# Transgressing workplace norms: Understanding the conceptualization and communication of trans identity in the workplace

By



Rebecca Baumler
B.A., University of Central Missouri, 2021

Submitted to the graduate degree program in Communication Studies and the Graduate Faculty of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

---

Chair: Cameron W. Piercy, Ph.D.

---

Angela Gist-Mackey, Ph.D.

---

Meggie Mapes, Ph.D.

Date Defended: 8 March 2023

The thesis committee for Rebecca Baumler certifies that this is the approved version of the following thesis:

# Transgressing workplace norms: Understanding the conceptualization and communication of trans identity in the workplace

Chair: Cameron W. Piercy, Ph.D.

Date Approved: 16 April 2023

## Abstract

Using Tracy and Trethewey's (2005) metaphor of the crystallized self, this project explores the influences of identity communication in and outside the workplace on work and life satisfaction. Using survey design, this study examined (1) how trans individuals communicate their trans identity at and outside work, (2) the relationship between identity communication at work and job satisfaction and life satisfaction, and (3) the relationship between identity communication outside work and satisfaction with job satisfaction and life satisfaction.

To analyze how trans folks communicate their identity in work and nonwork contexts and its relationship with job and life satisfaction, survey data was collected from 206 trans individuals who were currently employed or employed within the last two years at the time of the survey. The crystallized self was operationalized into measures focusing on communication about trans identity at and outside work, specifically outness and authenticity. The outness measures were explicit outness, implicit outness, and covering. Authenticity was divided into three constructs of authentic living, self-alienation, and accepting external influence. These measures were used to predict both job satisfaction and life satisfaction. This study also examines two covariates: perceptions of workplace supportiveness and work-life segmentation. The study found that job satisfaction was positively related to authenticity and supportiveness and negatively related to covering and work-life segmentation preferences. Life satisfaction was positively related with authenticity, and negatively related to covering, passing, and work-life segmentation preferences. The findings indicate that being able to engage in a more authentic version of self through openness about identity and having workplace support is crucial to job and life satisfaction.


*Keywords:* trans identity, crystallized self, passing, identity communication and performance, job satisfaction, life satisfaction

## Table of Contents

## List of Tables

# Chapter 1: Introduction

Trans representation and visibility worldwide has grown exponentially in the last decade. As of 2021, 2 million people identify as trans in the United States (U.S.) alone (Powell, 2021); however, this number is likely higher because individuals may not be openly trans. In tandem with this rise in trans visibility, the supportiveness of trans identity in the U.S. has also increased, with 72% of respondents indicating that they support trans rights (Human Rights Campaign [HRC] Foundation, 2022). Although the reported supportiveness suggests a pattern of increasing acceptance of trans identity, stories and statistics highlighting the lived experiences of trans folks show they encounter discrimination, harassment, and violence daily, with trans women of color facing the highest rates of victimization (HRC Foundation, 2021). Further, the current wave of anti-trans legislation and attack on bodily autonomy signals a backslide in queer and trans rights nationwide (Freedom for All Americans, 2022). One highly contested space for trans individuals is the workplace. This is particularly salient as individuals in the United States spend upwards of one third of their time, five days a week, working (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2021). While current federal workplace protections legally prohibit discrimination against gender identity (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission [EEOC], 2021), trans folks still face microaggressions and other forms of harassment, discrimination, violence, and inequality in the workplace (Sears et al., 2021). Along with these pervasive issues, trans people are harmfully "underrepresented, underemployed, and underpaid" in places of employment (Baboolall et al., 2021, p. 5).

Survey data collected by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) indicates that 73% of trans adults are in the workforce – this is nine percent less than the number of cisgender adults who are employed (Baboolall et al., 2021). However, this statistic grotesquely

overrepresents the number of individuals with a stable and livable income, as the research incorporates anyone receiving a wage. To further contextualize the challenges trans folks face finding and maintaining employment, a 2018 survey by the HRC Foundation observed that trans individuals are three times more likely to be unemployed than cisgender individuals. Supporting this, the survey data collected by the CDC shows that trans folks face more work instability, with 42% more trans than cisgender individuals working part-time and in lower-paying industries (Baboolall et al., 2021). Additionally, the average household income of a trans adult in the U.S. is around $17,000 less than a cisgender adult. Aside from experiencing underemployment and lower pay, other challenges in employment include hiding trans identity in the job process, with 50% of trans respondents saying they engaged in this behavior and 53% reporting they were not comfortable being out about their identity.

The staggering statistics representing the state of trans workers result from systemic issues and endemic discrimination in and outside of the work environment. A complex issue shaping perspectives of queer and trans identity is the notion that sexual orientation and gender identity are unprofessional, as heteronormativity and cisnormativity dominate workplace standards and norms, guiding notions of professionalism (HRC Foundation, 2018; McDonald & Kenney, 2021). Additionally, LGBTQ+ workers are more likely to hear jokes about sexuality and gender identity and are significantly more likely than non-LGBTQ+ individuals to be told to dress in a specific manner (HRC Foundation, 2018). These factors impact LGBTQ+ workers, making them feel unwelcome in the workplace and even causing them to hide their identities, as almost half of LBGTQ+ workers report remaining closeted at work, with that number being higher for trans individuals specifically (Baboolall et al., 2021; HRC Foundation, 2018). With these critical concerns in mind, this research investigates how trans individuals conceptualize

and communicate their trans identity in and outside of the workplace and the relationship with workplace and life satisfaction. This survey study contributes to the growing body of research on trans identities within organizational research and the broader Communication Studies discipline by focusing on how trans individuals communicate their identity in professional and personal environments.

Specifically, I examine (1) how trans individuals communicate their identity at work and outside work; (2) the relationship between identity communication at work and job satisfaction and life satisfaction; (3) the relationship between identity communication outside work and job satisfaction and life satisfaction. Understanding the influence that communicating trans identity in the workplace has on workplace and life satisfaction can inform organizational dialogues about trans identity. Throughout this thesis, I frequently refer to research on the collective LGBTQ+ community because of the limited research on the experiences of trans individuals. While not specific to trans experiences, the research on the LGBTQ+ community as a whole informs research on trans identity because many of the experiences may be parallel as both queer and trans folks face similar dominant, and often intolerant, cultural structures. Further, I use the term trans, which is shorthand for transgender, as inclusive of anyone who does not identify as the gender they were assigned at birth (National Center for Transgender Equality, 2023). While the term trans* was popularized in the mid-2000s as a way to be more inclusive of an array of gender identities (Tompkins, 2014), I choose to use trans sans-asterisk as some have problematized trans* as being used to exclude and other trans women and those who fall outside the binary (Trans Student Educational Resource, 2017.).

The paper begins by reviewing the literature on work and nonwork identities in relation to trans identity in the workplace while positioning the study within the crystallized self (Tracy

& Trethewey, 2005), followed by my research questions. Then, I outline my methods and participant demographics. Third, I overview the results of the survey. Lastly, I discuss the theoretical and practical implications of the study.

# Chapter 2: Literature Review

## Identity in the Workplace

Capitalist perspectives have perpetuated a narrative of work as central to identity, to the point that those who do not work face social stigmatization (de Souza, 2019). As of 2020, the average worker in the United States spends approximately 7.6 hours a day, five days a week, working (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2021). Workplace narratives have long conceived identity as a dichotomy of work and nonwork identities; a complex dance of identity Tracy and Trethewey (2005) label real vs. fake selves (Ramarajan & Reid, 2013; Reid, 2015; Miscenko & Day, 2016). Miscenko and Day (2016) define work identity as "the collection of meanings attached to the self by the individual and others in a work domain" (p. 216), existing at individual, interpersonal, and collective levels. In opposition to work identities, nonwork identities are those deemed not appropriate, in congruence with, or relevant to the workplace, such as race, gender identity, sexuality, and family. Organizations create definitions of the ideal worker, shaping conceptualizations of work and nonwork identity, circulating narratives of what is most desirable (Reid, 2015). Tracy and Trethewey (2005) argue that this familiar narrative leads employees to compartmentalize work and nonwork identities in order to feel that they are meeting and exceeding the organization's expectations. The authors note that the ability to align oneself with their work identity can depend on job type, with those performing dirty work, jobs that are stereotyped as lesser-than (physically, socially, or morally; Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999), as having more disjointed work and nonwork identities, while those in white-collar positions are encouraged to meld the two identities. Therefore, this thesis research will take into consideration the job type of participants.

The narrative of work and nonwork identities is also shifting, as the way work influences identity constantly fluctuates. For example, the boundaries between work and home have become even more obscured due to work-from-home policies resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic almost doubling the number of employees working out of their homes (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2021). The expectation of welcoming the workplace into one's home also means more overlap between identities they may have previously separated from work, such as being a parent, a partner, and other identities. However, the blurring of work-nonwork identities is not novel to the pandemic. Literature has cited reasons, including increased diversity and more frequent use of communication technology such as social media, as deteriorating the boundaries guiding which identities people bring into the workplace (Piercy & Carr, 2020; Ramarajan & Reid, 2013).

### *Job and Life Satisfaction and the Metaphor of the Crystallized Self*

The fluctuating boundaries of the complex work/nonwork identity dichotomy lead work and nonwork identities to often conflict with one another (Reid, 2015). Individuals may feel pressure to portray images that do not represent their authentic lifestyle but instead fit the expectations of the work environment (Ladge & Little, 2019). What identities one can enact at work, such as being open about sexual or gender identity, relates to the level of authenticity that is enacted in the workplace and has a significant impact on mental health and engagement. A review of prior empirical research on authenticity in the workplace reveals a positive correlation between authenticity and psychological well-being (Cha et al., 2019), indicating that separating work and nonwork identities may not be beneficial in the immediate work environment. Further, a survey study sampling 208 professionals found that those who engage inauthentically feel less

engaged in the workplace and have lower drive and internal motivation because of the emotional labor identity concealment requires (Reis et al., 2016).

Tracy and Trethewey (2005) proffer an attractive and powerful theoretical alternative to conceptualizing work and nonwork identities, the crystallization of identity. They encourage individuals who occupy various organizational positions, from ideal to marginalized, to conceptualize their work, home, and other aspects of life differently – to see themselves more holistically and less compartmentalized. An example the authors use is people responding to questions about what they did over the weekend with answers such as spending time with family instead of focusing on how little 'work' they accomplished. This idea can be transferred to understand how individuals with identities historically unwelcome in the workplace, like trans individuals, navigate communicating their identity. To develop the concept of crystallized identity, Tracy and Trethewey problematize the pervasive real-self ← → fake-self dichotomy. The dichotomy maintains a narrative where individuals more wholesomely engage in their nonwork identity as real, separating themselves from their work identity or 'fake-self,' and is akin to work and nonwork identity. According to Tracy and Trethewey, workers often strive for a preferred organizational self – where one prioritizes the needs and expectations of the workplace over other aspects of their lives.

One way the organizationally preferred self can manifest in workers is when those with non-dominant identities conceal the identity, such as trans employees who may hide their identity (Jones, 2021; Tracy & Town, 2020). Much research emphasizes a need for organizations and employees to view identity as holistic instead of divided by work and nonwork as a way to promote healthier work environments (Brandhorst, 2019; Miscenko & Day, 2016; Ramarajan & Reid, 2013; Reid, 2015). Tracy and Trethewey (2005) argue that crystallized individuals (i.e.,

those who blend their work and nonwork identity versus compartmentalization) are happier/more productive/less burned out than those who are not. Further, recognition of the specific challenges that marginalized employees face in their ability to crystalize their work and nonwork identities indicates a need to study such identities, like trans workers, to understand how workers engage with their identity and the impact identity management has on job and life satisfaction. Despite the challenges that accompany specific identities, the metaphor of the crystallized self is considered an ideal that can allow individuals to break free from the dichotomy that constrains them from enacting a full identity.

While Tracy and Trethewey (2005) clearly show their preference for this merging of identities, they are not without hesitation to note that challenging the real-self ←→ fake-self discourse is *hard*. The authors acknowledge that this process can be even more difficult for marginalized individuals, for example, they argue lesbians and gay men are constrained in their identity displays and disclosure as they manage the expectations of others and of the organization. Because the lived reality of disclosing or concealing one's identity as a trans individual has advantages and disadvantages, seeing how trans folks enact a crystallized identity, or not, provides insight into how trans folks conceptualize themselves, communicate their identity in the workplace, and the relationship between identity at work and outside of work.

**Gender Identity: Performance and Communication Strategies in the Workplace**

Gender is highly salient in the workplace as implicit and explicit expectations, policies, and conversations uphold normative notions of gender, like gendered bathrooms and trans-exclusive parental leave policies. However, conversations surrounding gender identity are often seen as irrelevant to the workplace (HRC Foundation, 2018), meaning trans identity is often conceptualized as a ‘nonwork identity.’ The social construction of gender in the workplace is

still limited in how gender is enacted and perceived, such as the gendering of specific roles and work environments like dress codes that marginalize gender-nonconforming workers.

Workplace policies and routines compound and are compounded by the stigmatization of LGBTQ+ identities. Stigma is "a simplified, standardized image of the disgrace of certain people that is held in common by a community at large" and is communicated through the sharing of stigma messages and the creation of stigma attitudes (Smith, 2007, p. 464). It is essential to view stigma as changing; stigmas are affected by "discourses and material conditions" (Meisenbach, 2010, p. 272). This means that stigma is influenced and changed by the social discourses about identity and that those dialogues have material implications such as workplace policies for trans people improving because of the social discourses reducing stigma. Additionally, Meisenbach draws attention to the "degree in breadth and depth" to which stigmas vary, referring to how much an identity is stigmatized and the intensity of the stigmatization (p. 272). For example, nonbinary and genderqueer individuals may face more stigma than binary trans individuals. To handle the stigmatization, individuals may hide or downplay their identity, such as engaging in passing or remaining closeted (Ferguson & Dougherty, 2021).

