City University of New York (CUNY)

CUNY Academic Works

Publications and Research

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

2018

Inclusive Work Practices: Turnover Intentions Among LGBT Employees of the U.S. Federal Government

Meghna Sabharwal

The University of Texas at Dallas

Helisse Levine

Long Island University

Maria J. D'Agostino

CUNY John Jay College

Tiffany Nguyen

The University of Texas at Dallas

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

More information about this work at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu/jj_pubs/390

Discover additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu>

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).

Contact: AcademicWorks@cuny.edu

Inclusive Work Practices: Turnover Intentions Among LGBT Employees of the U.S. Federal Government

American Review of Public Administration
2019, Vol. 49(4) 482–494
© The Author(s) 2018
Article reuse guidelines:
sagepub.com/journals-permissions
DOI: 10.1177/0275074018817376
journals.sagepub.com/home/arp

Meghna Sabharwal¹ , Helisse Levine², Maria D'Agostino³, and Tiffany Nguyen¹

Abstract

The federal government lags behind in progressive civil rights policies in regard to universal workplace antidiscrimination laws for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) Americans. The slow progress matters to inclusionary workplace practices and the theory and practice of public administration generally, as recognition of LGBT rights and protection are constitutive of representative bureaucracy and promoting social equity. This study examines the turnover intention rates of self-identified LGBT employees in the U.S. federal government. Using the Office of Personnel Management's inclusion quotient (IQ), and 2015 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey (FEVS), we identify links in the relationships between workplace inclusion and turnover outcomes among LGBT individuals. We also examine the impact of agency type on LGBT turnover rates based on Lowi's agency classification type. Key findings suggest that LGBT employees express higher turnover intentions than those that identify as heterosexuals/straight, and LGBT employees who perceive their agencies as redistributive or communal are less likely to experience turnover intentions. However, an open and supportive workplace environment had a positive impact on turnover, suggesting that to implement effective structural change in an organization's culture of inclusion, public sector managers must do more than merely "talk the talk." This finding is also suggestive of LGBT employees' desire to avoid the stigma of being LGBT and hide their identities. Institutions must heed the invisible and visible identities of their employees to be truly inclusive. Workplace practices that acknowledge the invisible and visible identities of their employees are a positive step toward real workplace inclusion.

Keywords

lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, inclusion, turnover intentions, federal employee viewpoint survey (FEVS), public sector employees

Introduction

The lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) population has historically been marginalized in the United States through the systematic denial of legal protections and benefits (Pizer, Sears, Mallory, & Hunter, 2012). Today, LGBT people continue to face discrimination as a result of homophobia and transphobia, and in many cases, face violence motivated by such beliefs about their sexual orientation and/or their gender identity (Herek, 1989; Riccucci & Gossett, 1996; Sears & Mallory, 2011; Tilcsik, 2011). Recent tragedies testify to this, such as the 2016 Orlando mass shooting, where 49, mainly Latino and Black LGBT attendees of a local gay club, were murdered and at least 53 were left injured.

Despite the U.S. Supreme Court deeming marriage a right of same-sex couples in the 2015 decision in *Obergefell v. Hodges*, the federal government lags behind in progressive civil rights policies, particularly in regard to universal workplace antidiscrimination laws for LGBT Americans. Although sexual orientation and gender identity remain

unprotected categories under the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, and national origin, at the end of 2016, 20 states plus D.C. banned discrimination based on both sexual orientation and gender identity or expression in employment, housing, and public accommodations (American Civil Liberties Union, 2017). However, according to the Human Rights Campaign, these protections remain inconsistently derived through a patchwork of state and local law (Fidas & Cooper, 2014). This slow progress matters—not only to inclusionary workplace practices but also to the theory and

¹The University of Texas at Dallas, Richardson, TX, USA

²Long Island University, Brooklyn, NY, USA

³John Jay College of Criminal Justice, New York, NY, USA

Corresponding Author:

Meghna Sabharwal, Associate Professor and Program Head, Public and Nonprofit Management, School of Economic, Political and Policy Sciences, The University of Texas at Dallas, 800 W. Campbell Road, GR 31, Richardson, TX 75080, USA.

Email: meghna.sabharwal@utdallas.edu

practice of public administration more generally, as recognition of LGBT rights and protection are constitutive of representative bureaucracy and promoting social equity. Understanding differences between LGBT and comparable heterosexual employees is important to human resources professionals who must ensure that all employees are treated equitably (Lewis & Pitts, 2017). However, recognition of sexually diverse populations extends to a greater public policy agenda that moves away from a climate of homo-negativity, which implicitly normalizes and naturalizes heterosexuality, resulting in a circular process and continued invisibility of the needs of sexually diverse people (Mulé et al., 2009).

Although previous studies have documented that minority employees experience higher rates of voluntary turnover than majority employees (e.g., Hofhuis, Van der Zee, & Otten, 2014), this study examines the turnover intention rates of self-identified LGBT employees of the U.S. federal government. Using the Office of Personnel Management's (OPM) inclusion quotient (IQ), and 2015 Federal Employee Viewpoint data (FEVS), including LGBT response item added in 2012, we refine existing measures of turnover and identify links in the relationships between workplace inclusion and turnover outcomes among LGBT individuals. Furthermore, we examine turnover intention of LGBT federal employees based on Lowi's (1985) classification of agency type. We argue that LGBT-inclusive policies and practices affect workplace climates and lower turnover rates among LGBT employees.

Although the overarching theme of this research is LGBT turnover intention, the nature of the problem and scope of the present study are unique for several reasons. First, there is a projected increase in the number of people who openly identify as LGBT. According to a 2016 Gallup Daily tracking survey, the portion of American adults identifying as LGBT increased to 4.1% in 2016 from 3.5% in 2012 (Gates, 2017). These figures imply that more than nearly 10 million adults now identify as LGBT in the United States, approximately 1.75 million more compared with 2012.

However, we must take caution to these approximations as they may underestimate the population because of several reasons, including a respondent's desire to avoid the stigma of being LGBT (Coffman, Coffman, & Ericson, 2017). Therefore, it is not surprising that despite a changing social and legal landscape for LGBT people, Fidas and Cooper (2014) revealed that over half (53%) of LGBT workers nationwide still hide who they are at work. In the public sector in particular, Cayer and Sabharwal (2013) report that LGBT employees may feel wary of accusations of bias if they openly express support for pro-LGBT civil rights, for as public servants they are expected to remain politically neutral.

Second, the costs of employees taking action on their expressed desire to leave their agencies are large for any organization, but especially pertinent for the federal government as they have complex hiring procedures and restricted

budgets for hiring as compared with the private sector (Albucher, 2015). Third, the psychological toll of perceived discrimination manifests well before many LGBT people even enter the workforce, afflicting LGBT youth from their high school years with higher rates of depressive symptoms (Almeida, Johnson, Corliss, Molnar, & Azrael, 2009).

