scale for Women. The Bisexual Microaggressions Scale for Women (BMSW; Flanders et al., 2018; Appendix C) is a 38-item scale assessing events that are negative or discriminatory towards bisexuality and bisexuals. This scale has a five-factor
structure. The BMSW’s subscales include Dismissal, Mistrust, Sexualization, Exclusion, and Denial of Complexity. The Dismissal subscale assesses the dismissal of bisexuality as a stable, legitimate identity using 6 items. A sample item for the Dismissal subscale is “Someone dismissed my bisexuality as a fad.” The 3-item Mistrust subscale assesses that it is communicated that bisexuality cannot be trusted. A sample item for the Mistrust subscale is “Someone indicated bisexuals are untrustworthy.” The Sexualization subscale is used to describe the hypersexualization of bisexual women with 16 items. A sample item for the Sexualization subscale is “Someone asked whether I have had sex with a woman.” The 10-item Exclusion subscale is operationalized as the bisexual erasure/exclusion from communities. “A sample item for the Exclusion subscale is “Someone indicated that bisexuals aren’t part of the LGBT community.” The last subscale is the 3-item Denial of Complexity which is defined as bisexual women are not assumed to be bisexual due to other identities that seem to conflict with bisexual identity. For the Denial of Complexity subscale, a sample item is “Someone assumed I cannot be bisexual because of my other identities.” Participants rate the frequency of items on a Likert scale, 0 (never) to 6 (every day), and 7 (this situation is not applicable to me). Scoring is conducted by calculating the scale total by excluding or coding for “0” the not applicable responses and then averaging all items. Thus, the scale is scored by using the mean of the total score for the frequency of bisexual microaggressions with higher scores implying a higher frequency of bisexual microaggressions. For the current study, the total scale score is used.

Evidence for the reliability of the BMSW was provided and determined to be strong. The internal reliability estimate of the BMSW’s total scores was .97 and each of the five subscales ranged from .83 to .94 for a community sample of 382 bisexual women from the United States and Canada (Flanders et al., 2018). Internal reliability was the only evidence of reliability.
provided and test-retest reliability was not provided for the BMSW. Furthermore, the Cronbach alpha for each subscale was over .70, thus indicating strong internal reliability for each subscale (Flanders et al., 2019). It is important to note that less than 10% of the validation sample was Black with only 3 Black women included in the development of focus groups, 18 during item plotting and measurement development, and 21 Black women during the measurement validation. For the current study, the Cronbach alpha for the entire scale was .98 which indicated a strong internal reliability. Thus, this shows that the BMSW is a measure with validity for Black women and therefore appropriate to use with this sample.

Evidence of the validity of the BMSW was provided in the Flanders et al. (2018) article. The construct validity is evident as the measure's structure has also been examined by exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. The five-factor structure was supported by an exploratory factor analysis and a confirmatory factor analysis (Flanders et al., 2018). Flanders and colleagues found that the RMSEA estimate was .07, CFI was .855 and the SRMR was .059. The authors noted that the RMSEA estimate, and the CFI indicated a poor fit but reported that the SRMR indicated a good fit. As evidence for convergent validity, the Bisexual Microaggressions Scale for Women has a strong positive correlation with the Anti-Bisexual Experiences Scale (ABES)-Heterosexual version (r = .65), a 23-item scale measuring prejudicial treatment bisexuals experience from heterosexuals, and the ABES-Lesbian/Gay version (r = .65), a 23-item scale measuring prejudices bisexuals experience from lesbian and gay communities (Brewster & Moradi, 2010). Flanders and colleagues (2018) provided no other information to support evidence of other forms of validity (e.g., discriminant or predictive validity) for the BMSW.
**Decent Work.** Decent work is defined as access to opportunity and an aspect of well-being regarding work (Douglass et al., 2017). The Decent Work Scale (DWS; Duffy et al., 2017; Appendix D) is a 15-item measure to assess decent work using five subscales. The Physically and Interpersonally Safe Working Conditions subscale (n = 3) measures the physical and emotional safety in the environment. A sample item of the physically and interpersonally safe subscale is “I feel emotionally safe interacting with people at work.” The Access to Health Care subscale (n = 3) measures access to healthcare through work. A sample item for the access to health care subscale is “I have a good healthcare plan at work.” The Adequate Compensation subscale (n = 3) measures the perception of having acceptable pay. A sample item for the adequate compensation subscale is “I do not feel I am paid enough based on my qualifications and experience.” The Hours that Allow for Free Time and Rest subscale (n = 3) measures free time and rest outside of work. A sample item for the hours that allow for free time and rest subscale is “I have free time during the work week.” The Organizational Values Complement Family and Social Values subscale (n = 3) measures the degree to which organizational values match personal values of the employee. A sample item of the organizational values complement family and social values scale is “My organization's values align with my family values.” The measure is rated on a 7-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The items of the scale are summed for an overall decent work score and divided by the total number of items to calculate the mean score to calculate the total score. To score each subscale the mean of the subscale is subtracted from the total mean score. This approach allows each subscale and the general score to be interpretable and used in analyses. The total score was used for the interpretation of the scale for this study with higher scores on the decent work scale indicating higher levels of decent work (Blustein et al., 2020).
As evidence for reliability, internal consistency reliability was provided for the DWS. The internal consistency reliabilities ranged from .79 to .97 for the subscales and .86 for the total scale (Douglass et al., 2017). The internal reliability for the total scale for the current study is .84. Other forms of evidence of reliability, such as test-retest reliability, were not provided for the DWS. In a study examining decent work with 238 racially and ethnically diverse adult employees, approximately 43% identified as Black and 54% of whom identified as female, the internal consistency of the total scale scores for the DWS were .90 (Douglass et al., 2020). In another study examining the PWT with a sample of 270 employed women of color (approximately 51% identified as African American), the internal reliability of the total scale scores was .86 (Kim et al., 2020).

Construct validity was provided for this measure as well. An exploratory factor analysis was conducted on this measure and resulted in a five-factor model with 15 items (Duffy et al., 2017). A confirmatory five-factor model was supported with confirmatory factor analysis and the CFI was reported at .98. The RMSEA was reported at .04 with the SRMR at .05 (Duffy et al., 2017). As evidence of convergent validity, the total scale score was significantly correlated with pay satisfaction (r = .72) and adequate compensation (r = .70) for a sample of adults. As evidence of predictive validity, decent work components and not the total score were predictors of job satisfaction (r = .64), work meaning (r = .55), and withdrawal intentions (r = .54) for a sample of 589 adults with approximately 5% of the sample identifying as Black (Duffy et al., 2017).

Work Volition Scale. The Work Volition Scale (WVS; Duffy et al., 2012; Appendix E) is a 13-item measure constructed to assess the perceived ability to make occupational choices despite constraints. The scale consists of three factors: volition, financial constraints, and structural constraints. Volition is defined as the feeling of ability for vocational choice. Financial and
structural constraints are defined as the feeling of volitional constraints. Specifically, financial constraints refer to financial issues such as limited financial resources or the need to provide for their family, whereas structural constraints refer to external constraints like limited job options (Duffy et al., 2012). The number of items on each subscale is 4 for the Volition subscale, 5 for the Financial Constraints subscale, and 4 for the Structural Constraints subscale.

A sample item for the Volition scale is “I’ve been able to choose the jobs I have wanted.” A sample item for the Financial Constraints scale is “When looking for work, I'll take whatever I can get.” Lastly, a sample item for the Structural Constraints scale is “Negative factors outside my personal control had a large impact on my current career choice.” The scale includes a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) and 7 (strongly agree) (Duffy et al., 2012). The Work Volition Scale score is obtained by adding the scores for all items after reverse scoring them for the Financial Constraint and Structural Constraint subscales. High scores on the Work Volition Scale are interpreted as greater levels of work volition.

Reliability evidence was provided for the scores of the Work Volition Scale. Scores for the Work Volition Scale have an internal consistency score of .85 (Duffy et al., 2012). The internal consistency scores for the subscales are moderate as evidenced by the Cronbach alpha for Volition was .69, for Financial Constraint .78, and Structural Constraint .64, the Volition and Structural Constraint subscales do not meet the suggested cut-off of .70 for Cronbach’s alpha. When applied to racial minorities, the subscales had higher internal reliability estimates of .78 for Volition, .81 for Financial Constraints, and .70 for Structural Constraints (Duffy et al., 2012). In another study by Kim and colleagues (2020), the internal reliability consistency of the scale was .91 with a sample of women of color, over 50% who identified as African American (n = 138). Additionally, the internal consistency for the total scale is .84 for the current study.
Validity was provided for the Work Volition scale as well. Evidence for construct validity was also found when confirmatory factor analysis was conducted (Duffy et al., 2012). The three-factor structure was supported as a good fit to the data by the model fit indices (Duffy et al., 2012). The RMSEA was reported at .07 and the CFI was .93. The chi-square value was ($\chi^2 = 108.70$). As evidence of convergent validity, the Work Volition Scale was moderately correlated ($r = .49$) with the Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy Scale (Betz et al., 1996) with a sample of 232 adults (Duffy et al., 2012). Duffy et al. provided evidence of discriminant validity for the Work Volition Scale by reporting that this measure had a weak correlation ($r = .21$) with the Career Locus of Control Scale (Trice et al., 1989). As additional evidence of discriminant validity, work volition had lower correlations with career barriers for undergraduate students (Duffy et al., 2012).

**Proactive Personality.** The Proactive Personality Scale (PPS; Bateman & Crant, 1993; Appendix F) is a 17-item scale that measures behaviors of identifying opportunities to change things at work and acting upon these opportunities (Crant, 2000; Li et al., 2010). The scale is rated on a 7-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The items on the scale are summed to provide an overall score for proactive personality (Crant, 1995). A sample item from the scale is “If I see something I don’t like, I fix it.” The total score for the Proactive Personality Scale was used for the interpretation of the scale for this study with higher scores indicating higher levels of proactive personality. The total scale score is obtained by adding scores for all items after reverse-scoring them.