Trans individuals may also engage in specific communicative acts to express their gender identity, such as through physical performances like clothing or wearing a chest binder, to verbal enactments like changing labels such as pronouns or discussing their identity, which can make their identity more visible (Wagner et al., 2016). Jones (2020) draws attention to how cisnormative organizational structures limit trans employees' ability to flourish in the workplace and constrain how trans individuals communicate their identity at work. Through analysis of 10 interviews, Jones explicates that cisnormativity others trans individuals through discursive social

practices and restrictive workplace policies, like filing to change one's name or gender on work-related documents and systems.

To navigate such tensions between work and nonwork identities, workers employ numerous identity strategies to meet the expectations of an organization by engaging in the negotiation of nonwork identities to gain a sense of control over identities (Ramarajan & Reid, 2013; Reid, 2015). Individuals may negotiate identities viewed as irrelevant or adverse to work by engaging in nonwork identity states ranging from encompassing the nonwork identity as part of the work identity to disregarding the identity in all aspects of life (Ramarajan & Reid, 2013). For instance, trans individuals may choose to disclose or conceal their identity in the workplace and even in specific work situations. The pressure to reveal one's LGBTQ+ identity often becomes even more salient at work-related events such as happy hours and daily rapport-building conversations. These occasions frequently involve 'getting to know you' topics typical of the workplace, like family, children, and romantic relationships, leading around one-in-five LGBTQ+ workers to avoid these social events due to worry about sharing or hiding their identity (HRC Foundation, 2018).

Embedded in these complicated identity management techniques are strategies of passing and revealing, where one may choose to hide or share information about themselves to better enact an expected work identity (Ramarajan & Reid, 2013; Reid, 2015). Stigmatized identities, such as being trans, may compound the repercussions of revealing or disclosing identities as individuals grapple with how to manage identities with negative associations. For queer and trans individuals, choosing when and how to share their LGBTQ+ identity with colleagues is complex and can significantly impact careers (Ragins et al., 2007). One way trans individuals may navigate their identity in the workplace is through passing. For trans individuals,

passing involves being perceived as cisgender but also often means others do not know the passing person is trans (Anderson et al., 2019; Dias et al., 2021). Passing can serve as a strategy to avoid stigmatization that coalesces with discrimination, harassment, and violence (Jones, 2020).

Facing an inauthentic, disjointed identity where one hides or downplays aspects of the self involves substantial emotional labor (Cha et al., 2019; Ferguson & Dougherty, 2021). Even if for a short duration, emotional labor negatively impacts work productivity and mental well-being (Berg, 2002). The emotional labor of inauthenticity, such as passing or remaining closeted, manifests in the workplace in various ways include engaging with conformity at work, such as "nodding, attire, and verbal or written statements" (Cha et al., 2019, p. 649). Such behaviors feign commitment to the organizational culture (Ferguson & Dougherty, 2022). Hiding one's identity, however, can limit their ability to advocate for themselves and is a reason why trans employees often have a "diminished voice at work" (Jones, 2020, p. 255). Another way employees facing stigmatization may navigate their identity is through self-alienation by separating themselves from the workplace culture and environment, lowering feelings of workplace belonging (Berg, 2002). Workplace belonging is being a part of the workplace through social practices and materiality, providing an important opportunity to "attempt to perform" and experience boundaries (Filstad et al., 2019, p. 129). However, feeling like one is a part of social practices in the workplace is difficult when one is limited in which identities they can enact but also fear exclusion when open about those identities.

Alongside balancing workplace belonging with one's own need for authenticity, there is social pressure to be open about one's trans identity because of the contention surrounding passing within and outside the trans community. While passing can be a way to affirm one's

identity or act as a safety mechanism, passing can lead to identity erasure, underrecognizing the prevalence of trans identity, and for some people, can be viewed as deceptive (Anderson et al., 2019; Moncel, 2020). It is also more complicated for trans people who engage in passing to advocate for their identity, as they may feel a need to remain silent to avoid revealing their identity (Jones, 2020). At the same time, trans individuals may communicate their gender identity through passing by ascribing to social scripts of the gender they identify with, such as dressing in a particular manner or engaging in gendered nonverbal communication, which can be gender-affirming (Anderson et al., 2019).

Spradlin (1998) analyzed the passing strategies she engaged in within organizational settings as a lesbian. Passing in the workplace regarding trans identity has not been extensively studied; however, studies such as Spradlin's that center on marginalized sexual identities can inform research on passing within the trans community. The research identified six strategies: "distancing, dissociating, dodging, distracting, denying, and deceiving" (p. 599). Commonalities between each strategy include removing and hiding oneself in conversational contexts, shifting topics, and denying one's identity. While each strategy is not explicitly measured, the present study seeks to capture the impact of engaging in these behaviors by asking participants if they advocate for and discuss their identity in various contexts within and outside of the workplace. It is essential to acknowledge that for many people, passing is not their desired choice but a practice that is a result of the limitations of the work environment and a necessity for some to find work, maintain employment, make career advancements, and feel welcomed into the workplace (Anderson et al., 2019). While passing is beneficial in many scenarios, it is vital to recognize the extensive emotional labor of the "oppressive task" (Spradlin, 1998, p. 599) of

constantly concealing an identity and worrying about reactions if someone's trans identity is revealed either by choice or by being outed (Anderson et al., 2019).

The act of passing is typically applied to trans individuals who fall within the binary, as nonbinary and genderqueer individuals often have a more fluid gender presentation, so passing simply does not apply to their identity (Anderson et al., 2019). Additionally, for individuals who transition while working, those who fall outside of the gender binary, or otherwise have a noticeable trans identity, the visibility of their trans identity can lead to issues such as finding employment, job loss, bathroom discrimination, and working harder to compensate for their identity (Budge, 2010). There are other strategies that researchers have identified that individuals may use to navigate their gender identity that can be more applicable to those who have a more visible identity or come out in a work environment. Nuru (2014) identified "(a) Closeted Enactment, (b) Disengagement, (c) passing, and (d) Label Changing" (p. 286) as ways individuals may navigate their gender identity (p. 286). These strategies are particularly applicable when individuals face a discrepancy between their gender identity and the social enactment of that gender (closeted enactment or disengagement) or who come out in the workplace (label changing). Partaking in acts such as changing one's name or pronouns (label changing) can increase the visibility of one's trans identity, leading to more stigmatization and harassment, causing trans individuals to feel they do not belong in the workplace. However, those same acts can be affirming of their gender identity, revealing the duality of these strategies. This study explores the varied impact of enacting these strategies in the workplace by asking participants questions about if they are openly communicating their identity in and outside of the workplace through acts such as coming out, talking about their identity with coworkers, or openly displaying trans pride items work (Brewster et al., 2012).

While individuals may separate their gender identity from their work by concealing their identity through passing, only presenting as the gender they identify with outside of work, or remaining closeted (HRC Foundation, 2018), these behaviors can impact an individual's ability to perform and be promoted (Baboolall et al., 202l). The work environment places trans individuals in a double-bind of being open about their identity in the workplace or concealing it, facing substantial emotional labor either way. Gender cannot be erased in the workplace, thus making trans identities highly relevant and vital to bringing more awareness. To better understand the experiences of trans employees, Jones (2020) proposed a transgender standpoint epistemology that allows for the centering of "transgender employees' embodied *ways of knowing* [as] a way to facilitate this understanding of lived experience" (p. 257, emphasis in original). The epistemology uncovers "the net realities available to a trans employee," which are limited by constraints that are a manifestation of cisnormativity in organizational practices (p. 267). Jones employs this epistemology in their research by asking, "In what ways do trans* employee's positionalities inform how they negotiate identity in the workplace, and what evidence do these negotiations reveal of a trans* standpoint epistemology?" (p. 268). The findings illuminate that trans folks are continuously navigating their own journey with transitioning and the realities of their trans identity in the workplace, thus constantly reconstructing this portion of identity crystallization (Tracy & Trethewey, 2005).

This study seeks to extend Jones' findings using the metaphor of crystallized self, by examining how trans employees perform, embody, and communicate their identity in the workplace. This research incorporates the reality of passing by exploring the benefits and limitations of concealing their trans identities and how individuals engage with and negotiate their gender identity. Further, applying the lens of crystallized identity allows for a more holistic

and multifaceted understanding of how working trans individuals perceive and communicate their gender identity in and outside of the work environment and the relationship with workplace and life satisfaction. Therefore, I pose the following research questions:

**RQ1**. How do trans individuals communicate their identity in and outside of the workplace?

**RQ2**. How is communication about trans identity in and outside of the workplace associated with job satisfaction and life satisfaction?

This study emphasizes the role of identity communication in and outside of the workplace, as communication about identity is central to Tracy and Trethewey's (2005) argument. Authenticity is realized through identity crystallization, and perceptions of authenticity can influence job and life satisfaction (Chat et al., 2019; Reis et al., 2016). Further, this thesis considers identity communication variables relating to openness as central to this study.

# Chapter 3: Methods

## Participants and procedures

Participants were recruited through Prolific[1]. Prolific provides a way to reach a more diverse pool of participants efficiently, is cost-effective, and is shown to have quality responses (Palan & Schitter, 2018). Further, the platform requires *ethical pricing*, meaning that participants are compensated at a minimum of $8.00, which is above the United States federal minimum wage (Pittman & Sheehan, 2016). For this study, participants were compensated at a rate of $8.00 an hour. Additionally, Prolific has many pre-screening questions, allowing this survey to only be available to users that already selected they identify as trans on a platform-managed pre-screening question. To further ensure that participants identified as trans, the survey began by asking, "Do you identify as trans?" with three response options of "yes," "no," and "other." Fifty-one participants were removed from the study for responding "no" to the question. Those who responded to "other" ($n$ = 22) were retained in the study because the individuals reported their gender identity as not being cisgender but shared that they did not identify with the label of trans or were concerned that did not fit the 'criteria.' Additionally, a requirement of the study was that individuals must have been employed within the last two years to ensure that they could recall their most recent work environment. Therefore, 41 individuals were removed for selecting they were last employed over two years ago. Additionally, 21 individuals were removed for missing the attention check questions, two individuals were removed for having illogical responses to the open-ended response, "Please describe your gender identity" and one individual was removed for not responding to over half of the questions, leaving a total of 206 participants. Any variance in testing is due to listwise deletion.

[1] This study was funded by the Department of Communication at the University of Kansas.

The majority of the participants identified as Caucasian (76.2%, *n* = 157). Sixteen participants (7.8%) identified as Black or African American, 14 (6.8%) identified as Asian, five (2.4%) identified as Native American, one person (.5%) identified as Native Hawaiian. Further, 10 participants (4.9%) selected other, and three participants (1.5%) chose not to disclose. Additionally, 10.7% of participants identified as Hispanic/Latinx. Participants' age ranged from 18 to 71 (*M* = 27.05, *SD* = 7.49). One individual reported age as "2." However, their responses were overall logical, therefore, they were retained in the study and the mean age was imputed to avoid the response acting as an outlier. Most participants had some form of a college education, with 77 (37.4%) reporting having some college but no degree, 17 (8.3%) had an Associates or technical degree, 58 (28.2%) had a Bachelor's degree, and 23 (11.1%) had a graduate or professional degree. Seventy-six participants reported working full time (36.7%), followed by 42 (20.3%) of participants being students, 34 (16.4%) working part-time, 23 (11.1%) doing freelance work. Additionally, 16 (7.7%) participants reported being unemployed and looking for work, three (1.4%) shared they were unemployed and not looking for work, three (1.4%) were homemakers or stay at home parents, and four (1.9%) individuals said they were unable to work.

One hundred and forty-seven (71%) participants were currently employed, 30 (14.5%) had been employed within the past six months, 14 (6.8%) had been employed from six months to a year ago, and 16 (7.7%%) had been employed between one to two years ago. Further, participants income was relatively split between three categories with 46 (22.2%) making $10,000 - $24,999, 48 (23.2%) making $25,000 - $50,999, and 54 (26.1%) making $51,000 - $100,999. Twenty-nine (14%) participants made less than $9,999, 20 (9.7%) made between $101,000-$200,999, and six (2.9%) chose not to share their income.

Participants self-reported their gender identity and the responses were then categorized. If participants included multiple descriptors, the first one was chosen as their primary gender identity. This approach takes a precise, self-described, measure of gender identity and classifies it into a *post hoc* code created by the researcher to facilitate statistical analysis. Many of the participants ($n$ = 81, 39.7%) identified as nonbinary. Sixty-four (31.4%) identified as a masculine identity (responses included transmasc, male, man, transgender man), 25 (12.3%) identified a feminine identity (responses included trans woman, female, trans girl), 13 (6.4%) identified as agender, 11 (5.4%) as genderqueer, five (2.5%) as genderfluid, four (2.0%) as gender nonconforming, and one (0.5%) identified as two-spirit. Responses were recoded into a dichotomous variable with zero representing non-binary identities ($n$ = 116) and one representing binary identities ($n$ = 90).

## Measures

### *Identity communication*

**Outness**. Sixteen items measured identity communication. Twelve items from the Workplace Sexual Identity Management Scale adapted for trans individuals and tested for reliability by Brewster et al. (2012) were used to measure whether individuals view themselves as being open about their identity within the workplace and outside of the workplace and how they express their identity. Further, one item from the original scale by Anderson et al. (2001) was included because it emphasizes the communicative aspect of identity disclosure. The item was rephrased to be applicable to trans identity (i.e., I display trans pride items). Additionally, I wrote three items were included that expand on concepts in the scale adapted by Brewster et al. The additional items are "I dress in ways that affirm my gender identity," which was included with explicit outness, and "I participate in the trans community," and "I have friends within the

trans community," both of which were included in the implicit outness construct. The Workplace Sexual Identity Management Scale (Brewster et al., 2012) consists of three subscales of *explicit outness, implicit outness,* and *covering* and was adapted to measure each construct for in the workplace and outside of the workplace. Each was measured using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 7 = *Strongly Agree*).