LGBT federal employees' perceived discrepancy of equitable workplace treatment on so many fronts demands that the federal government as an employer change to become more fair, open, and supportive to all its employees. Past research has examined how policies have affected the inclusion of gay men and lesbians in federal government including how veteran's preference affects the number of gay men that hold federal jobs (Lewis, 2013), and how policy has supported the denial of security clearance and the exclusion of gay men and lesbians from federal government (Colvin, 2004; Johnson, 1994, 2004; Lewis, 2001). Research has also explored whether LGBTs face employment discrimination (Cech & Pham, 2017; Federman & Elias, 2017; Lewis & Pitts, 2011, 2017).

The present study uses FEVS data to examine indicators of LGBT employees' turnover intentions in the federal government workplace. It adds to the existing literature by including inclusion and agency type as moderating factors to explain turnover intentions among LGBT employees. Fostering an inclusive environment in the federal (and all levels of) government is and will be crucial to retaining employees and thereby reducing costs of replacing employees who turnover because "discrimination is not only morally unacceptable: it is inefficient" (McClure, 2014, p. 179). Turnover not only consumes time and money, it can also indicate a legitimate organizational problem (McElroy, Morrow, & Rude, 2001). LGBT employees' intentions to turnover may signal key areas for improvement in the unequal treatment and inclusive practices implemented in the federal workplace (Lewis & Pitts, 2017). Literature providing background and supporting our hypotheses follow. Next, we discuss the variables and methods used in our study followed by discussion and suggestions for future research.

Literature Review and Hypotheses

LGBT Turnover Intentions

Studies in labor turnover intention owing to one's gender (Grissom, Nicholson-Crotty, & Keiser, 2012) and minority status (Hofhuis et al., 2014) have indicated important implications to diversity management research and practice in both the public (Meier & Hicklin, 2008) and private sectors (Vitaliano, 2010). In the public sector, for example, works by Cox (1994) and Clair, Beatty, and Maclean (2005), document how women, racial minorities, older workers, and others bearing a stigmatized identity have suffered job loss, limited career advancement, difficulty finding a mentor, and isolation at work. Of particular importance to the success of

these employees, (e.g., those who have been historically marginalized) are workplace inclusionary practices and policies (Shore et al., 2011). It has also been noted that these stigmatized social identities—particularly those workers who are identified as invisible, are not only common and increasing as a significant group in the U.S. workforce, but have been overlooked in much of the literature (Clair, Beatty, & MacClean, 2005). Surveys seeking national data on LGBT employment discrimination are also few (Sears & Mallory, 2011).

As the literature suggests, (e.g., Lewis & Pitts, 2017) the above referenced government policy decisions affect LGBT people in their places of employment in several ways. For instance, from their agency's commitment to diversity and relationships with their supervisors, LGBT federal employees are overall less satisfied than non-LGBT employees with their workplace treatment. In addition, Ragins and Cornwell (2001) found when LGBT employees perceive greater workplace discrimination, their desire to turnover from their organization increases. According to Sears and Mallory (2011) people who openly identify as LGBT at their workplaces had higher odds of being discriminated against than those who hide their sexual orientation or gender identity at work. Lewis and Pitts (2017) also found differences between LGBT employees and heterosexual employees' perceptions of fair treatment, which they equated to the differences based on race and ethnicity. LGBT employees were less satisfied than non-LGBT employees in all aspects examined, including performance appraisals, promotions, raises, prohibited personnel practices, commitment to diversity, agency leadership (Lewis & Pitts, 2017). Employees chiefly doubted whether actual work performance was the basis for receiving awards, promotions, and pay raises. There were larger differences between LGBT and non-LGBT employees' perceptions of opportunities for advancement and whether their performance led to equitable rewards; additionally, they were more dissatisfied with their supervisors, peers, and leaders of their agency, plus employee empowerment (Lewis & Pitts, 2017). Using a national survey of 534 gay and lesbian employees, Ragins and Cornwell (2001) found that supportive workplace policies had a direct effect on their turnover intentions.

Pitts, Marvel, and Fernandez's (2011) research supported significant indirect relationships between workplace satisfaction and a federal employee's decision to turnover. In looking at the differences between LGBT federal and heterosexual employees, Lewis and Pitts (2017) found that LGBT federal employees were 10% more likely to express considering leaving various federal agencies including Commerce, Housing and Urban Development, Agriculture, Homeland Security, and various arms of the Department of Defense. We, therefore, offer the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1 (H1): In federal government agencies, LGBT employees are likely to express higher turnover intentions than non-LGBT employees

Inclusion Practices and LGBT Individuals

Despite the importance of inclusive practices in organizations (Gasorek, 2000; Mor Barak, 2016; Mor Barak & Cherin, 1998; Pelled, Ledford, & Mohrman, 1999), few have studied its impact on turnover (Hwang & Hopkins, 2012). There are, however, several common definitional elements of inclusion in organizations. For example, Gasorek (2000) suggests that inclusive organizations are those where employees are valued, ideas are taken into account and used, people partner successfully within and across departments, current employees feel that they belong and prospective employees are attracted to the organization. According to Gasorek (2000), when people feel connected to each other and to the organization and its goals, the organization continuously fosters flexibility and choice, and attends to diversity.

Many have suggested that the precursor to inclusion is diversity management (Choi, 2009; Choi & Rainey, 2014; Mor Barak, Cherin, & Berkman, 1998). For instance, Choi (2009) demonstrated that effective diversity management mediates the relation between race/ethnicity, age, and sex and turnover intentions of government employees. Not only must diversity be managed properly for an organization to be better at achieving its goals; managers must make a concerted effort to create harmony among differences between employees (Choi, 2009). In other words, inclusion requires action and conscious choices (Sabharwal, 2014).

In the context of diversity management, Shore et al. (2011) define the nature of an inclusive environment as:

A climate of inclusion is one in which policies, procedures, and actions of organizational agents are consistent with fair treatment of *all* social groups, with particular attention to groups that have had fewer opportunities historically and that are stigmatized in the societies in which they live. (p. 1277)

Similar to Gasorek (2000) and Shore et al. (2011), Pless and Maak (2004) coined the term "culture of inclusion" suggesting that,

differences are recognized, valued and engaged. Different voices are understood as being legitimate and as opening up new vistas; they are heard and integrated in decision making and problem solving processes; they have an active role in shaping culture and fostering creativity and innovation; and eventually in adding value to the company's performance. (p. 130)

Although some models of inclusion focus on access to workplace resources and the ability to impact decision making (Mor Barak & Cherin, 1998; Pelled et al., 1999), a number of models have incorporated the identity and personhood of individuals when making an organization inclusive (Triana, García, & Colella, 2010). Mor Barak (2016) for example, who has done extensive research in the area of social work, developed the inclusion-exclusion framework. To be an

inclusive workplace, Mor Barak (2016) explains, an institution must go beyond merely providing employees adequate resources. The emerging normative paradigm posits that an organization and its management must authentically and consciously demonstrate concern for their employees' well-being and value what each individual has to offer as a result of his or her differing background. Based on the above models and emerging paradigm, Hypothesis 2 states:

