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As is the case for members of any stigmatized minority group, lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) individuals face heightened adversity within the workplace (Herek, 2009). However, unlike employees with stigmatized identities that are readily apparent (e.g., race, gender), employees who identify as LGB are afforded a unique opportunity to avoid the adversity associated with their stigma altogether by choosing not to identify themselves (e.g., maintain the appearance of being heterosexual). However, despite the potential negative consequences, many LGB employees choose to disclose their sexual orientation to their coworkers and supervisors. Research on the impact of disclosure behaviors on subsequent job satisfaction has had mixed results (Kuyper, 2015; Eldahan et al., 2016), making it unclear when it is advantageous for members of this community to identify themselves. Furthermore, much of the work done in today’s organizations is done in teams, making it more likely that LGB individuals will disclose to members of their team if they choose to disclose at all. However, there has been little attention paid to the outcomes associated with disclosure in work teams.
The following study examined the interaction effect of individual LGB identity characteristics (affirmation, centrality) and a team climate variable (identity support) in predicting the impact of disclosure on several key team-relevant outcomes (trust, commitment, withdrawal, conflict). Identity support was found to be related to several key team outcomes. Additionally, despite sample limitations such as range restriction and size, subgroup correlations suggested that there are different team-relevant outcomes associated with disclosure for employees with low levels of identity affirmation, working in teams with low levels of identity support. Furthermore, there was evidence of a moderating effect of identity centrality on the relationship between disclosure and team commitment.

Implications and future research directions are discussed.
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Introduction

“Is it better to speak or to die?” – Andre Aciman

For individuals who identify as lesbian, gay, or bisexual (LGB), the decision to speak the truth about their identity can feel like a matter of life and death. Whether an individual is coming out to his or her friends, family, or even to himself or herself, the moments before the act of disclosure can be particularly daunting. An individual who is about to tell others that they are LGB often experiences shame, self-doubt, and fear of rejection. Unfortunately, these fears are frequently warranted. LGB youth represent almost 40% of the homeless population, typically as a result of the very act of disclosure (Withers, 2012). Furthermore, the stigma associated with identifying as LGB is experienced throughout all stages of life (Dentato, Orwat, Spira, & Walker, 2014), with members of this population experiencing more adversity than their heterosexual peers (Herek, 2009). Adding to the difficulty of the disclosure process, members of this population have a choice to not disclose and allow others to simply assume their heterosexuality. For some, this alternative to stigma is appealing, leading them to maintain an identity which is not true to how they identify behind closed doors. However, for many, the act of disclosure is a way to live more authentically (Bosson, Weaver, & Prewitt-Freilino, 2012) and develop interpersonal relationships (King, Reilly, & Hebl, 2008). Whether or not an individual decides to disclose and “speak” has implications for their mental and physical health (Beals, Peplau, & Gable, 2009). Within the workplace, the decision to identify oneself as non-
heterosexual often carries weighty implications for the future success of the individual, making the decision even more complicated.

Existing research on the outcomes of disclosure in the workplace has had mixed results, with some studies showing a negative relationship between disclosure and individual-level outcomes (e.g., job satisfaction, turnover intentions) as a result of increased stress (Eldahan et al., 2016), while others show a positive relationship (Griffith & Hebl, 2002), or no difference (Kuyper, 2015) for individuals who disclose. There are clearly many factors that determine the experience of LGB employees after disclosing at work. Furthermore, existing research has been focused predominately on determining what contributes to the decision to disclose at work, but not what happens after the disclosure has occurred. Additionally, LGB individuals are most likely to disclose their sexual orientation to individuals with whom they have a close relationship (Omarzu, 2000). Much of daily life in today’s organizations involves teamwork, meaning a majority of an employee’s interactions will be with members of their team. Although this suggests an LGB individual would be most likely to disclose to their team members, should they decide to disclose at all, research has yet to look at the impact of disclosure on interpersonal dynamics within teams. Therefore, the current study will propose and test a model regarding the impact of LGB identity on several key team-relevant outcomes. In doing so, this study aims to make several contributions to the field’s understanding of the experience of LGB employees, as well as members of other groups with invisible stigmas (e.g., disability, illness).
First, this study examines identity variables of the discloser (identity affirmation, identity centrality) and the target of the disclosure (identity support). In doing so, this study aims to better understand the role identity plays in predicting team-relevant outcomes. Second, by proposing that the outcomes of disclosure are impacted by an interaction of individual and contextual variables, this study expands on prior theoretical work which proposed this relationship in racial-(Roberts, Cha, & Kim, 2014) and sexual-identity management contexts (Croteau, Anderson, & VanderWal, 2008; Jones & King, 2014). Third, this study answers a call for research that attempts to better understand the strengths of employees with unique backgrounds due to their minority status, in order to develop training and other practical applications that better serve the needs of all employees (Vaughan & Rodriguez, 2014). Finally, by examining the impact of disclosure team-relevant outcomes, this study offers a preliminary examination of the experience of LGB employees at this underrepresented organizational level.

**Theoretical Background**

**LGB Employee Experiences**

At first consideration, the percentage of the population identifying as LGB may seem insignificant, with a 2016 Gallup poll estimating about 4.1% of the United States population identifies in this manner (Gates, 2017). However, as more individuals come out and live openly, it encourages others to do the same. This would suggest not only that the current Gallup poll numbers are an underestimation, but that the percentage of the population identifying as LGB will
continue to grow (Gates, 2017). Furthermore, past research has shown that people do not have to identify as LGB themselves in order for workplace policy which concerns LGB individuals to have an impact on job satisfaction and turnover intentions (Dahling, Wiley, Fishman, & Loihle, 2016). Instead, these outcomes are influenced by the extent to which an individual identifies with the LGB community, whether due to his or her personal orientation or that of a loved one (Dahling et al., 2016). Policy and practices that impact the LGB community clearly impact the general work community within organizations as well. Despite the importance of understanding the experiences of this unique employee population, there has been a relatively lacking amount of research on the subject. The research that does exist has focused on a few broad topics (e.g., discrimination, diversity climate, disclosure). As previously stated, an employee’s sexual orientation must first be known to others in order for the employee to encounter any of the adversity associated with their stigmatized identity. Therefore, it is logical that a large portion of the literature on the LGB employee experience has focused on disclosure behaviors.

**Disclosure**

The term “coming out” has been popularized to refer to the process through which an individual informs others that they are not heterosexual (Clair, Beatty, & Maclean, 2005). This process is not the same for all members of the LGB community, with some choosing to come out on a person-by-person basis, while others choose to disclose to many individuals at once using social media. Day and
Schoenrade (2000) were among the first to examine the experience of gay and lesbian workers, determining that coming out “was best operationalized as a continuum of disclosure, measured as the degree to which homosexual workers do not keep their sexual orientation secret from associates” (p. 349). Their definition challenged prior notions that disclosure was a simple dichotomy of “out” or “closeted,” and showed that the act of disclosure had implications for gay and lesbian employees (Day & Schoenrade, 2000). However, this definition does not clearly delineate what disclosure in the workplace actually looks like, or what behaviors gay and lesbian employees perform to hide or reveal their sexual orientation, also known as sexual identity management (SIM) strategies (Chrobot-Mason, Button, & DiClementi, 2001).

According to Chrobot-Mason and colleagues (2001), gay and lesbian employees typically utilize one of three different SIM strategies in the workplace: counterfeiting, avoiding, or integrating. Counterfeiting refers to the creation of a false heterosexual identity (Chrobot-Mason et al., 2001). An individual who is practicing a counterfeiting SIM strategy, may fabricate a relationship in order to appear heterosexual (e.g., posting photos with a platonic friend of the opposite sex and passing them off as romantically involved). Counterfeiting is typically considered to have the most negative implications for individual outcomes in terms of psychological well-being and productivity, as it involves blatant denial of one’s self-truth (McNaught, 1993). An individual who does not wish to go this far in denying their sexual orientation may choose to engage in an avoiding SIM strategy.
Avoiding also fails to acknowledge one’s true sexual orientation, but to a lesser extent than counterfeiting. An individual who is avoiding will simply choose to ignore the issue altogether (Chrobot-Mason et al., 2001). They may opt to avoid social engagements that could reveal their sexual orientation (e.g., avoid talk of relationships, not bring a partner to a work event). Although similar to counterfeiting, avoiding does not have the same negative implications depending on the motivations of the individual (Jackson & Mohr, 2016). Unlike the first two, the final SIM strategy, integrating, involves the acknowledgement of one’s sexual orientation to others (Chrobot-Mason et al., 2001). According to Chrobot-Mason and colleagues (2001) methods of integrating may be either overt (e.g., telling others directly) or covert (e.g., displaying photos of their partner in the office). Disregarding instances where the cause of integrating is external to the individual (e.g., being outing), this strategy would most closely represent disclosure in the workplace.

Clair and colleagues (2005) suggested that SIM strategies typically fall into one of two broad categories: passing or revealing. Passing refers to a situation where an individual acts in such a way as to hide their membership in a less desirable social group, in an attempt to “enjoy the privileges afforded to the dominant group” (Clair et al., 2005, p. 82). In other words, by acting in a way that is thought of as being associated with the socially dominant group (e.g., acting straight), a member of a less dominant group (e.g., LGB) can be mistakenly classified as a member of that dominant group (e.g., heterosexual). Revealing, on
the other hand, refers to what is typically considering to be coming out, or integrating, in traditional SIM strategies. Clair and colleagues (2005) suggest that passing may occur unintentionally, with individuals who are less self-aware and engage in less self-monitoring, being more likely to accidentally “pass” as heterosexual. However, they suggest this can have negative social implications, should the individual’s peers suspect them to be a member of the LGB community and grow suspicious of the individual’s motives for withholding their identity from the group (Clair et al., 2005).

In addition to passing and revealing, prior research has suggested that individuals may choose to engage in a third category of behaviors: signaling (Jones & King, 2014). Signaling strategies are considered to be different from passing and revealing behaviors, as they allow an individual to gauge a peer’s reactions to disclosure behavior, without fully disclosing (Jones & King, 2014). An individual who is attempting to signal their sexual orientation to others may make statements which invite speculation as to their sexual orientation, without stating it explicitly. In this way, they attempt to provide their peers with hints as to the truth of their sexual orientation, but protect themselves by being able to backpedal should the response of the peer be negative. For example, an individual may attempt to signal their sexual orientation to their colleagues by discussing their involvement in gay friendly events (e.g., LGB pride festivals). However, if broaching such a topic elicits a negative response, they can simply suggest this involvement stems from a friend who identifies as LGB and backpedal to avoid negative social consequences.
This conceptualization of SIM strategies focuses on intentional revealing or signaling. However, prior research has found that individuals sometimes unintentionally reveal their sexual orientation due to their perceived mannerisms (Tskhay & Rule, 2015; Einarsdóttir, Hoel, & Lewis, 2016; Rule, Bjornsdottir, Tskhay, & Ambady, 2016).

More recently, researchers have begun to argue that workplace disclosure is more complicated than traditional SIM strategies would suggest. Jackson and Mohr (2016) argue that although concealment (e.g., counterfeiting/avoiding) “typically results in minimal information being communicated about one’s stigmatized identity, and high disclosure results in such information being shared freely” (p. 80-81), the two are not opposites ends of the same construct. Specifically, Jackson and Mohr (2016) suggest that there are three different ways in which individuals manage stigma, apart from disclosure (e.g., integration). The first, concealment behavior, could be considered similar to counterfeiting, with the individual actively attempting to hide their sexuality and resulting in similarly negative outcomes for the individual (e.g., depression, self-stigma; Jackson & Mohr, 2016). The next strategy, nondisclosure, would most closely parallel the SIM strategy of avoiding, as it involves failing to bridge the subject of sexual orientation altogether. Jackson and Mohr (2016) argue that nondisclosure would be more accurately depicted as the antithesis of disclosure, with the individual choosing not to say anything either way. Their final stigma management strategy, concealment motivation, is differentiated from concealment by the individual’s reasons for choosing to conceal
their sexual orientation (Jackson & Mohr, 2016). An individual utilizing the concealment motivation stigma management strategy may in fact attempt to hide their sexual orientation, but do so out of a belief that the issue is not relevant to the workplace (Jackson & Mohr, 2016). However, although this approach to stigma management suggests individual values play a role in determining the effects of behaviors that do not acknowledge one’s sexual orientation, Jackson and Mohr (2016) generally accept the delineation between these constructs and identity affirming behaviors as defined by integrating or revealing techniques (e.g., disclosure).

The way in which disclosure is defined and how stigma is managed in the workplace is a complicated process with clear implications for LGB employees. Therefore, it is unsurprising that the topic of disclosure is considered one of the most important topics studied with regards to the LGB employee experience (Anderson, Croteau, Chung, & DiStefano, 2001; Croteau et al., 2008). The following sections summarize the existing body of research that has examined the individual antecedents of disclosure (e.g., outness, risk management), as well as the external factors which influence an individual’s decision to disclose (e.g., organizational support, nondiscrimination policies), and how organizational and individual outcomes are impacted when an individual discloses an invisible stigma.

**Antecedents.** Members of the LGB community face heightened levels of discrimination and prejudice over the course of their lifetime compared to their heterosexual peers (Herek, 2009). Within the workforce, members of this
community are often the subject of stereotypical and discriminatory treatment that ranges in severity from mild irritation (e.g., inappropriate questions regarding their personal lives) to career damaging (e.g., being passed over for a position due to their sexual orientation; Waldo, 1999). As previously discussed, unlike members of visible minority groups (e.g., race, gender) LGB individuals are in the unique position to not make their minority status known depending on the SIM strategy they choose to use (Chrobot-Mason et al., 2001). For example, if an individual is concerned that the manager making a decision regarding a promotion is homophobic, they may choose not to discuss this aspect of themselves with this manager until the hiring decision has been made, if at all. However, many LGB employees make the decision to disclose their sexual orientation despite the associated risk, or before knowing how an organization or supervisor will respond to the information. Prior research into the antecedents of disclosure has attempted to explain why LGB employees, as well as members of other groups with invisible stigmas (e.g., cancer patients, mental illness, disability, HIV, pregnancy), make the choice to disclose at work (Sabat, Trump, & King, 2014; Jones & King, 2014). Clair and colleagues (2005) proposed that the antecedents of an individual’s decision to disclose their sexual orientation can be classified as either contextual conditions, individual differences, or personal motives.

Contextual conditions, perhaps the most highly researched of the three categories, refer to organizational conditions that serve to indicate to an LGB employee whether the disclosure of their sexual orientation will be met with
support or stigma (Clair et al., 2005). The most predominant of these contextual conditions is the extent to which the organization is perceived to support members of the LGB community (Chrobot-Mason et al., 2001; Driscoll, Kelley, & Fassinger, 1996). Intuitively, it makes sense that an individual will feel more comfortable disclosing a stigma if they work in an organization that supports the stigmatized group in general. However, Griffith and Hebl (2002) pointed out a distinction between an organization that is supportive and an organization that merely has gay-supportive policies, finding that the former led to an increase in disclosure behaviors, while the latter did not. In other words, just because an organization has policies that promote inclusion, an individual will not feel comfortable disclosing their stigma unless they perceive these efforts to be sincere and coming from higher levels of management (Griffith & Hebl, 2002). For example, many organizations attempt to implement diversity building initiatives, such as diversity training, in an attempt to build a more supportive environment for minorities. However, if these initiatives are not done correctly, they can cause more harm for members of minority groups, as they highlight differences between the groups rather than focusing on similarities (Marcus, 2013; Köllen, 2016). Despite positive intentions, such practices can result in backlash (Kaplan, 2006), making them unlikely to promote perceptions of LGB support within the organization as a whole.

In addition to organizational policies, Clair and colleagues (2005) proposed that interpersonal dynamics played a role in predicting disclosure behaviors, suggesting that the nature of the relationship between the parties involved
influences the likelihood of the disclosure itself. Ragins, Singh, and Cornwell (2007) found that LGB individuals were more likely to disclose if their coworkers or supervisors were also members of the LGB community. Furthermore, research into additional antecedents of disclosure behavior found that anticipated support played a role in predicting disclosure, with individuals being more likely to disclose if they perceive the target of the disclosure to be an ally to the community (Sabat et al., 2014). Prior research into the impact of trust between mother and son on the likelihood for the latter to disclose to the former found support for the importance of established trust in predicting disclosure behaviors (Miller & Boon, 1999), further highlighting the impact of interpersonal dynamics on the decision to disclose or not.

Finally, Clair and colleagues (2005) proposed that industry and professional norms (e.g., expectations of how to behave in professional environments) and legal protections play a role in predicting disclosure. Rumens and Kerfoot (2009) conducted qualitative analysis of the way gay men in the United Kingdom were perceived in the workforce, and found that “acting gay” could result in being perceived to be less professional. The relationship between perceived sexual orientation and expectations of job capabilities have been found to be further exacerbated in industries which are considered to be “masculine” (Collins, 2015; Johnston & Kilty, 2015), as well as within cultures with strict expectations of gender role (Ozturk, 2011). Despite the fact that there exist no federal regulations preventing employment discrimination against individuals on the basis of their
sexual orientation (Gerstein, 2017), there exist legal protections in many areas at
the state level, as well as organizational policies which attempt to prevent
discrimination (HRC, 2017). These legal protections serve to predict disclosure
behaviors by alleviating some of the risk associated with coming out at work.

The second of the categories, individual differences, refers to personality
characteristics, as well as situational differences, that lead certain individuals to be
more likely to disclose than others (Clair et al., 2005). They argue that the act of
disclosure is a risk, meaning individuals with a propensity to take additional risks
will be more likely to disclose (Clair et al., 2005). In a series of interviews,
McDermott (2006) found that there was indeed a sort of risk assessment performed
prior to making the decision to disclose. Additional support has since been found
for the notion that individuals weigh the pros and cons prior to disclosing their
sexual orientation (Hebl et al., 2014), disability (Stanley, Ridley, Harris, &
Manthorpe, 2011), and illness (Wagener et al., 2014).

Oldfield, MacEachen, Kirsh, and MacNeill (2016) argue that risk
assessment in the context of disclosure is not the same as in general. They argue
that the decision is not as simple as weighing the pros and cons, but rather
individuals must take into account the nature of the relationship itself (Oldfield et
al., 2016). This tenant of every-day risk theory could explain why propensity to
take risks would not predict a higher likelihood of disclosure independently.
Additional theoretical work has suggested that the act of coming out generates
hardiness in LGB individuals (Smith & Gray, 2009). This suggests that the
personality attribute of hardiness could predict the likelihood of an individual to disclose (Smith & Gray, 2009). Perhaps partially due to this, “outness”, or the extent to which an individual has disclosed their sexual orientation within different aspects of their lives, has been found to predict subsequent disclosure decisions (Sabat et al., 2014). Finally, situational characteristics, such as the developmental stage an individual finds themselves in or the presence of other stigmas (e.g., intersectionality), have been suggested as possible predictors of disclosure behavior which manifest themselves within individuals differently (Clair et al., 2005).