*Explicit outness* is being open about one's trans identity. A sample item is "I display trans pride items (flags, pronoun buttons, through clothes, etc.)." The scale was coded so that higher scores indicate higher, direct openness about trans identity. The scale was reliable for both in the workplace ($M$ = 4.28, $SD$ = 1.33, Cronbach's α = .76) and outside of the workplace ($M$ = 5.12, $SD$ = 1.04, Cronbach's α = .74). *Implicit outness* is when an individual does not directly label themselves as trans but is does not try to hide their identity. Higher scores on the scale indicate higher levels of indirect openness about trans identity. items center around advocating for trans identity such as "I have spoken out against anti-trans discrimination." The scale was reliable for both in the workplace ($M$ = 4.38, $SD$ = 1.45, Cronbach's α = .82) and outside of the workplace ($M$ = 5.78, $SD$ = 0.96, Cronbach's α = .73). Lastly, *covering* involves distancing oneself from their trans identity and avoiding sharing information that may indicate they are trans. The scale was coded so that higher scores indicated higher levels of covering. A sample item is, "I avoid associating myself with issues pertaining to gender identity." One item that was not reverse coded was removed from the scale to improve reliability: "I have regular contact with people known by others to be trans." However, removing this item did not change the results. The scale was reliable for both in the workplace ($M$ = 4.64, $SD$ = 1.34, Cronbach's α = .67) and outside of the workplace ($M$ = 5.00, $SD$ = 1.16, Cronbach's α = .65) (see Table 1 for a list of all measures and questions).

**Passing**. Six items taken from the Transgender Identity Survey measured passing (Bockting et al., 2020). Bockting et al. define passing as seeking to be seen as cisgender. Passing was separately measured from outness, as the act falls into a unique dimension distinct from being closeted entirely or completely open about being trans. Sample items include, "For me, passing is everything" and "Passing is a standard to measure my success." Participants were asked to respond on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 7 = *Strongly Agree*) for both in the workplace ($M$ = 3.33, $SD$ = 1.67) and outside the workplace ($M$ = 3.33, $SD$ = 1.69). The scale was reliable in (Cronbach's α = .95) and outside of the workplace (Cronbach's α = .91).

**Authenticity**. An individual authenticity measure was also included to better understand the extent of one's crystallization. The variable was measured by a 12-item scale created and validated by Van den Bosch and Taris (2013) to assess individual authenticity. The scale was developed to address a lack of person-centered authenticity measures specifically for organizational contexts and is divided by three constructs of authentic living, self-alienation, and accepting external influence. The scale was adapted to fit the context of the study by asking participants to respond to the scenarios regarding work and outside of the workplace. Participants were asked to respond on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 7 = *Strongly Agree*), with higher ratings representing higher feelings of authenticity across all three constructs.

*Authentic living* is the extent to which "individuals are true to their selves in most situations and live in accordance with their own values and beliefs" (Van den Bosh & Taris, 2013, p. 3). A sample item is, "I am true to myself in most situations." The scale was reliable for in ($M$ = 5.17, $SD$ = 1.22, Cronbach's α = .85) and outside of the workplace ($M$ = 5.74, $SD$ = 0.87, Cronbach's α = .68). *Self-alienation* is the feeling that one's actions do not align with who they perceive themselves to be. A sample item is "I feel "cut off" from who I really am." The scale

was reliable for in the workplace (*M* = 3.79, *SD* = 1.63, Cronbach's α = .85) and outside of the workplace (*M* = 4.28, *SD* = 1.50, Cronbach's α = .79). Lastly, *accepting external influence* is seeking to do what others expect even if it does not align with one's values. A sample item is, "I feel the need to do what others expect me to do." The scale was reliable for in the workplace (*M* = 4.54, *SD* = 1.25, Cronbach's α = .77) and outside of the workplace (*M* = 3.92, *SD* = 1.39, Cronbach's α = .80).

### *Job satisfaction*

A widely adopted scale developed by Cammann et al. (1979) was used to measure job satisfaction. The measure included three items: "In general, I don't like my job" (reverse coded), "All in all, I am satisfied with my job," "In general, I like working here," and asked participants to respond on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 7 = *Strongly Agree*; *M* = 4.29, *SD* = 1.83, Cronbach's α = .94). Higher values indicate higher job satisfaction.

### *Life satisfaction*

The Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) is a well-known scale measuring life satisfaction (Diener et al., 1985). The five-item measure included statements such as "In most ways my life is close to my ideal" or "I am satisfied with my life." Participants were asked to respond on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 7 = *Strongly Agree*), with higher ratings representing higher satisfaction with life (*M* = 4.66, *SD* = 1.83). The scale was reliable (Cronbach's α = .91).

### *Covariate variables*

**Workplace supportiveness.** An organization may create a discourse that communicates to a marginalized employee that their identity does not align with the organizationally preferred self. This discourse can be communicated through workplace supportiveness, which is expressed

through institutional policies and interactions with colleagues. To this point, research indicates that higher levels of workplace support, including inclusive institutional policies and affirming behaviors from coworkers and supervisors, facilitates identity disclosure and positively relates to job and life satisfaction (Huffman et al., 2021; Law et al., 2011). Conversely, an unsupportive workplace may lead individuals to conceal their identity (Tracy & Town, 2020).

Workplace supportiveness was measured using a 21-item scale. Twenty items are from the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgendered Climate Inventory, which were adapted and tested for reliability by Brewster et al. (2012) for trans individuals focusing on how accepting the work environment is. One question was added and modified, repeating a previous question, to incorporate perspectives relating to coworker and supervisor experiences. A sample item is "At my current or most recent place of employment, trans employees must be secretive at work about their gender identity." The items were measured on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = *Never* to 7 = *Always*), with higher values indicating a more supportive workplace ($M$ = 4.63, $SD$ = 1.33). The scale was reliable (Cronbach's $\alpha$ = .97).

**Segmentation**. A limitation of the crystallized self (Tracy & Trethewey, 2005) that this study seeks to explore is the possibility that individuals may also prefer not to blend their work and personal lives, also known as work-life segmentation. Individuals seek to maintain boundaries in alignment with their integration-segmentation preferences, and when they are able to do so, they experience less work-home conflict and stress, along with higher job satisfaction (Kreiner, 2006). However, many individuals face personal and organizational constraints that limit their ability to construct boundaries in ways that support their preferences. Specifically, those with stigmatized identities face barriers to revealing, engaging with, or concealing those identities in the workplace in alignment with their sense of self. Norms, exclusion in

organizational structures, and daily experiences with implicit and explicit queerphobia and transphobia dramatically influence how and to what extent one discloses their LGBTQ+ identity (Tatum, 2018).

Existing literature on boundary theory and work-life segmentation provides insight into how queer and trans folks manage their identity in the workplace and how they engage in their identity influences satisfaction with their well-being both on the job and in life (Lindsey, 2019; Ragins et al., 2007; Tatum, 2018). For queer and trans individuals, these challenges arise in situations like workplace social events, where one may feel pressured to share about personal relationships, or in the coming-out process, such as if a trans individual wants to change their name or pronouns but fears discrimination. Further, individuals may face boundary violations, like if a coworker or supervisor shares their LGBTQ+ identity without their consent (Di Marco et al., 2022; Kriener et al., 2009). Therefore, this study measures work-life segmentation in addition to the crystallized self. In line with Tracy & Trethewey's argument, the current study conceptualizes crystallization as a continuum along the dimension of communicating trans identity.

Four items measuring how individuals may separate their work-home life were included (Kreiner, 2006). This measure is important because some individuals may have a preference to separate their work-home life, which can impact their response to other variables. Participants were asked to respond on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 7 = *Strongly Agree*), with higher ratings representing higher feelings of segmentation ($M$ = 6.23, $SD$ = 0.96). A sample item is, “I prefer to keep work life at work.” The scale was reliable (Cronbach’s $\alpha$ = .87).

# Chapter 4: Results

## Research Question 1

The first research question asks broadly about how trans folks communicate their identities in the workplace. A few simple measures capture this dynamic, and then more complex measures (tested for RQ2) further elaborate the relationship. Some descriptive measures are personal pronoun use, if individuals are out to their coworkers and supervisors, and levels of outness in the workplace (see Tables 4 and 5 for means, standard deviations, and correlations of major variables).

A behavior that was significantly correlated with job and life satisfaction was personal pronoun use ($M$ = 3.89, $SD$ = 2.53). This measure captured the extent to which coworkers correctly used one's pronouns. Foremost, fifty-four (26.2%) individuals responded that they do not use the pronouns that aligned with their gender identity in the workplace, indicating that they are not entirely open about their identity in the workplace. Of those who indicated that they were open about their pronouns in the workplace and that their coworkers used their pronouns at least some of the time ($N$ = 113), 25.7% ($N$ = 53) shared that their coworkers *always* used their pronouns, 12.1% ($N$ = 25) shared that they almost always used their pronouns, and 35 (17%) shared that some coworkers used their pronouns, but that others did not. Furthermore, twenty participants (12.2%) indicated that their coworkers did not use their pronouns consistently. Ten (4.9%) participants shared that overall, their coworkers did not use their pronouns, but that they did have allies in the workplace that did use their correct pronouns. Ten (4.9%) participants indicated that their coworkers rarely used their pronouns, and five (2.4%) shared that they never use their correct pronouns.

This finding is important as it shows that many individuals are not open about using pronouns that align with their gender identity in the workplace, but also indicates that over half of the participants were open about using pronouns that align with their identity (56.9%) and of those individuals, many of them experience correct pronoun use at least some of the time. Corresponding with pronoun use, gender identity and pronoun use were negatively correlated. Specifically, individuals who identified as nonbinary were less likely to be open about the pronouns that aligned with their gender identity or were more likely to experience misgendering, despite being about open their pronouns ($r$ = -.31, $p$ <.001).

Another indication of how trans folks communicated their identity in the workplace was captured by a single item measure of outness to coworkers ($M$ = 3.38, $SD$ = 2.26) and supervisors ($M$ = 3.17, $SD$ = 2.41). Regarding outness to coworkers, 122 participants (59.2%) responded between being open only some of the time to not at all to coworkers. One hundred and seventy-three (41.3%) of individuals were open to coworkers at least over half of the time. For outness to supervisors, individuals were slightly less open. One hundred and twenty-nine participants (63.7%) were open less than half of the time. One hundred and seventy-six participants (36.9%) of participants were open over half of the time.

Alongside personal pronoun use and outness to coworker and supervisors, the identity communication variables of explicit outness and implicit outness captured how individuals communicated their trans identity. Both were measured twice, once for in the workplace and once for out of the workplace, and were statistically different in regards to those contexts (explicitly out, $t$(410) = 7.14, $p$ <.001, implicitly out, $t$(410) = 11.55, $p$ <.001). Individuals indicated that they were more likely to be explicitly out, outside of the workplace ($M$ = 5.34, $SD$ = 0.98) than in the workplace ($M$ = 4.37, $SD$ = 1.32). Additionally, individuals were more likely

to be implicitly out, outside of the workplace ($M$ = 5.64, $SD$ = 1.32) than in the workplace ($M$ = 4.19, $SD$ = 1.43). Further, the last identity communication variable of covering measures the extent to which individuals distance themselves from their trans identity and was measured both for in the workplace and outside of the workplace, and these measures were statistically different from each other ($t(410) = -2.96$, $p = .003$). Specifically, individuals were more likely to engage in covering in the workplace ($M$ = 3.08, $SD$ = 1.44), than outside of the workplace ($M$ = 2.56, $SD$ = 1.28). This is an important finding as it shows that individuals are more likely to distance themselves from their identity in the workplace and more likely to be open about their identity outside of work.

**Research Question 2**

To explore the relevant identity-related antecedents of job satisfaction and life satisfaction, I conducted four separate stepwise regressions predicting life satisfaction and job satisfaction, each model was essentially run twice, once with work-related measures and once with general life related measures. The same four steps were introduced for each model. The first step introduced the identity communication variables of implicit outness and covering. Due to issues of multicollinearity, explicit outness was not included in any of the models (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2019). The second step included the identity communication measure of passing. For the third step, authenticity constructs were introduced. The fourth step introduced segmentation preferences and general workplace support because they were not theorized antecedents but were included as an additional potential explanation. Lastly, the fifth step introduced demographic variables of relationship status, gender identity, race, and age.

To retain the focus on identity, I report results for the third step of the model (see Table 2). To offer a comprehensive view of the variables associated with life and job satisfaction, I also report two additional steps including covariates and control variables (see Table 3).

**Job Satisfaction (with workplace variables)**

The model using workplace variables to predict job satisfaction was significant: $F(6, 198) = 19.31$, $p < .001$), $r^2 = .37$. The first step introduced workplace identity communication variables and accounted for 15% of variance ($r^2_{adj} = .14$, $\Delta r^2 = .15$). Specifically, covering was significant ($\beta = -.34$, $p < .001$). The second step introducing passing in the workplace was not significant ($p = .54$). However, the third step introducing workplace authenticity constructs accounted for 22% of variance, showing a significant improvement to the model fit ($r^2_{adj} = .35$, $\Delta r^2 = .22$). Two authenticity measures were significant and showed that authenticity was positively related to job satisfaction. Accepting external influence ($\beta = .24$) and self-alienation ($\beta = .50$) were both significant ($p < .001$), but authentic living was not significant. Additionally, covering was no longer significant ($\beta = -.11$, $p = .15$). In sum, considering the theorized identity communication variables, job satisfaction was positively related to two authenticity constructs (accepting external influence and self-alienation), but when considering authenticity, the outness variables of implicit outness and covering were not significant.