Test-retest and internal consistency were provided in some studies as evidence of reliability for the scale. The test-retest reliability estimate was 0.72 over three months for upper-level undergraduate students (Bateman & Crant, 1993). For a study with racially and ethnically
diverse employed adults in the United States (43% African American and 54% female), the scale had an internal consistency of .89 (Douglass et al., 2020). For the current study, the Cronbach alpha is .90 for the total scale, indicating strong internal reliability.

As evidence of convergent validity, proactive personality was significantly correlated with peer nominations of transformational leadership ($r = 0.33$), extracurricular activities ($r = 0.29$), and personal achievements ($r = 0.21$) with a sample of upper-level undergraduate students (Bateman & Crant, 1993). Evidence of discriminant validity is shown by weak correlations between the proactive personality scale and locus of control ($r = 0.18$), private self-consciousness ($r = 0.19$), and neuroticism ($r = -0.16$) with 282 undergraduate students (Bateman & Crant, 1993).

**Procedure**

Participants were recruited through snowball sampling using social media including Facebook and Twitter groups targeting Black women, women of color, and Black LGBTQIA individuals; Lesbian, Bisexual, Gay, and Transgender Student Services at college campuses and universities, national organizations for bisexual persons and bisexuality, university departments by contacting the chairs, and directors of the community LGBTQ centers. Participants were also recruited through Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk) and Prolific, which are online platforms connecting researchers and participants. Seventy-five participants were recruited from MTurk while approximately 150 participants were recruited from Prolific. Participants recruited through MTurk and Prolific were paid $5 to complete the survey. Given that both MTurk and Prolific are online platforms designed to connect researchers and participants, precautions were taken to reduce the potential impact of random responses and bots. Bots invalidate and threaten the integrity of research (Storozuk et al., 2020). Potential bots were detected as the Qualtrics
platform would alert for potential bots and the researcher also checked each entry for completion time and duplicate IP addresses. Demographics were collected on each platform to ensure the participants met demographic criteria. All participants were offered the opportunity to enter their email addresses into a raffle to receive a $25 Amazon gift card. All participants completed the survey through Qualtrics. The survey took approximately 25-30 minutes to complete. The surveys administered included a demographic questionnaire, the Gendered Racism Microaggressions Scale, the Bisexual Microaggressions Scale for Women, the Decent Work Scale, the Work Volition Scale, and the Proactive Personality Scale. Manipulation checks (i.e., attention checks) were used to detect careless or random responses.

Research Design

This study has a quantitative descriptive correlational research design. The variables in the study are gendered racial microaggressions, bisexual-specific microaggressions, decent work, work volition, and proactive personality. The variables examined in this study are based on the intersection between gender, race, and sexual identity considering the study’s focus on Black bisexual women.
RESULTS

The purpose of the current study was to explore the accessibility of decent work for Black bisexual women with consideration for work volition and proactive personality as a mediator and a moderator on the adverse effects of gendered racial and bisexual microaggressions. The results of the current study are presented in this chapter. These results are presented as the preliminary and primary analyses.

Preliminary Analysis

Preceding the primary analysis, preliminary analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS 28.0 and Microsoft Excel. In the preliminary analysis, the data were assessed for univariate and multivariate outliers, skewness, kurtosis, and missing data. Analysis revealed no outliers and therefore, the assumption of normality was not violated for the data. Based on the preliminary analyses, there was no violation of the assumptions of normality, homoscedasticity, linearity, and multicollinearity. Skewness and kurtosis were assessed for normal distribution and found to fall within the range of a normal distribution. The skewness value was less than 1 and ranged between -.5 and 1 for each of the variables in the study indicating that the skewness of the data was relatively symmetrical. The kurtosis of the data was less than 3 for each of the variables and negative for two of the variables, indicating that the distribution of the data is platykurtic and produced fewer outliers. Linearity was observed using a scatterplot between the predictor and outcome variable. The scatterplot revealed the assumption of linearity was met. The assumption of homoscedasticity was assessed using the scatterplot as well. The patterns of the scatterplots showed equally distributed plots, indicating that the assumption of homoscedasticity was met. Lastly, multicollinearity was assessed and VIF values were below 10, revealing that multicollinearity was not a concern (Kim, 2019).
Missing values were analyzed in the preliminary analysis as well. In the final sample, 31 (10.1%) participants were missing at least one data point, while 268 (89.63%) participants were missing no data points. Missing values represented 0.24% of the final data set. One case was removed due to having a high of 40 data points missing (22.6%). Missing data were analyzed to detect if there was a pattern to missing data, or if data were missing at random. Little’s missing completely at random test was conducted and was not significant, \( \chi^2 (5032, 299) = 5023.461, p = .531 \). This indicates that the data were missing at random. Missing values were replaced using estimated pairwise deletion. Pairwise deletion was applied as it allows for pertinent cases with some missing values to be used when data provided by these cases are relevant to the variables being evaluated (Cook, 2021).

Additionally, based on demographic analysis, there were only two differences in the sample based on the demographic variables gathered from the sample. Using Process Version 4.3 (Hayes, 2023) for IBM SPSS Statistics Version 28, there was a significant difference in the appraisal of gendered racial microaggression between participants who were employed full-time compared to participants employed part-time (\( p = .0001 \)). Participants employed full-time had a higher appraisal of gendered racial microaggressions. Thus, it is important to control for these variables when conducting the analyses with gendered racial microaggressions. A correlation matrix is shown in table 3.

Table 3
Correlation Matrix of Age, Full-Time/Part-Time Work, Parent Ed, GRMA, GRMF, BMS, DWS, WVS, and PPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Age</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 FTime/PTime</td>
<td>-.24**</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 ParentEd</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 GRMA X BMS</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 GRMF X BMS</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.96**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 GRMA</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 GRMF</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 BMS</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.94**</td>
<td>.95**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 DWS</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 WVS</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>-.45**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 PPS</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Primary Analysis

To explore the first three hypotheses focused on the relationships between 1) gendered racial microaggressions and bisexual microaggressions, 2) gendered racial microaggressions with decent work, and 3) bisexual microaggressions with decent work, three Pearson correlations were conducted. Next, hierarchical regression was used to address research questions 4-7 to examine work volition and proactive personality as a mediator and a moderator on the relationship between microaggressions and decent work.

Gendered Racial Microaggressions and Bisexual Microaggressions Specific for Women

The first research question explored the relationship between bisexual microaggressions (measured by the Bisexual Microaggressions Scale for Women) and gendered racial microaggressions (measured by the Gendered Racial Microaggression Scale) using a Pearson product-moment correlation. It was hypothesized that bisexual microaggressions and gendered...
racial microaggressions would be positively correlated. The findings supported the first hypothesis. There was a strong positive correlation between the two variables with higher scores on the bisexual microaggressions scale (BSM) being associated with higher scores on the gendered racial microaggressions scale (GRMS). For GRMS appraisal and BMS, there was a strong positive correlation, \( r(297) = .49, p < .001 \), as well as for GRMS frequency and BMS, \( r(297) = .65, p < .001 \). The results indicate that Black bisexual women who report more bisexual microaggressions also reported more gendered racial microaggressions.

**Gendered Racial Microaggressions and Decent Work**

The study’s second research question explored the relationship between gendered racial microaggressions (measured by the Gendered Racial Microaggression Scale) and decent work (measured by the Decent Work Scale) using a Pearson product-moment correlation. It was hypothesized that gendered racial microaggressions and decent work would be negatively correlated. The second hypothesis was not supported. There was no significant correlation between the two variables. For GRMS appraisal, there was no significant correlation with decent work, \( r(297) = -.09, p = .11 \), as well as for GRMS frequency with decent work, \( r(297) = -.06, p = .27 \). Thus, the hypothesis was not supported as the direct, negative relationship between gendered racial microaggressions and decent work for Black bisexual women was not significant.

**Bisexual Microaggressions and Decent Work**

The third research question examined the relationship between bisexual microaggressions (measured by the Bisexual Microaggressions Scale for Women) and decent work (measured by the Decent Work Scale) using a Pearson product-moment correlation. It was hypothesized that bisexual microaggressions and decent work would be negatively correlated. The third hypothesis
was not supported. The correlation between bisexual microaggressions and decent work was not significant, \( r(297)= .11, \, p = .054 \). Therefore, there was not a significant negative relationship between bisexual microaggressions and decent work for Black bisexual women.

**Work Volition with Gendered Racial Microaggressions and Decent Work**

The fourth research question explored whether work volition (measured by the Work Volition Scale) would mediate the relationship between gendered racial microaggressions (measured by the Appraisal and Frequency subscales on the Gendered Racial Microaggressions Scale) and decent work (as measured by the Decent Work Scale). Two mediational analyses were conducted to assess work volition as a mediator for GRMS and decent work using Process Version 4.3 (Hayes, 2023) for IBM SPSS Statistics Version 28. Bootstrapping was conducted with 5,000 bootstrapped samples of the data with a 95% confidence interval to examine the indirect effects (Preacher et al., 2007). For the indirect effects, if the confidence interval does not include zero, a mediation effect is implied (Frazier et al., 2004).

**Table 4**

*Mediation Effects of WVS for GRMA and DWS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Effect</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1.45</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-2.26</td>
<td>-.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Total, Direct, and Indirect Effects

Work volition was assessed as a mediator for GRMS appraisal (GRMA) and decent work. For this analysis, in the first step, the total effect, the effect of GRMA on decent work without considering work volition was not significant, \( B = -1.25, \, SE = .77 \). 95% CI [-2.76, 0.27]. A direct effect, the effect of GRMA on decent work after considering work volition, was also not
significant, B = .20, SE = .79, 95% CI [-1.36, 1.76]. However, the indirect effect, the effect of GRMA on decent work through work volition, was significant, B = -1.45, SE = .47, 95% CI [-2.43, -0.62]. These results indicate that Black bisexual women’s appraisal of gendered racial microaggressions influenced work volition and indirectly influenced decent work via work volition. The mediation analysis of gendered racial microaggression appraisal and decent work by work volition is shown in Table 4.