The final category of disclosure antecedents outlined by Clair and colleagues (2005) is composed of personal motives. Although these motives often overlap with the other two categories (e.g., interpersonal dynamics, risk assessment), these personal motives suggest the act of disclosure is a tactic used by individuals to achieve a goal, which transcends conflicting motives (Clair et al., 2005). The first is the desire for authentic relationships and the development of self-esteem (Jones & King, 2014). This motive will be discussed in depth later with regards to self-verification (London, Polzer, & Omoregie, 2005) and social identity theory (Tajfel, 1982). Additionally, Clair and colleagues (2005) suggest that some individuals are driven to disclose by a desire to bring about social change. Increased familiarity with LGB individuals has been found to influence beliefs about the legal standing and right to equality of the LGB community (Dahling et al., 2016). In other words, as a heterosexual individual becomes more familiar with individuals who identify openly as LGB, their views on the treatment of this group
tend to grow more positive (Dahling et al., 2016). An individual motivated by social change to disclose feels that living openly will influence the feelings of their peers and advance their rights, as well as the rights of their community (Martinez & Hebl, 2010; Hebl et al., 2014). Similarly, Roberts and colleagues (2014) suggest that even individuals with visible stigmas (e.g., racial minorities) are motivated by a desire to educate others and advance the rights of their stigmatized group when determining how to manage their racial identities at work.

In addition to these altruistic motives, there exist pragmatic reasons to disclose at work as well, such as spousal benefits or other accommodations (Clair et al., 2005). With the legalization of marriage equality (Obergefell, 2015), many organizations are now required to extend benefits to same-sex couples who were not afforded them before. This could require an individual to identify themselves as LGB to management or human resources, in order to get accommodation, who would not otherwise choose to disclose. Similarly, if a same-sex partner became sick and needed care, an individual who would rather not reveal their sexual orientation might be required to do so. The need to disclose has been examined in the context of physical illnesses, such as HIV and cancer (Fesko, 2001; Robinson et al., 2015). Stergiou-Kita, Pritlove, and Kirsh (2016) found that cancer patients often disclosed to coworkers after their condition had grown severe enough to require additional support at work. These findings were echoed in the situation of individuals with hearing loss, who only chose to disclose when they were in need of additional accommodation in the workplace (Southall, Jennings, & Gagné,
Severity (Reavley, Morgan, & Jorm, 2017) as well as the extent to which the discloser predicted they would be viewed as incompetent after the disclosure itself (Ellison, Russinova, MacDonald-Wilson, & Lyass, 2003), were also found to be predictors of the decision to disclose mental illness. Ultimately, these findings demonstrate a sentiment that is common to all individuals living with a disability of some sort: a desire not to be viewed or treated any differently due to their disability (Whitt, Cawley, Yonker, & Polage, 2014). Although members of the LGB community do not face the same health-related difficulties of these groups, their ultimate goal of equal treatment expresses a similar sentiment.

Prior research has shown that long before an individual decides to disclose their sexual orientation to other individuals, there are a variety of factors which come into play, such as contextual conditions, individual differences, and personal motives (Clair et al., 2005). Therefore, it is understandable that research questions revolving around what makes an individual disclose have dominated much of the conversation surrounding LGB employee disclosure. However, that is only the first chapter of a complicated story. The following sections highlight research into the outcomes of disclosure at work, as well as the contextual factors that influence these outcomes.

**Outcomes.** For LGB employees and those they work with, the outcome of disclosure is perhaps more important than its cause. The following section summarizes the research on the outcomes of disclosure from three different angles: individual, interpersonal, and organizational. Results on the impact of
organizational policies (e.g., nondiscrimination policies) on the relationship between disclosure and job satisfaction has been troublingly inconclusive. Griffith and Hebl (2002) found that disclosure was related to lower levels of expressed job satisfaction for LGB employees working in organizations that were not supportive of this community. However, in a study of the impact of non-discrimination policies on employee outcomes, Tejeda (2006) found that these policies play little to no role in determining the job satisfaction LGB employees reported after disclosing their sexual orientation to their supervisors. Madera, King, and Hebl (2012) offered support for a negative relationship between disclosure and job satisfaction, showing that LGB employees who perceived discrimination after disclosing their sexual orientation expressed less job satisfaction.

Findings on the relationship between disclosure and turnover intentions have been similarly inconclusive, with some studies finding disclosure has a negative relationship with turnover intention (Chung, Williams, & Dispenza, 2009; Madera et al., 2012) while others show that disclosure results in an increase in turnover intention in organizations that are predominately heterosexual and lack protective policies (Ragins & Cornwell, 2001). Overall, these findings suggest that the extent to which an LGB employee perceives an increase in discrimination after disclosing their sexual orientation predicts whether or not they will express more job satisfaction or turnover intention after coming out at work. More troubling still, prior research has shown that individuals perceive more discrimination in the
workplace after coming out, regardless of the policies that an organization has in place (Tejeda, 2006).

Velez, Moradi, and Brewster (2013) suggested that minority stress theory (MST) explains the relationship between disclosure and individual outcomes. MST suggests that members of stigmatized groups experience higher levels of psychological distress due to their marginalized status within society (Meyer, 2003). According to MST, four distinct stressors are to blame for the increased level of psychological distress frequently reported by members of the LGB community: increased experiences of discrimination, internalized heterosexism, expectations of stigma, and concealment of identity (Meyer, 2003).

As previously discussed, the experience of discrimination is more commonly encountered by members of the LGB community than their heterosexual peers (Herek, 2009). Chung and colleagues (2009) proposed that discrimination can be either formal (e.g., official organizational policies) or informal (e.g., language and behaviors which create a hostile work environment for LGB employees). An additional dichotomy exists between perceived discrimination, behaviors that may be perceived as discriminatory when they are in fact innocent (e.g., a coworker’s use of the word “gay” to mean “stupid”) and real discrimination, behaviors which are intentionally hostile (e.g., blatant harassment). Finally, Chung and colleagues (2009) distinguish between potential discrimination, or discrimination which could be encountered if an individual were to disclose their sexuality, and encountered
discrimination, which refers to acts of discrimination which openly LGB individuals have experienced in the workplace.

In addition to experiences of discrimination, MST suggests that members of the LGB community experience heightened levels of psychological distress due to internalized heterosexism (Meyer, 2003). Internalized heterosexism is often defined as the “internal denigration of sexual minority people and identities” (Velez et al., 2013, p. 532). In other words, the extent to which an individual adopts a self-view that is denigrating due to their sexual orientation has been found to lead to reduced levels of job satisfaction for LGB employees (Velez et al., 2013). Similar to the distinctions made by Chung and colleagues (2009), MST suggests that even anticipated discrimination can result in feelings of psychological distress (Meyer, 2003). Prior research on workplace disclosure of pregnancy offers further support for the notion that anticipated discrimination can result in psychological distress (Fox & Quinn, 2015; Jones, 2017). On the other hand, Griffith and Hebl (2002) found that that disclosure can lead to reduced feelings of job anxiety if met with a positive response.

The final stressor discussed within MST, concealment of identity, has been discussed in length within the context of SIM strategies (Chrobot-Mason et al., 2001). However, in addition to other psychological implications, Madera (2010) suggests that the act of hiding one’s sexual orientation (e.g., self-regulation) results in a drain on cognitive resources. Self-regulation refers to the “exertion of control over the self and occurs when a person attempts to change the way he or she would
otherwise think, feel, or behave and involves overriding or inhibiting competing urges, behaviors or desires” (Muraven & Baumeister, 2000, p. 248). Furthermore, prior research has found that the ability to self-regulate can exhaust itself with overuse (Madera, 2010). Within the context of LGB identity concealment, this would suggest that the act of hiding one’s sexual orientation is an act of self-regulation and can result in a draining of self-regulatory resources (Dejordy, 2008; Madera, 2010). Therefore, in addition to psychological distress as suggested by MST, LGB employees who are not “out” at work must monitor their own behavior, taking up cognitive and self-regulatory resources and making them less productive overall (Madera, 2010; Tsai et al., 2015).

The act of disclosure does not just impact the discloser themselves. A qualitative study by Devine and Nolan (2007) found that LGB individuals are typically able to build stronger relationships with their peers if they have previously come out to them. Similarly, meta-analysis of the effects of disclosure in general found that sharing personal information leads to an increase in liking between individuals (Collins & Miller, 1994). On the other hand, a poor response to an act of disclosure can lead to interpersonal tension and, thereby, decrease job effectiveness (Tsai et al., 2015) and helping behaviors (Jones & King, 2014). Furthermore, although it is intuitive that an act of disclosure would impact the way individuals work together in the future, Everly, Shih, and Ho (2012) found that even nondisclosure has implications for performance. Their findings showed that in performance partnerships, nondisclosure led to poorer performance if one member
of the partnership felt distracted by speculation about the other’s sexual orientation (Everly et al., 2012).

Although outcomes at the organization level has been fairly understudied, the response LGB employees receive after disclosing their sexual orientation has been found to have implications for the climate of the organization overall (Bell, Özbilgin, Beauregard, & Sürgevil, 2011). Ward and Winstanley (2003) suggest that LGB individuals who do not disclose their sexual orientation are having part of their identity silenced. Building upon this, Bell and colleagues (2011) suggest that an organizational culture where individuals feel their identities are silenced leads to a work climate where employees feel that speaking out in general will have negative consequences. This closed-off climate can have unintended consequences for innovation and productivity. Finally, in one of the few studies that looked at the relationship between organizational policies regarding sexual orientation and organizational performance, Shan, Fu, and Zheng (2017) found that corporations with more inclusive policies outperformed those without. This suggests that there are additional underlying mechanisms which influence the performance of organizations as a result of these policies.

Disclosure clearly has important implications for performance outcomes at the individual-, interpersonal-, and organizational-levels (Everly et al., 2012; Velez et al., 2013; Shan et al., 2017). These implications extend to task performance, as well as affective components of performance, such as turnover intention and job satisfaction. However, it is important to note that there exists little research on
outcomes of disclosure within teams, despite clear theoretical implications (Clair et al., 2005). This study aims to extend the field’s understanding of the outcomes of disclosure at work by examining the way individual and team climate characteristics interact to impact team-relevant outcomes such as trust, commitment, conflict, and withdrawal.

**Contextual Influences.** The outcomes associated with disclosure are clearly as varied as the individuals to whom an individual decides to come out. Additionally, contextual influences may further skew these outcomes, making it difficult to predict how the disclosure process will impact an LGB employee. Ragins, Cornwell, and Miller (2003) explored the role that gender and race play in predicting the amount of discrimination perceived after disclosure. Their findings showed that an individual who disclosed in a work environment that was full of peers who were not of the same race or gender, or to a male supervisor, were more likely to perceive discrimination after disclosure (Ragins et al., 2003). Support for the role that gender plays in predicting experienced discrimination in terms of hiring has also been found, with women being found to perceive members of the LGB community as more hirable, while men perceived them to be less so (Everly, Unzueta, & Shih, 2016). Fassinger, Shullman, and Stevenson (2010) suggest that an affirmative LGB leadership paradigm is needed, which must consider the impact of the gender composition of groups and teams on the effectiveness of LGB leaders.
Prior research suggests that in addition to the gender of the individual to whom an LGB employee is coming out, there are other characteristics and conditions which may influence the outcomes of the disclosure process, such as religiosity (Strauss & Sawyerr, 2009) and contagion concern (Cascio & Plant, 2016). Contagion concern refers to a fear that association with members of the LGB community will result in being mislabeled as LGB as well (Cascio & Plant, 2016). In addition to characteristics of the target of the disclosure, oftentimes the question of when to come out presents challenges to members of the LGB community, particularly in a workplace context. Disclosure may be immediate (e.g., during an interview, signaled in a resume) or occur after having been working in an organization for years. A study into the effects of timing on the outcomes of disclosure behaviors found that although the supportiveness of the organization was more important than the timing of the act for the discloser, the heterosexual coworker who was disclosed to found disclosure at early stages to be unprofessional and discomforting (King et al., 2008). This would suggest that the circumstances of the disclosure also play a role in predicting its outcomes.

In addition to the characteristics of the individual and the context of the disclosure, organizational policies have been shown to impact disclosure outcomes. Understandably, an individual who experiences discrimination as a result of disclosure will report less job satisfaction as a result of the disclosure (Prati & Pietrantoni, 2014). Furthermore, support on three levels, supervisor, coworker, and organizational, has been found to predict job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and
outness, respectively (Huffman, Watrous-Rodriguez, & King, 2008). Furthermore, the importance of this third category of support (organizational support) was found to be more influential in predicting job satisfaction for individuals who identified as bisexual compared to monosexual (e.g., gay, lesbian; Green, Payne, & Green, 2011). Although organizational policies alone have been shown to be insufficient in predicting the job satisfaction of LGB employees (Griffith & Hebl, 2002), the support an individual feels after coming out plays a moderating role in the relationship between disclosure and individual outcomes (Bell et al., 2011; Prati & Pietrantoni, 2014; Sabat et al., 2014).

There are a number of factors which impact the experience of an employee after they come out at work. The current study proposes that within teams, the interaction of these different factors (e.g., individual characteristics, characteristics of others) plays a role to both further complicate and explain the outcomes of disclosure. The following section summarizes the existing research on how cognitive processes related to individual identity influence interpersonal interactions within teams.

**Identity Variables**

**Social Identity & Identity Theory.** Individuals identify themselves in many different ways. They may identify themselves by their job (e.g., doctor, lawyer), family role (e.g., mother, daughter), or some other factor (e.g., hockey fan). These identities play a role in shaping the way an individual interacts with others and the world around them. There has long existed a debate over the way in which an
individual’s social behavior is influenced by societal expectations (Hogg, Terry, & White, 1995; Stets & Burke, 2000). In general, there are two thought processes that are used to explain the phenomenon of social behavior: identity theory and social identity theory. Both theories are based on a belief that “the self is reflexive in that it can take itself as an object and can categorize, classify, or name itself in particular ways in relation to other social categories or classifications” (Stets & Burke, 2000; p. 224).

Social identity theory suggests that part of the impact society has on behavior stems from an individual’s awareness of their membership in a social category or group (Abrams & Hogg, 2006). One major component of social identity theory, which plays a role in explaining how individuals get part of their identity from their membership in a given social group (e.g., race, sexual orientation), is known as self-categorization. Self-categorization refers to the process by which an individual perceives similarities between themselves and other members of their social group and differences between themselves and individuals outside of their social group (Hogg et al., 1995). For example, an individual who identifies themselves as a member of the Democratic party will view Democratic political candidates as being more trustworthy than Republican candidates, as the former is a part of their social group and, thereby, an extension of themselves (Greene, 2004).

The implications of social identity theory have been examined within the context of many organizational topic areas, with evidence of both positive and
negative effects having been found. Chattopahyay and George (2001) found that if individuals developed social identities based on their status as a temporary employee (e.g., seasonal, short-term) they felt less organizational commitment, as opposed to internal (e.g., permanent) employees. There has also been evidence to suggest that if an organizational change is deemed to be threatening to an individual’s developed sense of social identity (e.g., mergers), turnover intentions increase for the threatened group (Sung et al., 2017). Furthermore, there has been evidence to support the supposition that groups formed on the basis of social identity are more likely to interpret behaviors viewed to be threatening to this group to be personally threatening as well (Korostelina, 2014). This can lead to rifts between subgroups and more workplace hostility in diverse organizations (Li & Hambrick, 2005; Thatcher & Patel, 2011). On the other hand, researchers have pointed out benefits to the creation of subgroups on the basis of social identity. Van Dick and colleagues (2009) found that if a work group created a strong social identity based on group membership, they were more likely to be motivated to perform as a group and less likely to engage in social loafing. Social identity has also been found to be a motivating factor for individuals performing jobs that are considered less desirable (Kreiner, Ashforth, & Sluss, 2006), as well as a driving force behind corporate social responsibility (de Roeck & Maon, 2016).

Where social identity theory postulates that individuals get part of their identity from their social group, identity theory suggests that individuals view themselves as filling a “role” within society and act in accordance with the
expectations of that role (Burke & Tully, 1977). For example, a person who identifies as a “mother” may believe they need to behave in a way that is more nurturing and compassionate, as an expectation of that role, than somebody who does not have children. According to identity theory, an individual will attempt to act in a way that is congruent with their identity role (Swann & Hill, 1982). This process of portraying what is expected of one’s social identity is known as self-verification. In addition to the implications for how an individual portrays themselves, self-verification theory suggests that individuals wish to have their identity confirmed by others (London et al., 2005). The importance of self-verification has been examined in spousal relationships, with studies finding that the extent to which one individual verified the other’s sense of self predicted the level of trust (Burke & Stets, 1999) and commitment (Ritts & Stein, 1995) expressed by either partner. Feelings of self-verification have been found to predict an individual’s expressed satisfaction in non-romantic relationships as well, such that an individual who feels verified by their work group is more satisfied with the group, even if they view themselves as being quite different from their fellow group members (Swann Jr., Kwan, Polzer, & Milton, 2003).

Swann Jr., Milton, and Polzer (2000) found that self-verification processes had important implications for performance as well. They found that in small groups, when individual group members were able to get the rest of the team to perceive them the way they perceived themselves (e.g., self-verification), the team felt a greater sense of connectedness and performance improved (Swann Jr. et al.,
2000). Additionally, there has been support for the notion that self-verification processes can be used as a method of motivating individuals to perform at a higher level over time (Rabinovich & Morton, 2017). Although empirical examination of the impact of self-verification on performance is limited, there appears to be a link between the two constructs, suggesting that organizations should be concerned with encouraging employees to see one another in a more authentic way. In fact, Polzer, Milton, and Swann, Jr. (2002) suggest that when members of a team see one another in a way that results in self-verification for all team members, diverse teams are better able to perform. They refer to this state of mutually elicited self-verification as interpersonal congruence (Polzer et al., 2002). Additional investigation of value congruence between team members (e.g., the extent to which the values of all team members align) shows that teams are able to better perform and experience less conflict when value congruence is high (Jehn, Chadwick, & Thatcher, 1997). Similarly, Bergman, Small, Bergman, and Rentsch (2010) found that teams performed better when team members viewed each other as similarly trustworthy. Teams which are unable to achieve a state of interpersonal congruence struggle to perform and experience more conflict than those that are able to do so (Polzer et al., 2002).