The fourth and fifth step introduced covariates and control variables. The fourth step introduced segmentation preferences and supportiveness, and also showed a significant improvement to the model fit ($r^2_{adj} = .41$, $\Delta r^2 = .06$). Both segmentation preferences ($\beta = -.15$, $p = .006$) and workplace supportiveness ($\beta = .25$, $p = .001$) were significant. While higher levels of segmentation were negatively related with work satisfaction, supportiveness was positively related. Furthermore, accepting external influence ($\beta = .22$) and self-alienation ($\beta = .39$), both

remained highly significant ($p$ <.001). The last step introducing demographic variables showed improvement to the model fit ($r^2_{adj}$ = .42, $\Delta r^2$ = .02). Specifically, relationship status was significant (β = .14, $p$ = .02). Additionally, segmentation remained significant (β = -.14, $p$ = .02), along with supportiveness (β = .24, $p$ = .002). Lastly, accepting external influence remained significant (β = .19, $p$ = .002) and self-alienation remained highly significant (β = .38, $p$ <.001).

**Job satisfaction (with life variables)**

The model using outside of work variables to predict job satisfaction was significant $F$(6, 198) = 9.27, $p$ <.001, $r^2$ = .22. The first step introducing identity communication variables accounted for 8% of variance ($r^2_{adj}$ = .07, $\Delta r^2$ = .08). Those who engaged in covering outside of the workplace had lower job satisfaction (β = -.28, $p$ <.001). The second step introducing passing was not significant. However, the third step introducing authenticity constructs accounted for 14% of variance and showed a significant improvement to the model fit ($r^2_{adj}$ = .20, $\Delta r^2$ = .14). Accepting external influence (β = .28) and self-alienation (β = .36) were both significant ($p$ <.001). Authentic living was not significant. The identity communication variables of covering remained significant at (β = -.22 $p$ = .003). Overall, these steps showed that, regarding identity communication variables, job satisfaction was positively related to all three authenticity constructs and negatively related to covering.

The fourth and fifth step introduced covariates and control variables. The fourth step introducing segmentation preferences and supportiveness also showed a significant improvement to the model fit ($r^2_{adj}$ = .39, $\Delta r^2$ = .19). Segmentation (β = -.17) was significant at $p$ = .002 and supportiveness (β = .40) was significant at $p$ <.001. Additionally, all three authenticity constructs were significant. Accepting external influence remained significant (β = .21, $p$ =.001) alongside self-alienation (β = .24, $p$ =.001). Authentic living became significant (β = .13, $p$ = .07). Lastly,

the identity communication variable of covering remained significant (β = -.12, $p$ = .09), along with implicit outness (β = -.12, $p$ = .07). The fifth step introducing demographic variables did not significantly improve model fit.

**Life satisfaction (with life variables)**

The model predicting life satisfaction from general life measures was significant: $F(6, 205) = 12.57$ , $p < .001$, $r^2 = .28$. The first step introducing identity communication variables was significant and accounted for 5% of variance in life satisfaction ($r^2_{adj} = .04$, $\Delta r^2 = .05$). Specifically, covering was positively associated with life satisfaction (β = -.19, $p$ = .01). The second step introducing passing showed improvement to the model fit ($r^2_{adj} = .05$, $\Delta r^2 = .01$). Passing was negatively related with life satisfaction (β = -.13, $p$ = .08), showing that those who engaged more in passing were more likely to have lower life satisfaction. Covering remained significant. The third step introduced authenticity and showed a significant improvement to the model fit, accounting for 21% of variance ($r^2_{adj} = .27$, $\Delta r^2 = .21$). Two authenticity measures, accepting external influence (β = .28) and self-alienation (β = .48), showed a significant positive relationship with life satisfaction ($p < .001$). Authentic living was not significant. Passing remained significant (β = -.17, $p$ = .01). However, covering was no longer significant, but implicit outness became significant (β = -.14, $p$ = .06), showing a negative association with life satisfaction. In sum, life satisfaction was positively related with self-alienation and accepting external influence constructs and negatively related to implicit outness and passing.

The fourth and fifth step introduced covariates and control variables. The fourth step introducing general workplace supportiveness and segmentation preferences was significant and accounted for 3% of variance ($r^2_{adj} = .25$, $\Delta r^2 = .03$). Specifically, segmentation was significant (β = -.17, $p$ = .006), showing that as preference to separate work and life increases, life

satisfaction is likely to decrease. Additionally, all three authenticity constructs were significant. Accepting external influence (β = .27) and self-alienation (β = .45) were both significant at $p <$ .001. Authentic living was also significant (β = .14, $p$ = .08). Further passing also remained significant (β = -.18, $p$ = .01). Additionally, implicit outness remained significant (β = -.13, $p$ = .08. Lastly, the fifth step introduced demographic variables and showed improvement to model fit, accounting for 5% of variance ($r^2_{adj}$ = .31, $\Delta r^2$ = .05). Specifically, relationship status was significant (β = .20), $p <$ .001), showing that being in a relationship was positively related to life satisfaction. Additionally, segmentation maintained a significant negative relationship with life satisfaction (β = -.17, $p$ = .005). For authenticity, accepting external influence (β = .27) and self-alienation (β = .38) were significant at $p <$ .001. Further, authentic living was also significant (β = .16, $p$ = .04). Lastly, passing remained significant (β = -.17, $p$ = .03), continuing to show a negative relationship with life satisfaction, even when accounting for other variables like segmentation and relationship satisfaction, and implicit outness also continued to show a significant negative relationship (β = -.14, $p$ = .05).

**Life Satisfaction (with workplace variables)**

The model predicting life satisfaction based on work-oriented variables was significant: $F(6, 205) = 10.10$, $p <$.001, $r^2$ = .23. The first step introducing identity communication in the workplace was significant ($r^2_{adj}$ = .04, $\Delta r^2$ = .05). Specifically, covering showed a significant negative relationship with life satisfaction (β = -.19, $p$ = .01). The second step introduced passing in the workplace and was also significant, accounting for 1% of variance ($r^2_{adj}$ = .05, $\Delta r^2$ = .01). Passing was negatively associated with life satisfaction, meaning that those who reported as being perceived as passing in the workplace were more likely to report lower life satisfaction (β = -.13, $p$ = .09). Covering was also significant (β = -.15, p = .06). The third step introduced

authenticity in the workplace and accounted for 21% of variance, showing a significant improvement to the model fit ($r^2_{adj}$ = .25, $\Delta r^2$ = .21). Specifically, accepting external influence (β = .28) self-alienation (β = .49) was highly significant ($p$ < .001) and authentic living was also significant (β = .19, $p$ = .02). Additionally, passing remained significant (β = -.16, $p$ = .02) and covering became significant (β = -.15, $p$ = .09). Overall, these steps showed that life satisfaction was positively related to two workplace identity constructs, self-alienation and authentic living, and negatively related to covering and passing.

The fourth and fifth step introduced covariates and control variables. The fourth step introduced segmentation preferences and workplace supportiveness was significant ($r^2_{adj}$ = .29, $\Delta r^2$ = .03). Specifically, those who indicated higher preferences for separating work and life were more likely to report lower life satisfaction (β = -.17, $p$ = .006). Furthermore, accepting external influence (β = .27) and self-alienation (β = .45) remained highly significant ($p$ <.001), and authentic living also remained significant (β = .13, $p$ = .08). Additionally, the authenticity construct of accepting external influence became significant (β = .14, $p$ = .08). Passing remained significant (β = -.18, $p$ = .01), however, covering was no longer significant. The last step introduced demographic variables and showed a significant improvement to the model fit ($r^2_{adj}$ = .27, $\Delta r^2$ = .06), with relationship status being highly significant (β = .24, $p$ <.001). As in the prior model, relationship status has a significant influence on life satisfaction. Additionally, segmentation preferences remained significant (β = -.13, $p$ =.005). For authenticity, accepting external influence (β = .11) was not significant. However, self-alienation (β = .37) was still highly significant ( $p$ <.001), and authentic living was also still significant (β = .18, $p$ = .04). However, accepting external influence was no longer significant. Lastly, passing remained negatively related to life satisfaction (β = -.14, $p$ = .08).

***Post hoc* analysis.** To add nuance to the findings outlined above, a *post hoc* analysis utilizing two regressions including the three outness variables of implicit outness, explicit outness, and covering was conducted to explore the effect of explicit outness, as it was taken out of the original four models due to issues of multicollinearity. The first model testing workplace outness on job satisfaction was significant: $F(3, 204) = 12.68$, $p < .001$, $r^2 = .16$. Job satisfaction was negatively associated with covering ($\beta = -.32$, $p < .001$), and explicit outness and implicit outness were nonsignificant.

The second model testing general outness on life satisfaction was significant: $F(3, 205) = 6.09$, $p < .001$, $r^2 = .08$. Covering was negatively associated with life satisfaction ($\beta = -.17$, $p = .02$). Explicit outness was positively associated with life satisfaction ($\beta = .26$, $p = .006$). However, implicit outness was nonsignificant. So, the findings from the *post hoc* indicate that for job satisfaction, covering is the most salient identity communication strategy and has a negative impact on job satisfaction. For life satisfaction, both covering and explicit outness were significant predictors; indicating that when individuals are able to be clearly open about their identity, they have higher life satisfaction.

# Chapter 5: Discussion

## Overview

How individuals negotiate their identity in and outside of work environments affects crucial outcomes like job and life satisfaction. The current study extends prior research on identity communication, trans identity, and the blurring of work and nonwork roles. I conducted an exploratory analysis, asking two research questions: RQ1 How do trans individuals communicate their identity in and outside of the workplace? RQ2 How is communication about trans identity in and outside of the workplace associated with job satisfaction and life satisfaction? To answer these questions, I tested four models to investigate the relationship between general life and work-related measures, including identity communication, segmentation, supportiveness of workplace environment, and demographic characteristics on job satisfaction and life satisfaction.

The first two models tested the relationship between work and nonwork variables as they relate to job satisfaction. The results showed that covering, authenticity, segmentation, and supportiveness were significant indicators of job satisfaction. Authenticity and supportiveness were positive predictors, while covering and segmentation were negatively associated with job satisfaction. However, there were differences between the two models. Notably, relationship status was a positive predictor of job satisfaction in the model using work variables, but the step introducing demographic variables was nonsignificant for the model using life variables to predict job satisfaction. Lastly, covering was only significant in the model using general life variables to predict job satisfaction, and not significant as a workplace variable.

The third and fourth models tested the relationship between work and nonwork variables as they relate to life satisfaction. Passing, authenticity, segmentation, and relationship status were

significant predictors for both models. Authenticity and relationship status were positively associated with life satisfaction, while passing, and segmentation were negatively associated. Findings were similar in direction and magnitude for both models. Across the four models, authenticity and segmentation were significant predictors of job and life satisfaction. However, supportiveness and covering were significant predictors of job satisfaction, while passing was only significant for life satisfaction. Additionally, implicit outness was significant in the model predicting life satisfaction with general life variables. The following sections provide additional detail about these constructs and address the study's theoretical implications for the metaphor of the crystallized self before presenting practical implications for employers, individuals, and society.

**Theoretical implications**

Scholars have considered the metaphor of the crystallized self in different organizational contexts such as employer surveillance (McEwan & Flood, 2018), dirty work (Tracy & Scott, 2006), and emotional labor and burnout (Zhang & Zhu, 2008), but often the theory is used as a *post hoc* explanation, or is not measured, and, thus, remains underexplored. In this study, operationalizing the crystallized self and measuring facets of identity communication and important antecedents yielded rich findings that can provide nuance to the theory. By exploring identity communication through the lens of blurring work and nonwork boundaries, this study utilizes empirical data to make a novel contribution to Tracy and Trethewey's (2005) metaphor of the crystallized self, supports major facets of the metaphor, addresses limitations of the theory, contextualizes the theory within the perspective of navigating a stigmatized identity, and connects it with additional theory.

As identity communication is a key feature of crystallized identity, this research considered aspects of communicating identity, including a general measure of authenticity and how open people are about their trans identity (explicit outness, implicit outness, covering, and passing). These measures provided insight into how trans folks communicate about their identity in and outside of the workplace, and the impact that identity communication has on job and life satisfaction. Further, this research contributes to an often understudied but crucial area of research on trans identity in organizational communication.

***Authenticity.*** Authenticity is a primary construct of the metaphor of the crystallized self (Tracy & Trethewey, 2005) and relating research on merging work and nonwork roles (Ramarajan & Reid, 2013). The metaphor of the crystallized self encourages individuals to conceptualize a more holistic, authentic version of themselves that prioritizes their values and beliefs instead of developing compartmentalized versions of self, separating who they are at work and outside of work. In line with this, the results suggest that individuals who are more authentic have higher job and life satisfaction. Specifically, those who indicated low levels of *self-alienation*, meaning they felt aligned with who they were, and *accepting external influence*, or low levels of striving to meet the expectations of other, had positive relationships with job and life satisfaction (Van den Bosch & Taris, 2013). Additionally, *authentic living*, or engaging in behavior that aligns with one's true self, also showed a positive relationship with job and life satisfaction. These findings align with previous studies on authenticity in and outside of the workplace (Cha et al., 2019; Reis et al., 2016).

As accepting external influence and self-alienation were measures focusing on feelings of inauthenticity, those two constructs of authenticity being the most salient shows that lower feelings of inauthenticity versus overt feelings of authenticity, were more important predictors of

job and life satisfaction and aligns with previous studies on workplace authenticity (Van den Bosch & Taris, 2013). Tracy and Trethewey (2005) encourage individuals to oppose organizational discourses that encourage employees to engage in an organizationally preferred self where they prioritize the expectations of the work environments over their own needs and downplay aspects of identity in the process. Thus, the findings regarding authenticity make an important contribution to crystallized identity because it shows the importance of prioritizing feeling aligned with one's sense of self over meeting the expectations of others, like the expectations of a work environment, supporting the key tenets of crystallized identity. Along with supporting previous research on authenticity as it relates to job and life satisfaction and placing a measure of authenticity within the context of the metaphor of the crystallized self, this study contributes to the role of trans identity and authenticity, showing that authenticity as a general construct, remains salient for trans individuals' job and life satisfaction, specifically.