For the second mediational analysis, work volition was examined as a mediator of the relationship between GRMS frequency (GRMF) and decent work. The total effect of the GRMF on decent work without considering work volition was not significant, B = -.86, SE = .77, 95% CI [-2.37, 0.66]. The direct effect of GRMF on decent work with consideration for work volition was not significant, B = 1.02, SE = .82, 95% CI [-0.58, 2.62]. The indirect effect of work volition on decent work was also not significant, B = -1.88, SE = .82, 95% CI [-3.10, -0.89]. Therefore, these results indicate that work volition did not significantly mediate the relationship between GRMF and decent work. They did not support the hypothesis that work volition would mediate the relationship between GRMF and decent work for Black bisexual women. The mediation effects of work volition as a mediator of the relationship between gendered racial microaggression frequency and decent work is shown in Table 5.
Mediation Effects of WVS for GRMF and DWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Effect</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-.86</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-2.37</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Effect</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect Effect</th>
<th>BootSE</th>
<th>BootLLCI</th>
<th>BootULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1.88</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-3.07</td>
<td>-.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Total, Direct, and Indirect Effects

Work Volition with Bisexual Microaggressions and Decent Work

The fifth research question examined whether work volition (measured by the Work Volition Scale) would mediate the relationship between bisexual microaggressions (measured by the Bisexual Microaggressions Scale for Women) and decent work (measured by the Decent Work Scale). A mediational analysis was used to assess work volition as a mediator for BMSW and decent work using Process Version 4.3 (Hayes, 2023) for IBM SPSS Statistics Version 28. Bootstrapping was conducted with 5,000 bootstrapped samples of the data with a 95% confidence interval to examine the indirect effects (Preacher, Rucker, & Hayes, 2007).

Table 6

Mediation Effects of WVS for BMS and DWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Effect</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Effect</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect Effect</th>
<th>BootSE</th>
<th>BootLLCI</th>
<th>BootULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1.45</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-2.26</td>
<td>-.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Total, Direct, and Indirect Effects

For this analysis, in the first step, the total effect, the effect of BMSW on decent work without considering work volition was not significant, B = .82, SE = .43, 95% CI [-0.01, 1.66]. A direct effect, the effect of BMSW on decent work after considering work volition was
significant, \( B = 2.28, \ SE = .44, \ 95\% \ CI [1.41, 3.14] \). The indirect effect, the effect of BMSW on decent work through work volition, was also significant, \( B = -1.45, \ SE = .37, \ 95\% \ CI [-2.26, -0.81] \). These findings indicate that BMSW had an indirect effect on decent work through work volition. Thus, the results of this analysis partly supported the fifth hypothesis since work volition partially mediated the relationship between BMSW and decent work for Black bisexual women. The mediation analysis between bisexual microaggressions and decent work by work volition is shown in table 6.

**Proactive Personality with Gendered Racial Microaggressions and Decent Work**

The sixth research question explored whether the relationship between gendered racial microaggressions (measured by the Gendered Racial Microaggressions Scale) and decent work (measured by the Decent Work Scale) was moderated by proactive personality. The sixth research question was assessed using two moderation analyses with the Process Version 4.3 (Hayes, 2023) for IBM SPSS Statistics Version 28 to assess proactive personality as a moderator of GRMS and decent work. Bootstrapping was conducted with 5,000 bootstrapped samples of the data with a 95% confidence interval to examine the indirect effects (Preacher, Rucker, & Hayes, 2007).

Prior to running moderation regression analyses, preliminary analyses were conducted to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, homoscedasticity, linearity, and multicollinearity. Multicollinearity was not found as VIF values were below 10. The assumptions required for hierarchical regression analysis were also tested. Next, the Mahalanobis distance (Mahalanobis D2; \( p < .001 \)) was calculated to search for multivariate outliers. The Mahalanobis distance values did not reveal cases exceeding the established critical value.
Demographic variables of full-time or part-time work and parent education were entered as covariates in each moderation analysis to control for these variables since these variables are stable. Gendered racial microaggressions were entered into two separate moderation analyses as GRMS Appraisal (GRMA) and GRMS Frequency (GRMF) as the appraisal and frequency of GRMS are not measured with the GRMS altogether but rather separately. In the first moderation analysis, proactive personality was examined as a moderator of the relationship between GRMA and decent work. Parental educational attainment and full-time or part-time work were entered as covariates to control for these variables since differences in GRMA were found amongst the sample based on whether they worked full-time or part-time as well as their parental educational attainment. In terms of the first moderation analysis, the overall model was significant, $F (5, 292) = 16.69, p < .001$, $R^2 = .22$, explaining 22% of decent work. However, GRMA was not found to be a significant predictor of decent work, $b = 1.59$, $t (292) = .52$, $p = .60$. Proactive personality was a significant predictor of decent work, $b = .69$, $t(292) = 3.29$, $p = .001$. Thus, for every one unit increase in proactive personality, there is a .69 unit increase in decent work. The interaction effect was not significant, $b = -.08$, $t(292) = -1.49$, $p = .13$. While proactive personality predicted decent work, proactive personality did not moderate the relationship between GRMA and decent work. The moderation analysis of proactive personality in the relationship between GRMA decent work is presented in table 7.
Table 7

Moderator Analysis: Proactive Personality as a moderator between Gendered Racial Microaggression Appraisal and Decent Work including SE, LL, UL, and p 2023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LL</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>48.75</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>24.14</td>
<td>73.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRMS Appraisal a</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>7.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive Personality b</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRMA x PPS c</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT or PT d</td>
<td>-6.82</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>-9.10</td>
<td>-4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ParentEd e</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.93</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 298. CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit. GRMS = Gendered Racial Microaggressions. GRMA = Gendered Racial Microaggressions Appraisal. PPS = Proactive Personality. FT or PT = Full-time or part-time work. ParentEd = Parent Education.

In the separate and second moderation analysis, proactive personality was examined as a moderator between GRMF and decent work. Parental educational attainment and full-time or part-time work were entered as covariates to control for these variables since a difference in GRMF was found amongst the sample based on parental educational attainment and employment status. In regard to GRMF, the overall model was significant, F(2, 292) = 16.9, p < .001, R^2 = .23, explaining 23% of the variance in decent work. However, GRMF was not a significant predictor of decent work, b = 1.14 t(292) = .36, p = .71. Proactive personality was significant in predicting decent work b = .67, t(292) = 3.31, p = .001. For every one unit increase in proactive personality, there is a .67 unit increase in perceived accessibility in decent work. The interaction effect, the effect between GRMF and decent work through proactive personality, was not significant, b = -.07, t(292) = -1.37, p = .17. While proactive personality predicted decent work,
proactive personality did not moderate the relationship between GRMF and decent work. The moderation analysis of proactive personality between GRMF and decent work is presented in table 8.

**Table 8**

*Moderator Analysis: Proactive Personality as a moderator between Gendered Racial Microaggressions Frequency and Decent Work including SE, LL, and p 2023*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>49.34</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>25.39 - 73.29</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRMS Frequency a</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>-.504 - 7.32</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive Personality b</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.27 - 1.08</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRMF x PPS c</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.18 - .03</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT or PT d</td>
<td>-7.07</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>-9.36 - -4.78</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ParentEd e</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.69 - 1.92</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 298. CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit. GRMS = Gendered Racial Microaggressions. GRMF = Gendered Racial Microaggressions Frequency. PPS = Proactive Personality. FT or PT = Full-time or part-time work. ParentEd = Parent Education.*

**Proactive Personality with Bisexual Microaggressions and Decent Work**

The seventh question explored whether the relationship between bisexual microaggressions (Bisexual Microaggressions Specific to Women Scale) and decent work (Decent Work Scale) was moderated by proactive personality. The seventh research question was assessed using moderation analysis with Process Version 4.3 (Hayes, 2023) for IBM SPSS Statistics Version 28 to assess proactive personality as a moderator of GRMS and decent work. Bootstrapping was conducted with 5,000 bootstrapped samples of the data with a 95%
confidence interval to examine the indirect effects (Preacher, Rucker, & Hayes, 2007). The moderation effect of proactive personality between BMS and decent work is shown in table 9.

Table 9

**Moderator Analysis: Proactive Personality as a moderate between Bisexual Microaggressions and Decent Work including SE, LL, UL and p 2023**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>50.38</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>34.03 - 66.72</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual Microaggressions</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>-.215 - 5.26</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive Personality</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.22 - .73</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMS x PPS</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.09 - .03</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT or PT</td>
<td>-6.17</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>-8.63 - -3.72</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ParentEd</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-1.16 - 1.57</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 298. CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit. BMS = Bisexual Microaggressions. PPS = Proactive Personality. FT or PT = Full-time or part-time work. ParentEd = Parent Education.*

In this moderation analysis, proactive personality was examined as a moderator between BMS and decent work. Demographic variables of parental educational attainment and employment status (fulltime or parttime) were entered as covariates to control for these variables as they are stable. The overall model was significant, F(3, 295) = 12.23, p <.001, R^2 = .11, explaining 11% of the variance in decent work. However, BMS was not a significant predictor of decent work, b = 3.47 t(295) = 1.82, p = .07. Proactive personality was significant in predicting decent work b = .54, t(295) = 4.13, p<.001. Essentially for every one unit increase in proactive personality, there is a .54 unit increase in perceived accessibility in decent work. The interaction effect was not significant, b = -.05, t(295) = -1.62, p = .11. While proactive personality predicted
decent work, proactive personality did not moderate the relationship between BMS and decent work.
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between gendered racial microaggressions and bisexual microaggressions with decent work for Black bisexual women. The mediating and moderating effects of work volition and proactive personality on these relationships between gendered racial and bisexual microaggressions with decent work were also examined. In this chapter, the findings of this study and its connection to prior literature are introduced followed by a discussion of the study’s limitations and implications.