For LGB individuals, the concept of personal identity is often closely tied to social identity (e.g., membership in the LGB community). The following sections summarize prior research into the way LGB identity is formed, and the implications
of identity affirmation and centrality on the need for identity support within a group context.

**LGB Identity.** The decision to come out as LGB can be met with rejection, hostility, and other negative outcomes. These negative responses have been shown to have negative mental health consequences, such as depression and increased risk of suicide (Yadegarfard, Meinhold-Bergman, & Ho, 2014). Additionally, the hostility that is experienced for being LGB is not a one-time occurrence, with members of this community experiencing increased levels of adversity for this part of their identity throughout their lives (Dentato et al., 2014). However, despite the potential for these negative outcomes, individuals still choose to “come out” as LGB.

In their qualitative study of the development of gay identity, Paul and Frieden (2008) found that the need for disclosure came after a tipping point was reached where the cognitive dissonance felt from not acknowledging one’s identity outweighed the concerns of being accepted by others. They found that it was at this point that LGB individuals begin to actively pursue a more open expression of their LGB identity (Paul & Frieden, 2008). However, they found that even after these feelings of a need to disclose emerge, it is common for members of the community to struggle with the extent to which to make their sexual orientation known to others (Paul & Frieden, 2008; Coon Sells, 2013). In a study of online discussion boards, Coon Sells (2013) found that LGB individuals may feel comfortable
expressing their sexuality openly online, but not acknowledge it in their day-to-day lives, creating two distinct realms of identity.

Carrion and Lock (1997) developed an eight stage model of LGB identity formation, with individuals initially discovering and exploring their attraction to members of the same sex, before moving on to accept this aspect of their identity, and ultimately integrate it into other aspects of their identity. Mosher (2001) suggests that the formation of LGB identity is often examined in one of two ways: essentialism and social constructionism. Essentialist theories view homosexual identity as having been established at birth, and that disclosure is simply the acknowledgement of this innate aspect of one’s identity (Kitzinger & Wilkinson, 1995). Essentialist theories of sexual identity state that individuals are born either heterosexual or homosexual (Mosher, 2001). According to essentialist theories, the steps in Carrion and Lock’s (1997) model of sexual identity formation are part of the natural process of accepting one’s true self (Mosher, 2001). Social constructionist theories of sexual identity development suggest that the concept of hetero- and homosexual is a falsely constructed dichotomy (Mosher, 2001). Social constructionists suggest that this false dichotomy results in a failure to account for the individual experience and varied expression of sexuality, thereby cheapening the identity formation process (Segal, 2000). Social constructionists typically view Carrion and Lock’s (1997) model as having been born out of a heterosexist society and suggest that the process of self-acceptance is made more difficult by this society (Mosher, 2001).
Regardless of the role society plays in the development of one’s identity as LGB (Mosher, 2001), the establishment of that identity is not a one-time thing, but rather something that must be done repeatedly whenever new individuals or situations are encountered. Smith and Gray (2009) suggested that this willingness to repeatedly “challenge or dispute powerful negative social messages about one’s sexual orientation” (p. 76) despite the potential for negative consequences is a sign of a strongly developed sense of self. Furthermore, prior research on the way the identities of minority groups are established suggests that this process of self-exploration can have positive implications for psychological health (Ghavami et al., 2011). The following sections summarizes the body of research which has examined two key components of identity (identity affirmation, identity centrality) as well as the impact they have when coupled with feelings of support.

**Identity Affirmation.** Adopting a positive view of one’s identity as LGB has been found to have positive implications for members of the LGB community. Woodford, Kulick, Sinco, and Hong (2014) found that self-acceptance lowers the overall amount of psychological distress experienced by LGB students facing heterosexist microaggressions. Furthermore, increased self-acceptance in members of the LGB community has been found to promote better integration of sexual identity with other aspects of identity, such as religiosity, leading to increased life satisfaction (Paul & Frieden, 2008; Dahl & Galliher, 2009). The derivation of a positive self-view from one’s minority status has been referred to by different
names (e.g. private regard, identity positivity), but is most commonly referred to as identity affirmation.

Mohr and Kendra (2011) define identity affirmation as the “degree to which an LGB person associates positive thoughts and feelings with her or his sexual orientation and membership in LGB communities” (p. 235). Individuals who express high levels of identity affirmation, feel a sense of pride in belonging to the LGB community (Mohr & Kendra, 2011). Rather than viewing their sexuality as a limitation or something to be embarrassed by, individuals with high levels of identity affirmation view their sexual orientation as contributing to the strength of their overall character (Vaughan & Waehler, 2010; Antebi-Gruszka, 2016).

Whitehead, Ainsworth, Wittig, and Gadino (2009) proposed that members of ethnic minority groups develop feelings of identity affirmation after first exploring their ethnic identities. This exploration of one’s identity leads to an increased familiarity and understanding of what it means to be part of this minority group and, in turn, an increased attachment to that identity and social group (Whitehead et al., 2009). Similarly, evidence for the role of identity exploration in predicting the development of an affinity for one’s identity has been found within the context of adolescents who are seeking to explore their own sexuality (Toomey, Anshalt, & Shramko, 2016). In the same way that increased familiarity with the LGB community leads to an increase in feelings of acceptance for this community in heterosexual individuals (Dahling et al., 2016), increased familiarity with one’s own LGB identity leads to more identity affirmation (Ghavami et al., 2011).
The outcomes associated with identity affirmation have been examined more extensively than the causes. In a recent study, Fredriksen-Goldsen and colleagues (2017) found that increased levels of identity affirmation result in an increased availability of social resources of support, possibly due to an increased connection to other members of a given social group. Similarly, a study examining the implications of intimate partner violence in Hispanic young adults found that identity affirmation predicted less incidents of victimization due to increased support resources (Forster et al., 2017). Although it intuitively makes sense that increased identity affirmation would lead to more support within a given social group, perhaps more interesting are the findings of Phinney, Ferguson, and Tate (1997) which showed that higher levels of identity affirmation also led to more positive attitudes towards individuals who were part of other social groups. This could suggest that identity affirmation leads to feelings of security and reduces the perception that differences between social groups are threatening.

Identity affirmation would appear to be related to feelings of pride and self-esteem due to group membership. Rowley, Sellers, Chavous, and Smith (1998) found that individuals who expressed pride in their racial identity felt similar levels of high self-esteem in other aspects of their life. From a mental health perspective, feelings of pride in one’s identity has been shown to decrease thoughts of suicide for members of both racial (Perry, Steven-Watkins, & Oser, 2013; Brittian et al., 2013) and sexual (Velkoff, Forrest, Dodd, & Smith, 2016) minority groups. On the other hand, Paul, Smith, Mohr, and Ross (2014) found that identity affirmation was
not related to feelings of depression for individuals who identified as bisexual. This supports prior research which suggests that this subgroup may have different experiences as a result of their sexuality compared to monosexual (e.g., gay, lesbian; Boccone, 2016). However, general support has been found for the notion that identity affirmation leads to less feelings of rejection of self and, thereby, more life satisfaction for members of racial and sexual minority groups (Sarno & Mohr, 2016).

The existing body of research offers clear support for the influence identity affirmation has over individual (Sarno & Mohr, 2016) and interpersonal outcomes (Phinney et al., 1997; Forster et al., 2017; Fredriksen-Goldsen et al., 2017), in terms of psychological health (Perry et al., 2013; Brittian et al., 2013; Velkoff et al., 2016) and development (Whitehead et al., 2009; Toomey et al., 2016). However, within the workforce, there exists little research into the implications of identity affirmation on interactions and outcomes within teams. The following study aims to address this gap, in order to better understand the role that personal identity plays in predicting team-relevant outcomes, in terms of both identity affirmation and identity centrality.

**Identity Centrality.** Any individual can be defined in a plethora of different ways, depending on the audience and context (e.g., female surgeon, stay-at-home dad). The same is true of the stigmatized identities that individuals can be classified by (e.g., white heterosexual female, Asian bisexual male), with these identities forming intersections of stigma (Williams & Frederick, 2015; Blankenship &
Stewart, 2017). However, not all of these identities are viewed with the same importance or regard. An individual may identify strongly by their gender, but feel little connection to their ethnic background. This concept of the relative importance of one identity compared to another is referred to as identity centrality (King et al., 2017).

According to Mohr and Kendra (2011), identity centrality can be defined as the “degree to which an aspect of a person’s identity (e.g., sexual orientation, racial, vocational) is central to her or his overall identity” (p. 235). At first consideration, the concepts of identity centrality and identity affirmation would appear to overlap (e.g., an individual who feels particularly positively about their vocational identity will define themselves more greatly by it). Although this can be true, it is not always the case. In fact, Kachanoff and colleagues (2016) found that an individual will tend to identify an aspect of their identity as being central to their overall identity if they feel extremely positively or extremely negatively about it. Therefore, it should come as no surprise that there exists a substantial amount of research that has examined the influence of identity centrality on individual outcomes.

A study by Wong and colleagues (2014) found that an undermined sense of masculinity leads to psychological distress in individuals who view their masculinity to be central to their identity. Similarly, Szymanski and Lewis (2016) found that perceived racial discrimination predicted psychological distress only in individuals with moderate to high levels of racial identity centrality. In fact,
Bombay, Matheson, and Anisman (2014) found that individuals were less likely to even perceive discrimination if the stigmatized identity was not considered to be central to them. Taking it one step further, a study on the impact of perceived heterosexism found that experienced prejudice predicted increased activism in members of the LGB community if the individual viewed their sexual orientation to be a central part of their identity (Dunn & Szymanski, 2017). In addition to the implications of identity centrality in the perception and response to discrimination, Carter (2015) found that deaf individuals were more likely to become involved with the deaf community if they considered their deafness to be central to their identity. Rock and colleagues (2011) offer additional support for the implications of centrality for feelings of connectedness with one’s social group. They found that individuals who viewed their racial identity to be central were more likely to feel accepted and experience popularity in populations comprised of other members of the same social group (Rock et al., 2011).

Identity centrality has also been found to have implications for the relationship between identity affirmation and the psychological effects discussed in the previous section on identity affirmation. Rowley and colleagues (1998) found that individuals who felt positively about their racial identity experienced a greater upswing in self-esteem if they also viewed that racial identity to be central. Furthermore, the relationship between identity affirmation and positive mental health outcomes (e.g., less depression, lower anxiety) was likewise strengthened by identity centrality. This “strengthening effect” of identity centrality has been
observed in other stigmatized groups, such as mental illness and substance abuse (Quinn et al., 2014).

**Identity Support.** The concept of support can take many different forms depending on the context. Vaux (1988) suggests that workplace support is the result of interactions that provide emotional, instrumental, or structural assistance to an individual, and that other individuals or the organization itself may provide this support. Prior research has shown that feelings of support for one’s identity are rated as being more important for members of the LGB community than their heterosexual peers (Wayment & Peplau, 1995) and that feelings of identity support play a role in predicting overall psychological well-being for members of this community (Beals & Peplau, 2005). However, as policies and state legislation change to prevent discrimination, the line of what constitutes support (e.g., lack of heterosexist discrimination, presence of nondiscrimination policies) continues to blur.

Heterosexism refers to an “ideological system that denies, denigrates, and stigmatizes any nonheterosexual form of behavior, identity, relationship, or community” (Lyons, Brenner, & Fassinger, 2005, p. 539). Heterosexist work environments have been found to have negative implications for organizations in terms of the performance of organizational citizenship behaviors (Brenner, Lyons, & Fassinger, 2010), overall profitability (Shan et al., 2017) and litigation (EEOC, 2017). Additionally, King and Cortina (2010) suggest that organizations have an obligation to promote quality of life for all of their employees, including LGB
employees. Barron and Hebl (2010) extend this obligation to include an imperative that organizations strive to make the community within which they operate a safer one for employees who identify as members of this population. In other words, simply preventing discrimination does not constitute support. Indeed Velez and Moradi (2012) found that heterosexist discrimination and LGB-support were not opposite end of the spectrum, with only the latter leading to increased perceptions of organizational fit and job satisfaction for LGB employees.

As discussed in depth previously, perceived support has been found to predict important individual outcomes for LGB employees, such as disclosure (King et al., 2017), perceived discrimination (Ragins & Cornwell, 2001), job satisfaction (Huffman et al., 2008), and turnover (Ragins & Cornwell, 2001). Additionally, Huffman and colleagues (2008) found that it was important for support to come from multiple sources (e.g., organizational, coworkers, supervisor). Specifically, they found that supervisor support was related to job satisfaction, while coworker support was related to life satisfaction, and organizational support predicted the outness of an individual (Huffman et al., 2008).

Although the impact of perceived identity support has not been explicitly explored in teams, prior research in the area of self-verification and an individual’s need to achieve interpersonal congruence in diverse teams, suggests that identity support is necessary for teams to work together cohesively (London et al., 2005). Therefore, the following study proposes the examination of identity support as a
perceived team climate variable. Similar to distinctions that have been made at the organizational level (Griffith & Hebl, 2002), identity support within a team involves more than just nondiscrimination policies, but rather a team climate that is supportive of the LGB community.

**Work Team Effectiveness**

The word “team” can be operationalized in many different ways and take many different forms depending upon the context. The term is perhaps most commonly considered in an athletic context, where “team” refers to a group of individuals taking to the field to play a game of football or other sport. Within this context, identifying who is part of the team is as simple as looking at the color of their jersey, or the side of the field on which they play. Within an organizational context, it can be more difficult to identify what group of employees comprise a team. Although they may be members of a formally identified “team”, oftentimes a team in an organization refers to a department, branch, or possibly even an entire organization in the case of small businesses. A work team may look different within different organizations, but ultimately there is a set of generally accepted criteria a group must meet in order to constitute a “team”. Kozlowski and Ilgen (2006) state that a team must consist of “(a) Two or more individuals who; (b) socially interact (face-to-face or, increasingly, virtually); (c) possess one or more common goals; (d) are brought together to perform organizationally relevant tasks; (e) exhibit interdependencies with respect to workflow, goals, and outcomes; (f) have different roles and responsibilities; and (g) are together embedded in an
encompassing organizational system, with boundaries and linkages to the broader system context and task environment” (p. 79). In other words, teams must contain multiple members who interact with one another and work together interdependently in order to achieve an organizational goal.

From a very broad angle, teams are thought to operate in an input-process-outcome (IPO) framework, whereby a team takes raw materials (e.g., ability of team members) and turns them into a desired final product (e.g., team performance; Mathieu, Maynard, Rapp, & Gilson, 2008). Within the IPO framework, inputs refer to individual- (e.g., team member competencies), team- (e.g., task structure), and organization-level (e.g., organizational design) factors which impact the way a team operates (Mathieu et al., 2008). Processes refer to the interactional behaviors of a team’s members which contribute to the goal pursuit of the team itself (Mathieu et al., 2008). Outcomes refer to the ultimate product of the team’s interactions, such as performance (Mathieu et al., 2008). However, the IPO framework has been criticized for failing to address the complexities of team effectiveness, with later frameworks adopting an expanded definition of the process stage, known as the input-mediator-outcome (IMO) model (Mathieu et al., 2008).

Within the IMO model, the definitions of input and outcome remain unchanged. However, the middle stage of team effectiveness is divided into processes and emergent states (Marks, Mathieu, & Zaccaro, 2001). Emergent states refers to factors such as the extent to which team members feel safe to share new ideas with one another (e.g., psychological safety; Edmondson, 1999) which impact
the extent to which a team is able to interact effectively (Mathieu et al., 2008).

Building on the IMO model of team effectiveness, Ilgen, Hollenbeck, Johnson, and Jundt (2005) suggested that the final “outcome” then becomes an “input” for the team’s next performance episode. This cycle then continues for the duration of the life of the team (Ilgen et al., 2005).

**Team Outcomes**

In order to meet the changing demands of industry, more organizations are utilizing some degree of teamwork to harness the benefits of collaboration and cooperation between employees (Devine et al., 1999). Teams that are able to work together cohesively can prove to be productive and beneficial assets to organizations. However, teams that are not able to work together in a harmonious manner can have negative implications for performance at both the team- and individual-level. Further complicating matters, the modern workforce is more diversified than before. This means it is very unlikely that a team will ever be composed of members with the same background, viewpoints, or values. As previously discussed, differences in social identity can have particularly significant implications for team performance if managed incorrectly (Swann Jr. et al., 2003).

The following sections highlight prior research on several key attitudinal (e.g., trust, commitment) and behavioral (e.g., conflict, withdrawal) team outcomes, as well as their connection to overall team performance.

**Team Trust.** Trust refers to “an individual’s willingness to accept vulnerability based on positive expectations of the intentions or behavior of another” (de Jong,
Dirks, & Gillespie, 2016, p. 1136). Within a team context, this definition can be modified to refer to how willing an individual team member is to show vulnerability to other members of their team, and have positive expectations of the experience. A further delineation of trust that seems especially pertinent for teams with diverse compositions was provided by Schaubroeck, Lam, and Peng (2011), who defined trust as falling into one of two categories: cognition-based and affect-based trust.

Cognition-based trust “refers to trust that is based on performance-relevant cognitions such as competence, responsibility, reliability, and dependability” (Schaubroeck et al., 2011, p. 864). Within a team context, this would be indicative of the extent to which one team member has trust in a fellow team member’s ability to accomplish any tasks for which they are responsible. Affect-based trust can be thought of as the more interpersonal aspect of trust, based on a belief that the other party has genuine care for one’s well-being (McAllister, 1995). Within a team setting, this can be thought of as the extent to which team members feel they have each other’s backs and want the best for one another. Within teams which are required to work closely with one another, it is important that both cognition- and affect-based trust are established (Schaubroeck et al., 2011). Cognition-based trust allows team members to split up responsibilities and endows team members with feelings of autonomy (Langfred, 2004), while affect-based trust provides team members with an environment which allows them to feel comfortable and confident (Edmondson, 2004).
Interest in trust as a predictor of team effectiveness has grown in recent years (Mathieu et al., 2008). Prior research has shown that trust impacts overall levels of team performance due to its influence on team processes (e.g., team monitoring, team effort; de Jong & Elfring, 2010) as well as individual level outcomes (e.g., team satisfaction; Costa, Roe, & Tailieu, 2001) and well-being (e.g., stress; Costa et al., 2001). Furthermore, a recent meta-analysis by de Jong and colleagues (2016) found that cognition-based trust and affect-based trust both served as unique predictors of team performance. This suggests that additional research is needed to better understand the mechanisms through which these two categories of trust impact team outcomes (de Jong & Elfring, 2010).