***Outness***. While authenticity was a significant predictor of job and life satisfaction, supporting Tracy and Trethewey's (2005) conclusions, specific variables measuring openness about trans identity, referred to as outness, were also significant. The four variables focusing on how individuals communicated their trans identity were explicit outness, implicit outness, covering, and passing. The variables measuring outness capture how individuals may communicate their trans identity. Being explicitly out means that individuals speak directly and openly about their identity or may display symbols representative of their identity (wearing a trans pride flag pin; Brewster et al., 2012). On the other hand, implicitly out refers to indirect outness where one might talk about trans issues or advocate for trans folks but not speak in direct relationship to their personal identity. Lastly, covering involves distancing oneself from their identity, and intentionally censoring information to hide their identity.

Although explicit outness was removed from the main regression models and implicit outness was insignificant in those models, *post hoc* analysis of all three variables provided additional explanation about their relationship with job and life satisfaction. Covering was the only outness variable that was a significant predictor of job satisfaction. This indicates that when accounting for the various identity communication variables, it has the most influence of the three variables on job satisfaction and engaging in the behavior has a negative impact on job satisfaction. However, both explicit outness and covering were related with life satisfaction. Explicit outness was positively related to life satisfaction, indicating that when individuals were more open about their identity, they had higher life satisfaction. Covering showed a negative association with life satisfaction, indicating that those who distanced themselves from their identity have lower life satisfaction.

In the main models, covering and passing were both significant predictors of the outcomes. *Covering*, an identity management strategy that involves separating oneself from their identity, was negatively related to job satisfaction but was not a significant predictor of life satisfaction. LGBTQ+ individuals often engage in various strategies to mitigate adverse experiences that arise due to their identity (see, Spradlin, 1998; Nuru, 2014), which is supported in this study. Covering was a negative predictor in the job satisfaction model using general life variables, showing that when individuals distanced themselves from their identity outside of work, it negatively impacted job satisfaction. The findings regarding covering emphasize an essential issue with the idea of crystallization: individuals with stigmatized identities, like being trans, face unique challenges in and outside of the workplace that may limit the extent they can engage in crystallization efforts. Therefore, the significance of covering challenges some of the core concepts of the metaphor of the crystallized self. It is crucial to recognize the privilege of

being able to enact an authentic, holistic version of oneself in and outside of the workplace. Additionally, it may simply not always be in an individual's best interests to pursue crystallization efforts if they fear adverse outcomes by expressing their identity.

Supporting these ideas relating to covering and identity communication, the mean of covering was higher for in the workplace than outside of the workplace, and the means of explicit and implicit outness were higher for outside of the workplace than in the workplace. This may support Tracy and Trethewey's (2005) claim that individuals engage in the organizationally preferred self – trans folks may be more likely to hide their identities to meet the expectations of or fit in with the work environment. These results also indicate that an ideal version of self would be one who could be directly open about their identity (explicitly out) and not having to distance oneself from their identity (covering), which is associated with higher job and life satisfaction, aligning with the central idea of crystallization.

***Passing tensions.*** Passing, as a general construct, was a nonsignificant predictor of job satisfaction but had a significant negative relationship with life satisfaction. Literature argues that passing is a useful identity management strategy to avoid harmful outcomes like workplace discrimination due to being trans (Bockting et al., 2021). However, nonsignificant relationships between passing and job satisfaction might be explained by covering. As research on identity management techniques for queer and trans individuals has noted, the different identity management techniques share conceptual overlap (see, Spradlin, 1998; Nuru, 2014), including covering and passing, as they both can be associated with separating oneself from their trans identity in their communication with others.

The distinction between covering and passing is important here, as covering centers around not associating oneself with trans identity (Brewster et al., 2012), while individuals who

pass are perceived as cisgender but still can be open about their trans identity in conversation. The significance of covering but not passing in the models using workplace-specific variables could be because individuals are focused on identity management to mitigate adverse experiences in the workplace. However, covering was only significant in the workplace models as a general life variable. This shows that in the workplace, being able to communicate authentically was a more significant predictor. Further, the results show a moderate but significant positive correlation between passing and covering both regarding in the workplace ($r$ = .38, $p$ <.001) and outside of the workplace ($r$ = .41, $p$ <.001) (see Tables 4 and 5 for correlations), indicating that as individuals engaged in one strategy, the extent to which they engaged in the other increases. This is an important finding as it shows the relationship between the two variables, indicating that those who pass are likely to use covering strategies and vice versa. Additionally, as covering is significant in the workplace models and passing is not, it shows the importance an individual places on not being seen as trans in the workplace. This finding contributes to the literature on strategies individuals use to manage their identity (see, Nuru, 2014) by providing insight to how trans individuals navigate this but also by recognizing potential discernable differences about when and how individuals engage in these strategies, such as differences that arise as a result of context (work vs. nonwork).

While nonsignificant for job satisfaction, passing was a negative predictor of life satisfaction. Passing in the mainstream narrative is often portrayed as an ideal; it allows individuals to be perceived as the gender they identify with without others knowing they are trans. Therefore, passing is often a way for individuals to feel affirmed in their gender identity. Along with this, passing is used as a safety mechanism, as trans folks often engage in passing to avoid discrimination and harassment (Bockting, et al., 2021). A potential explanation for passing

being negatively associated with life satisfaction is the pressure to conform to cisgender norms and standards in order to be more accepted, a concept that has been documented through analysis of trans narratives (Zhang, 2022). The items measuring passing emphasize the importance an individual places on passing instead of whether they view themselves as passing. Therefore, passing in this study may account for the pressures and expectations to pass instead of focusing on whether someone does pass. Indeed, the wording of the passing items (e.g., "For me passing is everything") reflect these pressures. Future research ought to further investigate the pressure to conform to cisgender norms, while also considering the benefits and drawbacks of those who perceive themselves to pass in various environments.

Overall, the findings regarding authenticity, outness, and passing, indicate a need for more research that focuses on the pressures that trans individuals may face to uphold to societal notions of gender and the implications that has. Further, the findings regarding the outness aspect of identity communication contribute to the crystallized self, showing, overall, that authentic communication, whether that is through less emphasis on passing or being explicit out about one's trans identity leads to higher job and life satisfaction, which are important theorized outcomes of the crystallized self. Additionally, the findings regarding these identity communication variables highlight the widely theorized emotional labor that trans individuals may face when either distancing themselves from their identity (covering) or feeling the need to conform to gender norms and be perceived as cisgender (passing).

The negative association between covering outside of the workplace and job satisfaction, and in and outside of the workplace for life satisfaction and passing in and outside of the workplace and life satisfaction found in this study emphasize the emotional labor resulting from individuals engaging in an inauthentic version of self, highlighting the complexity of identity

concealment (Ferguson & Dougherty, 2021). The identity concealment represented through covering, passing, and openness exemplified through explicit outness, shows overlap with the crystallized self as individuals indicate higher job and life satisfaction when they are able to be more open about their identity and indicate they perceive themselves as being authentic. However, it is critical to recognize the tension this finding raises. While the finding indicates that openness about trans identity leads to higher job and life satisfaction, it is essential to recognize that trans folks may choose to not be open about their identity for a variety of reasons. Prior research on identity disclosure, and popular discourse, oftentimes overemphasize the importance of identity disclosure, or even subsumes that one owes it to others to come out. However, this Westernized perspective of coming out overlooks the various situational, cultural, and other factors that shape one's identity disclosure experiences (Boe et al., 2018). Therefore, this research looks at identity disclosure from a perspective where workplaces and otherwise can create environments that afford trans folks a *choice* in identity disclosure where they do not fear adverse outcomes from sharing their identity, if that is what they choose (Di Marco et al., 2022; Parkison et al., 2019).

***Segmentation and supportiveness.*** The crystallized self also recognizes external factors, including relationships and discourse, which influence identity construction and crystallization (Tracy & Town, 2020). Aside from the major identity communication variables, this research considers two covariates of segmentation and supportiveness to provide more insight into the metaphor of the crystallized self and its implications for identity communication.

Research on boundary theory and segmentation preferences shows that when individuals are able to achieve and maintain their preferences for segmentation and manage their boundaries, they have better outcomes in areas such as job performance, life satisfaction, and work-family

conflict (Kreiner, 2006). However, the present study found that satisfaction with life and work decreases as segmentation preferences (i.e., a preference for separating work and nonwork) increase. Further, individuals, overall, had a higher preference for segmentation, aligning with prior research on the queer and trans community, showing that LGBTQ+ individuals have higher segmentation preferences (Dilmaghani, 2020).

A possible explanation for the negative relationship between segmentation and job and life satisfaction is because individuals engaged in segmentation to manage their trans identity, as seen in the construct's relationship with authenticity. Segmentation preferences were negatively correlated with authentic living and self-alienation, indicating that authenticity and segmentation have an inverse relationship. This bolsters existing research on queer and trans identity and boundary work, providing further support that identity does matter in the workplace (Di Marco et al., 2022; Ragins et al., 2007; Parkinson et al., 2019), and that individuals who are trans have higher job satisfaction when they can successfully integrate their identity (Martinez et al., 2017). Additionally, LGB research shows that when individuals are able to integrate their identity in the workplace, they have higher job and life satisfaction, a finding mirrored in the present study (Lindsey, et al., 2020).

Along with segmentation, supportiveness was also significant as a covariate. Unsurprisingly, workplace supportiveness of trans identity was moderately correlated with job satisfaction. However, in the models, supportiveness was only a significant predictor of job satisfaction and not life satisfaction. In other words, while there is spillover between work and life-in-general, supportive work environments are not enough to improve overall life satisfaction. Additionally, supportiveness was positively correlated with being out to coworkers and supervisors, being out to coworkers and supervisors was correlated with supportiveness, along

with outness to coworkers and supervisors having a small but significant correlation with job and life satisfaction, showing that as outness with coworkers and supervisors increased, so did job and life satisfaction. Both these findings align with previous findings on coworker/supervisor support and overall supportive organizational climate for trans identities (Huffman et al., 2021). Further, segmentation and supportiveness were negatively correlated ($r$ = -.14, $p$ < .05), potentially supporting previous findings that those who have less fear associated with disclosure are more likely to integrate their identity (Ragins et al., 2007). The findings regarding supportiveness and segmentation provide further insight into boundary theory by contributing to another situational factor that may inhibit individuals' comfortability with coming out or being open about their identity in the workplace (see, Di Marco, et al., 2022). Lastly, supportiveness being a significant positive predictor of job satisfaction emphasizes the importance of encouraging workplaces that truly engage in practices that support marginalized identities as the finding indicates that such support really does matter for important well-being outcomes.

Along with contributing to boundary theory, the findings regarding both segmentation and supportiveness can be connected back to Tracy and Trethewey's (2005) metaphor of the crystallized self which claims those engaging in crystallization will be more satisfied with all aspects of their life. As part of metaphor of the crystallized self relies on the argument that individuals that numerous factors are implicated in the process of crystallization, including discourses and relationships, segmentation and supportiveness prove to be crucial determinants of authenticity and identity communication, as the data presented here show. Future research should consider supportiveness and segmentation as moderating the effects of identity communication variables on the outcomes of job and life satisfaction.

## Practical Implications

**Organizational.** The findings of this study have several practical implications that can help contribute to more positive and affirming experiences for trans individuals regarding work and nonwork environments. Regarding the workplace, while there are federal workplace protections prohibiting discrimination on the basis of gender identity (EEOC, 2021), microaggressions, implicit norms, workplace culture, and other practices exist and have varied implications for trans and gender nonconforming individuals (Jones, 2020; Sears et al., 2021). Crucially, the findings suggest that when individuals can be authentic in and outside the workplace, they have higher job satisfaction. In tandem with this, when trans folks can be *open* about their trans identity, they have higher job satisfaction. Understanding the implications of authenticity and openness about identity within the workplace is helpful for employers as they can emphasize destigmatizing conversations surrounding gender identity or sexuality that are common aspects of workplace socialization.

Additionally, work environments that are supportive of trans identity are associated with higher job satisfaction. Therefore, an emphasis should be placed on creating workplace cultures that foster an environment that allows trans employees to feel that they can be authentic to who they are both regarding the social aspect of organizations and in policy and procedures that may be gendered and trans-exclusionary. An aspect of supportive work environments addressed in this research is the use of personal pronouns. Coworkers and supervisors using preferred pronouns was positively associated with supportiveness ($r = .50$, $p < .001$), job satisfaction ($r = .28$, $p < .001$), and those effects spillover into nonwork with a positive correlation with life satisfaction ($r = .21$, $p < .01$). Furthermore, results show that nonbinary individuals are less likely to use pronouns that align with their gender identity or more likely to face misgendering,

highlighting a critical need for workplaces to provide more resources and training specifically on nonbinary identities and pronouns. Therefore, workplaces can implement inclusive practices by being attentive to providing resources and training on trans inclusive practices, like pronouns, as it is imperative to creating a supportive climate, as this study demonstrates.

Aside from implementing practices and fostering a culture that promotes inclusivity and affirms trans identity, other aspects of this study indicate that support services might also positively impact trans employee. Distancing oneself from their trans identity, labeled as covering, was negatively associated with job satisfaction and life satisfaction. So, while individuals may engage in covering to avoid the stigmatization associated with being trans, it has serious implications for long term job and life satisfaction. So, another way that employers can provide support to trans employees could be through a trans employee resource group or counseling services where individuals can talk about some of the implications of disclosing or revealing their identity in the workplace and receive peer and professional support. This can be helpful to mitigate the emotional labor put on trans employees who feel they must hide their identity or out themselves by advocating for trans identity within the workplace.