The study’s first hypothesis proposed that there would be a positive relationship between gendered racial and bisexual microaggressions for Black bisexual women, was supported. This finding is consistent with and adds to the existing literature on gendered racial and bisexual-based oppression for sexual minority people of color (Gessner et al., 2019; Shangani et al., 2020; Sutter et al., 2016; Velez et al., 2019). For example, Gessner and colleagues (2019) conducted a qualitative thematic content analysis based on qualitative data with 58 sexual minority people of color. They found that this group reported experiencing intersectional forms of stigma based on race, gender, and sexuality. They also found sexual minorities to experience stigma distinctly based on their gender identity (women, genderqueer, or men). Lastly, they found that bisexual people of color were more likely to report erasure. In another study, Shangani and colleagues (2020) found that African American sexual minorities reported higher enacted and expected stigma regardless of their socioeconomic background. These studies provide support that the association between gendered racial microaggressions and sexuality-based microaggressions.

While these previous studies have established a connection between gendered racial and sexual oppression, the current study adds support that this relationship exists for oppression in the form of gendered racial and bisexual microaggressions for Black bisexual women. It is
important to study the intersection between gendered racial and bisexual oppression for Black bisexual women as Black women often face intersectional forms of oppression across various contexts. Amongst these various contexts includes mistreatment in the workplace directed toward Black women (Waldron, 2019). These experiences can negatively impact mental and physical health outcomes for Black women (Chinn et al., 2021; Spates et al., 2020), and Black bisexual women in particular. Researching and adding to the literature on the intersectional relationship between forms of oppression such as gendered racial and bisexual microaggressions is important for the critique of such oppression towards Black bisexual women. Black bisexual women are a significantly understudied group, and therefore, this study highlights that gendered racial and bisexual microaggressions can be intersectional for this group.

The study’s second hypothesis proposed a negative relationship between experiences of gendered racial microaggressions and decent work for Black bisexual women. The hypothesis was not supported. Additionally, the study’s third hypothesis was that there would be a negative relationship between experiences of bisexual-specific microaggressions and decent work for Black bisexual women. The third hypothesis was also not supported. These findings align with some prior literature (Smith et al., 2020) and contradict other literature regarding whether marginalization has a direct relationship with decent work (Kim et al., 2022). When comparing the results of prior studies to the current study, consideration should be given to the fact that marginalization in the current study was defined differently than in prior studies examining decent work. This study specifically looked at microaggressions (gendered racial and bisexual) and did not specify if these experiences are linked explicitly to occurrences in the workplace. Therefore, this lack of clear connection to the workplace may have contributed to the differences in reports regarding the relationship between marginalization and decent work. Future research
should include identifying and developing valid ways to measure microaggressions and other forms of marginalization that occur in the workplace. Thus, researchers should explore how microaggressions are identified and responded to in the workplace.

Furthermore, it is important to note that microaggressions as examined in the current study differ from other forms of marginalization. For example, a difference is that microaggressions have been more associated with adjustment outcomes such as internalization and stress (Lui & Quezada, 2019). Thus, while other forms of marginalization are more easily identifiable and can influence the overall experience of the work environment, microaggressions can influence work-related outcomes by impacting adjustment. Microaggressions have this impact on adjustment and work outcomes compared to other forms of marginalization as microaggressions are more insidious and less evident, making it harder to appraise as marginalization rather than internalize. The insidious nature of microaggressions could have also contributed to the nonsignificant results regarding the relationship between microaggressions and decent work in the current study with Black bisexual women. Specifically, participants in the current study may not have identified instances of microaggressions in situations where microaggressions occurred. Therefore, participants likely did not identify microaggressions as contributing to their experiences of decent work but rather internalized any difficulty with obtaining decent work. Rather participants may have attributed these experiences to different factors aside from gendered racial or bisexual microaggressions such as a personal lack of competence or low performance.

The study’s fourth hypothesis examined whether work volition would mediate the relationship between experiences of gendered racial microaggressions and decent work for Black bisexual women. Work volition mediated the relationship between GRMA and decent work for
Black bisexual women. However, the mediation effect was not significant for GRMF. Thus, the relationship between gendered racial microaggressions and decent work was partially mediated by work volition. This result of partial mediation aligns with some prior research on work volition as work volition did act as a mediator between marginalization and decent work in previous literature. Duffy and colleagues (2020) found that work volition acted as a mediator between experiences of lifetime marginalization and decent work with a sample of over 1,500 employed adults. Work volition also acted as a mediator for a sample of sexual minority employed adults (Allan et al., 2019). However, since in the current study, work volition acted only as a mediator for the appraisal of gendered racial microaggressions rather than the frequency, it is important for Black bisexual women to recognize and acknowledge gendered racial microaggressions for there to be an impact on their work volition and therefore on decent work. Therefore, if Black bisexual women do not appraise an event as being a gendered racial microaggression, they will be less likely to acknowledge any negative work-related outcomes related to gendered racial microaggressions. This adds to the understanding of how gendered racial microaggressions, as well as other forms of microaggressions, can influence work experiences for marginalized groups.

The study’s fifth hypothesis proposed that work volition would mediate the relationship between experiences of bisexual-specific microaggressions and decent work for Black bisexual women. The hypothesis was not supported. This finding contradicts prior research on work volition and decent work. This discrepancy from prior research exists as microaggressions can influence career choices and therefore individuals may choose career fields where they are more likely to obtain decent work based on messages, they receive about career opportunities. Some of those messages could be based on their sexual identity, gender identity, and racial identity.
Prior research has confirmed a relationship exists between work volition and decent work despite experiences of marginalization. For example, Williams and colleagues (2023) found racial microaggressions to predict work volition and work volition to predict decent work for a sample of 241 Black employed adults. However, they found no direct relationship between racial microaggressions and decent work. In another study examining racial microaggressions with racially and ethnically diverse employed adults, Douglass and colleagues (2020) found a positive relationship between work volition and decent work as well as a direct and indirect relationship between marginalization and decent work. In another study examining the PWT with sexual minority employed adults, Allan and colleagues (2019) found that work volition mediated the relationship between social class and workplace climate with decent work. In another study examining the ability to secure decent work for gender and sexual minority employees, work volition mediated the relationship between constraints (financial strain and workplace climate) and access to decent work (Smith et al., 2020). While these studies highlight the mediating role that work volition can play, the difference between these prior studies and the current study is that they examined constraints rather than marginalization. These studies also included samples across the sexual minority and gender minority communities whereas the current study only examined bisexual Black women.

The current study examined marginalization in the form of microaggressions toward bisexuals and gendered racial minorities. The experiences of bisexual and gendered racial microaggressions differ for Black bisexual women compared to other sexual, racial, and gender minority communities. Specifically, Black women and bisexuals occupy unique positions in their racial and sexual minority communities as they are often ostracized and experience group discrimination (Hodson et al., 2021; Pennasilico & Amodeo, 2019). Given that Black bisexual
women are ostracized based on multiple social identities, their experiences of work volition and decent work are also distinct. Awareness of multilayered covert forms of oppression influences work volition or the perception of work choice and thus impacts access to decent work. However, without full awareness of the nature of bisexual microaggressions or being able to make a distinction between bisexual microaggressions from other forms of marginalization, Black bisexual women may not perceive work volition or access to decent work to be impacted at all by this form of oppression. Other forms of marginalization including gendered racial microaggressions or oppression could be experienced as more impactful than bisexual microaggressions on work-related experiences. Therefore, given the population of the current study and the examination of microaggressions not only does the current study add to the literature on PWT but it further indicates the distinctive differences in experiences for Black bisexual women.

The sixth hypothesis proposed that proactive personality would moderate the relationship between gendered racial microaggressions and decent work for Black women. The hypothesis was not supported. Based on existing research, positive results were expected as proactive personality has been found to buffer against the negative effects of predictors of marginalization. Specifically, the moderation effect was examined as proactive personality has been found to compensate for disadvantages in the workplace such as discrimination and marginalization (Ayoub et al., 2018; Douglass et al., 2019). Additionally, proactive personality was found to buffer against the negative effects of other predictors of decent work, including lower work volition and lower socioeconomic status (Kim et al., 2020). The moderation effects of proactive personality also seemed likely for the current study as proactive personality was also found to be more common in Black individuals compared to other racial groups in another study
(Spitzmuller et al., 2015). However, this finding aligns with other current literature on proactive personality and decent work. According to Kossen and McIlveen (2018), marginalized individuals have trouble accessing work despite their level of proactive personality. They found that although proactiveness contributed to a positive mindset regarding current circumstances and confidence in abilities, marginalized individuals still experienced limited access to decent work. Thus, while a proactive personality could positively inform how a person perceives their inability or ability to access decent work, it may not influence their actual ability to obtain decent work. Therefore, the results are not positive potentially because the marginalization of Black bisexual women can impact their ability to obtain work that would be considered decent due to discriminatory hiring practices.

Lastly, the seventh hypothesis was that a proactive personality would moderate the relationship between bisexual-specific microaggressions and decent work for Black bisexual women. The seventh hypothesis was also not supported. Since this study examined the relationship between bisexual microaggressions and decent work as moderated by a proactive personality, this finding still adds to the literature as this has not been previously evident in research. In prior research, proactive personality did not have a direct or indirect relationship with decent work for various samples including women of color (Kim et al., 2020) or racially diverse employed adults (Douglass et al., 2020). However, it has been evident that proactive personality buffers against marginalization and decreases negative career outcomes (Ayoub et al., 2018; Douglass et al., 2019). Proactive personality was also shown to have a mediator effect when examining the moderation of work volition between social status and decent work (Kim et al., 2020). Thus, proactive personality was examined as a moderator between bisexual microaggressions and decent work as it was believed to have some impact on variables that
impact decent work and a potential indirect relationship with decent work. The similarity in this study shows that while proactive personality had a direct relationship with decent work, it might serve a separate purpose than moderating the relationship between microaggressions or marginalization and decent work, specifically for Black bisexual women.