**Team Commitment.** Even a team with the potential to perform at the highest level can fail if it is unable to retain the team members which make it a high-performing team. Despite the high cost implications of team member turnover, one potential buffer (team commitment) has received far less attention at the team level than at the organizational level (Neininger, Lehmann-Willenbrock, Kauffeld, & Henschel, 2010). Team commitment can be defined as “the strength of team members’ involvement and identification with their team” (Neininger et al., 2010, p. 568). According to Meyer and Allen (1991), commitment can be categorized as continuance, normative, or affective. Within a team context, continuance commitment refers to the desire of a team member to stay affiliated with a team because they feel they have no other alternative (Neininger et al., 2010). Similarly, normative commitment refers to commitment that stems from feeling compelled to
do so (Neininger et al., 2010). In their study of sales teams, Dixon, Gassenheimer, and Barr (2002) found that the impact of a perceived alternative led to individual team members leaving even the most successful teams. This would suggest that external factors can lead high performers to choose to abandon a work team, regardless of prior feelings of obligation (Dixon et al., 2002). Unlike continuance or normative commitment, affective commitment emerges from an individual’s desire to remain on the team (Neininger et al., 2010). Simply put, an individual remains on a team because they want to be a part of the team. Prior research on the impact of commitment has shown it to be positively related to performance at both the organization (Tett & Meyer, 1993) and team level (Neininger et al., 2010).

Mathieu and colleagues (2008) point out that commitment has been found to be positively related to team viability. As teams continue to become more specialized, the importance of team member retention will only increase, making it all the more import to thoroughly understand the factors which influence commitment within teams (Neininger et al., 2010).

**Team Conflict.** Conflict refers to team processes that emerge due to disagreements or some other perceived incompatibility between team members (Jehn, 1995). Conflict can be categorized as either task, process, or relationship conflict (Jehn, 1995). Task conflict occurs due to a disagreement between team members over what objectives should be prioritized over other (Brehmer, 1976), while process conflict refers to the way in which a task should be accomplished (de Wit, Greer, & Jehn, 2012). The third type, relationship conflict, does not pertain to the task that is
being performed, but rather emerges from interpersonal rifts between team members, which may result in one team member disliking another (Walton, Dutton, & Cafferty, 1969). In teams which work together closely, disagreements and conflict can compound on one another, with potentially detrimental implications for team outcomes (de Dreu & Wingart, 2003).

A meta-analysis by de Wit and colleagues (2012)’s found that the three types of conflict (task, process, relationship) had implications for both proximal and distal outcomes in teams. Proximal outcome refers to emergent team states, such as cohesion and team viability (Hackman & Wageman, 2005; Marks et al., 2001), while distal outcome refers to overall team performance (de Wit et al., 2012). Process and relationship conflict was found to negatively impact all proximal and distal outcomes, while the implications of task conflict was more mixed (de Wit et al., 2012). This echoes the seemingly contradictory prior research on the relationship between task conflict and performance, with some researchers finding a negative relationship between the two (de Dreu & Weingart, 2003) and others finding positive outcomes associated with task conflict (Jehn, Greer, Levine, & Szulanski, 2008; Bradley et al., 2012; Bradley, Klotz, Postlethwaite, & Brown, 2013). The findings of de Wit and colleagues (2012) perhaps holds some insight into these conflicting findings, as they showed the positive relationship with performance emerged when task conflict was not combined with instances of relationship conflict. From an intuitive perspective, this would suggest that perhaps
conflicts which emerge from interpersonal disagreements are more likely to harm
team performance than other types of conflict.

In a recent discussion of the state of team research, Mathieu, Hollenbeck,
van Knippenberg, and Ilgen (2017) highlight the emphasis that has been placed on
the field’s understanding of conflict within teams. In order for teams to be
effective, they must manage conflict appropriately (LePine et al., 2008).
Furthermore, not all conflict would appear to be equal, with conflicts which emerge
from interpersonal disagreements carrying heavier negative implications for team
performance than task or process conflict (de Wit et al., 2012).

**Team Withdrawal.** In order for organizations to be successful, it is important for
them to have employees who are engaged and present when they are at work. Prior
research on withdrawal has found it has negative implications for organizational
outcomes such as employee morale (Koslowsky, Sagie, Krausz, & Singer, 1997)
and turnover (Laczo & Hanisch, 1999), as well as employee outcomes such as
psychological well-being and substance abuse (Lehman & Simpson, 1992). From a
broad angle, withdrawal can be classified into two categories of behaviors: job
withdrawal and work withdrawal (Hanisch & Hulin, 1990). Job withdrawal could
be considered similar to turnover, in that it involves behaviors such as quitting or
retiring from an organization (Laczo & Hanisch, 1999). Work withdrawal, on the
other hand, refers to any one of a variety of behaviors, such as wasting time while
at work, daydreaming, and absenteeism, that result in lower cognitive and
emotional investment in a job, but do not involve the individual actually leaving the
organization (Laczo & Hanisch, 1999). Both job and work withdrawal have been found to be linked to feelings of organizational, job, or coworker dissatisfaction, and have costly implications for organizations (Laczo & Hanisch, 1999).

Fuentes and Sawyer (1989) proposed that employees respond to dissatisfaction with their work environment in one of four ways: Exit, Loyalty, Voice, and Neglect. Exit would most closely resemble job withdrawal, in that it results in an employee choosing to leave an organization or role (Lehman & Simpson, 1992). Loyalty refers to the employee opting to ride-it-out with an organization, and wait for problems to be resolved by upper level management (Lehman & Simpson, 1992). In other words, individuals choosing the loyalty option in response to job dissatisfaction, believe in the organizational process and have faith that circumstances will get better in time. Voice refers to the decision of an employee to attempt to be the change they want to see, making their opinions known and attempting to get dissatisfactory policies or practices changed within the organization (Lehman & Simpson, 1992). Finally, neglect refers to behaviors that indicate psychological withdrawal from the role, such as being late, leaving early, daydreaming, or even sleeping on the job (Lehman & Simpson, 1992). This final category would most closely resemble Hanisch and Hulin (1990)’s concept of work withdrawal. Individuals choosing to engage in neglect behaviors, do not leave the organization or necessarily even intend to leave the organization, either due to personal reasons or circumstances. Instead, they opt to no longer be present while they are working. Like work withdrawal, these behaviors can have negative
implications for both organizational and employee outcomes (Lehman & Simpson, 1992).

Prior research on the impact of withdrawal on team outcomes has been fairly limited. However, intuitively, it is not possible for a team where members work together in a highly interdependent manner to be successful if some members are engaging in work withdrawal behaviors. For example, if one member’s task is dependent upon the completion of another team member’s work first, but this second team member is constantly taking extended breaks or not coming to work, neither team member will be able to complete their assigned tasks and the team’s performance will suffer. Furthermore, coworker dissatisfaction has been found to predict withdrawal behaviors (Laczo & Hanisch, 1999). Within a team setting, coworkers work closely with one another, suggesting that coworker dissatisfaction could have exponentially detrimental effects over time. In addition to the negative implications of withdrawal for team performance, prior research has shown that if one or more members of a team withdraw from the group there will be less communication, psychological safety, and team learning (Foldy, Rivard, & Buckley, 2009). Nevertheless, much of the prior research on withdrawal has focused more on the outcomes associated with it (e.g., conflict) and not on the causes of withdrawal itself (Mathieu et al., 2017).

**Hypothesis Development**

The majority of previous research on the disclosure of LGB status has focused on antecedents (e.g., individual differences, organizational climate) to the
act itself, with less attention having been paid to what happens after an individual has come out to their coworkers. The existing research that has examined the outcomes of disclosure have been inconsistent, with some studies showing an increase in positive outcomes for an individual who discloses their sexual orientation (Griffith & Hebl, 2002), while others show no difference after disclosure (Kuyper, 2015), or even negative outcomes (Eldahan et al., 2016). Furthermore, real life accounts of the experience of coming out at work can be just as varied, particularly when an individual comes out to a team with whom they work closely. I propose this inconsistency is due to the interaction between individuals and their environment, specifically levels of individual identity affirmation and team identity support (see Figure 1 for proposed model).

Prior to making the decision to openly identify as LGB, an individual must experience a certain level of self-acceptance for this portion of their identity. In other words, before an individual feels confident that coming out to others will result in acceptance, they must be able to come out to themselves and find self-acceptance. As a result of these feelings of self-acceptance, it is not uncommon for the individual to come to appreciate an aspect of their identity which might otherwise be viewed as a detriment. The process of repeatedly coming out to others despite societal expectations results in a strongly formed sense of self (e.g., hardiness) which is rooted in this social identity (Smith & Gray, 2009). For the sake of simplicity, this study will refer to these disclosers as having high identity affirmation.
Individuals are more likely to express aspects of their personality they view to be socially desirable (e.g., intelligence, friendliness). Individuals who view their sexuality as an asset (e.g., high identity affirmation), feel a desire to identify themselves as LGB to other members of their team to a greater extent (e.g., higher disclosure of LGB identity). This higher disclosure can have positive (e.g., trust, commitment) or negative outcomes (e.g., withdrawal, conflict) within a team depending on the extent to which the team is supportive and accepting of LGB identities. These outcomes are further complicated by the fact that it is not always possible for an LGB individual to predict how a team will respond to the disclosure itself. In particular, this can cause problems for individuals who disclose shortly after joining the team, as the discloser has had less time to gather information about the team that would help predict their response.

**High Affirmation and High Support**

Teams are rarely composed of individuals who share all of the same values (Jehn et al., 1997). This is especially true of teams that are culturally diverse, but even in culturally homogenous teams, individual members may express different levels of motivation, integrity, and many other personal values (Jehn et al., 1997). The views of society on LGB rights have become more positive in recent years (Pew, 2013), meaning there are many instances where all, or almost all, of the members of a team may share a positive view of members of the LGB community. These teams can be said to have high team LGB identity support. The climate of these teams is supportive of the disclosure of sexual orientation, and to some
extent, may even encourage the open discussion of topics related to the LGB community.

When a team member with high identity affirmation feels comfortable discussing topics that they view as important to their community (e.g., marriage equality, discrimination) with their team, they will develop more trust for that team. Furthermore, the topic of discussion does not have to be inherently related to their sexual orientation for this effect to occur. A discloser with high identity affirmation may feel a desire to discuss relationship problems. Although a lover’s quarrel is not inherently related to the LGB community, if the partner is of the same sex, this becomes an act of increasing the disclosure of one’s LGB identity to others. An individual with high identity affirmation will feel proud of this relationship and want to discuss it openly, thereby sharing something personal with team members. Prior research on the development of trust suggests that individuals who share more personal information with one another tend to develop more feelings of liking and trust over time (Collins & Miller, 1994). Furthermore, in their study of spousal trust, Burke and Stets (1999) found that if one individual confirms the self-view of their partner, feelings of trust are fostered between the two parties. For an LGB individual who views their sexuality as a good thing, a supportive team response to increased LGB identity disclosure is a form of self-verification, suggesting higher feelings of trust in such a situation.

Individuals are more apt to be satisfied with their team members if they feel respected by them. Prior research has found that an individual who feels satisfied
with their coworkers will express more commitment to their team (Bishop & Scott, 2000). For an individual with high identity affirmation, this includes feeling their sexual orientation is respected. When a team shows support for the LGB community in direct or indirect ways, an individual with high identity affirmation is more likely to feel their sexual orientation is respected, and, therefore, that they themselves are respected. As a result of these feelings of respect, and the aforementioned developing feelings of trust (Burke & Stets, 1999), an individual will feel more committed to their team. Furthermore, social exchange theory suggests that individuals will attempt to reciprocate within interpersonal relationships, meaning when one individual offers up something of value (e.g., trust) the other individual will attempt to reciprocate (Worthy, Gary, & Kahn, 1969). In the case of disclosure, this attempt at reciprocity could lead a discloser who feels respected and safe as a result of their disclosure to their team to reciprocate by expressing more commitment and support for the team itself.

An LGB individual with high identity affirmation is more likely to experience less negative team outcomes if the team is high in identity support as well. As previously mentioned, it is unlikely for all the members of a team to share entirely identical values (Jehn et al., 1997). However, personal values are more likely to have implications for conflict if they do not align with one another (Jehn et al., 1997). Individuals who view their association with the LGB community as a good thing value inclusion and equality, as well as pride in the LGB community. Teams with high identity support typically value these same things. As a result of
this congruence of personal values, there is less potential for interpersonal conflict within this scenario. This can become particularly evident as an LGB individual feels secure enough to share personal information with their team. As the discloser shares more information about their personal lives with their team (e.g., stories about their significant other, experiences as part of the LGB community) with a supportive team, the response will be similarly supportive and there will be less of a source for conflict as a result. Furthermore, Polzer and colleagues (2002) found that diverse groups were able to establish harmonious working relationships, without forcing group members to abandon their individual identities if the group achieved a high level of interpersonal congruence. Their findings showed that groups who reported high levels of interpersonal congruence expressed lower levels of relationship conflict (Polzer et al., 2002).

In addition to less potential for conflict, individuals with high identity affirmation who are working in teams with high identity support are less likely to feel like an outsider in their group. A shared understanding of the LGB community can mitigate the effects of feeling different from others due to sexual orientation (Woodford & Kulick, 2015). Furthermore, self-verification has been found reduce feelings of being in an “outgroup” and feel less dissatisfied by perceived differences between themselves and the group (Swann Jr. et al., 2003; Dejordy, 2008). Furthermore, prior study has shown that the process through which an individual brings members of their team to see them as they see themselves can lead to feelings of connectedness within a group (Swann Jr., et al., 2000).
feeling able to help educate and inform team members of issues that affect the LGB community, individuals with high identity affirmation develop a sense of connection with the group. It holds true that individuals who feel connected to others in a group are less likely to withdraw from that group. Based on this understanding of the implications of self-verification and social identity theory, I hypothesize:

*Hypothesis 1: For individuals with high levels of LGB identity affirmation working in teams with high LGB identity support, disclosure will have positive relationships with a) trust and b) commitment, and negative relationships with c) conflict and d) withdrawal.***

**High Affirmation and Low Support**

As previously mentioned, although ideal, it is rare for a team to be composed of members who share entirely homogenous values. This means that an LGB individual may end up working on a team whose members are not supportive of the LGB community. Due to the nature of invisible stigma and sexual identity management strategies, LGB individuals are less likely to openly identify themselves if they feel that doing so would put them at risk for heightened levels of discrimination (Tejeda, 2006). For individuals with high identity affirmation, this results in goals which contradict one another (e.g., feeling safe at work, feeling authentic at work). However, social identity theory suggests that individuals who feel positively about their social identity are more likely to act if they feel that identity is threatened (Dahling et al., 2016). Furthermore, as previously mentioned,
it is not always possible to predict how others will react to the disclosure of sexual orientation. Therefore, it is feasible that individuals with high identity affirmation may choose to disclose, even in a potentially hostile environment. Such acts of disclosure may result in rejection and discrimination (Tejeda, 2006). Even if the response is not this severe, there exist implications for the increased LGB identity salience of an individual with high identity affirmation in a team with low identity support.

Members of the LGB community face higher levels of discrimination than heterosexual individuals (Herek, 2009), meaning the decision to identify as LGB to another person leaves the individual vulnerable to possible adversity as a result. If this disclosure is responded to with rejection, it is unlikely that the discloser will trust the target of the disclosure in the future. An individual with high identity affirmation is more likely to have positive expectations of the act of disclosure. The act of disclosure itself makes the discloser vulnerable, implying that there is some level of previously established trust (Omarzu, 2000). Accordingly, a negative response (e.g., rejection) is more likely to be viewed as an act of trust violation and signal to the discloser that their initial feelings of trust were unwarranted, which will result in a less trusting relationship between the two parties in the future. This effect has been seen in relationships as tightly formed as mother and son (Miller & Boon, 1999), suggesting that a negative response to disclosure is more likely to result in less trust in a less closely developed relationship between team members. Additionally, a negative response to disclosure will lead to less discussion of
personal information in the future (e.g., relationships, workplace concerns), which will serve as an obstacle to further trust development (Borden, Lopresto, Sherman, & Lyons, 2010). Furthermore, a negative response to disclosure will likely cause the discloser to behaviorally withdraw from the group in order to avoid additional negative interactions in the future. This withdrawal compounds the effects of trust violation, as it provides the team with less opportunities to reestablish feelings of trust.

Due in part to the lack of trust development, a high identity affirmation individual who is working in a low identity support team is less likely to feel a sense of obligation to the team itself. Even if the response to the act of disclosure is not overly negative, a low identity support team is less likely to create a climate in which open discussion of issues related to the LGB community is prevalent. An individual is less likely to feel loyalty to other individuals who they do not feel are invested in them personally, leading to less feelings of team commitment. Furthermore, if a high identity affirmation individual does not feel their identity and differences are valued within their team, they are more likely to look for other viable alternatives to their current team, a factor that has been found to lead to less commitment in sales teams (Dixon et al., 2002).

On the other hand, high identity affirmation individuals are more likely to experience negative team outcomes when working within low identity support teams. As the saying goes, “A house divided cannot stand.” Jehn and colleagues (1997) found that there is more interpersonal conflict in teams that do not share
congruent values (e.g., determination). As previously discussed, social identity theory suggests that self-categorization (e.g., choosing to openly identify with a social group) results in a stronger adherence to the beliefs and viewpoints of a chosen social group, resulting in values that mirror this group (Stets & Burke, 2000). Accordingly, if the values of the individual (e.g., identity affirmation) do not match the values of the team (e.g., identity support), there is more potential for conflict between the two parties in response to acts of disclosure. A high identity affirmation individual may also attempt to share information about their personal lives (e.g., relationships) with their team, regardless of the initial response to the disclosure itself. If this act is met with negativity (e.g., disgust, statements of disapproval), the interactions could be a trigger for confrontation and conflict. This conflict could be particularly detrimental when the information being shared is personal in nature, as an individual with high identity affirmation will feel more personally threatened by the negative response and feel a need to defend themselves, further escalating the conflict.