Hypothesis 2 (H2): Inclusive practices (open, fair, cooperative, supportive and empowering environments) will reduce turnover among employees

With few exceptions, there has been limited research on LGBT inclusive practices and turnover intentions. Pichler, Ruggs, and Trau's (2017) recent work on inclusive practices of organizational- and individual-level outcomes of LGBT-supportive policies suggest that among firms with LGBT-supportive policies and practices, all employees, including LGBT individuals, feel more supported and more fairly treated—and as a result, these feelings will be reciprocated. Munoz (2005) reported that LGBT-supportive workplace climates had significant and positive effects on job-related variables such as turnover intentions, which suggests an overall beneficial effect of LGBT-supportive workplace climates on the well-being of LGBT employees. Also, Choi (2009) found that racial/ethnic and sex diversity had a negative relationship to turnover intention, as there were a higher number of EEO (equal employment opportunity) complaints. We, therefore, extend Pichler et al. (2017), Munoz (2005), and Choi's (2009) findings and develop the hypothesis that

Hypothesis 3 (H3): LGBT employees who experience greater inclusion (open, fair, cooperative, supportive and empowering environments) are less likely to express intent to turnover

Agency Type and LGBT Turnover

The literature on the distribution and integration of women and men in public-sector jobs provides evidence that women often face glass walls, especially in certain types of agencies. Lowi's typology classifies government agency types as (a) regulatory, (b) distributive, (c) redistributive, and (d) constituent. Distributive agencies are typically "agentic"¹ whereas redistributive or "communal"² (Eagly, 2005; Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Eagly, Johannesen Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Eagly & Karau, 2002) are typically those that require emotional labor (e.g., Department of Education, Department of Veteran Affairs, and Department of Housing and Development). Acker (1992) maintains that in a "gendered institution" "gender is present in the processes, practices, images and ideologies, and distributions of power in the various sectors of social life" (p. 567). Given the interplay between a public organization, its

environment and the inner workings of the organization itself (Rainey, 2009), some agencies may be more conducive to welcoming minorities than others because of their respective workplace culture (Newman, 1994). According to Riccucci (2009) "redistributive" agency types have the greatest concentration of minorities—such as people of color.

Researchers have also looked at the different organizational cultures particular to each agency type and their respective influences on women's employment opportunities and workplace experiences (Newman, 1994; Sabharwal, 2015). With regard to the influence of gendered bureaucracy on women, the discrepancy between women holding higher authority positions and men holding such positions includes a lesser involvement in policy making for women (Sabharwal, 2015). Because women are overrepresented in redistributive agencies, which are "most closely tied to entitlement expenditures in the federal budget, which is by and large automatic spending," the opportunities for women to make discretionary decisions about spending are fewer than in a distributive agency (Sabharwal, 2015, p. 402).

In distributive agencies, there have been noted some obstacles for women who seek to advance their careers (Newman, 1994). Distributive agencies have the highest mean salaries, but also the greatest salary differential between women and men (Sneed, 2007). Newman (1994) found that for a female job candidate to obtain a higher position within an organization, she must conform to the agency's concept of its ideal employee, which arises from the group culture established as a result of and influenced by the function that the agency plays in the government. If she is not perceived as fitting in, she may fail to get the position despite her qualifications. Therefore, "a lack of fit model of bias may be inherent in questions of equity in the workplace" (Newman, 1994, p. 281). By comparison, redistributive agencies have a greater likelihood of having women as department heads, therefore, a greater likelihood of administrators prioritizing women-focused policies (Saidel & Loscocco, 2005). The organizational culture and values of an organization have great sway over both women and men department heads in their priority setting (Saidel & Loscocco, 2005). Redistributive agencies also "unquestionably have the lowest levels of gender-based occupational segregation" (Sneed, 2007, p. 887).

In addition, some researchers have documented that gay employees are concentrated in female-dominated fields (Baumle, Compton, & Poston, 2009). In particular, using two nationally representative surveys in the United States for the period 2008-2010, Tilcsik, Anteby, and Knight (2015) report that lesbian and gay (LG) employees are found in artistic, service-oriented, and care-oriented fields and fields wherein one typically works independently. Confronted with stigma, these employees may even modify their behaviors over time, developing perceptiveness in social situations to gauge how their identity may be received if revealed and a desire to work independently (Tilcsik et al., 2015). Furthermore, LG employees have honed skills that adapt to

their concealable stigma (e.g., an attribute that draws stigma when made public but can remain undisclosed without others' knowledge) and may be drawn to occupations that engage this social perceptiveness (Tilcsik et al., 2015). Although several studies have examined the gendered nature of organizations, we expect this phenomenon to spillover to LGBT employees as well. Thus, based on past studies we hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 4 (H4): In the federal government, agency type will be a significant indicator of turnover rates.

Hypothesis 5 (H5): LGBT federal government employees in redistributive or communal agencies are less likely to experience turnover intentions than those employed in distributive, constituent and regulatory agencies that are typically agentic

Data and Methodology

Data for this study come from the 2015 FEVS, which is the most comprehensive data set of federal government employees in the United States made available by the OPM. A total of 421,748 employees responded to the survey. A total of 82 agencies, 37 large and 45 small/independent agencies are represented in the survey. The data are weighted to ensure accurate representation of the survey population and produce unbiased estimates of population statistics.

Measures

Dependent variable. The outcome variable, *turnover intention* has four possible responses: (a) no; (b) yes, to take another job within the federal government; (c) yes, to take another job outside the federal government; and (d) yes, other. The responses were recoded to no = 0 and yes = 1 (all other categories). Approximately 34% of the employees report their intentions to leave to take up another job within the federal government or outside the federal government. Research conducted by Fernandez et al. (2015) reported that only five different studies from 2000-2015 years focused on turnover as a primary outcome variable. In addition, no studies to our knowledge have examined the moderating relationship of inclusion with LGBT status and turnover.

Independent variables

LGBT status. The key independent variable is LGBT status; heterosexuals/straight were coded as 0 and those that identified as LGBT were coded as 1. Individuals who chose not to reveal their sexual/gender identity were excluded from the study. Only 3% of the sample identified as LGBT, 84% of the respondents identified as heterosexuals and the remaining 13% preferred not to disclose their sexual/gender orientation.³

Inclusion. The OPM introduced its IQ to FEVS in 2014. The IQ assesses fair treatment, openness, empowerment,

and cooperation among employees, and federal government supervisors' supportiveness. OPM's framework of the IQ suggests that making demonstrable improvement in the workplace environment for minorities requires more than just speciously claiming support. The IQ measures observable behaviors of workplace inclusion, which presupposes that practicing certain behaviors will foster changed habits and attitudes (Ajzen & Fishbein, 2005). OPM's rationale for including IQ in FEVS is to track improvements in employee engagement, performance, and job satisfaction. We examine the relationship between inclusion and its individual subcomponents on LGBT federal employees' likelihood to express a desire to turnover. Each component of the IQ captures a distinct and critical component of inclusion that scholars have developed across disciplines (Davidson & Ferdman, 2002; Gasorek, 2000; Holvino, Ferdman, & Merrill-Sands, 2004; Mor Barak & Cherin, 1998; Pelled et al., 1999; Sabharwal, 2014; Shore et al., 2011). Each of the five measures of IQ is comprised of items for a total of 20 questions. A list of all the questions along with individual Cronbach alpha scores is reported in the appendix section. The alpha scores of all the five IQ measures are 0.8 and above.