Overall, the results of the current study are consistent with prior literature on the marginalization of Black women and Black sexual minority women. Specifically, Black women experience GRMS in the workplace, and behaviors such as identity shifting were not found to buffer against the negative impact of GRMS in the workplace (Dickens et al., 2019). Likewise, proactive personality that results in proactive behaviors does not at all influence the impact of GRMS on workplace outcomes (i.e., decent work). Also, it should be considered that there is no evidence that proactive personality always manifests in proactive behaviors in all circumstances in the workplace or every workplace across distinct groups of people. Proactiveness is a tactic that is most useful for avoidable circumstances or that the person perceives themselves as able to change (Lin et al., 2018). Bisexual microaggressions as well as gendered racial microaggressions and other forms of marginalization are often unavoidable in the workplace and persist despite efforts to change the environment. Additionally, based on the results of this study, proactive personality is tied to decent work directly for Black bisexual women. Therefore, they likely use proactive behaviors in some circumstances to increase access to decent work, such as negotiating salary or advocating for a promotion. However, they do not use proactive behaviors in the face of microaggressions to access decent work. This could be that they do not see the benefit in doing so, had failed prior attempts, or deem the consequences as too costly.

Limitations
While it has added some new insights to existing literature, there are several limitations to the current study. The first limitation is that using an online survey reduces the researcher's ability to vet for eligibility of participants and frequency of the completion of the study. Sample legitimacy is thus challenged due to possible participant misrepresentation (Kramer et al., 2014). However, the researcher analyzed IP addresses, locations, and time of completion to eliminate the possibility of participants completing the survey multiple times. The advantage of using a web-based approach despite these limitations is that a web-based survey expands a researcher's ability to access the target population, especially for understudied groups such as Black bisexual women. Another limitation of the study is the measurement of marginalization was not phrased as specific to a career or work-related experiences. It is possible that some participants referred to microaggressions they experienced at work while others may have referred to microaggressions in general. Thus, whether microaggressions in the workplace or in general contribute to access to decent work may need to be clarified further in future research.

Another limitation is the recruitment method, i.e., convenience sampling (i.e., social media and email). Participants who were accessible were included in the study as participants opted to participate in the study. Also, monetary funding was provided to participants by way of a raffle which could have impacted those who participated in the study. Due to not engaging in random sampling, sampling bias may have occurred. Sampling bias occurs when the sample is unrepresentative of the population (Nielson et al., 2017; Suen et al., 2014). When not engaging in random sampling, sampling bias occurs because it can result in less sampling diversity and more homogeneous data (Nielson et al., 2017). Thus, there could be similarities regarding the sample of Black bisexual women who participated in the study that do not reflect the general population of Black bisexual women. This sampling method limits the generalizability of the sample.
Lastly, another limitation of the study was the use of an online survey format, Qualtrics, which was linked to the data collection platforms Mturk and Prolific. One benefit of using an Mturk sample is that the Mturk samples do not differ significantly from community and student samples regarding age, race, gender, or attentiveness (Goodman et al., 2013). Another advantage to using Mturk is that large and diverse samples can be accessed for a reduced cost (Cheung et al., 2016). However, the use of Mturk samples can threaten the validity of research findings. For example, Mturk data collection can threaten construct validity due to selection bias related to Mturk workers selecting themselves. Also, social desirability could still impact the data as Mturk workers are partly motivated by ratings and payment (Cheung et al., 2016). A study by Douglas and colleagues (2023) compared the quality of the data collected through Mturk, Prolific, and Qualtrics platforms. They found that participants were often motivated by pay but that Prolific participants provided more meaningful answers and took their time with surveys compared to Mturk participants. Prolific also provided additional information such as geolocation and was more cost effective than Mturk or Qualtrics. By using an online survey, the environment is uncontrolled, making the participants susceptible to distractions. Also, participants did not receive assistance navigating the online survey and so did not gain clarification on survey questions or core concepts relevant to the study.

**Implications**

**Research Implications**

There are several implications for research based on the findings of the study. The findings of the current study show that there is an intersectional relationship between gendered racial and bisexual microaggressions. As participants endorsed more gendered racial microaggressions, their endorsement of bisexual microaggressions also increased. Since research
on gendered racial microaggressions as well as research on bisexual microaggressions are emerging areas of research, there has been no examination of these two forms of microaggressions together (aside from the current study). Thus, the current study adds important insights to existing literature focused on gendered racial microaggressions for Black women and bisexual-specific microaggressions. Consistent with the legacy of Black women scholars, this study adds to research on the interlocking forms of oppression facing Black women with consideration for sexual identity and found evidence of a relationship between different forms of oppression (gendered racial and bisexual specific microaggressions) faced by Black bisexual women (Adams & Lott, 2019; Harris-Perry, 2011).

In prior research, LGB-POC microaggressions (microaggressions targeting LGB people of color) have been examined (Balsam et al., 2011; Ramirez & Galupo, 2019). Ramirez and Galupo (2019) found that bisexual people of color experience intersectional marginalization (race, sexuality, and gender) and more negative mental health outcomes compared to other LGB groups. It was also found that social support and positive identity buffer against negative mental health outcomes for young bisexual people of color (Flanders et al., 2019). These studies further implicated the importance of examining the experiences of bisexuels using an intersectional framework. However, prior research has not explored intersectional marginalization across contexts and how to buffer against negative effects of marginalization across contexts. Additionally, no other research has specifically looked at gendered racial and bisexual microaggressions. Thus, there is a need for continued research on intersectional microaggressions or marginalization for bisexual persons in general and especially for understudied bisexual groups such as bisexual Black women. This study adds to knowledge
about how to address negative work outcomes for Black bisexual women in clinical practice and research.

Additionally, the present study adds to the knowledge regarding how to identify ways to improve access to decent and quality work. Specifically, this study provides insight regarding the relationship between microaggressions and decent work. The results of this study revealed a direct positive relationship between gendered racial microaggressions and bisexual specific microaggressions for Black bisexual women. The higher reported frequency and appraisal of gendered racial microaggressions, the higher the reported frequency of bisexual specific microaggressions. This implies that in environments with higher occurrences of microaggressions, both gendered racial and bisexual microaggressions occurred. Black bisexual women who are more likely to experience and report gendered racial and bisexual specific microaggressions may have similar traits such as higher awareness of gendered racial and anti-bisexual marginalization or even higher salience gender racial and/or bisexual identity.

Therefore, researchers should examine the relationship between personal characteristics and reports of stress-appraisal and frequency of gendered racial and bisexual specific microaggressions.

In terms of the relationship between microaggressions and decent work, there was no relationship found between gendered racial microaggressions and decent work. This contradicts prior literature in which decent work and gendered racial microaggressions were linked for a sample of Asian American women (Choi et al., 2022). Despite these concepts being generally the same, however, gendered racial microaggressions were measured differently for the study by Choi and colleagues (2022), who used the gendered racial microaggression scale for Asian American women (Keum et al., 2018). Thus, the experience of gendered racial microaggressions
was specified for this group which differs from how gendered racial microaggressions manifests for Black women. Black women’s experience of gendered racial microaggressions is directly tied to gendered racism and anti-black racism which is tied to the development of the economy of the United States which was based on the enslavement of Black people. Due to this difference in the experiences of gendered racial microaggressions the result of this study differs in that gendered racial microaggressions were not tied to decent work for Black bisexual women in this sample. Future researchers could further explore the relationship between gendered racial microaggressions and work-related outcomes aside from decent work such as job satisfaction or career choice.

Gendered racial microaggressions like gendered racism are constant rather than situational for Black women and could appear as a condition of living in a country where anti-blackness is pervasive. It can be hard to differentiate gendered racial microaggressions as a barrier to accessing to decent work rather than a normalized daily oppressive experience for Black women and Black bisexual women for this study. Future researchers can help clarify this difference by focusing on gathering detailed information about how Black women perceived themselves to experience gendered racial microaggressions. Specifically, future researchers can define how gendered racial microaggressions are displayed in the workplace and by defining types of workplaces gendered racial microaggression experiences.

In addition to gendered racial microaggressions, this study also examined the relationship between bisexual microaggressions with decent work. There was also no direct relationship between bisexual microaggressions and decent work. This could partly be due to their appraisal of which identity of theirs is being targeted by microaggressions. The experience of bisexual microaggressions for Black bisexual women who are in heterosexual relationships and
partnerships and who are not out in the workplace differs from that of those who are in same-sex relationships or partnerships and out in the workplace. It is likely based on level of outness, and the type of partnership Black bisexual women which influences whether they are perceived to either be lesbians or heterosexual (Mohr et al., 2017), which is a common bisexual microaggression for bisexual women. Thus, if they are perceived to be heterosexual, bisexual microaggressions or other forms of anti-bisexual marginalization will likely not impact their access to decent work. In the future, researchers should explore the impact of level of outness on the frequency of bisexual microaggressions in the workplace. Furthermore, researchers can explore whether level of outness acts as a mediator between bisexual microaggressions and other work outcomes such as career choice or job satisfaction. Therefore, future research could provide insight as to why there is a nonsignificant relationship between bisexual microaggressions and decent work and explore whether this is true for other workplace outcomes.

In terms of intersectional microaggressions and Black bisexual women, this study revealed an indirect relationship between marginalization and work outcomes for Black bisexual women. Specifically, participants in this study who reported higher work volition were more likely to perceive themselves as obtaining decent work despite higher frequency or stress appraisal of gendered racial microaggressions. These results imply that other factors such as work environment or personality traits should be considered regarding gendered racial microaggressions in the lives of Black bisexual women. Given the pervasiveness of gendered racial microaggressions towards Black women, experiencing gendered racial microaggressions in the United States is unavoidable and a part of life outside of work. Increased work volition could influence how Black bisexual women perceive themselves as capable of partaking in decent work despite their identity as Black women. With this considered, identity could influence the
relationship between gendered racial experiences (i.e., gendered racial microaggressions) and decent work. Additionally, prior literature found that gendered racial identity buffers against gendered racial microaggressions (Martins et al., 2020). Therefore, future research should explore the effects of gendered racial identity on the relationship between gendered racial microaggressions and decent work. Researchers might also examine gendered racial identity centrality or salience and the impact on the relationship between gendered racial microaggressions and decent work. Researchers might also identify factors contributing to how Black bisexual women respond to experiences of gendered racial microaggressions in the workplace to access decent work and obtain positive work outcomes such as work promotions.