**Personal.** In nonwork environments, the ability to be authentic is important to life satisfaction, as the authenticity variables showed a positive relationship with the outcome. Passing was a significant negative predictor of life satisfaction. The negative relationship between passing and life satisfaction (and no relationship with job satisfaction) may indicate the adverse effects of trying to conform to cisgender norms. While this study did not look at specific reasons for passing, previous research on passing has associated the act with fear or simply to avoid the stigma associated with being trans (Bockting et al., 2020). Therefore, resources must be available to cisgender folks to continue to break down gender norms and stereotypes

surrounding trans folks, so perhaps they may feel less pressure to have to engage in passing or covering.

## Limitations and Future Research

The present study offers insight into how trans individuals communicate their identity in and outside the workplace and the effect on job and life satisfaction. However, there are limitations of this study. Foremost, the sample is predominately white (76.2%), and the majority had some form of higher education. Additionally, the study was limited to those employed or employed within the past two years at the time of the survey, to effectively recall a recent work environment and ensure that the work environment referred to in the study was timely. Further, most participants were employed at the time of the survey. Given the high unemployment trans folks face (HRC Foundation, 2018), it is important to recognize that the experiences of unemployed trans folks are underrepresented in this study. Therefore, future research could focus on the experiences of unemployed trans folks.

There are also limitations of the study design and measurement. First and foremost, it is essential to recognize that the metaphor of the crystallized self (Tracy & Trethewey, 2005) positions authenticity as a non-linear process and the authors even argue that we should not speak in terms of (in)authentic selves but instead consider how people enact a "'preferred' sense of self" (p. 185) that emphasizes the fluid nature of identity that is constructed and negotiated through institutional, interpersonal, and intrapersonal processes. So, it is important to acknowledge the ways in which this research purports some of the same "managerialist and entrepreneurial discourses" (Tracy & Trethewey, p. 169). Future research could investigate the way individuals enact a preferred sense of identity and also acknowledge the ways individuals

engage in behaviors that are antithetical to crystallized identity through concepts discussed by Tracy and Trethewey such as strategized self-subordination or perpetually deferred identities.

Furthermore, while the crystallized self provides a theoretical framework that centers around how individuals navigate work and nonwork identities and suggests an optimal way to balance these tensions, there are other theories that can be explored that are better suited for the quantitative nature of this research. Another theoretical route that could be explored from this perspective is the Communication Theory of Identity (CTI). The theoretical constructs of CTI align with this research as trans folks face identity gaps, or inconsistencies in how one presents themselves, as they navigate how to present themselves and communicate their identity in different environments (Hecht et al., 2005). Further, there are known measures for CTI, making the theory appropriate for quantitative research (see Jung & Hecht, 2004).

Alongside theory, there are also limitations of the survey itself. The survey was designed to capture both work and nonwork experiences. While the repeated measures have the potential to lead to similar responses and less variance between the work and nonwork measures, all of the repeated measures besides passing were statistically different from each other: explicitly out, $t(410) = 7.14$, $p < .001$, implicitly out, $t(410) = 11.55$, $p < .001$, covering $t(410) = 2.96$, $p = .003$, authentic living, $t(410) = 5.46$, $p < .001$, self-alienation, $t(410) = 3.17$, $p < .001$, accepting external influence, $t(410) = 4.76$, $p < .001$. Another limitation was with the analysis. While using stepwise regression analysis did provide insight into the variables, other methods like mediation and moderation analysis can provide more nuance into how the variables interact with one another. For example, a moderation analysis could provide more insight into how segmentation preferences and supportiveness impact the strength and direction of the relationship between identity communication variables such as explicit outness.

Regarding the measurement, one of the more significant limitations of the measurements is the passing scale. Passing is a relatively binary concept; thus it is difficult to effectively capture the experiences of nonbinary gender identities in the measures. In this study, over half of the participants identified as a gender that was not binary ($n$ = 116). Therefore, these questions may not have accurately captured their experiences and others shared their experiences were not adequately represented in these questions. Additionally, while segmentation was a significant predictor across all four models, this study did not capture why trans folks reported high segmentation preferences, but instead included a general measure of segmentation preferences. Therefore, future research can explore the nuances of segmentation preferences and trans individuals. Lastly, two of the scales had lower reliability. Covering had lower reliability for at work ($\alpha$ = .67) and outside of work ($\alpha$ = .65). Brewster et al.'s scales have not been widely used in research, so future research could further investigate the reliability of the covering scale to identify ways the scale could be adapted to increase reliability. Additionally, authentic living had lower reliability for outside of work ($\alpha$ = .68). Given that measure used was adapted for workplace experiences (Van den Bosch & Taris, 2013), it may be that it was not a strong fit for out of work experiences and so the findings should be interpreted with caution.

There are many opportunities that arose from this project for future research. First, there were several single item measures about workplace experiences and transitioning that were not included in the results. These items can be used in a future study to explore the relationship between transition status, pronoun use, and outness to coworkers and supervisors and the outcomes of job and life satisfaction. Additionally, a future project could isolate the outness measures of explicit outness, implicit outness, and covering, as the present study removed explicit outness due to multicollinearity. Future projects could also incorporate the open-ended

responses that were collected. These responses captured additional insight on trans individuals' experiences in the workplace.

## Conclusion

This study explored an essential but underrepresented area in organizational communication – the impact of identity communication on work and life satisfaction. Using the crystallized self as the foundational theoretical concept, this study explored the impact of how an individual chooses to communicate their trans identity on in and outside of the workplace and the impact that has on two important outcomes of job and life satisfaction. The results make an important novel contribution to the metaphor of the crystallized self (Tracy & Trethewey, 2005) by providing empirical data to support and extend the theory. Further, the results bolstered previous research regarding authenticity, work-life segmentation, and supportive work environments. I caution against the narrative of the crystallized individual being viewed as best for trans individuals but instead the gold standard for organizational culture. Workplaces *must* create an environment where trans individuals *can* feel safe and supported in their trans identity and be treated with dignity, where they can merge work and nonwork identities and not feel constrained by concealing their identity as a safety mechanism. However, it is imperative to recognize that all trans individuals navigate their identity differently; regardless, they should be able to navigate their identity the way they want to in any environment.

In short, workplaces (not just employees) are responsible for combatting issues of social rejection, isolation, and stigmatization. Individuals do benefit form authenticity, but sharing identity authentically is not the sole responsibility of the (trans) individual. Further, we call for additional research on creating supportive workplaces where all workers, regardless of their identity, can practice authenticity.

## References

Anderson, A.D., Irwin, J. A., Brown, A. M., & Grala, C. L. (2019). "Your picture looks the same as my picture:" An examination of passing in transgender communities. *Gender Issues, 37*(1), 44–60. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12147-019-09239-x

Anderson, M.Z., Croteau, J. M., Chung, Y. B., & DiStefano, T. M. (2001). Developing an assessment of sexual identity management for lesbian and gay workers. *Journal of Career Assessment, 9*(3), 243–260. https://doi.org/10.1177/106907270100900303

Ashforth, B.E., & Kreiner, G. E. (1999). "How can you do it?": Dirty work and the challenge of constructing a positive identity. *The Academy of Management Review, 24*(3), 413–434. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1999.2202129

Trans Student Educational Resources. (2017, December 4th). *Asterisk.* https://transstudent.org/issues/asterisk/

Baboolall, D., Greenberg, S., Obeid, M., & Zucker, J. (2021, November). *Being transgender at work*. McKinsey & Company. Retrieved April 13, 2022, from https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/diversity-and-inclusion/being-transgender-at-work.

Berg, D. N. (2002). Bringing one's self to work: A Jew reflects. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 38*(4), 397–415. https://doi.org/10.1177/002188602237789https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562919867983

Bockting, W. O., Miner, M. H., Swinburne Romine, R. E., Dolezal, C., Robinson, B. E., Simon Rosser, B.R., & Coleman, E. (2020). The transgender identity survey: A measure of internalized transphobia. LGBT Health, 7(1), 15-27. https://doi:10.1089/lgbt.2018.0265

Boe, J., Maxey, V., Bermúdez, J. M. (2018). Is the closet a closet? Decolonizing the coming out process with Latin@ adolescents and families. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy*, *30*(1), 1-19. https://doi.org/10.1080/08952833.2018.1427931

Brandhorst, J. K. (2019). Bringing communication theory into the management classroom: Rejoinder to "Critical language and discourse awareness in management education." *Journal of Management Education*, *43*(6), 673–679. https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562919867983

Brewster, M.E., Velez, B., DeBlaere, C., & Moradi, B., Tracey, T. (2012). Transgender individuals' workplace experiences: The applicability of sexual minority measures and models. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *59*(1), 60–70. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025206

Budge, S. L., Tebbe, E. N., & Howard, K. A. (2010). The work experiences of transgender individuals: Negotiating the transition and career decision-making processes. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *57*(4), 377–393. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020472

Bureau of Labor Statistics - U.S. Department of Labor. (2021). *American time use survey - May to December 2019 and 2020 results.* https://www.bls.gov/tus/

Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, G. D., & Klesh, J. (1983). Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire. In S. E. Seashore, E. E. Lawler, P. H. Mirvis, & C. Cammann (Eds.), Assessing Organizational Change: A Guide to Methods, Measures, and Practices (pp. 71-138). New York: Wiley-Interscience.

Cha, S. E., Hewlin, P. F., Roberts, L. M., Buckman, B. R., Leroy, H., Steckler, E. L., Ostermeier, K., & Cooper, D. (2019). Being your true self at work: Integrating the fragmented

research on authenticity in organizations. *Academy of Management Annals*, *13*(2), 633–671. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2016.0108

de Souza, R. (2019). *Feeding the other: Whiteness, privilege, and neoliberal stigma in food pantries*. The MIT Press.

Dias, C., Rocha, L., Tateo, L., & Marsico, G. (2021). "Passing" and its effects on Brazilian transgender people's sense of belonging to society: A theoretical study. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 31*(6), 690-702. https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2535

Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction with Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 49*, 71-75. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13

Dilmaghani. (2020). Exploring the link between sexual orientation, work-life balance satisfaction and work-life segmentation. *International Journal of Manpower, 41*(6), 693–715. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-10-2018-0313

Di Marco, D.D., Hoel, H., Arenas, A., Munduate, L. (2022). Non-heteronormative sexual orientations at work: Disclosure dynamics and the negotiation of boundaries between lesbian and gay employees and their coworkers. *Journal of Homosexuality*. https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2022.2122365

Ferguson M.W., & Dougherty, D. S. (2022). The paradox of the black professional: Whitewashing blackness through professionalism. *Management Communication Quarterly, 36*(1), 3–29. https://doi.org/10.1177/08933189211019751

Filstad, C., Traavik, L. E., & Gorli, M. (2019). Belonging at work: the experiences, representations and meanings of belonging. *The Journal of Workplace Learning, 31*(2), 116–142. https://doi.org/10.1108/JWL-06-2018-0081

Freedom For All Americans. (2022). *Legislative tracker: Anti-transgender legislation filed for the 2022 Legislative Session*. Freedom For All Americans. Retrieved from https://freedomforallamericans.org/legislative-tracker/anti-transgender-legislation/.

Hecht, M. L., Warren, J.R., Jung, E., & Krieger, J.L. (2005). The communication theory of identity: Development, theoretical perspective and future directions. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 257-278). Sage.

Huffman, A. H., Mills, M. J., Howes, S. S., & Albritton, M. D. (2021). Workplace support and affirming behaviors: Moving toward a transgender, gender diverse, and non-binary friendly workplace. *International Journal of Transgender Health, 22*(3), 225-242. https://doi.org/10.1080/26895269.2020.1861575

Human Rights Campaign Foundation. (2018). *A workplace divided: Understanding the climate for LGBTQ Workers Nationwide*. https://www.hrc.org/resources/a-workplace-divided-understanding-the-climate-for-lgbtq-workers-nationwide

Human Rights Campaign Foundation. (2021). *Fatal violence against the transgender and gender non-conforming community in 2021*. https://www.hrc.org/resources/fatal-violence-against-the-transgender-and-gender-non-conforming-community-in-2021

Human Rights Campaign Foundation. (2022). *Trans Lives & Positive Visibility*. HRC Digital Reports. https://reports.hrc.org/trans-lives-positive-visibility

Jones, S. E. (2020). Negotiating transgender identity at work: A movement to theorize a transgender standpoint epistemology. *Management Communication Quarterly, 34*(2), 251–278. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318919898170

Jung, E., & Hecht, M. L. (2004). Elaborating the communication theory of identity: Identity gaps and communication outcomes. *Communication Quarterly, 52*(3), 265-283. https://doi.org/10.1080/01463370409370197

Kreiner, G. (2006). Consequences of work-home segmentation or integration: A person-environment fit perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 27(*4), 485-507. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.386

Ladge, J. J., & Little, L. M. (2019). When expectations become reality: Work-family image management and identity adaptation. *Academy of Management Review*, *44*(1), 126–149. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2016.0438

Law, C., Martinez, L., Ruggs, E., Hebl, M., & Akers, E. (2011). Trans-parency in the workplace: How the experiences of transsexual employees can be improved. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *79*(3), 710-723.