For an LGB individual with high identity affirmation working in a low identity support team, it can be easy to feel ostracized from heterosexual team members due to their sexuality. Oftentimes, this perceived ostracism leads an individual to further withdraw from the group. Within a team context, this may mean an individual may choose not to participate in happy hours after work, or other activities which can build relationships due to fear of further rejection. Farmer and Aguinis (2005) found that leaders who failed to provide adequate
identity support to their followers instilled feelings of progressive withdrawal in their followers. Therefore, it follows that a similar situation of progressive withdrawal would occur in teams where high identity affirmation individuals do not feel adequate identity support. Accordingly, I hypothesize:

*Hypothesis 2: For individuals with high levels of LGB identity affirmation working in teams with low LGB identity support, disclosure will have negative relationships with a) trust and b) commitment, and positive relationships with c) conflict and d) withdrawal.*

**Low Affirmation and Low Support**

Although identification with the LGB community and subsequent disclosure behaviors can result in positive individual self-views if characterized by feelings of self-acceptance, the stigma against homosexuality created by societal, familial, and religious beliefs, makes it impossible for some individuals to accept themselves as LGB. For these individuals, despite the fact that they may openly identify as LGB, their sexuality becomes a source of shame and self-deprecation (Vu, Tun, Sheehy, & Nel, 2012) rather than a positive aspect of their identity. Additionally, implicit inversion theory suggests gay men feel they must act in a feminine way, in order to live up to societal expectations of their sexuality (Boysen et al., 2011). This self-imposed violation of gender role can result in increased levels of homonegativity in gay men who believe they should act masculine (Sánchez & Vilain, 2012).
An individual who views their LGB identity as a bad thing (e.g., low identity affirmation) will not have the same experience working in low or high identity support teams as an individual who does not view homosexuality negatively (e.g., high identity affirmation). Individuals are less likely to advertise attributes that bring feelings of shame or guilt, which means individuals with low identity affirmation are intuitively less likely to come out to coworkers at all. However, situations outside of the individual’s control (e.g., spousal benefits, social media; Clair et al., 2005) as well as behavioral cues may serve to inform team members of an individual’s sexuality, despite their personal intentions to disclose or not (Tskhay & Rule, 2015; Einarsdóttir et al., 2016; Rule et al., 2016). Finally, as mentioned, these individuals may still openly identify as LGB despite their personal opinions of the matter. The disclosure that results, whether intentional or not, has implications for team outcomes as well.

Within the context of social identity, the impact of a shared value, or lack thereof, plays a different role in determining team outcomes. In the case of the development of trust, if an individual with low identity affirmation comes out to a low identity support team, it is unlikely for trust to be developed just because of the shared disapproval of the LGB community. Instead, this shared value may, in fact, result in more awkward interactions and less positive evaluations of one another. Consider, for example, an individual with low identity affirmation who feels they are allowed to make a self-deprecating joke about themselves but does not appreciate a joke being made at their expense by another. Despite setting a
precedent that it is acceptable to make jokes about the LGB community, the act of another doing the same thing could result in negative feelings and, in turn, less feelings of trust. Similarly, awkward interactions and negative emotions may result in feelings of dissatisfaction in the team throughout. This could, in turn, lead the party that has been perceived to be the cause of the change (e.g., the discloser) to look for viable alternatives to the team in the future (Bishop & Scott, 2000; Dixon et al., 2002). Furthermore, an individual who has a negative self-view and has this negative view confirmed by others, although possibly feeling a sense of self-verification, will also feel his or her negative view is being reinforced and is therefore accurate. As a result, the discloser may feel even more negatively about themselves than they did to begin with, and being unable to identify the true source of the negative feelings (e.g., their self-view), they may feel compelled to find a new environment (e.g., look to leave the team or organization).

Additionally, the atmosphere of the team may suffer as a result of the disclosure of an individual with low identity affirmation in a low identity support team. Even if the team attempts to keep offensive comments at a minimum and does not engage in any open hostility directed at the discloser, and the individual attempts to avoid the subject as much as possible, the shared climate of “don’t ask, don’t tell” can result in higher levels of stress within the team. Teams operating under conditions of stress are more likely to experience interpersonal conflict, meaning this atmosphere could become a toxic one. Minority stress theory suggests that individuals in minority groups experience more anxiety as a result of their
minority status (Eldahan et al., 2016). This increased level of anxiety, in turn, results in a higher propensity of an individual to withdraw from social interactions entirely (Norton, 2010). Therefore, I hypothesize:

**Hypothesis 3:** For individuals with low levels of LGB identity affirmation working in teams low levels of LGB identity support, disclosure will have negative relationships with a) trust and b) commitment, and positive relationships with c) conflict and d) withdrawal.

**Low Affirmation and High Support**

The entertainer, RuPaul, is known for her saying “If you can’t love yourself, how the hell are you gonna love someone else?” (Ercolini, 2012). For an individual with low identity affirmation, this means that the presumably good intentions of a team with high identity support may, in fact, not result in positive outcomes. Although it may seem counterintuitive, diversity initiatives within organizations have often been found to lead to an increase in dissatisfaction of LGB employees, as they serve to highlight the differences between this population and other employees (Kaplan, 2006; Köllen, 2016). Similarly, if a team overcompensates in its support of the LGB community, it may only serve to highlight a difference that puts the LGB member in an out-group. This effect would be particularly negative for individuals with low identity affirmation, as the topic is less likely to be broached by the individual themselves. In other words, whereas a high identity affirmation individual may feel positively about an event with implications for the LGB community (e.g., legislation that promotes equality for this community) and
bring it up accordingly, an individual with low identity affirmation may prefer to avoid the subject in general. If members of a high LGB identity support team bring up this information instead (e.g., asks if they have heard about the new legislation), they are highlighting a difference that brings the discloser shame. This may lead the individual to withdraw and avoid social interactions in the future, or trigger interpersonal conflict. Furthermore, self-verification theory suggests that individuals want their self-views to be confirmed by others, even if that self-view is negative (London et al., 2005). This would suggest that an expression of identity support by a team that does not match a low identity affirmation individual’s self-views does not give the individual the self-verification they desire and undermines their trust in the group. Similarly, this lack of trust and perceived threat to their self-view will leave the discloser looking for viable alternatives to their current team.

Finally, an individual with low identity affirmation working in a team where they are the only LGB member may be more likely to perceive acts of kindness as tokenism and view these acts and their perpetrators as being less trustworthy. In other words, an individual who has a negative self-view may view the attempts of others to make them feel accepted as being inauthentic or even manipulative as a result of their own negatively-skewed biases. As a result of this perceived inauthenticity, the discloser is likely to feel less trust in their team. Additionally, feelings of tokenism can lead to the LGB member feeling as if they are in the spotlight, with more attention paid to their mistakes than heterosexual
peers (LaSala, Jenkins, Wheeler, & Fredriksen-Goldsen, 2008). This can lead to additional feelings of pressure and further exacerbate negative outcomes in such an environment. Thus, I hypothesize:

_Hypothesis 4: For individuals with low levels of LGB identity affirmation working in teams with high levels of LGB identity support, disclosure will have negative relationships with a) trust and b) commitment, and positive relationships with c) conflict and d) withdrawal._

**Moderating Role of LGB Identity Centrality**

As is the case for any social identity, being a member of the LGB community does not mean the same thing to all of its members. Some LGB individuals derive a majority of their personal identity from their membership in the LGB community. The majority of their friendships are formed within the community and news related to the community is of the utmost importance. Workplace policies which promote the inclusion and equal treatment of this community are more important to individuals who identify more strongly as LGB, with anything less than full support being viewed as threatening. However, it is rare for an individual to identify with only one social group, meaning that even if an individual identifies as LGB they may have other identities (e.g., racial identity, gender identity) that they consider to be more central (Williams & Frederick, 2015; Blankenship & Stewart, 2017). For these individuals, being LGB simply means they are likely to have a partner of the same-sex. As a result, threats to the LGB aspect of their identity may not be viewed as negatively. Social identity theory
suggests that within these identity intersections, the importance placed on each identity varies depending upon how central the individual feels that identity is overall (Williams & Frederick, 2015; Blankenship & Stewart, 2017). Contextual factors play a role in determining which social identity comes to the forefront of an individual’s mind (e.g., social environment, primacy), but certain identities may become most central to an individual (Cameron, 2004).

Within the team environment, it holds that the extent to which an individual views their sexual orientation to be central to their identity would affect the intensity of the previously discussed relationships between LGB identity disclosure and outcomes. For example, an individual who views their sexual orientation as being central to their identity is more likely to feel personally affected by issues related to this community that may be unrelated to the workplace (e.g., advances in the equal treatment of this group). As a result of this heightened emphasis, an individual with high LGB identity centrality would be more likely to discuss the situation with their coworkers. If the team responds adequately (e.g., expresses interest, concern), the interaction would result in more positive team outcomes, such as an increased likelihood to remain invested in the team (e.g., less withdrawal, more commitment). On the other hand, responses that are viewed as negative after disclosure occurs would be viewed as even more of a trust violation and result in even greater loss of trust in the team itself.

It is important to note that this intensification effect would be seen regardless of whether or not the individual has high or low levels of individual
identity affirmation. Personality attributes that are deemed to be more central to both individual- and social-identity have been found to be rated as more important to an individual regardless of the nature of these attributes as good or bad (Chen, Taylor, & Jeung, 2006). Furthermore, a failure to support central identity characteristics has been shown to result in the development of more negative interpersonal relationships (Farmer & Aguinis, 2005). Finally, an individual with high LGB identity centrality would be more likely to perceive even the subtle changes in the way they are treated after coming out and attribute these changes to the act of disclosure itself, further heightening the relationship between LGB identity disclosure and team outcomes. Based upon this understanding of identity centrality, my final hypothesis suggests:

*Hypothesis 5: LGB identity centrality moderates the relationship between disclosure and a) trust, b) commitment, c) conflict, and d) withdrawal.*
Figure 1. Proposed model of affirmation-support interaction.
Methods

Participants

Participants for this study were recruited by reaching out to members of the LGB community. This was done primarily using the first author’s connection to the LGB community to recruit participants over email by reaching out to community leaders. This resulted in the survey being distributed to several major listservs, in conjunction with organizational Employee Resource Groups. Additionally, contacts at local LGB organizations throughout the country (e.g., PROMO, The Center Orlando) were sent recruiting materials and encouraged to distribute amongst their memberships via email, as is common practice when studying members of this population (Clair et al., 2005; Devine & Nolan, 2007). Finally, participants were recruited utilizing the “snowball method,” where participants are asked to pass the survey along to other members of the community who may be interested in the research (Sabat et al., 2014). This method has become common for researchers interested in studying the LGB community, with general success in attaining adequate sample size having been reported despite inherent limitations (Sabat et al., 2014).

In order to qualify for inclusion in the study, participants had to identify as non-heterosexual, be at least 18 years old, and have experience working in a group or team. In order to be considered to have had adequate experience working on a team, the participant must have previously worked in an environment where two or more individuals worked interdependently on an organizationally related task
(Kozlowski & Ilgen, 2006). In keeping with the definition of Koszlowksi and Ilgen (2006), individuals within these groups must interact socially on a regular basis, and work together towards a common, organizational goal. In order to cast a wide enough net for this exploratory research, these teams can be official work teams, or teams as defined within a department, branch, or organizations (in the event of small businesses). However, future research should attempt to examine the implications of disclosure in more tightly defined team structures.

Finally, it is important to note that, although future research is needed in order to understand the experience of transgender employees, prior research has shown that gender identity is unique (Sabat et al., 2014). Therefore, this study focused on the experience of employees who identified as LGB. Other demographic information was collected, but was not used to select out participants.

**Measures**

**LGB Identity Disclosure.** The extent of disclosure of LGB identity was measured using Mohr and Fassinger (2000)’s Outness Inventory (OI). The OI was designed to measure the degree to which lesbian and gay participants’ sexual orientation is known and talked about openly within different spheres of their lives (Mohr & Fassinger, 2000). The original scale contains 11-items on a 7-point scale (1 = person definitely does not know about your sexual orientation status, 7 = person definitely knows about your sexual orientation status and it is openly talked about). Additionally, one item was added to the scale to ask participants to rate the extent to which they are out to their work team, using the same 7-point scale. As this
construct is measured using one item, reliability information could not be determined. Although this added item will be the variable of interest, all items from the original scale will be retained to use as a control variable for the extent to which the participant is “out” in all aspects of their life. All scale items are included in Appendix A.

**LGB Identity Affirmation.** In order to measure LGB identity affirmation, the Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Positive Identity Measure (LGB-PIM) was used (Riggle et al., 2014). The measure consists of 25 items, which ask participants to rate a series of statements regarding their status as an LGB person on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree). Sample items include “I embrace my LGB identity” and “I feel a connection to the LGB community.” Reliability analysis of the LGB-PIM revealed it to have a strong reliability, with Cronbach’s alpha equaling .94. All scale items are included in Appendix A.

**LGB Identity Support.** Team LGB identity was measured using a modified version of the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgendered Climate Inventory (LGBTCl) written by Liddle, Luzzo, Hauenstein, and Schuck (2004). The scale was originally developed to measure perceived workplace climate for LGBT employees and consists of 20 items to be rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree). The items will be modified to include language which asks participants to rate the extent to which a series of statements describes the climate of their “work team” as opposed to “workplace” in general.
Example items include “Within my work team, coworkers are as likely to ask nice, interested questions about a same-sex relationships as they are about a heterosexual relationship” and “Within my work team, employee LGBT identity does not seem to be an issue.” Although participants for this study will be selected on the basis of their sexual orientation and not their gender identity, prior research suggests that the treatment of employees on the basis may have implications for the individual outcomes of employees who identify as LGB (Green et al., 2011). Therefore, the original language, “LGBT” will be retained. LGBTCI was found to have excellent internal consistency ($\alpha = .96$). All scale items are included in Appendix A.

**LGB Identity Centrality.** Items from Mohr and Kendra’s (2011) Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Identity scale (LGBIS) were used to measure identity centrality. LGBIS is a 27-item measure, consisting of seven subscales, which asks participants to rate a series of statements about their experience as an LGB person using a 6-point Likert-type scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree). Sample items used to measure identity centrality include “To understand who I am as a person, you have to know that I’m LGB.” and “Being an LGB person is a very important aspect of my life.” The observed reliability of the identity centrality items from the LGBIS was quite high ($\alpha = .91$). All scale items are included in Appendix A.

**Team Trust.** The extent to which an individual feels trust in their team was measured using an adapted version of McAllister (1995)’s Affect- and Cognition-Based Trust Scales. The 11-item measure asks participants to rate their agreement
with statements regarding the extent to which they perceive their team members to be affectively and cognitively trustworthy on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree). Sample items include “Members of this team have a sharing relationship. All members can freely share our ideas, feelings, and hopes” and “I can rely on members of this team not to make my job more difficult by careless work.” Observed reliability for the measure was found to be strong (α = .88). All scale items are included in Appendix A.

**Team Commitment.** Team commitment was measured using an adapted form of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979). Participants are asked to rate their agreement with a series of 15 statements on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree). A sample item includes “I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this team be successful”. The scale was observed to have strong reliability (α = .89). All scale items are included in Appendix A.

**Team Conflict.** Team conflict was measured using Jehn and Mannix’s (2001) intragroup conflict scale, which includes items pertaining to the three types of conflict: task, process, and relationship conflict. The scale contains 9 items, which ask participants to rate the frequency of conflict behaviors within their team on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = None, 5 = A lot). Sample items include “How much relationship tension is there in your work group?” and “How much conflict of ideas is there in your work group?” The Cronbach’s alpha for the aggregated conflict measure was high (α = .88). All scale items are included in Appendix A.
Team Withdrawal. Withdrawal was measured using an adapted version of the Psychological Withdrawal Behavior items taken from Lehman and Simpson’s (1992) Withdrawal Scale. The scale contains 7 items, which ask participants to report the frequency with which they have engaged in a withdrawal behavior while working in their team over the last 12 months, with all items measured on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = None, 7 = Eleven or more times). A sample item includes “In the last 12 months, how many times have you left work for unnecessary reasons.” The scale was observed to have a reliability of $\alpha = .78$. All scale items are included in Appendix A.

Control Variables. As previously mentioned, the Outness Inventory was retained in its entirety in order to control for a participant’s overall “outness.” An individual who is “out” in very few aspects of their life, may view being out to their team as more significant, possibly eclipsing the effects of identity affirmation or centrality. Additionally, measures of Propensity to Trust (Mayer & Davis, 1999) and Social Desirability (Reynolds, 1982) were included in order to control for their potentially confounding effects. All control variable items are included in Appendix A.

Procedure

Qualified participants were asked to fill out two online surveys. The two surveys were time-lagged in order to reduce the likelihood of common method and other biases. For example, without time-lagging a participant could realize how supportive their team was of their sexual identity during one part of the survey, and inflate their ratings of team outcomes accordingly. The surveys were composed of
the measures described in the previous section, with survey one (T1) containing the measures of LGB identity disclosure (12 items), identity affirmation (25 items), identity support (20 items) and identity centrality (27 items). Survey two (T2) will contain the measures of team outcomes of trust (11 items), commitment (15 items), conflict (9 items), withdrawal (8 items), control variables (23 items), and demographics.

T2 was made available to participants who completed T1 after one week. Participants were asked for their email address at the end of the first survey, in order to link response sets from T1 and T2. This identifying information was removed after the complete response set had been compiled in order to ensure confidentiality. The time-lagged nature of the survey, combined with the confidentiality of the responses will serve dual purposes, providing more accurate responses while reducing the risk of common method variance in the results (Feldman & Lynch, Jr., 1988). Furthermore, attention check items were included to promote more accurate and thoughtful responses.

Results

Initial Data Collection

In the initial round of data collection, 74 participants completed both part one and part two of the survey. Prior to conducting any analyses, participants’ responses were combined using their provided emails. This identifying information was then removed from the dataset to ensure participants’ privacy. The survey contained seven attention check items in various scales. Any participant who failed...
more than two of these attention checks was removed from the dataset. This resulted in the removal of one participant, bringing the final total sample for phase one of data collection to 73.

After reverse coding items within the measures as appropriate, reliability analysis was conducted for all measures used in the study (Identity Affirmation, Identity Support, Identity Centrality, Trust, Commitment, Withdrawal, Conflict), as well as for each of the control measures (Propensity to Trust, Total Disclosure, Social Desirability) in order to determine if the reliability coefficient of the measure was high enough to be deemed suitable for use in the survey. Reliability information for single item questions, such as the item regarding disclosure to one’s team, was not calculated. All measures were found to have high reliability. Composite scores of all variables were calculated, including a composite score for disclosure items not relating to the work team itself (Total Disclosure).