Work volition did not mediate the relationship between gendered racial microaggressions with decent work and only partially mediated the relationship between BMS and decent work. Thus, Black bisexual women felt they had somewhat more choices in work in the face of bisexual microaggressions as opposed to gendered racial microaggressions. Increased work volition was tied to increased perception of access to decent work. In terms of experiences of gendered racial microaggressions, Black bisexual women can be more identifiable by their gendered racial identity as opposed to their bisexual identity. This could partly be informed by outness at work or the perception of their sexual identity by coworkers and supervisors. Due to bi-erasure, bisexual women are often rendered invisible or erased institutionally and interpersonally as they are assumed to either be heterosexual or lesbian (Legge et al., 2018). Some bisexual women might also choose to engage in identity shifting (using neutral language to refer to romantic partners, avoiding topics related to sexual identity, etc.) to manage outness at work. Furthermore, prior literature reported that bisexual women may not disclose their identity or may engage in identity shifting to navigate workspaces and decrease vulnerability to
heterosexist discrimination (Arena & Jones, 2017; Bowleg et al., 2008). Further evidence is needed to provide support for whether identity management influences level of work volition in the face of anti-bisexual marginalization for Black bisexual women.

In this study, the moderation effect of proactive personality was not supported for gendered racial or bisexual specific microaggressions with decent work. The moderation effect of proactive personality on the relationship between microaggressions and decent work has not been previously examined. Therefore, despite the moderation effect not being supported for the current study, this study adds to the literature as it provides some information about this moderation. Proactive people believe in their ability to change and impact their work environment (Bateman & Crant, 1993). Based on the results of study, Black bisexual women do not perceive themselves as able to change or stop the harmful impact of gendered racial and bisexual microaggressions by being proactive. Since gendered racial and bisexual microaggressions occurring in the workplace are a microcosm of gendered racial and sexuality-based oppression occurring in society, they can seem tied to these forms of oppression and therefore unable to be managed or changed by an individual’s actions. Future research should further explore how bisexual women and Black bisexual women navigate experiences of bisexual microaggressions in a different context. It is also imperative to further assess the level of outness as it relates to navigating bisexual microaggressions in pursuit of decent work in future research as well.

In addition, future researchers could explore further the work-related experiences of microaggressions for Black bisexual women. Future researchers might consider conducting qualitative and phenomenological studies on gendered racial and bisexual microaggressions experienced by Black bisexual women at work. Qualitative research could also be used to
determine whether gendered racial and bisexual microaggressions impact specific aspects of decent work rather than decent work. For example, researchers could explore whether the increase in frequency of gendered racial and/or bisexual microaggressions influence to what degree the workplace is considered as interpersonally safe or complements family and social values. Along with future researchers furthering research and knowledge regarding understanding the impact of gendered racial and microaggressions at work for Black bisexual women, future researchers could also explore ways for Black bisexual women to respond to these incidents in the workplace.

Future research could benefit from exploring strategies to counteract the impact of gendered racial and bisexual microaggressions for Black bisexual women. Prior researchers have defined some interpersonal and systemic strategies to counteract the impact of microaggressions. Sue and colleagues (2019) developed microinterventions to dismantle and disempower racial microaggressions at the interpersonal, institutional, and societal level. Similarly, future researchers might consider examining the efficaciousness of microinterventions in responding specifically to gendered racial and bisexual specific microaggressions. Specifically, researchers might explore how to modify microinterventions not only to specifically address gendered racial and bisexual microaggressions but to also examine how efficacious they are in the workplace.

Additionally, in future research on microaggressions there should be consideration for how microaggressions are defined and the familiarity the sample has with the concept. The way in which microaggressions are defined could impact findings as research participants may define their experiences of marginalization differently or associate other forms of marginalization with their ability to access decent work. For example, some participants might be more aware of overt marginalization and its impact on work. The awareness of microaggressions and how they are
defined could also influence whether research participants acknowledge the influence of microaggressions on work experiences including the inability to access decent work. Therefore, future researchers should consider inquiring about participant’s familiarity with the concept of microaggressions as well as consider providing a definition of the term microaggression.

Lastly, researchers should consider potential difficulties with recruitment of samples of Black bisexual women. In the current study there was difficulty initially accessing this sample as Black bisexual women occupy multiple marginalized identified, and it is often hard to identify this particular population. Future researchers should consider utilizing snowball sampling through bisexual organizations as well as online platforms, specifically Prolific for recruitment of Black bisexual women. These resources were shown to be the most reliable and efficacious for recruiting a significant number of participants within a timeframe of one week to one month. Thus, future researchers should take time to consider a plan for how to access this population and the timeframe for data collection and analysis.

**Practice Implications**

The current study has implications for practice and training in counseling psychology. The study’s findings highlight the level at which forms of oppression are intersectional for Black bisexual women based on the correlation between gendered racial and bisexual microaggressions. Thus, when working with Black bisexual women, mental health professionals should be informed about how to assist Black bisexual women with navigating microaggressions from an intersectional perspective as well as workplace discrimination and overcoming barriers at work. In terms of addressing microaggressions, practitioners should work to familiarize themselves with the literature on microaggressions including both how to define microaggressions but also on implementing microinterventions (Miles et al., 2021). Practitioners
can familiarize themselves with literature on specific microaggressions including intersectional, gendered racial, and bisexual microaggressions as there is no prior literature specifically looking at microaggressions for Black bisexual women. Additionally, practitioners should work on building competency in multiculturalism (Miles et al., 2021). Practitioners should also inquire about whether clients appraise incidents as microaggressions or related to marginalization targeting their social identities (race, gender, or sexuality). Inquiring about how the client appraises the incident will allow practitioners to understand how to approach dialogue around this topic. Understanding this can determine whether the client needs validation, psychoeducation about microaggressions, or encouragement in asserting themselves or engaging in activism.

Nadal (2014) also provided questions to determine responses to microaggressions, including intersectional, gendered, racial, and LGBT microaggressions. This list of questions includes questions such as asking whether a microaggression occurred and determining the possible consequences of responding to a microaggressions. This list of questioning provided by Nadal (2014) is also useful to practitioners to help clients assess for microaggression occurrences and plan how to respond to them or even to provide directly to clients to help them determine how to assess for and respond on their own. Additionally, while it is helpful for Black bisexual women clients and other marginalized clients to reflect upon and learn about the occurrences of microaggressions targeting them, it is just as important for them to understand how these can occur in the workplace and how to navigate them in that context.

In the workplace, Black bisexual women experience both bierasure that renders them invisible and gendered racial oppression that at times makes them hypervisible. Counseling psychologists should also be aware that often Black bisexual women must manage all three
identities as Black, bisexual, and women to mitigate their vulnerability to discrimination at work. Also, given that Black bisexual women experience such barriers to accessing decent work, counseling psychologists should be aware of and prepared to provide appropriate resources for this group including support groups, culturally relevant websites and online communities, and appropriate reporting protocol for such instances (i.e., how to document and report discriminatory experiences if needed).

In addition, clinicians providing individual therapy to Black bisexual women should implement cultural values of Black women in clinical practice. Implementing culturally appropriate interventions can include validating Black bisexual women’s experiences rooted in negative stereotypes based on race, gender, and sexuality (Avent Harris et al., 2021). Therapist should also have an awareness of systemic oppressions facing Black bisexual women and provide positive affirmation for their bisexual identity as well (Nova et al., 2013). It was also found to be effective and helpful for clinicians to encourage activism with Black women clients (Avent Harris et al., 2021). Therefore, it can also be helpful to Black bisexual women clients to explore ways they can engage in activism in the workplace including advocating against racist, sexist, and heterosexist policies in the workplace. Thus, individual therapy can be useful for guiding Black bisexual women in dealing with internalized and external stressors related to anti-black racial, gender, and bisexual based marginalization.

Furthermore, practice interventions such as providing support groups for Black women that are inclusive of sexual minority and bisexual women should be considered as well. Support groups have been found to be effective in relieving stress when discussions on workplace discrimination were facilitated for Black women (Mays, 1995). In more recent findings, Black women groups, referred to as ‘sistah’ circles, were found to provide support and assist with
mental health (Jones et al., 2023). Black women groups can also allow Black women to have a place to connect with other Black women with similar presenting concerns as well as allow them to share resources (Coker et al., 2023; Jones et al., 2023). Therefore, provision of support groups led by Black women could also be useful in providing a safe place for Black women, including Black bisexual women, to connect with other Black women about shared experiences and to relieve psychological distress connected to discriminatory experiences.

Lastly, practical implications that go beyond individual therapy for strategies to intervene against gendered racial and bisexural microaggressions in the workplace are also relevant. Defining strategies benefits this population and employers and employees in general, as it will encourage employers to create a workplace environment that caters to and fosters appreciation for increased diversity within the workforce. Prior researchers have defined some interpersonal and systemic strategies to counteract the impact of microaggressions. Microinterventions, used to intervene against racial microaggressions, could also be useful in implementing to counteract gendered racial and bisexual microaggressions in the workplace (Sue et al., 2019). Microinterventions include dismantling and counteracting the microaggressions as well as gathering support for the individual targeted by the microaggression, in this case it would be Black bisexual women. These microinterventions are not only useful for individuals in the workplace but could be useful for the employer to implement or for use of diversity consultants as well.