Agency type. Literature shows the impact of gendered bureaucracy on turnover (Lewis & Pitts, 2017; Sabharwal, 2015). Utilizing Lowi's (1985) typology, we divided the agencies into four types: redistributive, distributive, regulatory, and constituent agencies. Redistributive agencies are dominated by women given the nature of the work that demands client interaction and emotional labor as opposed to other agencies that are male dominated and are mostly concerned with policy making and implementation (Sabharwal, 2015). We expect similar patterns of agency segregation to apply to LGBT employees.

Control variables. Minority status, supervisory role, and tenure were used as additional controls in the study. Minority status was recoded as 1 = *minorities* and 0 = *nonminorities*. More than one third (34.5%) identified as minorities. Respondents who identified as non/supervisory or team leader were coded as 0, and those that identified as supervisor, manager, and senior leader were coded as 1; approximately one fifth of the total sample (21%) identified as supervisors. Tenure was classified into three categories: 1 = *fewer than 5 years*, 2 = *6 to 14 years of experience*, and 3 = *15 or more years of work experience in the federal government*.

Given the binary nature of the dependent variable, turnover intention, a logistic regression is utilized. The model goodness of fit is also reported. Before the logistic model results are presented, Table 1 provides the descriptive statistics of the variables under study and Table 2 reports the correlations. As seen from Table 1, 18% of the sample has respondents from redistributive agencies, 26% from distributive, 31% from constituent, and 24% from regulatory agencies. The average tenure of respondents is between 6

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of LGBT, Inclusion, Agency Type, and Turnover Model.

Variables	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Minimum	Maximum	Measure
Intention to leave	0.34	0.47	0	1	Yes = 1; no = 0
LGBT status	0.03	0.18	0	1	1 = LGBT; 0 = heterosexual
IQ					
Fair	10.91	3.25	5	15	Five items on a 3-point scale; 1 = negative, 2 = neutral, and 3 = positive
Open	9.69	2.23	4	12	Four items on a 3-point scale; 1 = negative, 2 = neutral, and 3 = positive
Cooperative	4.63	1.58	2	6	Two items on a 3-point scale; 1 = negative, 2 = neutral, and 3 = positive
Supportive	13.29	2.65	5	15	Five items on a 3-point scale; 1 = negative, 2 = neutral, and 3 = positive
Empowering	9.38	2.63	4	12	four items on a 3-point scale; 1 = negative, 2 = neutral, and 3 = positive
Agency type					
Redistributive	0.18	0.39	0	1	1 = Redistributive agencies
Distributive	0.26	0.44	0	1	1 = Distributive agencies
Constituent	0.31	0.46	0	1	1 = Constituent agencies
Regulatory	0.24	0.43	0	1	1 = Regulatory agencies
Minority	0.34	0.48	0	1	1 = Minority
Supervisor	0.21	0.41	0	1	1 = Supervisor, manager, and senior leader
Tenure	2.26	0.76	1	3	1 = Fewer than 5 years (17.9%); 2 = 6-14 years of experience (34.4%); 3 = 15 or more years of experience (42.2%)

Note. LGBT = Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender; IQ = inclusion quotient.

Table 2. Correlation With Intention to Leave.

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Intention to leave	1													
2. LGBT status	.022**	1												
IQ														
3. Fair	-.31**	-.02**	1											
4. Open	-.31**	-.03**	.76**	1										
5. Cooperative	-.26**	-.03**	.61**	.66**	1									
6. Supportive	-.27**	-.02**	.57**	.67**	.46**	1								
7. Empowering	-.35**	-.03**	.68**	.72**	.62**	.57**	1							
Agency type														
8. Redistributive	.01	.03**	-.01**	-.02**	-.01**	-.03**	.01	1						
9. Distributive	-.03**	.01*	.03**	.01**	.04**	.04**	-.28**		1					
10. Constituent	.09**	-.03**	-.06**	-.04**	-.04**	-.05**	-.04**	-.32**	-.40**	1				
11. Regulatory	-.07**	.01**	.04**	.02**	.04**	.04**	.01	-.27**	-.34**	-.38**	1			
12. Minority	.03**	-.02**	-.03**	-.10**	.02**	-.05**	.01	.07**	-.07**	-.02**	.03**	1		
13. Supervisor	-.04**	.01	.22**	.15**	.12**	.05**	.13**	-.04**	.04**	.03**	-.04**	-.05**	1	
14. Tenure	-.04**	-.03**	.02**	-.02**	-.01**	-.04**	.01	-.09**	.08**	-.08**	.09**	-.01**	.18**	1

Note. LGBT = lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender; IQ = inclusion quotient.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

and 14 years, and more than 20% report being in supervisory roles. No problem with multicollinearity is reported in the study.

Results

To examine how LGBT employees perceive inclusiveness in their work environment, an independent sample *t* test was performed across both groups of LGBT and heterosexuals. The results are presented in Table 3. Across all the 20 measures of inclusion, LGBT employees report lower levels of agreement. All of the results are statistically significant. The

results of the *t* test indicate that LGBT employees perceive lower inclusive environment than their heterosexual counterparts in regard to their workplaces being fair, open, cooperative, supportive and empowering.

The results of the logistic regression are presented in Table 4, which examine the odds of federal employees' intent to turnover, specifically those that identify as LGBT. We also examine how inclusionary environments and type of agencies (feminine vs. masculine) affect one's intent to leave with a focus on LGBT group. To interpret the model using a logistic regression, it is easier to examine the effect sizes of the independent variables on turnover intention by observing the

Table 3. Mean Differences Across LGBT and Heterosexual Federal Employees Across the Measures of Inclusion Quotient.

	LGBT	Heterosexuals
Fair		
Q23: In my work unit, steps are taken to deal with a poor performer who cannot or will not improve.	1.83***	1.92
Q24: In my work unit, differences in performance are recognized in a meaningful way.	1.93***	2.02
Q25: Awards in my work unit depend on how well employees perform their jobs.	2.07***	2.15
Q37: Arbitrary action, personal favoritism, and coercion for partisan political purposes are not tolerated.	2.24***	2.33
Q38: Prohibited personnel practices are not tolerated.	2.50***	2.57
Open		
Q32: Creativity and innovation are rewarded.	2.02***	2.11
Q34: Policies and programs promote diversity in the workplace.	2.36***	2.46
Q45: My supervisor is committed to a workforce representative of all segments of society.	2.56***	2.62
Q55: Supervisors work well with employees of different backgrounds.	2.45***	2.54
Cooperative		
Q58: Managers promote communication among different work units.	2.18***	2.31
Q59: Managers support collaboration across work units to accomplish work objectives.	2.26***	2.39
Supportive		
Q42: My supervisor supports my need to balance work and other life issues.	2.68***	2.73
Q46: My supervisor provides me with constructive suggestions to improve my job performance.	2.41***	2.49
Q48: My supervisor listens to what I have to say.	2.64***	2.69
Q49: My supervisor treats me with respect.	2.71***	2.75
Q50: In the last 6 months, my supervisor has talked with me about my performance.	2.68***	2.71
Empowering		
Q2: I have enough information to do my job well.	2.51***	2.58
Q3: I feel encouraged to come up with new and better ways of doing things.	2.32***	2.39
Q11: My talents are used well in the workplace.	2.27***	2.37
Q30: Employees have a feeling of personal empowerment with respect to work processes.	2.03***	2.17

Note. The items are on a 3-point scale, 1 = *negative*, 2 = *neutral*, and 3 = *positive*. LGBT = lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender.