**Descriptive Statistics.** Descriptive statistics were recorded for the final sample of 73 participants, with an age breakdown as follows: 23-27 years old (28.8%), 28-35 years old (35.6%), 36-42 years old (11.0%), 43-50 years old (8.2%), 51-58 years old (13.7%), and older than 65 years old (2.7%). Additionally, 61.6% of the sample identified as male, 31.5% identified as female, and 6.8% identified in a way other than male or female, with 57.5% of the sample identifying as gay, 20.5% lesbian, 12.3% bisexual, and the remainder identifying their sexuality as “other”. The sample was overwhelmingly Caucasian (91.8%). The average team size of respondents was eight members.
Correlational Analysis. Prior to hypothesis testing, each control variable (Propensity to Trust, Social Desirability, Total Disclosure) was correlated with the variables in the study. There was found to be some correlation between the control and study variables. Therefore, control variables were included in subsequent analyses.

In order to explore whether the relationship between identity disclosure and team-relevant outcome variables is different for individuals with high/low identity affirmation working in teams with high/low support, a baseline of the relationships was first examined. Identity disclosure was not found to be significantly correlated with any of the outcome variables (see Table 1). However, it is interesting to note that the results did find that identity support was positively related to trust ($r = .57$, $p < .01$) and commitment ($r = .30$, $p < .05$), and negatively related to conflict ($r = -.39$, $p < .01$) and withdrawal ($r = -.11$, n.s.).

The original analysis plan included moderation analysis. However, the limited sample size made this approach unfeasible. Instead, simple effects were examined in order to explore the relationship between disclosure and outcomes within sub-groups that represented the hypothesized combinations of affirmation and support (Hypotheses 1 – 4). In order to form these sub-groups, identity affirmation and identity support were dichotomized around the mean score of the sample (see Table 2).

Additionally, due to known limitations in the sample size and, therefore, statistical power, all findings will be interpreted in terms of the actual effect size
and practical significance, in addition to more traditional tests of significance (Hemphill, 2003). According to Cohen’s (1992) suggestions, correlations between .10 and .30 are considered small, between .30 and .50 are considered moderate, and higher than .50 are considered large. These classifications will be used for the duration of hypothesis testing.
Table 1. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Study Variables – Initial Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</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. Identity Disclosure</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>1.71</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. Identity Affirmation</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identity Support</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>(.96)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identity Centrality</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Team Trust</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>(.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Team Commitment</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Team Conflict</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.56**</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>(.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Team Withdrawal</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>-.58**</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>(.78)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Propensity to Trust</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>(.66)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Total Disclosure</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>(.72)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Social Desirability</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>(.67)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. For all focal study variables, partial correlations were performed controlling for Propensity to Trust, Total Disclosure, and Social Desirability. Bivariate correlations performed between control variables and study variables. Total Disclosure refers to average score on Outness Inventory, excluding team item. Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient is presented in parentheses in the diagonal. *p < .05, **p < .01 (two-tailed)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Support</th>
<th></th>
<th>Low Support</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Affirmation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Affirmation</td>
<td>16én</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANOVA. Due to the manner in which the subgroups were created, a one-way ANOVA was performed to test whether the means were significantly different between the subgroups for each of the identity variables (See Table 3). For all three identity variables, the assumption of homogeneity of variances was not met. ANOVA results showed that there are significant mean differences among the four group means for disclosure, $F (3, 69)= 7.09, p < .01$, identity affirmation, $F (3, 69)= 38.85, p < .01$, and identity support, $F (3, 69)= 34.11, p < .01$.

Furthermore, post-hoc tests using the Bonferroni correction showed that identity affirmation was significantly higher in the groups considered to be “high affirmation” than those considered “low affirmation”, with a similar pattern being found for identity support. Despite unequal group size and the violation of the assumption of sphericity, these findings suggest there is a difference in identity affirmation and identity support levels in the different subgroups and that these differences are as anticipated.
Table 3. One-Way ANOVA Results of Subgroup on Identity Variables – Initial Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity Disclosure</td>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>49.47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.49</td>
<td>7.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td>160.50</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>209.97</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Affirmation</td>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>37.48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>38.85**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td>22.19</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59.67</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Support</td>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>43.35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td>34.11**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td>29.23</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72.59</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. **p < .01
Hypothesis Testing. Hypothesis 1 proposed that for individuals with high levels of LGB identity affirmation working in teams with high levels of LGB identity support, disclosure will have positive relationships with a) trust and b) commitment, and negative relationships with c) conflict and d) withdrawal. Analysis of the relationship between disclosure and the proposed team-relevant outcomes did not yield significant results for trust ($r = .17, n.s.$), commitment ($r = .29, n.s.$), conflict ($r = -.14, n.s.$), or withdrawal ($r = -.38, n.s.$). See Table 4.

However, it is notable that despite the lack of significance, likely due to lack of power, the observed pattern of relationships is in the expected direction. The effect sizes found in this sub-sample for the relationship between team disclosure and team trust, as well team conflict can be considered small and in the expected direction, even though they are not statistically significant. Furthermore, the effect sizes found for the relationship between disclosure and team commitment, as well as team withdrawal, can be considered moderate and in the expected direction. Thus, hypothesis 1 may be considered partially supported when interpreting the direction and magnitude of the effect size.
Table 4. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for High Identity Affirmation/High Identity Support Subgroup – Initial Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity Disclosure</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Trust</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Commitment</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Conflict</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.65**</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Withdrawal</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Partial correlations performed controlling for Propensity to Trust, Total Disclosure, Social Desirability.  
*p < .05, **p < .01 (two-tailed)
Hypothesis 2 proposed that for individuals with high levels of LGB identity affirmation working in teams with low levels of LGB identity support, disclosure will have negative relationships with a) trust and b) commitment, and positive relationships with c) conflict and d) withdrawal. Analysis of the relationship between disclosure and the proposed team-relevant outcomes did not yield significant results for trust ($r = .01, n.s.$), commitment ($r = -.02, n.s.$), conflict ($r = .21, n.s.$) or withdrawal ($r = .06, n.s.$). See Table 5.

Additionally, the observed pattern of relationships in this group is only partially in the expected direction. There was observed to be small positive effects for conflict and withdrawal as predicted, but positive as opposed to negative effects for trust and no effect for commitment. Therefore, hypothesis 2 was not supported.
Table 5. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for High Identity Affirmation/Low Identity Support Subgroup – Initial Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity Disclosure</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Trust</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Commitment</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Conflict</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Withdrawal</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.61*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Partial correlations performed controlling for Propensity to Trust, Total Disclosure, Social Desirability.  
*p < .05, **p < .01 (two-tailed)
Hypothesis 3 proposed that for individuals with low levels of LGB identity affirmation working in teams low levels of LGB identity support, disclosure will have negative relationships with a) trust and b) commitment, and positive relationships with c) conflict and d) withdrawal. This analysis revealed a significant relationship between disclosure and withdrawal ($r = .51, p < .05$) and a relationship which was approaching significance between disclosure and conflict ($r = .44, p = .06$). Additionally, although not significant, the proposed pattern of the relationships between disclosure and trust ($r = -.27, n.s.$) and disclosure and commitment ($r = -.27, n.s.$) was seen. See Table 6.

When considering the effect sizes seen in this subgroup, we see disclosure has moderate negative effects on team trust and team commitment, even though they are not statistically significant. Furthermore, the effect size found for the relationship between disclosure and team conflict can be considered moderate and in the right direction as well as statistically significant. Finally, the effect size for the relationship between disclosure and team withdrawal can be considered large and in the expected direction, in addition to approaching statistical significance. Thus, hypothesis 3 can be considered partially supported when interpreting the direction and magnitude of the effect size.
Table 6. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Low Identity Affirmation/Low Identity Support Subgroup – Initial Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity Disclosure</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Trust</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Commitment</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Conflict</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.66**</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Withdrawal</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>-.49*</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Partial correlations performed controlling for Propensity to Trust, Total Disclosure, Social Desirability.
*p < .05, **p < .01 (two-tailed)
Hypothesis 4 proposed that for individuals with low levels of LGB identity affirmation working in teams with high levels of LGB identity support, disclosure will have negative relationships with a) trust and b) commitment, and positive relationships with c) conflict and d) withdrawal. Analysis of the relationship between disclosure and the proposed team-relevant outcomes did not yield significant results for trust ($r = -0.40, n.s.$), commitment ($r = -0.34, n.s.$), conflict ($r = -0.08, n.s.$), or withdrawal ($r = -0.07, n.s.$). See Table 7.

When considering the direction and practical significance of the effect size of the relationships in this subgroup, the observed pattern of relationships in this group is not in the expected direction. The effect size between disclosure and trust, as well as commitment, can be said to be small-to-moderate and in the expected direction (negative). However, the effect size for disclosure and conflict, as well as withdrawal, are small and not in the expected direction (negative, as opposed to positive). Therefore, hypothesis 4 was not supported, either in terms of statistical significance or when interpreting the direction and magnitude of the effect size.
Table 7. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Low Identity Affirmation/High Identity Support Subgroup – Initial Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity Disclosure</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Trust</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Commitment</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Conflict</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Withdrawal</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.65*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Partial correlations performed controlling for Propensity to Trust, Total Disclosure, Social Desirability.  
*p < .05, **p < .01 (two-tailed)
**Linear Regression.** Hypothesis 5 proposed that identity centrality moderated the relationship between disclosure and a) trust, b) commitment, c) conflict, and d) withdrawal. In order to test these hypotheses, a series of multiple linear regressions were conducted. The following sections highlight the results of this analysis for trust, commitment, conflict, and withdrawal.

In the first step, two variables were included: disclosure and identity centrality. These variables did not account for a significant amount of variance in trust, $R^2 = .06$, $F(2, 70) = 2.14$, n.s., commitment, $R^2 = .02$, $F(2, 70) = .60$, n.s., conflict, $R^2 = .02$, $F(2, 70) = .54$, n.s., or withdrawal, $R^2 = .01$, $F(2, 70) = .38$, n.s. Next, the interaction term between centrality and disclosure was added to the regression model. This also did not account for a significant proportion of the variance in trust, $\Delta R^2 = .04$, $\Delta F(1, 69) = 2.66$, n.s. (Table 8), conflict, $\Delta R^2 = .02$, $\Delta F(1, 69) = 1.39$, n.s. (Table 9), or withdrawal, $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $\Delta F(1, 69) = .27$, n.s. (Table 10).
Table 8. Results of Moderated Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Identity Analysis and Trust – Initial Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrality</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure*Centrality</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R^2)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Delta R^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F)</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *\(p < .05\)*

Table 9. Results of Moderated Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Identity Analysis and Conflict – Initial Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrality</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure*Centrality</td>
<td>-.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R^2)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Delta R^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F)</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *\(p < .05\)*
Table 10. Results of Moderated Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Identity Analysis and Withdrawal – Initial Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrality</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure*Centrality</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *$p < .05$
However, the interaction term between centrality and disclosure accounted for a significant proportion of the variance in team commitment, $\Delta R^2 = .07$, $\Delta F(1, 69) = 5.04, p < .05$, $b = 1.40, t(69) = 2.24, p < .05$ (Table 11). The pattern of this significant interaction is shown in Figure 2, suggesting that for individuals high in identity centrality, the relationship between disclosure and team commitment was positive. However, for individuals with low identity centrality, this relationship was negative.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrality</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure*Centrality</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta R^2 )</td>
<td></td>
<td>.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F )</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>5.04*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p < .05*

*Figure 2. Interaction of identity centrality and disclosure on team commitment.*
**Power Analysis.** Due to concerns with the sample size as previously mentioned, post-hoc power analyses was conducted using GPower. This analysis showed that the sample size provided sufficient power for subgroup correlation analysis, due to the large size of the correlations. However, for any more complex analyses (e.g., ANOVA, regression), the sample would need to be at least doubled in order to gain adequate power.

**Collection of Supplemental Data**

Due to the fact that the sample size achieved with the original data collection plan (2 time-separated surveys) was smaller than desired, a decision was made to run a supplementary combined single-time survey, despite the known risk for common method bias (Feldman & Lynch, Jr., 1988). This second “wave” of data collection was performed using Amazon Mechanical Turk (mTurk). In order to qualify for participation, mTurk respondents had to have previously identified as gay, lesbian, bisexual, or other, be 18 years of age, reside in the United States, and have prior experience working as part of a team as described previously. This resulted in an initial sample size of 97 participants. Due to the nature of data collected on mTurk, the data was then screened for quality on the basis of response time and participant’s response to items regarding their team size, which resulted in the removal of 16 participants. Finally, the data was then screened for outliers in any of the variables being studied, which resulted in the removal of an additional
participant. This process resulted in a final sample size consisting of 80 participants.

**Descriptive Statistics.** Descriptive statistics were recorded for the initial sample of 80 participants, with an age breakdown as follows: 18-22 years old (2.5%), 23-27 years old (26.3%), 28-35 years old (32.5%), 36-42 years old (17.5%), 43-50 years old (10.0%), 51-58 years old (10.0%), and 59-65 years old (1.3%). Additionally, 31.3% of the sample identified as male, 67.5% identified as female, and 1.3% identified in a way other than male or female, with 21.3% of the sample identifying as gay, 32.5% lesbian, 42.5% bisexual, and the remainder identifying their sexuality as “other”. In terms of ethnicity, the sample identified as Caucasian (78.8%), black or African American (15.0%), Asian (3.8%), and Hispanic or Latino (2.5%). The average team size of respondents was nine members.

**Correlational Analysis.** This data was initially analyzed as a separate dataset, with reliability information calculated for all measures. The same control measures and analyses methodology were retained in an effort to treat both datasets as similarly as possible. Correlations were then run between all variables (Table 12). Unlike in the initial dataset, identity disclosure was found to be significantly positively correlated with trust \((r = .42, p < .01)\) and commitment \((r = .34, p < .01)\). Again, it is interesting to note that identity support was positively related to trust \((r = .82, p < .01)\) and commitment \((r = .71, p < .01)\), and negatively related to conflict \((r = -.44, p < .01)\) and withdrawal \((r = -.33, p < .01)\). In order to further explore these
relationships, subgroups were created around the midpoints of identity affirmation and identity support (See Table 13).
### Table 12. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Study Variables – Supplemental Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</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>Identity Disclosure</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>1.71</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>Identity Affirmation</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Support</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Centrality</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Trust</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Commitment</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Conflict</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.59**</td>
<td>-.45**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Withdrawal</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propensity to Trust</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Disclosure</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>(.79)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* For all focal study variables, partial correlations were performed controlling for Propensity to Trust, Total Disclosure, and Social Desirability. Bivariate correlations performed between control variables and study variables. Total Disclosure refers to average score on Outness Inventory, excluding team item. Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient is presented in parentheses in the diagonal. *p < .05, **p < .01 (two-tailed)
Table 13. Descriptive Statistics for Subgroups – Supplemental Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Support</th>
<th></th>
<th>Low Support</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Affirmation</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Affirmation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANOVA. As previously mentioned, the manner in which the subgroups were created required a one-way ANOVA to be performed in order to test whether the means were significantly different between the subgroups for each of the identity variables (See Table 14). For disclosure, the assumption of homogeneity of variances was met. However, this was not the case for identity affirmation or identity support. ANOVA results showed that there are significant mean differences among the four group means for disclosure, $F (3, 76)= 4.93, p < .01$, identity affirmation, $F (3, 76)= 41.12, p < .01$, and identity support, $F (3, 76)= 34.39, p < .01$.

Furthermore, post-hoc tests using the Bonferroni correction showed that identity affirmation was significantly higher in the groups considered to be “high” in affirmation than “low” affirmation, with a similar pattern being found for groups considered “high” and “low” identity support. Despite unequal group size and the violation of the assumption of sphericity, these findings suggest there is a difference in identity affirmation and identity support levels in the different subgroups and that these differences are as anticipated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity Disclosure</td>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>41.70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>4.93**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td>214.19</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>255.89</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Affirmation</td>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>49.28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.43</td>
<td>41.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td>30.36</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79.64</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Support</td>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>66.93</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22.31</td>
<td>34.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td>49.31</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116.24</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. **p < .01*
**Hypothesis Testing.** Hypothesis 1 proposed that for individuals with high levels of LGB identity affirmation working in teams with high levels of LGB identity support, disclosure will have positive relationships with a) trust and b) commitment, and negative relationships with c) conflict and d) withdrawal. This analysis revealed a significant negative relationship between disclosure and withdrawal ($r = -.46, p < .05$). However, no other significant relationships were found for commitment ($r = .10, n.s.$), trust ($r = -.08, n.s.$), or conflict ($r = .09, n.s.$). See Table 15.

Furthermore, although disclosure had a moderate, negative effect on withdrawal, none of the other effect sizes were practically significant or interpretable. Therefore, hypothesis 1 was only partially supported.
Table 15. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for High Identity Affirmation/High Identity Support Subgroup – Supplemental Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity Disclosure</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Trust</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Commitment</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Conflict</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Withdrawal</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>-.46*</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.64**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Partial correlations performed controlling for Propensity to Trust, Total Disclosure, Social Desirability.
*p < .05, **p < .01 (two-tailed)*
Hypothesis 2 proposed that for individuals with high levels of LGB identity affirmation working in teams with low levels of LGB identity support, disclosure will have negative relationships with a) trust and b) commitment, and positive relationships with c) conflict and d) withdrawal. Analysis of the relationship between disclosure and the proposed team-relevant outcomes did not yield significant results for trust \( (r = -.25, \text{n.s.}) \), commitment \( (r = -.11, \text{n.s.}) \), conflict \( (r = .38, \text{n.s.}) \), or withdrawal \( (r = .18, \text{n.s.}) \). See Table 16.

However, it is notable that despite the lack of significance, likely due to lack of power, the observed pattern of relationships is in the expected direction. The effect size found in this sub-sample for the relationships between disclosure and trust, commitment, and withdrawal, can be considered small and in the expected direction, even though they are not statistically significant. Additionally, the effect size for the relationship between disclosure and conflict was moderate and in the expected direction (positive). Thus, hypothesis 2 can be considered partially supported when interpreting the direction and magnitude of the effect size.
Table 16. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for High Identity Affirmation/Low Identity Support Subgroup – Supplemental Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity Disclosure</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Trust</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Commitment</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.68*</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Conflict</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.84**</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Withdrawal</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.67*</td>
<td>-.80**</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Partial correlations performed controlling for Propensity to Trust, Total Disclosure, Social Desirability.

*p < .05, **p < .01 (two-tailed)
Hypothesis 3 proposed that for individuals with low levels of LGB identity affirmation working in teams with low levels of LGB identity support, disclosure will have negative relationships with a) trust and b) commitment, and positive relationships with c) conflict and d) withdrawal. This analysis revealed a significant relationship between disclosure and trust \( (r = .44, p < .05) \), as well as between disclosure and commitment \( (r = .54, p < .05) \). The relationships between disclosure and conflict \( (r = .15, n.s.) \) and withdrawal \( (r = -.15, n.s.) \) were not significant. See Table 17.