Training Implications

In addition to practice implications, there are training implications for counseling psychologists based on the study's results. While the number of Black bisexual women in the field of counseling psychology has not been reported, this group's needs overlap with that of
Black women and bisexual/queer women. Thus, addressing the needs of this group would be beneficial to several other minority groups that partake in the field of counseling psychology. Given the prevalence of bisexual and gendered racial microaggressions in the current study for Black bisexual women, training programs should allow for assistance to Black bisexual women (and similar groups) with resources to access decent work. Mentorship programs and specified training opportunities are beneficial to the academic progress and professional development of Black students (Shorter, 2016). Specifically, mentorships between Black professionals and professors were recommended as a strategy to guide Black students in their careers and navigating racism (Shorter, 2016). Mentorship and training programs were also found to positively impact LGB counseling psychology trainees in prior research, especially with consideration of multiple minoritized identities (Croteau, 1998). However, there has since been little exploration of the positive impact of mentorship for LGB counseling psychology students. Thus, further exploration of the impact and mentorship needs of sexual minority students holding multiple minority identities needs further exploration. Considering the positive impact of mentorship programs on Black and LGB students, access to mentorship programs might increase Black bisexual women's perception of work volition thus increasing their ability to access decent work. Thus, training programs in counseling psychology and other related fields should consider how mentorship and training opportunities could positively influence the academic and career outcomes of Black bisexual women and other overlapping groups.

Other training considerations include specifically training clinicians to work with Black bisexual women and other individuals with marginalized intersections of identities. When training clinicians to work with this population, increasing the diversity within psychology and counseling and incorporating nondominant perspective frameworks should be considered.
According to the American Psychological Association (2018), approximately 84% of the psychology workforce is White and over 70% of psychology doctoral graduates were White. Thus, there is a lack of racial/ethnic diversity in psychology. Diversifying the field of psychology, including increasing Black clinicians, would allow the field to be more prepared to train clinicians to work with Black and other diverse communities as more perspectives from these communities will be represented and reflected in the research, training, and practice of psychology especially at the graduate level (Goode-Cross & Grim, 2016).

A critical part of incorporating diverse perspectives includes incorporating nondominant frameworks that differ from traditional models as they focus on the lives of people of color and queer people. For example, integrating frameworks such as liberation theory, critical race theory, and radical healing are perspectives that should be integrating into training curriculum and practice (French et al., 2020) to prepare psychologists and counselors to address the needs of marginalized communities like Black bisexual women. Likewise, to address career related experiences of communities like Black bisexual women, trainees are typically required to complete a course on vocational psychology or career counseling and should be exposed to nontraditional models of vocational psychology including the psychology of working framework used for this study. Exposing trainees to approach career counseling from a non-dominant perspective prepares future practitioners to address the career experiences of groups like Black bisexual women.

**Conclusion**

This study makes a valuable contribution since it adds to the literature on Black women and Black bisexual women in vocational psychology, an area of research in which they have been deemed invisible. The exclusion of Black bisexual women and Black women in
psychological research reflects the extended history of Black women being excluded or marginalized within civil rights organizations and movements (Crenshaw, 2013; Epps & Warren, 2020). Black women began documenting and producing literature on understanding the daily lived experiences and intersection of oppression facing Black women and Black sexual minority women (Collins, 2000; Nayak, 2019). The intellectual production of Black women scholars redefined femininity and womanhood as experienced by Black women which is tied directly to the survival of Black women (Harris-Perry, 2011; hooks, 2014). Consistent with prior Black feminist and Womanist scholarship, the current study centralized the experiences of Black women and more specifically Black bisexual women (Nayak, 2019). This study also provides continued evidence of the matrix of oppression faced by Black women in the workplace and in the broader society.

Additionally, the findings have implications for practice and research. These findings can be used in career counseling, training, and psychological research. Regarding practice, findings from this study indicate the importance of acknowledging and addressing the intersectional experiences of Black bisexual women when they are seeking, navigating, and obtaining work. Furthermore, in training experiences, this should be acknowledged as having multiple marginalized identities are linked to experiencing unique forms of marginalization that could impact academic and career outcomes for this group. Lastly, future researchers should consider examining the intersectional relationship between gendered racial microaggressions and bisexual microaggressions with relevant additional variables related to the relationship between gendered racial and bisexual microaggressions and decent work.
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Appendices

Appendix A: Demographic Form

**Demographic Form**

1. What is your age? ______

2. Please select one of the following that best describes your gender.
   a. Woman
   b. Transgender
   c. Gender Nonconforming
   d. ________________

3. What is your race/ethnicity? ________________

4. What is your sexual identity?
   a. Bisexual
   b. ________________

5. Please share your job title. ________________

6. What geographic region do you currently reside? ________________

7. What is your marital status?
   a. Single
   b. Married
   c. Divorced
   d. Widowed.

8. Please select your employment status.
   a. Employed
   b. Unemployed
   c. Student
   d. Social Security (SSI)
   e. Retired

9. Please select one of the following that best describes your educational attainment.
10. Please select one of the following that best describes one of your parent’s educational attainment.
   a. Did not finish high school
   b. GED/ High School diploma
   c. Associate’s Degree
   d. Bachelor’s Degree
   e. Graduate Degree
   f. Doctorate Degree
   g. Unknown

11. Please select one of the following that best describes your other parent’s educational attainment.
   a. Did not finish high school
   b. GED/ High School diploma
   c. Associate’s Degree
   d. Bachelor’s Degree
   e. Graduate Degree
   f. Doctorate Degree
   g. Unknown

12. What is your immediate family’s household income?
   a. 0-12,000
   b. 13,000-20,000
   c. 21,000-35,000
   d. 36,000-45,000
e. 50,000-65,000

f. 75,000+
Appendix B

Permission was obtained from Dr. Jioni Lewis to use this scale.

**Gendered Racial Microaggressions Scale – Black Women**

**Directions.** Please think about your experiences as a Black woman. Please read each item and think of how often each event has happened to you in your lifetime. In addition, please rate how stressful each experience was for you. Stressful can include feeling upset, bothered, offended, or annoyed by the event.

**Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Less than once a year</td>
<td>A few times a Year</td>
<td>About once a month</td>
<td>A few times a month</td>
<td>Once a week or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appraisal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This has never happened to me</td>
<td>Not at all stressful</td>
<td>Slightly stressful</td>
<td>Moderately stressful</td>
<td>Very stressful</td>
<td>Extremely stressful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Someone accused me of being angry when I was speaking in a calm manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Someone assumed that I did not have much to contribute to the conversation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I have been told that I am too independent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Someone has made me feel unattractive because I am a Black woman.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In talking with others, someone has told me to calm down.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My comments have been ignored in a discussion in a work, school, or other professional setting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I have been told that I am too assertive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Someone has made a sexually inappropriate comment about my butt, hips, or thighs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I have been perceived to be an &quot;angry black woman.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Someone has challenged my authority in a work, school, or other professional setting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Someone made a negative comment to me about my skin color/skin tone.

12. Someone made me feel exotic as a Black woman.

13. Someone has imitated the way they think Black women speak in front of me (for example, "g-i-r-l-f-r-i-e-n-d").

14. I have been disrespected by people in a work, school, or other professional setting.

15. Someone made me feel unattractive because of the size of my butt, hips, or thighs.

16. I have been assumed to be a strong Black woman.

17. Someone has assumed that I should have a certain body type because I am a Black woman.

18. I have felt unheard in a work, school, or other professional setting.

19. I have received negative comments about my hair when I wear it in a natural hairstyle.

20. I have been told that I am sassy and straightforward.

21. Someone objectified me based on my physical features as a Black woman.

22. I have felt someone has tried to "put me in my place" in a work, school, or other professional setting.

23. Someone assumed I speak a certain way because I am a Black woman.

24. I have felt excluded from networking opportunities by White co-workers.

25. I have received negative comments about the size of my facial features.
26. Someone perceived me to be sexually promiscuous (sexually loose).

Please do not copy, reproduce, or circulate the Gendered Racial Microaggressions Scale without written permission from the author.

© 2015 Jioni A. Lewis
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Bisexual Microaggression Scale: For Women

Please think about the number of times you have experienced each situation in the last 6 months, related to your sexual identity. Select the response that best matches your experience.

0—Never
1—Once
2—A few times
3—About once a month
4—About once a week
5—Multiple times a week
6—Every day
7—This situation is not applicable to me.

1. Someone suggested my bisexual identity is a phase.
2. Someone told me I don’t belong in LGBT spaces.
3. Someone said they don’t understand bisexuals.
4. Someone dismissed my bisexuality as a fad.
5. Someone dismissed bisexuality as just a way to get attention.
6. Someone suggested I am confused about my bisexual identity.
7. Someone indicated bisexuals are untrustworthy.
8. Someone implied bisexuals are unreliable.
9. Someone showed mistrust toward me because I’m bisexual.
10. Someone suggested I would leave them for someone of another gender.
11. A romantic partner asked for details about my sexual behavior with people of other genders.
12. Someone was offended when I turned down their sexual advances.
13. Someone asked inappropriate questions about my bisexuality.
14. Someone asked me what genitals I like.
15. Someone asked me about my past sexual experiences when I told them I’m bi.
16. Someone asked whether I have had sex with a woman.
17. Someone asked whether I have had sex with a man.
18. Someone asked how many men I have had sex with.
19. Someone asked me to prove that I’m bi by discussing my sexual history.
20. Someone asked how I knew that I was bisexual.
21. Someone asked which gender I prefer the most.
22. Someone heterosexual seemed to assume I would hit on their romantic partner(s).
23. Someone made sexual advances toward me when I told them I’m bi.
24. Someone asked if I wanted to have a threesome when I told them I’m bi.
25. Someone assumed that coming out as bi is a way of saying I’m open for anything sexually.
26. Someone indicated that bisexuals aren’t part of the LGBT community.
27. Someone made me feel ashamed to date men.
28. A bisexual character on a show was not labeled as bisexual.
29. Someone discussed an LGBTQ issue that erased bisexuality.
30. Someone defined bisexuality as reinforcing of gender binaries (i.e., the idea that there are only two genders).
31. Someone gave me less support than they gave people of other sexual identities.
32. Someone who is gay or a lesbian was uncomfortable around me.
33. Bisexuality was excluded from an LGBTQ space or discussion.
34. Someone made me feel I had to be hyperaware of my bisexuality at an LGBTQ event.
35. Gay men or lesbians saw me as an ally more than as part of the community.
36. Someone assumed I cannot be bisexual because of my other identities.
37. I was pressured to constantly validate my other identities because I am bi.
38. Someone called my other identities into doubt because I’m bi.
Appendix D