Lindsey, A., King, E., Gilmer, D., Sabat, I., & Ahmad, A. (2020). The benefits of identity integration across life domains. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *67*(8), 1164–1172. https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2019.1607683

Martinez, L. R., Sawyer, K. B., Thoroughgood, C. N., Ruggs, E. N., & Smith, N. A. (2017). The importance of being "me": The relation between authentic identity expression and transgender employees' work-related attitudes and experiences. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 102*(2), 215–226. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000168

McDonald, J. & Kenney, S. (2021). Queer studies and organizational communication. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication* (pp. 1-21). https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.013.1289

McEwan, B., & Flood, M. (2018). Passwords for jobs: Compression of identity in reaction to perceived organizational control via social media surveillance. *New Media & Society, 20*(5), 1715-1734. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444817706073

Meisenbach, R. J. (2010). Stigma management communication: A theory and agenda for applied research on how individuals manage moments of stigmatized identity. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 38*(3), 268–292. https://doi.org/10.1080/00909882.2010.490841

Miscenko, D., & Day, D. V. (2016). Identity and identification at work. *Organizational Psychology Review*, *6*(3), 215–247. https://doi.org/10.1177/2041386615584009

Moncel, D. (2020, January 8). *The politics of passing*. Be You Network. Retrieved April 19, 2022, from https://www.beyounetwork.org/articles/the-politics-of-passing

Nuru, A. K. (2014). Between layers: Understanding the communicative negotiation of conflicting identities by individuals. *Communication Studies*, *65*(3), 281–297. https://doi.org/10.1080/10510974.2013.833527

Palan, & Schitter, C. (2018). Prolific.ac—A subject pool for online experiments. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance*, 17, 22–27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbef.2017.12.004

Parkinson, R., Flowers, P. & Semlyen, J. (2019). Exploring the workplace: an interpretative phenomenological analysis of trans men's experience. *Psychology of Sexualities Review, 10*(1). https://doi.org/10.53841/bpssex.2019.10.1.36

Piercy, C. W., & Carr, C. T. (2020). Employer reviews may say as much about the employee as they do the employer: Online disclosures, organizational attachments, and unethical behavior. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 48*(5), 577-597. https://doi.org/10.1080/00909882.2020.1812692

Pittman, M., & Sheehan, K. (2016). Amazon's Mechanical Turk a digital sweatshop? Transparency and accountability in crowdsourced online research. *Journal of Media Ethics, 31*(4), 260-262. https://doi.org/10.1080/23736992.2016.1228811

Powell, L. (2021, December 9). *We are here: At least 20 million LGBTQ+ adults in U.S.* Human Rights Campaign. Retrieved April 12, 2022, from https://www.hrc.org/press-releases/we-are-here-lgbtq-adult-population-in-united-states-reaches-at-least-20-million-according-to-human-rights-campaign-foundation-report.

Ragins, B. R., Singh, R., & Cornwell, J. M. (2007). Making the invisible visible: Fear and disclosure of sexual orientation at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(4), 1103–1118. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.1103

Ramarajan, L., & Reid, E. (2013). Shattering the myth of separate worlds: Negotiating nonwork identities at work. *Academy of Management Review*, *38*(4), 621–644. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2011.0314

Reid, E. (2015). Embracing, passing, revealing, and the ideal worker image: How people navigate expected and experienced professional identities. *Organization Science*, *26*(4), 997–1017. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2015.0975

Reis, G., Trullen, J., & Story, J. (2016). Perceived organizational culture and engagement: The mediating role of authenticity. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 31*(6), 1091–1105. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-05-2015-0178

Sears, B., Mallory, C., Flores, A., & Conron, K. (2021). *LGBT people's experiences of workplace discrimination and harassment.* Williams Institute. https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/publications/lgbt-workplace-discrimination/

Smith, R. A. (2007). Language of the lost: An explication of stigma communication. *Communication Theory, 17*, 462-485. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2007.00307.x

Spradlin, A. L. (1998). The price of "passing:" A lesbian perspective on authenticity in organizations. *Management Communication Quarterly, 11*(4), 598–605. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318998114006

Tatum, A. K. (2018). Workplace climate and satisfaction in sexual minority populations: An application of social cognitive career theory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 65*(5), 618–628. https://doi.org/10.1037/cou0000292

Tompkins, A. (2014). Asterisk. *Transgender Studies Quarterly, 1*(1-2), 26–27. https://doi.org/10.1215/23289252-2399497

Tracy, S. J. & Scott, C. (2006). Sexuality, masculinity, and taint management among firefighters and correctional officers. *Management Communication Quarterly, 20*(1), 6–38. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318906287898

Tracy, S. J., & Town, S. (2020). Real, fake, and crystallized identities, in A. D. Brown (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Identities in Organizations*. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198827115.013.3.

Tracy, S. J. & Trethewey, A. (2005). Fracturing the real-self---fake-self dichotomy: Moving toward crystallized organizational identities. *Communication Theory, 15*, 168-195. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2005.tb00331.x

National Center for Transgender Equality. *Understanding transgender people: The basics.* (2023, January 27). https://transequality.org/issues/resources/understanding-transgender-people-the-basics

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2021, June 15). *Protections against employment discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity*. Retrieved April 12, 2022, from https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/guidance/protections-against-employment-discrimination-based-sexual-orientation-or-gender.

Van den Bosch, R., & Taris, T. W. (2013). Authenticity at work: Development and validation of an individual authenticity measure at work. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 15*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-013-9413-3

Wagner, P.E., Kunkel, A., & Compton, B. L. (2016). (Trans)lating identity: Exploring discursive strategies for navigating the tensions of identity gaps. *Communication Quarterly, 64*(3), 251–272. https://doi.org/10.1080/01463373.2015.1103286

Zhang, E. (2022). "I don't just want to look female; I want to be beautiful": Theorizing passing as labor in the transition vlogs of Gigi Gorgeous and Natalie Wynn. *Feminist Media Studies*, 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1080/14680777.2022.2041687

Zhang Q. & Zhu, W. (2008). Exploring emotion in teaching: Emotional labor, burnout, and satisfaction in Chinese higher education. *Communication Education, 57*(1), 105–122. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520701586310

## Tables

**Table 1:**
*List of predictors*

| Variables | Items |
|---|---|
| Explicit Outness (Brewster et al., 2012) | 1. I dress in a way that affirms my gender identity.<br>2. I interact in ways that affirm my gender identity.<br>3. I tell people when I am going to a trans identified location.<br>4. I openly associate with people are openly trans.<br>5. I am active in trying to obtain equal access and treatment.<br>6. I display trans pride items (flags, pronoun buttons, through clothes, etc.)<br>7. I use pronouns that affirm my gender identity. |
| Implicit Outness (Brewster et al., 2012) | 1. I have made objections to trans jokes or slurs.<br>2. I have spoken out against anti-trans discrimination.<br>3. I react in positive ways when discussing television shows or movies with trans themes.<br>4. I have friends in the trans community.<br>5. I participate in the trans community (social events, places, LGBTQ+ or trans-specific affinity groups or employee resource group). |
| Covering (Brewster et al., 2012) | 1. I avoid associating myself with issues pertaining to gender identity.<br>2. I avoid trans identified locations (social events, places, LGBTQ+ or trans-specific affinity group or employee resource group).<br>3. I have regular contact with people known by others to be trans.<br>4. I avoid work-related social events like happy hours because of my trans identity. |
| Passing (Bockting et al., 2021) | 1. For me, passing is everything.<br>2. I cannot be happy unless I am perceived as a cisgender woman or man.<br>3. Being read (recognized as trans) makes me try harder to pass.<br>4. Passing is my biggest concern.<br>5. It's much better to pass as cisgender than to be recognized as trans.<br>6. Passing is a standard to measure my success. |
| Authentic Living (Van den Bosch & Taris, 2013) | 1. I am true to myself in most situations.<br>2. I always stand by what I believe in.<br>3. I behave in accordance with my values and beliefs.<br>4. I find it easier to get along with people when I'm being myself. |
| Self-alienation (Van den Bosch & Taris, 2013) | 1. I feel alienated.<br>2. I feel "cut off" from who I really am.<br>3. I feel as if I don't know myself very well.<br>4. I have to hide the way I feel inside. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Accepting external influence (Van den Bosch & Taris, 2013) | 1. I feel the need to do what others expect me to do.<br>2. I am strongly influenced by the opinions of others.<br>3. Other people influence me greatly.<br>4. I behave in a manner that people expect me to behave. |
| Segmentation (Kriener, 2016) | 1. I don't like to have to think about work while I'm at home.<br>2. I prefer to keep work life at work.<br>3. I don't like work issues creeping into my home life.<br>4. I like to be able to leave work behind when I go home. |
| Supportiveness (Brewster et al., 2012) | 1. At my current or most recent place of employment, trans employees are free to be themselves.<br>2. At my current or most recent place of employment, trans employees are treated with respect.<br>3. At my current or most recent place of employment, trans people consider it a comfortable place to work at.<br>4. At my current or most recent place of employment, trans employees feel accepted by coworkers.<br>5. At my current or most recent place of employment, trans employees feel accepted by supervisors.<br>6. At my current or most recent place of employment, my immediate work group is supportive of trans employees.<br>7. At my current or most recent place of employment, the company or institution as a whole provides a supportive environment for trans people.<br>8. At my current or most recent place of employment, the atmosphere for trans employees is improving.<br>9. At my current or most recent place of employment, trans employees are comfortable talking about their personal lives with coworkers.<br>10. At my current or most recent place of employment, trans employees must be secretive about their trans identity.<br>11. At my current or most recent place of employment, the atmosphere for trans employees is oppressive.<br>12. At my current or most recent place of employment, there is pressure for trans employees to stay closeted (to conceal their gender identity/expression).<br>13. At my current or most recent place of employment, trans identity does not seem to be an issue.<br>14. At my current or most recent place of employment, trans employees feel free to display pictures of their romantic partners.<br>15. At my current or most recent place of employment, trans employees fear job loss because of gender expression or identity. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | 16. At my current or most recent place of employment, coworkers are as likely to ask me nice, interested questions about my sexual relationships as they are to a person who is cisgender.<br>17. At my current or most recent place of employment, employees are expected to act in gender traditional ways.<br>18. At my current or most recent place of employment, non-trans employees are comfortable engaging in trans-friendly humor with trans employees.<br>19. At my current or most recent place of employment, trans employees are met with thinly veiled hostility (for example, scornful looks or icy tone of voice).<br>20. At my current or most recent place of employment, coworkers make comments that seem to indicate a lack of awareness of trans issues.<br>21. At my current or most recent place of employment, trans people are less likely to be mentored. |

**Table 2:**

*Results of Step 3 across Regressions*

| | W→J | L→J | L→L | W→L |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Step 1 – Identity Communication | | | | |
| Implicit Outness | .06 | -.12 | -.14‡ | -.04 |
| Covering | -.11 | -.22** | -.04 | .12 |
| Step 2 – Passing | | | | |
| Passing | .03 | .002 | -.17* | -.17* |
| Step 3 – Authenticity | | | | |
| Authentic Living | .12[a] | .10 | .12 | .20* |
| Self-Alienation | .50*** | .36*** | .48*** | .39*** |
| Accepting External Influence | .24*** | .28*** | .28*** | .10 |
| $\Delta r^2$ | .22*** | .14*** | .21*** | .18*** |
| F (*df*) | 19.31 (6, 198) | 9.27 (6, 198) | 12.57 (6, 199) | 10.10 (6, 199) |
| Total $r^2$ | .37 | .22 | .28 | .23 |

Note. Standardized regression coefficients reported.
[a]p = .10 ‡p < .10. *p <.05. **p <.01 ***p <.001.
Note. W→J refers to job satisfaction predicted by workplace variables, L→J refers to job satisfaction predicted by general life variables, L→L refers to life satisfaction predicted by general life variables, and W→L refers to life satisfaction predicted by workplace variables.

**Table 3:**

*Results of Step 5 across Regressions*

| | W→J | L→J | L→L | W→L |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Step 1 – Identity Communication | | | | |
| Implicit Outness | .01 | -.12 | -.14* | -.05 |
| Covering | -.47 | -.12‡ | -.04 | .05 |
| Step 2 – Passing | | | | |
| Passing | -.02 | -.05 | -.17* | -.14‡ |
| Step 3 – Authenticity | | | | |
| Authentic Living | .10 | .14* | .16* | .18** |
| Self-Alienation | .38*** | .22** | .38*** | .37*** |
| Accepting External Influence | .19** | .20** | .27*** | .11 |
| Step 4 – Covariates | | | | |
| Segmentation | -.14* | -.16** | -.17** | -.13** |
| Supportiveness | .24** | .41*** | .04 | -.08 |
| Step 5 – Demographics | | | | |
| Relationship status | .14* | .13** | .20*** | .24*** |
| Gender Identity | .01 | .05 | .002 | -.03 |
| Age | -.08 | -.06 | .06 | .03 |
| Race | .04 | .03 | -.07 | -.07 |
| $\Delta r^2$ | .02‡ | .02 | .05** | .06** |
| F (*df*) | 13.21(6, 198) | 12.10 (6, 198) | 8.77(6, 199) | 7.32 (6, 199) |
| Total $r^2$ | .45 | .43 | .35 | .31 |

Note. Standardized regression coefficients reported.
[a]p = .10 ‡p < .10. *p <.05. **p <.01 ***p <.001.
Note. W→J refers to job satisfaction predicted by workplace variables, L→J refers to job satisfaction predicted by general life variables, L→L refers to life satisfaction predicted by general life variables, and W→L refers to life satisfaction predicted by workplace variables.