In terms of effect size, the effect size for the relationship between disclosure and conflict was small and in the expected direction. However, the effect size for withdrawal was small and not in the expected direction. Furthermore, the effect sizes for trust and commitment were moderate and large respectively. However, the relationships were both positive, meaning hypothesis 3 was not supported.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity Disclosure</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Trust</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Commitment</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Conflict</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Withdrawal</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.44*</td>
<td>-.65**</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Partial correlations performed controlling for Propensity to Trust, Total Disclosure, Social Desirability.*

*p < .05, **p < .01 (two-tailed)
Hypothesis 4 proposed that for individuals with low levels of LGB identity affirmation working in teams with high levels of LGB identity support, disclosure will have negative relationships with a) trust and b) commitment, and positive relationships with c) conflict and d) withdrawal. Analysis of the relationship between disclosure and the proposed team-relevant outcomes did not yield significant results for trust ($r = .48, n.s.$), commitment ($r = .05, n.s.$), conflict ($r = -.47, n.s.$) or withdrawal ($r = -.31, n.s.$). See Table 18.

Additionally, analyses of the patterns of effect size found that although there was a moderate to large effect of disclosure on trust, as well as conflict, and a moderate effect of disclosure on withdrawal, the effects were not in the expected direction. Furthermore, there did not appear to be an effect of disclosure on commitment. Therefore, hypothesis 4 was not supported.
Table 18. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Low Identity Affirmation/High Identity Support Subgroup – Supplemental Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity Disclosure</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Trust</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Commitment</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Conflict</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>-.61*</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Withdrawal</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Partial correlations performed controlling for Propensity to Trust, Total Disclosure, Social Desirability.  
*p < .05, **p < .01 (two-tailed)
**Linear Regression.** Hypothesis 5 proposed that identity centrality moderated the relationship between disclosure and a) trust, b) commitment, c) conflict, and d) withdrawal. In order to test these hypotheses, a series of multiple linear regressions were conducted. The following sections highlight the results of this analysis for trust, commitment, conflict, and withdrawal.

In the first step, two variables were included: disclosure and identity centrality. These variables accounted for a significant amount of variance in trust, $R^2 = .21$, $F(2, 77) = 10.03$, $p < .01$, commitment, $R^2 = .18$, $F(2, 77) = 8.29$, $p < .01$, and withdrawal $R^2 = .09$, $F(2, 77) = 3.63$, $p < .05$. However, these variables did not for a significant amount of variance in conflict, $R^2 = .02$, $F(2, 77) = .92$, n.s.

Next, the interaction term between centrality and disclosure was added to the regression model. This did not account for a significant proportion of the variance in trust, $\Delta R^2 = .04$, $\Delta F(1, 76) = 2.66$, n.s. (Table 19), commitment, $\Delta R^2 = .01$, $\Delta F(1, 76) = .92$, n.s. (Table 20). conflict, $\Delta R^2 = .01$, $\Delta F(1, 76) = .41$, n.s. (Table 21), or withdrawal, $\Delta R^2 = .03$, $\Delta F(1, 69) = 2.78$, n.s. (Table 22). Therefore, hypothesis 5 was not supported.
Table 19. Results of Moderated Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Identity Analysis and Trust – Supplemental Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrality</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure*Centrality</td>
<td>-.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>10.03**</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p < .05, **p < .01

Table 20. Results of Moderated Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Identity Analysis and Commitment – Supplemental Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrality</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure*Centrality</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>8.29**</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p < .05, **p < .01
Table 21. Results of Moderated Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Identity Analysis and Conflict – Supplemental Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrality</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure*Centrality</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$*

Table 22. Results of Moderated Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Identity Analysis and Withdrawal – Supplemental Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrality</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure*Centrality</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>3.63*</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$*
Exploratory Analyses of Combined Data

After having analyzed the results of the two datasets separately, and in an effort to explore the subgroup correlations more fully, the two were combined and analyzed as a single dataset. However, due to the slight differences in the way the two datasets were collected (e.g., time-lagged in phase one, no identifying information in phase two), a determination needed to be made as to whether or not the two datasets could reasonably be combined. Therefore, the data was coded depending on whether it had been collected during the initial phase or via mTurk. The two sample sizes were roughly equal in terms of sample size (Phase One: n = 73, mTurk: n = 80), and were compared on the major identity-related variables in a series of one-way ANOVA (Table 23).

Although the two groups were not significantly different from one another in terms of identity affirmation or identity support, there was a significant difference between the two groups in terms of disclosure. However, it was deemed acceptable to merge the two datasets despite this difference due to the fact that it was possibly the result of the heightened anonymity of data collected on mTurk and should not impact the results beyond this.
Table 23. One-Way ANOVA Results of Data Source on Identity Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity Disclosure</td>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>24.74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.74</td>
<td>7.93**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td>467.94</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>492.68</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Affirmation</td>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td>138.34</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>138.36</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Support</td>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td>178.52</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>178.59</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Centrality</td>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td>315.88</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>316.51</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. **p < .01
Descriptive Statistics. The merged dataset was screened for outliers, resulting in the removal of one participant from the combined data set and a merged dataset sample size of 152. Descriptive statistics were recorded for the combined sample, with an age breakdown as follows: 18-22 years old (1.3%), 23-27 years old (27.6%), 28-35 years old (33.6%), 36-42 years old (14.5%), 43-50 years old (9.2%), 51-58 years old (11.8%), 59-65 years old (0.7%), and older than 65 years old (1.3%). Additionally, 46.1% of the sample identified as male, 50.0% identified as female, and 3.9% identified in a way other than male or female, with 38.8% of the sample identifying as gay, 26.3% lesbian, 28.3% bisexual, and the remainder identifying their sexuality as “other”. In terms of ethnicity, the sample identified as Caucasian (84.9%), black or African American (9.2%), Hispanic or Latino (3.3%), Asian (2.0%), and American Indian or Alaskan Native (0.7%). The average team size of respondents was between eight and nine members.

Correlational Analysis. After merging the two datasets, the same control measures and analyses methodology were retained in order to remain consistent. Correlations were then run between all variables (Table 24). Within the larger dataset, identity disclosure was found to be positively correlated with trust \((r = .42, p < .01)\) and commitment \((r = .34, p < .01)\). Again, it is interesting to note that identity support was positively related to trust \((r = .71, p < .01)\) and commitment \((r = .52, p < .01)\), and negatively related to conflict \((r = -.35, p < .01)\) and withdrawal \((r = -.18, p < .05)\). In order to further explore these relationships, subgroups were created around the midpoints of identity affirmation and identity support (Table 25).
Table 24. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Study Variables – Combined Dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</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>Identity Disclosure</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>1.81</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>Identity Affirmation</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Support</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>(.96)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Centrality</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>(.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Trust</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Commitment</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Conflict</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.49**</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Withdrawal</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.46**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propensity to Trust</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>(.65)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Disclosure</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>(.81)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.37*</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>(.75)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. For all focal study variables, partial correlations were performed controlling for Propensity to Trust, Total Disclosure, and Social Desirability. Bivariate correlations performed between control variables and study variables. Total Disclosure refers to average score on Outness Inventory, excluding team item. Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient is presented in parentheses in the diagonal. *p < .05, **p < .01 (two-tailed)*
Table 25. Descriptive Statistics for Subgroups – Combined Dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Support</th>
<th></th>
<th>Low Support</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Affirmation</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Affirmation</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANOVA. After subgroups had been created (Low Affirmation/Low Support: n = 44; Low Affirmation/High Support: n = 33; High Affirmation/Low Support: n = 34; High Affirmation/High Support: n = 41), multiple one-way ANOVAs were conducted to determine whether the groups were significantly different from one another in terms of the study variables (Table 26). Despite a violation of sphericity and differences in subgroup size, the results suggested that the subgroups were different enough for testing.
Table 26. One-Way ANOVA Results of Subgroup on Identity Variables - Combined Dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity Disclosure</td>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>98.39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32.80</td>
<td>88.64**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td>394.29</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>492.68</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Affirmation</td>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>88.89</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29.63</td>
<td>88.64**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td>49.47</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>138.36</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Support</td>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>104.40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34.80</td>
<td>69.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td>74.19</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>178.59</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. **p < .01*
**Hypothesis Testing.** Hypothesis 1 proposed that for individuals with high levels of LGB identity affirmation working in teams with high levels of LGB identity support, disclosure will have positive relationships with a) trust and b) commitment, and negative relationships with c) conflict and d) withdrawal. The analysis of the combined data did not reveal any significant relationships for trust ($r = -0.14, n.s.$), commitment ($r = -0.04, n.s.$), conflict ($r = 0.10, n.s.$), or withdrawal ($r = -0.13, n.s.$). See Table 27.

Additionally, the observed pattern of effect sizes in this group was not in the expected direction. There was seen to be a small negative effect on trust and withdrawal, and no effect on commitment or conflict. Therefore, hypothesis 1 was not supported.
Table 27. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for High Identity Affirmation/High Identity Support Subgroup – Combined Dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity Disclosure</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Trust</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Commitment</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Conflict</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.57**</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Withdrawal</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
<td>-.66**</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Partial correlations performed controlling for Propensity to Trust, Total Disclosure, Social Desirability. 
*p < .05, **p < .01 (two-tailed)
Hypothesis 2 proposed that for individuals with low levels of LGB identity affirmation working in teams with high levels of LGB identity support, disclosure will have negative relationships with a) trust and b) commitment, and positive relationships with c) conflict and d) withdrawal. Analysis of the relationship between disclosure and the proposed team-relevant outcomes did not yield significant results for trust ($r = .08, n.s.$), commitment ($r = -.10, n.s.$), conflict ($r = .32, n.s.$), or withdrawal ($r = .22, n.s.$). See Table 28.

Additionally, the observed pattern of relationships in this group was not in the expected direction. Although there was seen to be small-to-moderate positive effects of disclosure on conflict and withdrawal as expected, there was not observed to be an effect on trust or commitment. Therefore, hypothesis 2 was not supported.
Table 28. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for High Identity Affirmation/Low Identity Support Subgroup – Combined Dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity Disclosure</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Trust</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Commitment</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Conflict</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Withdrawal</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.63**</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Partial correlations performed controlling for Propensity to Trust, Total Disclosure, Social Desirability.

*p < .05, **p < .01 (two-tailed)
Hypothesis 3 proposed that for individuals with low levels of LGB identity affirmation working in teams with low levels of LGB identity support, disclosure will have negative relationships with a) trust and b) commitment, and positive relationships with c) conflict and d) withdrawal. Analysis of the relationship between disclosure and the proposed team-relevant outcomes did not yield significant results for trust (r = .25, n.s.), commitment (r = .27, n.s.), conflict (r = .25, n.s.), or withdrawal (r = .19, n.s.). See Table 29.

Additionally, the observed pattern of relationships in this group was not in the expected direction for all outcomes. There was a small, positive effect of disclosure on conflict and withdrawal as expected, but also for trust and commitment, when a negative effect was anticipation. Therefore, hypothesis 3 was only partially supported.
Table 29. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Low Identity Affirmation/Low Identity Support Subgroup – Combined Dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity Disclosure</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Trust</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Commitment</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Conflict</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.34*</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Withdrawal</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.36*</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Partial correlations performed controlling for Propensity to Trust, Total Disclosure, Social Desirability.

*p < .05, **p < .01 (two-tailed)
Hypothesis 4 proposed that for individuals with high levels of LGB identity affirmation working in teams with low levels of LGB identity support, disclosure will have negative relationships with a) trust and b) commitment, and positive relationships with c) conflict and d) withdrawal. Analysis of the relationship between disclosure and the proposed team-relevant outcomes did not yield significant results for trust ($r = .12, n.s.$), commitment ($r = - .14, n.s.$), conflict ($r = - .27, n.s.$) or withdrawal ($r = -.13, n.s.$). See Table 30.

Additionally, the observed pattern of relationships in this group was not in the expected direction. Disclosure was observed to have a small negative effect on commitment, as expected, but also on conflict and withdrawal, and a small positive effect on trust. Therefore, hypothesis 4 was not supported.
Table 30. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Low Identity Affirmation/High Identity Support Subgroup – Combined Dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity Disclosure</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Trust</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Commitment</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Conflict</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.53**</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Withdrawal</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Partial correlations performed controlling for Propensity to Trust, Total Disclosure, Social Desirability.  
*p < .05, **p < .01 (two-tailed)
**Linear Regression.** Hypothesis 5 proposed that identity centrality moderated the relationship between disclosure and a) trust, b) commitment, c) conflict, and d) withdrawal. In order to test these hypotheses, a series of multiple linear regressions were conducted. The following sections highlight the results of this analysis for trust, commitment, conflict, and withdrawal.

In the first step, two variables were included: disclosure and identity centrality. These variables accounted for a significant amount of variance in trust, $R^2 = .14, F(2, 149) = 12.47, p < .01$ and commitment, $R^2 = .08, F(2, 149) = 6.37, p < .01$. However, these variables did not account for a significant amount of variance in conflict, $R^2 = .00, F(2, 149) = .10, n.s.$, and withdrawal $R^2 = .01, F(2, 148) = .95, n.s.$

Next, the interaction term between centrality and disclosure was added to the regression model. This did not account for a significant proportion of the variance in trust, $\Delta R^2 = .00, \Delta F(1, 148) = .14, n.s.$ (Table 31), commitment, $\Delta R^2 = .00, \Delta F(1, 148) = .30, n.s.$ (Table 32). conflict, $\Delta R^2 = .01, \Delta F(1, 148) = .84, n.s.$ (Table 33), or withdrawal, $\Delta R^2 = .02, \Delta F(1, 148) = 1.34, n.s.$ (Table 34). Therefore, hypothesis 5 was not supported.
### Table 31. Results of Moderated Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Identity Analysis and Trust – Combined Dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrality</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure*Centrality</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>12.47**</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$*

### Table 32. Results of Moderated Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Identity Analysis and Commitment – Combined Dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrality</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure*Centrality</td>
<td></td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>6.37**</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$*
### Table 33. Results of Moderated Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Identity Analysis and Conflict – Combined Dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrality</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure*Centrality</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$*

### Table 34. Results of Moderated Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Identity Analysis and Withdrawal – Combined Dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrality</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure*Centrality</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$*
Summary of Results

In an effort to better understand the role that disclosure plays in determining team-relevant outcomes, subgroup correlations were examined in two separate datasets, as well as a third combined dataset. This resulted in findings that were, at times, conflicting. In order to better understand the results, the effect sizes for all three datasets, as well as whether or not the results offered practical support of the originally stated hypotheses can be found in Table 35. The table is color coded for ease of interpretability, with green representing findings which supported the initial hypothesis, yellow representing correlations which occurred in anticipated direction, but not significant, and red representing findings that offered no support for the initial hypothesis (e.g., relationships in the opposite direction or near zero). Correlations that were found to be significant are in bold.

Additionally, although the test of centrality in the initial dataset suggested a possible moderation of the relationship between disclosure and team commitment, subsequent analyses of the supplemental and merged datasets do not suggest this relationship.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Low A/Low S</th>
<th>Low A/High S</th>
<th>High A/Low S</th>
<th>High A/High S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>- .27</td>
<td>- .40</td>
<td>- .01</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mturk</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>- .25</td>
<td>- .08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>- .14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>- .27</td>
<td>- .34</td>
<td>- .02</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mturk</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>- .11</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>- .14</td>
<td>- .10</td>
<td>- .04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>- .38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mturk</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>- .14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mturk</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>- .13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. A = Affirmation, S = Support*
Discussion

This study set out to examine the implications of individual (LGB Identity Affirmation) and team (LGB Identity Support) characteristics for LGB employees, as well as examine the impact of disclosure on different team-relevant outcomes (Trust, Commitment, Conflict, Withdraw). Although limited in terms of sample and analyses, its findings have important implications, both in terms of theory and practice.

First and foremost, this study was the first of its kind to look at the impact of disclosure on team-relevant outcomes. This in and of itself is important, as prior research suggests LGB individuals are more likely to disclose to individuals to whom they feel close (Omarzu, 2000), making team members among the most likely to be disclosed to in the workplace. The findings suggest that the extent to which an individual feels their LGB identity is supported by their team is highly positively correlated with trust and commitment, and negatively correlated with conflict. This demonstrates support for prior findings that perceived identity support at the supervisor, peer, and organizational level is an important predictor of individual outcomes (Huffman et al., 2008), while expanding the conversation of LGB identity support to a new level, the team. Furthermore, prior research on organizational policies regarding the LGBT community has shown there is a difference between non-discrimination and LGBT supportive policies (Griffith & Hebl, 2002). The findings that team support has implications for the extent to
which an individual feels trust for and commitment to their team, while being less likely to perceive conflict or withdraw from the team offers support for this distinction.

Furthermore, examination of the relationship between disclosure to one’s work team and these same team outcomes using identity support/identity affirmation subgroup correlations, using two different datasets, offered some interesting results. In the initial phase of data collection, for example, for low affirmation individuals working in a low support team, disclosure had small, negative effects on trust and commitment, and a large positive on conflict and withdrawal. However, in the analysis of the supplemental data which was collected, these relationships were virtually reversed, with disclosure having moderate and large positive effects on trust and commitment, respectively, and a small negative effect on withdrawal. These inconsistent patterns and conflicting findings suggest that there may be other factors which impact the outcomes of disclosure in low support teams for low affirmation individuals. For example, it is possible that after disclosing to a work team, an individual will feel more commitment to that team, regardless of the response, as opposed to trying to find a new team and have to disclose all over again. The two datasets were analyzed for potentially confounding differences, with none being found. However, it is possible that there may be some other difference between the two datasets that was unable to be adequately analyzed (e.g., quality).
Not all of the analyses offered conflicting results. For high affirmation individuals working in high support teams, both datasets revealed disclosure had a small, positive effect on team trust, and a moderate, negative effect on withdrawal. Interestingly enough, in the final combined dataset, disclosure was found to be positively related to team trust and commitment in the overall sample. This positive effect of disclosure on team trust was also seen within each subgroup, with the exception of high affirmation/high support teams, where a small, negative effect was observed. This would suggest that, generally speaking, disclosure and trust are positively related. Although this was not what was hypothesized, it is possible that the relationship between trust and disclosure is inherently positive due to the fact that individuals tend to disclose after first establishing trust. However, the design of the current study does not allow for the interpretation of the causal direction of these two constructs. However, in teams where both the LGB member and his or teammates feel positively about the LGB community, other factors may impact trust more strongly than disclosure.