*** $p < .001$.

probability differences, using average marginal/partial effects. This was possible by running the margins command in STATA.

We ran four models—Models 1 and 2 are separate models for LGBT and heterosexual employees, Model 3 is without interactions, and Model 4 is the full model. LGBT employees who perceive their work environments as fair, open, supportive, and empowering are less likely to turnover. Although cooperativeness was not significant in the LGBT model, it had a significant impact on heterosexual employees to reduce turnover intentions. Empowerment was significant in reducing turnover intentions in both Models 1 and 2. Interestingly, turnover intentions among LGBT employees who worked in distributive and constituent agencies (male dominated) was higher than LGBT employees that worked in redistributive agencies (female dominated). The results were opposite in Model 2, that is, heterosexual employees working in distributive and regulatory agencies expressed lower intentions to turnover than those heterosexuals employed in redistributive agencies. Although heterosexuals employed in constituent

agencies expressed the most likelihood to turnover across all types of agencies.

Model 3 examined the effect of LGBT and agency type on turnover intentions in the federal government without including any interaction terms. LGBT employees report 2.6% higher probability to turnover than heterosexuals. Similar results are reported in Model 4, which includes interaction terms. The results in Model 4 indicate that the probability of turnover is 1.8% higher for LGBT employees as compared with heterosexuals thus, confirming Hypothesis 1 that LGBT employees will express higher turnover intentions than those that identify as heterosexuals/straight. Across both Models 3 and 4, we found that inclusive practices (open, fair, supportive, cooperative and empowering environments) reduce turnover intentions among federal employees—thus confirming Hypothesis 2. Specifically, in the full-model, the probability of turnover reduced by 1.2% with a one unit increase in the perception of fairness index. Similarly, having a management that is open to new and

Table 4. Logistic Regression With LGBT Status, Inclusion Quotient, and Agency Type on Turnover Intentions of Federal Employees.

	Coefficient	Margin	Coefficient	Margin	Coefficient	Margin	Coefficient	Margin
	Model 1: LGBT		Model 2: Heterosexuals		Model 3: Without Interaction		Model 4: Full Model	
LGBT					.137***	0.026	.096**	.018
IQ								
Fair	-.018**	-0.008	-.062***	-0.012	-.061***	-0.011	-.062***	-.012
Open	-.055***	-0.011	-.037***	-0.007	-.038***	-0.007	-.037***	-.007
Cooperative	-.005	-0.001	-.027***	-0.005	-.026***	-0.005	-.027***	-.005
Supportive	-.087***	-0.017	-.037***	-0.007	-.038***	-0.007	-.037***	-.007
Empowering	-.183***	-0.036	-.192***	-0.037	-.192***	-0.036	-.192***	-.036
Agency type (redistributive agency reference group)								
Distributive agency	.132**	0.026	-.052***	-0.008	-.046***	-0.009	-.051***	-.010
Constituent agency	.344***	0.08	.335***	0.064	.336***	0.063	.336***	0.063
Regulatory agency	-.081	-0.016	-.278***	-0.049	-.270***	-0.051	-.277***	-.052
IQ × LGBT								
Fair × LGBT							-.038***	-.007
Open × LGBT							.022*	.004
Cooperative × LGBT							-.021	-.004
Supportive × LGBT							.046***	.009
Empowering × LGBT							-.013	-.002
Agency type × LGBT (redistributive agency reference group)								
Distributive agency × LGBT							.139**	.026
Constituent agency × LGBT							.005	.001
Regulatory agency × LGBT							.182***	.034
Controls								
Minority	.206***	0.041	.131***	0.023	.133***	0.025	.133***	.025
Supervisor	.025	0.005	.121***	0.026	.118***	0.022	.118***	.022
Less than 5 years of experience	.364	0.072	.037	0.012	.051	0.010	.054	.010
6-14 years of experience	.263	0.052	-.151**	-0.023	-.133**	-0.025	-.132**	-.025
More than 15 years of experience	-.003	-0.001	-.158***	-0.028	-.148**	-0.028	-.146**	-.027
Constant	2.56***		2.61***		2.60***		2.6***	
Pseudo R ² (Nagelkerke square)	.206		.19		.19		.19	

Note. Margin is the marginal effect. LGBT = lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender; IQ = inclusion quotient.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

diverse ideas and groups, is cooperative and supportive resulted in a significant decrease in an employees' intent to leave the federal government. Empowerment was the most significant of all inclusion variables—the probability of turnover reduced by 3.6% with a one unit increase in the perception of empowerment index.

Agency type also affects turnover intentions of overall employees across Models 2, 3, and 4, thus verifying Hypothesis 4. Specifically, we find that compared to redistributive agencies, the odds of turnover in distributive and regulatory agencies is significantly lower, while the odds of turnover among constituent agency employees is significantly higher than redistributive agency employees. The results as noted in Models 2, 3, and 4 are different for Model 1 wherein LGBT employees in distributive and constituent agencies (perceived as masculine/agent) are more likely to express their intentions to turnover than LGBT employed in redistributive agencies (perceived as more feminine/

communal). Across all models, minorities were more likely to express intentions to turnover as were those with fewer than 5 years of experience in the federal government. In the full model, the probability of turnover reported among minorities was 2.5% greater than nonminorities. Likewise, the probability of turnover for federal employees with longer tenures (more than 15 years) was 2.7% lower than those employees with fewer than 15 years of experience. Being a supervisor increased the intent to turnover than those not in supervisory positions.

Moderating Effects of IQ and Agency Type on Intent to Turnover

The moderating effect of inclusion on turnover is depicted in Model 4, and was consistent only when LGBT employees perceived their work environment to be fair. When compared to non-LGBT employees, the probability of turnover among

Table 5. List of Hypotheses and Verification.