**Table 4:**
*Work-specific Variables*

| | | M | SD | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Gender Identity | .44 | .50 | -- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. | Know other trans folx | 1.61 | .53 | .00 | -- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. | Personal Pronoun Use | 3.89 | 2.53 | -.31*** | .27*** | -- | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. | Out to Coworkers | 3.38 | 2.36 | .04 | -.20** | .53*** | -- | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. | Out to Supervisors | 3.17 | 2.41 | .04 | -.20* | .48*** | .89*** | -- | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. | Passing | 3.33 | 1.67 | .52*** | .09 | .05 | -.13* | -.10 | -- | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. | Explicit Outness | 4.28 | 1.33 | .12* | -.35*** | .68*** | .65*** | -.62*** | -.16* | -- | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. | Implicit Outness | 4.38 | 1.45 | -.01 | -.42*** | .39*** | .58*** | .55*** | -.18* | .69*** | -- | | | | | | | | |
| 9. | Covering | 3.08 | 1.44 | .17* | .19** | 19** | -.38*** | -.38*** | .38*** | -.39*** | -.33*** | -- | | | | | | | |
| 10. | Authentic Living | 5.17 | 1.22 | .00 | .10 | .33*** | .37** | .34*** | -.22** | .49*** | .41*** | -.46*** | -- | | | | | | |
| 11. | Self-Alienation | 3.79 | 1.63 | .10 | .18* | .50*** | .37** | .34*** | -.23** | .49*** | .26*** | -.29*** | .57*** | -- | | | | | |
| 12. | Accepting External Influence | 4.54 | 1.25 | .05 | .29*** | .15* | .14‡ | .21** | -.21** | .20** | .29*** | -.30*** | .28*** | .36*** | -- | | | | |
| 13. | Segmentation | 6.23 | .96 | -.09 | .09 | -.09 | -.03 | -.03 | -.01 | -.06 | .00 | -.02 | -.17* | -.16* | .11 | -- | | | |
| 14. | Supportiveness | 4.63 | 1.33 | .10 | -.21** | .50*** | .45*** | .47*** | -.10 | .49*** | .35*** | -.36*** | .46*** | .58*** | -.14* | -.14* | -- | | |
| 15. | Job Satisfaction | 4.30 | 1.84 | .07 | -.08 | .28*** | .18* | .15* | -.11 | .26*** | .19* | -.21*** | .41*** | .55*** | -.02 | -.24*** | .54** | -- | |
| 16. | Life Satisfaction | 3.66 | 1.59 | -.05 | -.05 | .21** | .15* | .17* | -.22** | .28*** | .09 | -.12* | .35*** | .43*** | -.09 | -.19* | .20*** | .40*** | -- |

Note. Pearson's correlations reported. [a]p = .10 ‡p < .10. *p <.05. **p <.01 ***p <.001.

**Table 5:**
*General life Variables*

| | | M | SD | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Gender Identity | .44 | .50 | -- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. | Know other trans folx | 1.61 | .53 | .00 | -- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. | Personal Pronoun Use | 3.89 | 2.53 | -.31*** | .27*** | -- | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. | Out to Coworkers | 3.38 | 2.36 | .04 | -.20** | -.50*** | -- | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. | Out to Supervisors | 3.17 | 2.41 | .04 | -.20** | -.45*** | .89*** | -- | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. | Passing | 3.33 | 1.69 | .52*** | .06 | -.14* | -.07 | -.08 | -- | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. | Explicit Outness | 5.12 | 1.04 | .16* | -.06 | -.14* | .26*** | .21** | -.40*** | -- | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. | Implicit Outness | 5.78 | .96 | -.11 | -.02 | -.10 | .28*** | .25*** | -25*** | .60*** | -- | | | | | | | | |
| 9. | Covering | 2.56 | 1.28 | .22* | .04 | .03 | -.16* | -.14‡ | .41*** | -.34*** | .40*** | -- | | | | | | | |
| 10. | Authentic Living | 5.74 | .87 | -.08 | .01 | .11 | .17* | .10 | -.22** | .42*** | .56*** | -.36*** | -- | | | | | | |
| 11. | Self-Alienation | 4.28 | 1.50 | .05 | .06 | .23*** | .15* | .17* | -.23*** | .41*** | .26*** | .-35*** | .56*** | -- | | | | | |
| 12. | Accepting External Influence | 3.92 | 1.39 | .08 | .20** | .01 | .05 | .10 | -.34*** | .14* | .04 | -.26*** | .26*** | .40*** | -- | | | | |
| 13. | Segmentation | 6.23 | .96 | -.09 | .09 | .07 | -.03 | -.03 | -.03 | .00 | .08 | .-03* | .04 | -.05* | -.01 | -- | | | |
| 14. | Supportiveness | 4.63 | 1.33 | .10 | -.21** | -.47*** | .45*** | .47*** | -.04 | .30*** | .16* | -.28** | .14* | .24*** | .04 | -.14* | -- | | |
| 15. | Job Satisfaction | 4.30 | 1.84 | .07 | -.08 | -.21** | .18* | .15* | -.06 | .28*** | .08* | .28*** | .25*** | .33*** | .09 | -.24*** | .54*** | -- | |
| 16. | Life Satisfaction | 3.66 | 1.59 | -.05 | -.05 | -.20* | .15* | .17* | -.20** | .25*** | .07 | -.22** | .31*** | .43*** | .01 | -.19* | .20*** | .40*** | -- |

Note. Pearson's correlations reported. [a]p = .10 ‡p < .10. *p <.05. **p <.01 ***p <.001.

# Appendix A

## Demographic Questions

1. Do you identify as trans?
    1. Yes
    2. No
    3. _____ (Short Answer Space)
2. What is your age? (open-ended)
3. Are you Hispanic, Latinx, or of Spanish origin?
    a. Yes
    b. No
4. Please specify your race/ethnicity (select all that apply)
    1. White/Caucasian
    2. Black or African American
    3. Native American
    4. Asian
    5. Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
    6. Other/Unknown
    7. Prefer not to say
5. What is the highest degree or level of education you have completed?
    1. Some high school
    2. High School
    3. Associate degree

4. Bachelor's Degree
5. Master's Degree
6. Ph.D. or professional degree
7. Trade School
8. Prefer not to say

6. What best describes your current employment status?
    a. Working full-time
    b. Working part-time
    c. Freelance or gig work
    d. Unemployed and looking for work
    e. Unemployed and not looking for work
    f. A homemaker or stay-at-home parent
    g. Student
    h. Retired
    i. Unable to work
    j. Other
7. Where is your primary work location?
    a. Remote
    b. Work site
    c. Hybrid
    d. Other _____ please explain.
8. What is your current occupation or most recent occupation if not currently employed?
    a. _____ (Short answer)

9. What is your annual household income?
    a. Less than $10,000
    b. $11,000 - $24,000
    c. $25,000 - $50,000
    d. $51,000 - $100,000
    e. $101,000 - $200,000
    f. More than $200,000
    g. Prefer not to say
10. What gender do you identify as?
    1. _____ (Short Answer Space)
    2. Prefer not to answer.
11. What is your sexual orientation?
    a. _____ (Short Answer Space)
    b. Prefer not to answer

The following questions relate to your experiences as a trans employee. When responding to the questions, please consider your current or most recent place of employment. Questions ask about your perceptions of trans identity, your feelings about your trans identity, and experiences regarding your identity in and outside of the workplace. While you are encouraged to complete the survey, you may skip any questions you are not comfortable answering, and you may end the survey at any time.

1. In your current or most recent workplace, how open are you about your trans identity?

| | Not open at all | | | | | | Very open |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| With coworkers | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| With supervisors | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

2. If you are open about your trans identity at work, approximately when did you come out in your current or most recent place of work?
    a. Within the past year
    b. 1-2 years ago
    c. 2-5 years ago

   d. 5-10 years ago
   e. 10 plus years ago
   f. I am not open about my trans identity in the workplace
   g. _____ other
   h. NA
2. Where do you perceive yourself to be in your journey of transitioning?
   a. Pre-transition
   b. During transition
   c. Post-transition
   d. I do not plan on transitioning
   e. Other _____ (please explain)
   f. NA
3. Do your coworkers use your personal pronouns?
   a. Yes, always
   b. Yes, almost always
   c. Yes, but there are some people who do not
   d. No, but I have allies who do
   e. No, rarely
   f. No, never
   g. Other _____ (please explain)
   h. NA
4. Do you know of people at your work that identify as trans?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Other _____ (please explain)
   d. NA

**Identity Communication**

***Outness as trans (identity communication)***

The following statements ask about your communication experiences about your trans identity in and outside of the workplace. On a scale of 1 – 7, please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements (1 = Strongly Disagree and 7 = Strongly Agree). Higher numbers indicate more agreement with each of the statements.

1. I avoid associating myself with issues pertaining to gender identity.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

2. I avoid trans identified locations (social events, places, LGBTQ+ or trans-specific affinity group or employee resource group).

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

3. I have regular contact with people known by others to be trans.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

4. I avoid work-related social events like happy hours because of my trans identity.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

5. I dress in a way that affirms my gender identity.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

6. I interact in ways that affirm my gender identity.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

7. Being trans is not important to this question, select agree to demonstrate you read this.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

8. I have made objections to trans jokes or slurs.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

9. I have spoken out against anti-trans discrimination.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

10. I react in positive ways when discussing television shows or movies with trans themes.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

11. I have told many people that I am trans.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

12. I tell people when I am going to a trans identified location.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

13. I openly associate with people known to be trans.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

14. I am active in trying to obtain equal access and treatment.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

15. I display trans pride items (flags, pronoun buttons, through clothes, etc.).

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

16. I participate in the trans community (social events, places, LGBTQ+ or trans-specific affinity group or employee resource group).

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

17. I have friends within the trans community.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

18. I use pronouns that affirm my gender identity.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

***Passing (identity communication)*** (Bockting et al., 2020)
The following questions ask about passing in and outside of the workplace. On a scale of 1 – 7, please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements (1 = Strongly Disagree and 7 = Strongly Agree). Higher numbers indicate more agreement with each of the statements.

1. For me, passing is everything.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

2. I cannot be happy unless I am perceived as a cisgender woman or man.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

3. Being read (recognized as trans) makes me try harder to pass.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

4. Passing is my biggest concern.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

5. It’s much better to pass as female or male than to be recognized as trans.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

6. Passing is a standard to measure my success.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

**Satisfaction**

***Workplace Satisfaction*** (Cammann et al., 1979)

The following questions ask about satisfaction with your current or most recent work environment. Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements relating to your current or most recent place of work. (1 = Strongly disagree and 7 = Strongly agree). Higher numbers indicate more agreement with each of the statements.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. In general, I don't like my job. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2. All in all, I am satisfied with my job. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3. In general, I like working here. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

***Life Satisfaction*** (Diener et al., 1985)

The following questions ask about satisfaction with your life outside of work. Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements relating to your current or most recent place of work (1 = Strongly disagree and 7 = Strongly agree). Higher numbers indicate more agreement with each of the statements.

1. In most ways my life is close to my ideal.

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

2. The conditions of my life are excellent.

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

3. I am satisfied with my life.

| Strongly Disagree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

4. So far, I have gotten the important things I want in life.

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

5. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

**Authenticity**

***Authenticity*** (Van den Bosch & Taris, 2013)

The following questions ask whether you are able to be your authentic self in the workplace and outside of the workplace. Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements relating to your current or most recent place of work. (1 = Strongly Disagree and 7 = Strongly Agree). Higher numbers indicate more agreement with each of the statements.

1. I am true to myself in most situations.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

2. I always stand by what I believe in.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

3. I behave in accordance with my values and beliefs.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

4. I find it easier to get on with people when I'm being myself.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

5. I feel alienated.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

6. I feel "cut off" from who I really am.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

7. I feel as if I don't know myself very well.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

8. I have to hide the way I feel inside.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

9. I feel the need to do what others expect me to do.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

10. I am strongly influenced by the opinions of others.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

11. Other people influence me greatly.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

12. I behave in a manner that people expect me to behave.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Outside of the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

**Supportiveness**

***Supportive workplace climate*** (Brewster et al., 2012, adapted from Liddle et al., 2004)

The following questions ask about the supportiveness of your work environment. Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements relating to your current or most recent place of work. (1 = Never and 7 = Always). Higher numbers indicate more agreement with each of the statements.

1. At my current or most recent place of employment, trans employees are free to be themselves.

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

2. At my current or most recent place of employment, trans employees are treated with respect.

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

3. At my current or most recent place of employment, trans people consider it a comfortable place to work at.

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

4. At my current or most recent place of employment, trans employees feel accepted by coworkers.

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

5. At my current or most recent place of employment, trans employees feel accepted by supervisors.

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

6. At my current or most recent place of employment, my immediate work group is supportive of trans employees.
7.

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

8. At my current or most recent place of employment, the company or institution as a whole provides a supportive environment for trans people.

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

9. At my current or most recent place of employment, the atmosphere for trans employees is improving.

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

10. At my current or most recent place of employment, trans employees are comfortable talking about their personal lives with coworkers.

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

11. At my current or most recent place of employment, trans employees must be secretive. (R)

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

12. At my current or most recent place of employment, the atmosphere for trans employees is oppressive. (R)

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

13. At my current or most recent place of employment, there is pressure for trans employees to stay closeted (to conceal their gender identity/expression). (R)

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

14. At my current or most recent place of employment, employee trans identity does not seem to be an issue.

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

15. At my current or most recent place of employment, trans employees feel free to display pictures of their romantic partners.

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

16. At my current or most recent place of employment, trans employees fear job loss because of gender expression or identity. (R)

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

17. At my current or most recent place of employment, coworkers are as likely to ask nice, interested questions about my sexual relationships as they are to a person who cisgender is.

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

18. At my current or most recent place of employment, employees are expected to act in gender traditional ways. (R)

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

19. At my current or most recent place of employment, non-trans employees are comfortable engaging in trans-friendly humor with trans employees.

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

20. At my current or most recent place of employment, trans employees are met with thinly veiled hostility (for example, scornful looks or icy tone of voice). (R)

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

21. At my current or most recent place of employment, coworkers make comments that seem to indicate a lack of awareness of trans issues. (R)

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

22. At my current or most recent place of employment, trans people are less likely to be mentored. (R)

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

**Segmentation**

***Segmentation Preferences*** (Kreiner, 2006)

1. I don't like to have to think about work while I'm at home.

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

2. I prefer to keep work life at work.

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

3. I don't like work issues creeping into my home life.

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

4. I like to be able to leave work behind when I go home.

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

1. Thank you for you time and your valuable response, is there anything else that you would like to share about how you interact with and your openness with your trans identity at or outside of the workplace?

   a. _____(Short Answer)