Counter to our hypothesis, for individuals with low identity affirmation, working in teams with high support, disclosure was found to have a small to moderate negative effect on conflict and withdrawal. Furthermore, although the initial data collection showed a small negative effect of disclosure on trust as hypothesized, the supplemental data revealed that disclosure had a moderate, positive effect on trust. Combined with the overall findings in all analyses that team
support was positively related to trust, and negatively related to conflict and withdrawal, this would suggest that, generally speaking, team support results in more trust and less conflict and withdrawal for LGB members.

On the other hand, results from both datasets suggest that for high affirmation individuals working in low support teams, disclosure has at least a small, positive effect on conflict and withdrawal. This suggests that individuals who feel positively about their LGB identity desire to feel supported by their team and a failure to do so results in more turmoil. Team effectiveness is often dependent on the extent to which team members are able to cooperate with one another, which makes this potential relationship troubling. Furthermore, this finding that disclosure may have negative outcomes for LGB employees in low support environments contradicts the commonly held belief that coming out is always a positive experience, which leads to more authentic relationships with others. In other words, there may be circumstances where disclosure has unintended negative consequences. This could offer a partial explanation for the conflicting findings of prior studies regarding the outcomes of disclosure as a good or bad thing. However, there exists an important caveat to this point. The same relationships were not found for individuals who felt positively about their identity, and in teams that were highly supportive, the observed pattern of relationships, albeit not significant, suggest that disclosure has positive implications. Additional research is needed to understand the nuances of these relationships, but it would
seem that a climate that is supportive of members of the LGB community has positive implications for team-relevant outcomes.

Analysis of the moderating role of identity centrality in the different datasets offered conflicting results on the importance of this factor in determining the relationship between disclosure and team commitment. More specifically, in the initial dataset, the relationship between disclosure and team commitment was positive for individuals who were high in identity centrality, but negative for those who were low in identity centrality. This suggests that there are times where disclosure may have unintended negative outcomes. This supports prior findings that identity centrality plays a role in determining interpersonal outcomes for members of stigmatized populations (Farmer & Aguinis, 2005). Furthermore, this suggests that team commitment involves a certain amount of need for perceived authenticity and alignment of self- and team-views. However, the fact that this effect was not replicated in the subsequent analysis undermine this interpretation and challenges prior findings regarding the role of identity centrality in interpersonal relationships. Additionally, the finding that this moderating effect was not present for the other outcome variables, suggests that other factors come into play in determining the level of trust, conflict, and withdraw that comes from the act of disclosing to one’s team.

From a practical angle, this study highlights the importance of developing a team climate which is supportive of individual differences in the sexual orientation
of its team members. As previously mentioned, the subgroup correlations suggest that the impact of disclosure in teams with high identity support was negligible. However, for teams with low levels of identity support disclosure was associated with increased levels of withdrawal and conflict. Furthermore, this relationship was found despite the range restriction in the sample in terms of identity support ($M = 5.52$). This suggests these effects could be even more exacerbated in teams that are exceptionally low in identity support. This expands on the need for organizational policies which promote inclusion and suggests the need for this sort of policy (e.g., team contracts) which also incorporate a climate of support for individuals who do not identify as heterosexual within work teams. Additionally, the findings that disclosure could have positive or negative outcomes dependent on characteristics of the individual, suggest that it is important for organizations to avoid falling into the mindset of a “one-size-fits-all” solution for members of this population.

**Limitations**

Recruitment of participants for this study was difficult, likely because it examined somewhat sensitive and personal topics in a relatively small proportion of the population. Therefore, the first, and most consequential limitation of this study, lies in the sample that was collected for analysis. Although the initial recruiting effort of the study followed typical best practices for this area of research, and supplemental data was collected using mTurk, the sample was impacted by range restriction. The vast majority of respondents reported high levels
of perceived LGB identity support within their teams and high levels of identity affirmation within themselves. This is not surprising, as participants were solicited in a manner that encouraged participation in the name of bettering the working conditions of LGBT employees. Individuals who did not feel positively about their teams or their own identity would be less likely to heed this call to action.

However, this is particularly troubling, given the nature of some of the relationships being studied. Additionally, the limited sample size made it impossible to conduct more complex data analysis.

An additional limitation lies in the measure used for the predictor variable. Identity salience (e.g., disclosure) was measured with a single item, asking about the extent to which they had come out to their work teams. Furthermore, additional items asked about disclosure to a work supervisor. Within organizations, supervisors often are part of the team itself, meaning there could have been some overlap here. Additionally, by asking participants to rate the extent to which they had disclosed to their team as a whole, variance at the individual team member level was lost. It is possible that an individual would have disclosed to the majority of their team members, but not all. This could result in a bit of ambiguity in the way in which they responded to this item. Additionally, with just a single item there was less variance at the individual level, making it less likely for significant relationships to be detected. Furthermore, the cross-sectional nature of the study, and loose definition of what constituted a work team (team size ranged from 2 to 30
members) meant that it was likely that not all participants used the same definition of team when responding to this item.

Finally, although this study was designed to begin the conversation of what happens within a work team when an individual discloses their sexual orientation, no team-level analysis was implemented.

**Future Research Directions**

As previously stated, this study sought to explore the implications of disclosure in a new research context. Although the results are not conclusive, they do encourage further research which will examine the outcomes of disclosure within work groups and teams.

First, as previously discussed, future research should examine the implications of disclosure in a sample that is more varied in terms of identity support and identity affirmation. There are inherent limitations in conducting research with members of the LGBT community, particularly in terms of anonymity, which would only be more important to take into consideration in a study with individuals who do not feel positively about their identity as LGBT. However, this would appear to be the group that needs organizational support most of all. Additionally, future research should explore the role that other aspects of LGBT identity play in determining group outcomes. For example, this study did not examine factors such as concealment motivation (Jackson & Mohr, 2016), or identity counterfeiting (Chrobot-Mason et al., 2001), which would likely play a role
in determining team relevant outcomes, such as trust, should team members suspect their teammate is not being forthright with their sexuality.

This study also did not consider the experiences of transgender employee disclosure. Although prior research suggests these experiences are unique when compared to sexual orientation (Sabat et al., 2014), future research should consider the LGBT community as a whole. Additionally, there exist other invisibly stigmatized groups (e.g., mental disability), which may experience disclosure differently within work teams. These unique experiences can serve to better inform organizational policies. Additionally, prior research has suggested that disclosure has different implications for job satisfaction between these two groups (Green et al., 2011). Future research should examine whether the impact of disclosure on team-relevant outcomes is the same for individuals who identify as bisexual, as compared to mono-sexual.

This study examined the relationships between individual and team characteristics cross-sectionally. Prior research has shown that timing can play a role in determining the perceptions of the individuals to whom sexual orientation is disclosed. This could be particularly important to consider in a team context. Therefore, future research should examine disclosure in a longitudinal manner. This would be particularly pertinent for studying the relationship between disclosure and trust, in order to determine the causal relationship between these two constructs. This study examined disclosure as the extent to which an individual’s sexuality is
known to their team as a whole. Future research should examine the impact of
disclosure to individual team members, using a social network analysis perspective,
to see if the centrality of the individual who is disclosing plays a role in
determining team outcomes.

Finally, and most significantly, this study examined team-relevant
outcomes, but did not examine team-level constructs. Previous research has shown
that diversity practices can result in backlash that impacts other individuals within
an organization as well as LGB employees (Kaplan, 2006). Future research should
look at how disclosure impacts team performance at the team-level in order to get a
more complete picture of how disclosure impacts the outcomes of not only the
discloser, but their teammates as well.

Conclusion

This study was the first in a line of research that is needed in order to better
understand the outcomes of disclosure at work more fully. There are many factors
which play a role in determining whether coming out at work is a good or bad
thing. By examining these factors within work teams, and beginning the
conversation of the impact disclosure has on team-relevant outcomes, we aim to
advance the conversation on how to better build a more inclusive work
environment for all employees.
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Appendix A: Measures

**Disclosure:**
Mohr, J., & Fassinger, R. (2000). *Outness inventory*
http://dx.doi.org.portal.lib.fit.edu/10.1037/t07106-000

Use the following rating scale to indicate how open you are about your sexual orientation to the people listed below. Try to respond to all of the items, but leave items blank if they do not apply to you. If an item refers to a group of people (e.g., work peers), then indicate how out you generally are to that group.

1 = person definitely does NOT know about your sexual orientation status
2 = person might know about your sexual orientation status, but it is NEVER talked about
3 = person probably knows about your sexual orientation status, but it is NEVER talked about
4 = person probably knows about your sexual orientation status, but it is RARELY talked about
5 = person definitely knows about your sexual orientation status, but it is RARELY talked about
6 = person definitely knows about your sexual orientation status, and it is SOMETIMES talked about
7 = person definitely knows about your sexual orientation status, and it is OPENLY talked about
0 = not applicable to your situation; there is no such person or group of people in your life

1. Mother
2. Father
3. Siblings (sisters, brothers)
4. Extended family/relatives
5. My new straight friends
6. My work peers (outside of my work team)
7. My work supervisor(s)
8. My work team (i.e., if you are a member of multiple teams, rate ONE particular team that you will be discussing throughout these surveys)
9. Members of my religious community (e.g., church, temple)
10. Leaders of my religious community (e.g., church, temple)
11. Strangers, new acquaintances
12. My old heterosexual friends
LGB Identity Affirmation

Use the following rating scale to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree that the following statements are true about yourself.

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Somewhat Disagree
4 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
5 = Somewhat Agree
6 = Agree
7 = Strongly Agree

1. My LGBT identity leads me to important insights about myself.
2. I am more aware of how I feel about things because of my LGBT identity.
3. My LGBT identity motivates me to be more self-aware.
4. Because of my LGBT identity, I am more in tune with what is happening around me.
5. My LGBT identity has led me to develop new insights into my strengths.
6. I feel I can be honest and share my LGBT identity with others.
7. I am honest with myself about my LGBT identity.
8. I have a sense of inner peace about my LGBT identity.
9. I embrace my LGBT identity.
10. I am comfortable with my LGBT identity.
11. I feel supported by the LGBT community.
12. I feel visible in the LGBT community.
13. I feel included in the LGBT community.
14. I feel a connection to the LGBT community.
15. I find positive networking opportunities in the LGBT community.
16. My LGBT identity allows me to understand my sexual partner better.
17. My LGBT identity allows me to be closer to my intimate partner.
18. My LGBT identity frees me to choose who I want as my sexual/intimate partner.
19. I have a sense of sexual freedom because of my LGBT identity.
20. My LGBT identity helps me to communicate better with my intimate partner.
21. As an LGBT person, it is important to act as an advocate for LGBT rights.
22. My LGBT identity makes it important to me to actively educate others about LGBT issues.
23. My experience with my LGBT identity leads me to fight for the rights of others.
24. I am more sensitive to prejudice and discrimination against others because of my LGBT identity.
25. I have a greater respect for people who are different from society’s expectations because of my LGBT identity.
Team LGB Identity Support
http://dx.doi.org.portal.lib.fit.edu/10.1037/t07100-000

Please rate the following items according to the extent to which you agree that they describe the atmosphere for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered (LGBT) employees in your work team, using the following scale.

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Somewhat Disagree
4 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
5 = Somewhat Agree
6 = Agree
7 = Strongly Agree

Within my team…
1. Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered (LGBT) employees are treated with respect.
2. LGBT employees must be secretive.
3. Coworkers are as likely to ask nice, interested questions about a same-sex relationship as they are about a heterosexual relationship.
4. LGBT people consider it a comfortable place to work.
5. Non-LGBT employees are comfortable engaging in gay-friendly humor with LGBT employees (for example, kidding them about a date).
6. The atmosphere for LGBT employees is oppressive.
7. LGBT employees feel accepted by coworkers.
8. Coworkers make comments that seem to indicate a lack of awareness of LGBT issues.
9. Employees are expected to not act “too gay.”
10. LGBT employees fear job loss because of sexual orientation.
11. My immediate work group is supportive of LGBT coworkers.
12. LGBT employees are comfortable talking about their personal lives with coworkers.
13. There is pressure for LGBT employees to stay closeted (to conceal their sexual orientation or gender identity/expression).
14. Employee LGBT identity does not seem to be an issue.
15. LGBT employees are met with thinly veiled hostility (for example, scornful looks or icy tone of voice).
16. The company or institution as a whole provides a supportive environment for LGBT people.
17. LGBT employees are free to be themselves.
18. LGBT people are less likely to be mentored.
19. LGBT employees feel free to display pictures of a same-sex partner.
20. The atmosphere for LGBT employees is improving.
LGB Identity Centrality

Use the following rating scale to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree that the following statements are true about yourself.

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Somewhat Disagree
4 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
5 = Somewhat Agree
6 = Agree
7 = Strongly Agree

1. I prefer to keep my same-sex romantic relationships rather private.
2. If it were possible, I would choose to be straight.
3. I'm not totally sure what my sexual orientation is.
4. I keep careful control over who knows about my same-sex romantic relationships.
5. I often wonder whether others judge me for my sexual orientation.
6. I am glad to be an LGB person.
7. I look down on heterosexuals.
8. I keep changing my mind about my sexual orientation.
9. I can't feel comfortable knowing that others judge me negatively for my sexual orientation.
10. I feel that LGB people are superior to heterosexuals.
11. My sexual orientation is an insignificant part of who I am.
12. Admitting to myself that I'm an LGB person has been a very painful process.
13. I'm proud to be part of the LGB community.
14. I can't decide whether I am bisexual or homosexual.
15. My sexual orientation is a central part of my identity.
16. I think a lot about how my sexual orientation affects the way people see me.
17. Admitting to myself that I'm an LGB person has been a very slow process.
18. Straight people have boring lives compared with LGB people.
19. My sexual orientation is a very personal and private matter.
20. I wish I were heterosexual.
21. To understand who I am as a person, you have to know that I’m LGB.
22. I get very confused when I try to figure out my sexual orientation.
23. I have felt comfortable with my sexual identity just about from the start.
24. Being an LGB person is a very important aspect of my life.
25. I believe being LGB is an important part of me.
26. I am proud to be LGB.
27. I believe it is unfair that I am attracted to people of the same sex.
Team Trust
McAllister, D. J. (1995). *Affect- and cognition-based trust scale*
http://dx.doi.org.portal.lib.fit.edu/10.1037/t55229-000

Use the following rating scale to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree that the following statements are true regarding your team.

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Somewhat Disagree
4 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
5 = Somewhat Agree
6 = Agree
7 = Strongly Agree

1. Members of this team have a sharing relationship. All members can freely share our ideas, feelings, and hopes.
2. I can talk freely to this team about difficulties I am having at work and know that members of my team will want to listen.
3. My team would feel a sense of loss if one of its members was transferred and we could no longer work together.
4. If I shared my problems with my team, I know they would respond constructively and caringly.
5. I would have to say that members of this team have made considerable emotional investments in their working relationships with one another.
6. Members of this team approaches their job with professionalism and dedication.
7. Given this team’s track record, I see no reason to doubt its competence and preparation for the job.
8. I can rely on members of this team not to make my job more difficult by careless work.
9. Most members of this team, even those who are not close friends, trust and respect each other as coworkers.
10. Other work associates of mine who must interact with members of my team consider them to be trustworthy.
11. If people knew more about the background of the other members of my team, they would be more concerned and monitor their performance more closely.
Team Commitment

Listed below are a series of statements that represent possible feelings that individuals might have about the team for which they work. With respect to your own feelings about the particular team for which you are filling out this survey, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by checking one of the seven alternatives below each statement.

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Somewhat Disagree
4 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
5 = Somewhat Agree
6 = Agree
7 = Strongly Agree

1. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this team be successful.
2. I talk up this team to my friends as a great team to work on.
3. I feel very little loyalty to this team. (R)
4. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working on this team.
5. I find that my values and the team’s values are very similar.
6. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this team.
7. I could just as well be working for a different team as long as the type of work was similar. (R)
8. This team really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.
9. It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this team. (R)
10. I am extremely glad that I chose this team to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.
11. There is not too much to be gained by sticking with this team indefinitely. (R)
12. Often, I find it difficult to agree with this team’s policies on important matters relating to its employees. (R)
13. I really care about the fate of this team.
14. For me, this is the best of all possible teams for which to work.
15. Deciding to work on this team was a definite mistake on my part. (R)
**Team Conflict**

Use the following rating scale to indicate how much of the time the scenario described in each statement occurs within your team.

1 = None  
2 = Very Little  
3 = Some  
4 = Quite a Bit  
5 = A Lot

1. How much relationship tension is there in your work group?  
2. How often do people get angry while working in your group?  
3. How much emotional conflict is there in your work group?  
4. How much conflict of ideas is there in your work group?  
5. How frequently do you have disagreements with your work group?  
6. How often do people in your work group have conflicting opinion about the project you are working on?  
7. How often are there disagreements about who should do what in your work group?  
8. How much conflict there in your group about task responsibilities?  
9. How often do you disagree about resource allocation in your work group?
Team Withdrawal

Use the following rating scale to indicate how often the scenarios described in each statement has occurred.

1 = None  
2 = One time  
3 = Two to three times  
4 = Four to six times  
5 = Seven to eight times  
6 = Nine to ten times  
7 = Eleven or more times

In the last 12 months, *in regards to the work done with your work team*, how many times have you…
1. Had thoughts of being absent  
2. Left your work area for unnecessary reasons  
3. Spent your work time daydreaming  
4. Spent work time on personal matters  
5. Put less effort into job than you should have  
6. Had thoughts of leaving your team  
7. Let others in the team do your work
Propensity to Trust

Use the following rating scale to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the listed statements.

1 = Strongly Disagree  
2 = Disagree  
3 = Somewhat Disagree  
4 = Neither Agree nor Disagree  
5 = Somewhat Agree  
6 = Agree  
7 = Strongly Agree

1. One should be very cautious with strangers.  
2. Most experts tell the truth about the limits of their knowledge.  
3. Most people can be counted on to do what they say they will do.  
4. These days, you must be alert or someone is likely to take advantage of you.  
5. Most salespeople are honest in describing their products.  
6. Most repair people will not overcharge people who are ignorant of their specialty.  
7. Most people answer public opinion polls honestly.  
8. Most adults are competent at their jobs.
Social Desirability

Please read each statement and select the response that best describes you.

True
False

1. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.
2. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.
3. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.
4. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were not right.
5. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.
6. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.
7. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.
8. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.
9. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.
10. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.
11. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.
12. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.
13. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.