Hypothesis	Verified/not verified
H1: LGBT employees will express higher turnover intentions than non-LGBT employees	Verified
H2: Inclusive practices (open, fair, cooperative, supportive, and empowering environments) will reduce turnover among employees	Verified
H3: LGBT employees who experience greater inclusion (open, fair, cooperative, supportive, and empowering environments) are less likely to experience turnover	Partially verified (LGBT employees who perceive their work environment to be fair are less likely to turnover; those who perceive their environment as open and supportive are more likely to turnover)
H4: In federal governments, agency type will be a significant indicator of turnover rates	Verified
H5: LGBT employees in redistributive agencies are less likely to experience turnover intentions than those employed in distributive, constituent and regulatory agencies	Partially verified (LGBT employees in distributive and regulatory agencies are more likely to turnover than those in redistributive agencies).

Note. LGBT = Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender.

LGBT respondents who perceived their work practices to be fair, and felt that they were treated equally was lower by .7%. However, the effects of an open and supportive workplace environment as perceived by LGBT employees, had a positive impact on turnover, thus not completely supporting Hypothesis 3.

Furthermore, as hypothesized, the probability of turnover for LGBT employees working in distributive and regulatory agencies was 2.6% and 3.4% higher as compared with LGBT employees employed in redistributive (feminine) agencies. The turnover rates for LGBT in constituent agencies were nonsignificant, thus partially confirming Hypothesis 5. A list of study hypotheses and its verification are expanded in Table 5.

Conclusion and Discussion

This study examined the impact of inclusive practices and agency type on turnover intentions of LGBT employees in the federal workforce. Our findings show that LGBT employees who identify their workplace as more inclusive (e.g., fair, cooperative and empowering) are less likely to express their intent to turnover. Also, as workplaces bolster their LGBT-supportive policies, people may be more inclined to be open about one's identity. For example, as OPM added the LGBT response item to the FEVS in 2012, the percent of federal government employees identifying as LGBT has increased; in 2012, 2.2% said they were LGBT—by 2014, 2.8% of 2014 FEVS respondents self-identified as LGBT. As government faces constricted budgets, the resources necessary *after* employee's turnover (i.e., recruitment, training, and development of incoming employees), strain its capacity for higher performance. To mitigate the need to pick up the pieces once employees have left, government should focus on increasing its inclusivity, specifically of LGBT employees.

However, contrary to expectations, LGBT individuals who perceive their environment to be open and supportive are actually more likely to turnover. This result supports the

view of LGBT employees' desire to avoid the stigma of being LGBT by hiding their identities, which may result in under-reporting. This finding also suggests that to implement effective structural change in an organization's culture of inclusion, public sector managers must do more than merely "talk the talk." Therefore, while an employer can provide necessary resources, it must also give more and do more to make people feel included (Sabharwal, 2014). Institutions must heed the invisible and visible identities of their employees and constituents to truly be inclusive. Workplace practices that do acknowledge this concept of people's interwoven identity, that is, the inseparability of one's personal life and one's work life, are a positive step toward real workplace inclusion.

The ideal of inclusion, as Yoshino and Smith (2013) discuss, has been to allow individuals to bring their authentic selves to work. However, the development into the idea of inclusion and identity particularly applies to LGBT employees who occupy a different public space in terms of the discrimination they experience, how they feel in and access to public spaces (Sanschagrin, 2011). They also bear a concealable stigma, that is, their sexual orientations and in some cases, their gender identities, can be hidden and undisclosed allowing them to evade stigmatization. Most inclusion efforts have not explicitly and rigorously addressed the pressure to conform that prevents individuals from realizing that ideal. One example is the provision of gender-neutral restrooms, and health care coverage.

Although Lowi's (1985) typology was not developed to imply gendering of organizations it has been used by public administration scholars as a way to classify agencies based on occupational segregation (e.g., Mastracci & Bowman, 2015; Newman, 1994). Here, we used Lowi's typology to look at the impact of agency classification on LGBT's intent to turnover. We found that LGBT employees in redistributive agencies are less likely to express turnover intention than those working in distributive and regulatory agencies. To

mitigate the need to pick up the pieces once employees have left, government should focus on increasing its inclusivity, specifically of LGBT employees. The literature maintains that redistributive agencies are more inclusive of minorities and gay individuals (Riccucci, 2009). Although not the intent of the study, future research can parse out differences across type of agencies to understand whether being a distributive agency is what makes DOD and Homeland Security much less welcoming than redistributive agencies or is it the military influence?

Although this study included LGBT response items recently added to the 2015 FEVS data set, limitations to this research exist. For one, LGBT individuals remain hesitant to identify themselves for research purposes. This also illustrates the challenges researchers' face measuring sexual orientation and gender identity and gathering valid and reliable data for describing LGBT populations. Future research should hone in on the intersectionality of LGBT individuals. For example, Chung and Harmon (1994) caution that studying lesbians and gay men as a monolith yields inaccurate findings due to each population's uniqueness. We also recommend researchers take a comparative look at LGBT inclusion efforts across different levels of government and sectors.

As millennials move away from identifying within traditional sex/gender binaries such as "man/woman" and "gay/straight" (Glaad.org, 2017), and are more likely to openly identify as LGBT than in prior generations, a younger and more diverse workforce that is accepting of the LGBT community will become the voice for nondiscrimination protection and inclusion. Regardless of these steps forward, present and future public sector managers must remain resolute in the face of possible political challenges that could reverse progress for equality. Given this potential undoing, a next phase to this research may be to understand how public organizations can further an inclusive and nondiscriminatory workforce agenda (e.g., skillset, best practices, and readiness) as the conflict over federal civil rights statutes and LGBT rights will no doubt continue in the years ahead.

Appendix

Inclusion Quotient (IQ)—2015 FEVS (Federal Employee Viewpoint) Survey

1. Fair: Are all employees treated equally? $\alpha = .85$

Q23: In my work unit, steps are taken to deal with a poor performer who cannot or will not improve.

Q24: In my work unit, differences in performance are recognized in a meaningful way.

Q25: Awards in my work unit depend on how well employees perform their jobs.

Q37: Arbitrary action, personal favoritism and coercion for partisan political purposes are not tolerated.

Q38: Prohibited Personnel Practices (for example, illegally discriminating for or against any employee/applicant, obstructing a person's right to compete for employment, knowingly violating veterans' preference requirements) are not tolerated.

2. Open: Does management support diversity in all ways? $\alpha = .78$

Q32: Creativity and innovation are rewarded.

Q34: Policies and programs promote diversity in the workplace (for example, recruiting minorities and women, training in awareness of diversity issues, mentoring).

Q45: My supervisor is committed to a workforce representative of all segments of society.

Q55: Supervisors work well with employees of different backgrounds.

3. Cooperative: Does management encourage communication and collaboration? $\alpha = .9$

Q58: Managers promote communication among different work units (for example, about projects, goals, needed resources).

Q59: Managers support collaboration across work units to accomplish work objectives.

4. Supportive: Do supervisors value employees? $\alpha = .86$

Q42: My supervisor supports my need to balance work and other life issues.

Q46: My supervisor provides me with constructive suggestions to improve my job performance.

Q48: My supervisor listens to what I have to say.

Q49: My supervisor treats me with respect.

Q50: In the last 6 months, my supervisor has talked with me about my performance.