Decent Work Scale

Please choose one answer to each of the following statements based on this scale:

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Moderately Disagree
3 = Slightly Disagree
4 = Neutral
5 = Slightly Agree
6 = Moderately Agree
7 = Strongly Agree

1. I feel emotionally safe interacting with people at work.
2. At work, I feel safe from emotional or verbal abuse of any kind.
3. I feel physically safe interacting with people at work.
4. I get good healthcare benefits from my job.
5. I have a good healthcare plan at work.
6. My employer provides acceptable options for healthcare.
7. I am not properly paid for my work. (r)
8. I do not feel I am paid enough based on my qualifications and experience. (r)
9. I am rewarded adequately for my work.
10. I do not have enough time for non-work activities. (r)
11. I have no time to rest during the work week. (r)
12. I have free time during the work week.
13. The values of my organization match my family values.
14. My organization’s values align with my family values.
15. The values of my organization match the values within my community.
Appendix E

Work Volition Scale

Please choose one answer to each of the following statements based on this scale:

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Moderately Disagree
3 = Slightly Disagree
4 = Neutral
5 = Slightly Agree
6 = Moderately Agree
7 = Strongly Agree

1. I’ve been able to choose the jobs I have wanted.
2. I can do the work I want, despite external barriers.
3. The current state of the economy prevents me from working the job I want (r).
4. The jobs I would like to pursue don’t exist in my area (r).
5. Due to my financial situation, I need to take any job I can find (r).
6. When looking for work, I’ll take whatever I can get (r).
7. In order to provide for my family, I often have to take jobs I do not enjoy (r).
8. I don’t like my job, but it would be impossible for me to find a new one (r).
9. I feel able to change jobs if I want to.
10. The only thing that matters in choosing a job is to make ends meet (r).
11. I feel that outside forces have really limited my work and career options (r).
12. I feel control over my job choices.
13. Negative factors outside my personal control had a large impact on my current career choice (r).

Total scale score: all items
Appendix F

Proactive Personality Scale

Please choose one answer to each of the following statements based on this scale:

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Moderately Disagree
3 = Slightly Disagree
4 = Neutral
5 = Slightly Agree
6 = Moderately Agree
7 = Strongly Agree

1. I am constantly on the lookout for new ways to improve my life.
2. Wherever I have been, I have been a powerful force for constructive change.
3. Nothing is more exciting than seeing my ideas turn into reality.
4. If I see something I don’t like, I fix it.
5. No matter what the odds, if I believe in something I will make it happen.
6. I love being a champion for my ideas, even against others’ opposition.
7. I excel at identifying opportunities.
8. I am always looking for better ways to do things.
9. If I believe in an idea, no obstacle will prevent me from making it happen.
10. I can spot a good opportunity long before others can.
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HSIRB Approval Letter

Date: February 24, 2021

To: Samuel Beasley, Principal Investigator
    Angela Lewis, Student Investigator for dissertation

From: Amy Naugle, Ph.D., Chair

Re: IRB Project Number 21-01-12

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project titled “The Impact of Gendered Racial and Bisexual Specific Microaggressions on the Access to Decent Work for Black Bisexual Women: An Examination of the Moderation Effects of Work Volition and Proactive Personality” has been approved under the exempt category of review by the Western Michigan University Institutional Review Board (IRB). 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: This research may only be conducted exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes to this project (e.g., add an investigator, increase number of subjects beyond the number stated in your application, etc.). Failure to obtain approval for changes will result in a protocol deviation.

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 IRB for consultation.

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

Western Michigan University
Counselor Education Counseling Psychology

Principal Investigator: Samuel Beasley, PhD
Student Investigator: Angela Lewis, MS
Title of Study: The Impact of Gendered Racial and Bisexual Specific Microaggressions on the Access to Decent Work for Black Bisexual Women: An Examination of the Moderation Effects of Work Volition and Proactive Personality

You are invited to participate in this research project titled "The Impact of Gendered Racial and Bisexual Specific Microaggressions on the Access to Decent Work for Black Bisexual Women: An Examination of the Moderation Effects of Work Volition and Proactive Personality."

STUDY SUMMARY: This consent form is part of an informed consent process for a research study and it will provide information that will help you decide whether you want to take part in this study. Participation in this study is completely voluntary. The purpose of the research is to examine the relationship between marginalization such as gendered racial and bisexual specific microaggressions with decent work for Black bisexual women and will serve as Angela Lewis’ dissertation project for the requirements of the doctoral degree in counseling psychology. If you take part in the research, you will be asked to complete a survey online. Your time in the study will take approximately 25 minutes to complete the survey. Possible risk and costs to you for taking part in the study may be discomfort from answering sensitive questions and time to complete the survey and there are no direct benefits from taking part in this study. Your alternative to taking part in the research study is not to take part in it.

The following information in this consent form will provide more details about the research study. Please email the student investigator, Angela Lewis at angela.c.lewis@wmich.edu if you have any questions or need more clarification and to assist you in deciding if you wish to participate in the research study. You are not giving up any of your legal rights by agreeing to take part in this research or by signing this consent form. After all of your questions have been answered and the consent document reviewed, if you decide to participate in this study, you will be asked to sign this consent form.

What are we trying to find out in this study? The purpose of this study is to understand the relationship between gendered racial microaggressions and bisexual specific microaggressions and access to decent work for Black bisexual women. The role of work volition and proactive personality in this relationship will also be examined.
Who can participate in this study?
Individuals who identify as Black, bisexual women and are at least 18 years of age. Participants should have some history of work experience or be currently employed.

Where will this study take place?
The data for the study will be collected using Qualtrics, an online survey software. The location in which the surveys are completed is determined by the participant.

What is the time commitment for participating in this study?
The time commitment for participating in this study is approximately 25 minutes. Completion of this study may take less or more time depending on how fast each survey is completed.

What will you be asked to do if you choose to participate in this study?
If you choose to participate in this study, you will be asked to respond to questions on surveys regarding your experiences in the workplace.

What information is being measured during the study?
Information measured in this study include experiences of gendered racial microaggressions, bisexual specific microaggressions, decent work, proactive personality, and work volition.

What are the risks of participating in this study and how will these risks be minimized? The risks for participating in this study are considered minimal. There is possibility that you will find it uncomfortable to answer questions on the survey. Participation in this study is voluntary therefore if you chose to, you may stop participation in the study at any time. You can choose to not answer any question for any reason. You are also able to contact the principal investigator or the student investigator if they have questions prior to, during, or after the study. Information collected from your participation in the survey will be kept confidential.

What are the benefits of participating in this study?
Results from this study will contribute to filling gaps in the literature on Black bisexual women in the workplace. Results can be used to inform workplaces and individuals about the workplace experiences of Black bisexual women. There are no direct benefits to you.

Are there any costs associated with participating in this study? There are no costs associated with participating in this study.

Is there any compensation for participating in this study?
There is no compensation offered for participation in this study.

Who will have access to the information collected during this study?
The principal investigator, student investigator, and Western Michigan University’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) will have access to the information collected during this study. All data will be kept secure, in accordance with the standards of Western Michigan University, federal regulations, and the American Psychological Association.
What will happen to my information collected for this research project after the study is over? After information that could identify you has been removed, de-identified information collected for this research may be used for research presentations at professional conferences or research publications.

What if you want to stop participating in this study? You can choose to stop participating in the study at anytime for any reason. You will not suffer any prejudice or penalty by your decision to stop your participation. You will experience NO consequences personally if you choose to withdraw from this study.

Should you have any questions prior to or during the study, you can contact the faculty advisor, Samuel Beasley at samuel.beasley@wmich.edu or the student investigator, Angela Lewis at angela.c.lewis@wmich.edu. You may also contact the Chair of the Institutional Review Board at 269-387-8293 or the Vice President for Research at 269-387-8298 if questions arise during the course of the study.

This consent document has been approved for use for one year by the Western Michigan University Institutional Review Board (WMU IRB) 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.

I have read this informed consent document. The risks and benefits have been explained to me. To indicate your consent and participate in the study please select one below.

_____ I agree to participate in this research study.
_____ I do not agree to participate in this research study.
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Email Exchange for Permission for use of Gendered Racial Microaggression Scale

Greetings Dr. Lewis,

My name is Angela Lewis, a doctoral candidate in the counseling psychology program at Western Michigan University. I am emailing you seeking permission to use your gendered racial microaggression scale for my dissertation study. I am hoping to examine gendered racial microaggressions for Black bisexual women for my dissertation. If you have any additional questions about my research or interests in using your scale for my dissertation please let me know.

Thank you so much for your time,
Angela Lewis, MS CPC-I
Doctoral Candidate
Counseling Psychology
Western Michigan University

Hi Angela (future Dr. Lewis) ;-) 

Thanks so much for your interest in using the Gendered Racial Microaggressions Scale for your research project. Please fill out the scale utilization form linked below. Once you submit the form, you will receive a link on your screen that includes the scale items and scoring information. If you have any questions, please feel free to reach out to me or my graduate research assistant Shereen who is CC’d on this email.

GRMS Utilization Form: https://forms.gle/y6Ug8EyCvuhibz6pKA

Best,
Jioni A. Lewis, Ph.D.
Associate Professor & Co-Director of Training
Counseling Psychology Doctoral Program
University of Maryland, College Park
Website: https://education.umd.edu/jioni-lewis

Vice President for Education & Training (2022-2025)
Society of Counseling Psychology (APA Division 17)

_Past President, Psychology of Black Women (2020-2021)_

Society for the Psychology of Women (APA Division 35)