5. Empowering: Do employees have the resources and support needed to excel? $\alpha = .81$

Q2: I have enough information to do my job well.

Q3: I feel encouraged to come up with new and better ways of doing things.

Q11: My talents are used well in the workplace.

Q30: Employees have a feeling of personal empowerment with respect to work processes.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Notes

1. Agentic behavior is defined as: “characteristics, which are assigned more strongly to men than women, describe primarily an assertive, controlling and confident tendency. . .” “In employment settings, agentic behaviors might include speaking assertively, competing for attention, influencing others, initiating activity directed to assigned tasks, and making problem-focused suggestions” (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001, p. 783).
2. Communal characteristics are ascribed more strongly to women than men, describe primarily a concern with the welfare of other people—for example, affectionate, helpful, kind, sympathetic, interpersonally sensitive, nurturant, and gentle. In employment settings, communal behaviors might include speaking tentatively, not drawing attention to oneself, accepting others’ direction, supporting and soothing others, and contributing to the solution of relational and interpersonal problems (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001, p. 783).
3. Those who did not respond to the survey question were coded as missing. However, the actual responses to the question include 10.2% did not respond, heterosexual/straight were 75.7%, 2.6% of the respondents were LGBT, and the remaining 11.5% chose not to disclose.

ORCID iD

Meghna Sabharwal <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1294-559X>

References

- Acker, J. (1992). From sex roles to gendered institutions. *Contemporary Sociology*, 21, 565-569.
- Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (2005). The influence of attitudes on behavior. In D. Albarracín, B. T. Johnson, & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *The handbook of attitudes* (pp. 173-221). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Albucher, M. (2015). *Analytics, human resources: Diagnose and forecast employee turnover with predictive analytics*. GovLoop. Retrieved from <https://www.govloop.com/community/blog/diagnose-forecast-employee-turnover-predictive-analytics/>
- Almeida, J., Johnson, R. M., Corliss, H. L., Molnar, B. E., & Azrael, D. (2009). Emotional distress among LGBT youth: The influence of perceived discrimination based on sexual orientation. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 38, 1001-1014.
- American Civil Liberties Union. (2017). *Past LGBT nondiscrimination and anti-LGBT bills across the country*. Retrieved from <https://www.aclu.org/other/past-lgbt-nondiscrimination-and-anti-lgbt-bills-across-country>
- Baumle, A. K., Compton, D. R., & Poston, D. L., Jr. (2009). *Same sex partners: The demography of sexual orientation*. Albany: The State University of New York Press.
- Cayer, N. J., & Sabharwal, M. (2013). *Public personnel administration: Managing human capital*. San Diego, CA: Birkdale Publishers.
- Cech, E. A., & Pham, M. V. (2017). Queer in STEM organizations: Workplace disadvantages for LGBT employees in STEM related federal agencies. *Social Sciences*, 6(1), Article 12.
- Choi, S. (2009). Diversity in the US federal government: Diversity management and employee turnover in federal agencies. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 19, 603-630.
- Choi, S., & Rainey, H. G. (2014). Organizational fairness and diversity management in public organizations: Does fairness matter in managing diversity? *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 34, 307-331.
- Chung, Y. B., & Harmon, L. W. (1994). The career interests and aspirations of gay men: How sex-role orientation is related. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 45, 223-239.
- Clair, J. A., Beatty, J. E., & MacClean, T. L. (2005). Out of sight but not out of mind: Managing invisible social identities in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review*, 30, 78-95.
- Coffman, K. B., Coffman, L. C., & Ericson, K. M. M. (2017). The size of the LGBT population and the magnitude of antigay sentiment are substantially underestimated. *Management Science*, 63, 3147-3529.
- Colvin, R. A. (2004). Agenda setting, innovation, and state gay rights policy: An event history analysis. *The American Review of Politics*, 25, 241-263.
- Cox, T. (1994). *Cultural diversity in organizations: Theory, research and practice*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Eagly, A. H. (2005). Achieving relational authenticity in leadership: Does gender matter? *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 459-474.
- Eagly, A. H., & Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C. (2001). The leadership styles of women and men. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 781-797.
- Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 569-591.
- Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 233-256.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, 109, 573-598.
- Federman, P. S., & Elias, N. R. (2017). Beyond the lavender scare: LGBT and heterosexual employees in the federal workplace. *Public Integrity*, 19, 22-40.
- Davidson, M. N., & Ferdman, B. M. (2002). A matter of difference-Inclusion: What can I and my organization do about it? *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 39, 80-85.
- Fernandez, S., Resh, W. G., Moldogaziev, T., & Oberfield, Z. W. (2015). Assessing the past and promise of the Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey for public management research: A research synthesis. *Public Administration Review*, 75(3), 382-394.
- Fidas, D., & Cooper, L. (2014). *The cost of the closet and the rewards of inclusion: Why the workplace environment for LGBT people matters to employers*. Human Rights Campaign Foundation. Retrieved from <https://www.hrc.org/resources/the-cost-of-the-closet-and-the-rewards-of-inclusion>
- Gasorek, D. (2000). Inclusion at Dun & Bradstreet: Building a high-performing company. *The Diversity Factor*, 8(4), 25-29.
- Gates, G. J. (2014). *LGBT demographics: Comparisons among population-based survey*. The Williams Institute, UCLA School of Law. Retrieved from <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/lgbt-demogs-sep-2014.pdf>
- Gates, G. J. (2017, January 11). In U.S., more adults identifying as LGBT. *Gallup*, Social & Policy Issues. Retrieved from <http://www.gallup.com/poll/201731/lgbt-identification-rises.aspx>
- Glaad.org. (2017). *Accelerating acceptance 2017*. Retrieved from http://www.glaad.org/files/aa/2017_GLAAD_Accelerating_Acceptance.pdf
- Grissom, J. A., Nicholson-Crotty, J., & Keiser, L. (2012). Does my boss's gender matter? Explaining job satisfaction and employee

- turnover in the public sector. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 22, 649-673.
- Herek, G. M. (1989). Hate crimes against lesbians and gay men: Issues for research and policy. *American Psychologist*, 44, 948-955.
- Hofhuis, J., Van der Zee, K. I., & Otten, S. (2014). Comparing antecedents of voluntary job turnover among majority and minority employees. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 33, 735-749.
- Holvino, E., Ferdman, B. M., & Merrill-Sands, D. (2004). Creating and sustaining diversity and inclusion in organizations strategies and approaches. In M. S. Stockdale & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), *The psychology and management of workplace diversity* (pp. 245-276). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Hwang, J., & Hopkins, K. (2012). Organizational inclusion, commitment, and turnover among child welfare workers: A multilevel mediation analysis. *Administration in Social Work*, 36, 23-39.
- Johnson, D. K. (1994). Homosexual citizens: Washington's gay community confronts the civil service. *Washington History*, 6(2), 44-63.
- Johnson, D. K. (2004). *The lavender scare: The cold war persecution of gays and lesbians in the federal government*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lewis, G. B. (2001). Barriers to security clearances for gay men and lesbians: Fear of blackmail or fear of homosexuals? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 11, 539-558.
- Lewis, G. B. (2013). The impact of veterans' preference on the composition and quality of the federal civil service. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 23, 247-265.
- Lewis, G. B., & Pitts, D. W. (2011). Representation of lesbians and gay men in federal, state, and local bureaucracies. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 21, 159-180.
- Lewis, G. B., & Pitts, D. W. (2017). LGBT-heterosexual differences in perceptions of fair treatment in the federal service. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 47, 574-587.
- Lowi, T. J. (1985). The state in politics: The relation between policy and administration. In R. G. Noll (Ed.), *Regulatory policy and the social sciences* (pp. 67-105). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Mastracci, S., & Bowman, L. (2015). Public agencies, gendered organizations: The future of gender studies in public management. *Public Management Review*, 17, 857-875.
- McClure, S. (2014). Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender issues: Business imperative. In W. Swan (Ed.), *Gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender civil rights: A public policy agenda for uniting a divided America* (pp. 179-190). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- McElroy, J. C., Morrow, P. C., & Rude, S. N. (2001). Turnover and organizational performance: A comparative analysis of the effects of voluntary, involuntary, and reduction-in-force turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 1294-1299.
- Meier, K. J., & Hicklin, A. (2008). Employee turnover and organizational performance: Testing a hypothesis from classical public administration. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18, 573-590.
- Mor Barak, M. E. (2016). *Managing diversity: Toward a globally inclusive workplace*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mor Barak, M. E., & Cherin, D. A. (1998). A tool to expand organizational understanding of workforce diversity: Exploring a measure of inclusion-exclusion. *Administration in Social Work*, 22, 47-64.
- Mor Barak, M. E. M., Cherin, D. A., & Berkman, S. (1998). Organizational and personal dimensions in diversity climate: Ethnic and gender differences in employee perceptions. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 34, 82-104.
- Mulé, N. J., Ross, L. E., Deeprase, B., Jackson, B. E., Daley, A., Travers, A., & Moore, D. (2009). Promoting LGBT health and wellbeing through inclusive policy development. *International Journal for Equity in Health*, 8, Article 18. doi:10.1186/1475-9276-8-18
- Munoz, C. S. (2005). *A multi-level examination of career barriers for sexual minorities employees* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia). Retrieved from https://getd.libs.uga.edu/pdfs/munoz_corey_s_200505_phd.pdf
- Newman, M. A. (1994). Gender and Lowi's thesis: Implications for career advancement. *Public Administration Review*, 54, 277-284.
- Pelled, H. L., Ledford, G. E., Jr., & Mohrman, S. A. (1999). Demographic dissimilarity and workplace inclusion. *Journal of Management Studies*, 36, 1013-1031.
- Pichler, S., Ruggs, E., & Trau, R. (2017). Worker outcomes of LGBT-supportive policies: A cross-level model. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 36, 17-32.
- Pitts, D., Marvel, J., & Fernandez, S. (2011). So hard to say good-bye? Turnover intention among US federal employees. *Public Administration Review*, 71, 751-760.
- Pizer, J. C., Sears, B., Mallory, C., & Hunter, N. D. (2012). Evidence of persistent and pervasive workplace discrimination against LGBT people: The need for federal legislation prohibiting discrimination and providing for equal employment benefits. *Loyola of Los Angeles Law Review*, 45, Article 715.
- Pless, N., & Maak, T. (2004). Building an inclusive diversity culture: Principles, processes and practice. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 54, 129-147.
- Ragins, B. R., & Cornwell, J. M. (2001). Pink triangles: Antecedents and consequences of perceived workplace discrimination against gay and lesbian employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 1244-1261.
- Rainey, H. G. (2009). *Understanding and managing public organizations* (4th edition). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Riccucci, N. M. (2009). The pursuit of social equity in the federal government: A road less traveled? *Public Administration Review*, 69, 373-382.
- Riccucci, N. M., & Gossett, C. W. (1996). Employment discrimination in state and local government: The lesbian and gay male experience. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 26, 175-200.
- Sabharwal, M. (2014). Is diversity management sufficient? Organizational inclusion to further performance. *Public Personnel Management*, 43, 197-217.
- Sabharwal, M. (2015). From glass ceiling to glass cliff: Women in senior executive service. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 25, 399-426.
- Saidel, J. R., & Loscocco, K. (2005). Agency leaders, gendered institutions, and representative bureaucracy. *Public Administration Review*, 65, 158-170.
- Sanschagrin, E. L. (2011). *The LGBT community and public space: A mixed methods approach* (Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 573). Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.du.edu/etd/573>
- Sears, B., & Mallory, C. (2011). *Documented evidence of employment discrimination & its effects on LGBT people*. The Williams Institute. Retrieved from <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu>

- /wp-content/uploads/Sears-Mallory-Discrimination-July-20111.pdf
- Shore, L. M., Randel, A. E., Chung, B. G., Dean, M. A., Ehrhart, K. H., & Singh, G. (2011). Inclusion and diversity in work groups: A review and model for future research. *Journal of Management*, 37, 1262-1289.
- Sneed, B. G. (2007). Glass walls in state bureaucracies: Examining the difference departmental function can make. *Public Administration Review*, 67, 880-891.
- Tilcsik, A. (2011). Pride and prejudice: Employment discrimination against openly gay men in the United States. *American Journal of Sociology*, 117, 586-626.
- Tilcsik, A., Anteby, M., & Knight, C. (2015). Concealable stigma and occupational segregation: Toward a theory of gay and lesbian occupations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 60, 446-448.
- Triana, M. D. C., García, M. F., & Colella, A. (2010). Managing diversity: How organizational efforts to support diversity moderate the effects of perceived racial discrimination on affective commitment. *Personnel Psychology*, 63, 817-843.
- Vitaliano, D. F. (2010). Corporate social responsibility and labor turnover. *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society*, 10, 563-573.
- Yoshino, K., & Smith, C. (2013). *Uncovering talent: A new model of inclusion*. The Leadership Center for Inclusion, Deloitte University. Retrieved from <https://www.lclldnet.org/media/mce>

_filebrowser/2014/09/24/Uncovering-Talent-LCLD-Presentation-KYoshino.pdf

Author Biographies

Meghna Sabharwal is an associate professor and program director in the Public and Nonprofit Management program in the School of Economic, Political and Policy Sciences at the University of Texas at Dallas. Her research focuses on public human resources management, specifically related to diversity, job satisfaction, productivity, and high-skilled migration.

Helisse Levine, PhD, is an MPA director and professor of public administration at LIU-Brooklyn. Her research focuses on economic and fiscal constraints in non-market organizations, public sector social inequities, and the role of gender in public management.

Maria D'Agostino is an associate professor in the Department of Public Management at John Jay College of Criminal Justice. Her research focuses on women in public administration, experiential education and public service.

Tiffany Nguyen is an alumnae from The University of Texas at Dallas with her Bachelor of Science in Public and Nonprofit Management. Her research interests include organizational theory, human-centered design, and human rights.