Inclusion and protection in tension: reflections on gathering sexual orientation and gender identity data in the workplace

Toorn, J.M. van der; Bracco, S.E.; Gaitho, W.; Ryan, W.S.; Horne, S.G.; Anderson, J.R.; Leskinen, E.A.

Received: 2 December 2023 | Revised: 11 July 2024 | Accepted: 13 July 2024

DOI: 10.1111/josi.12632

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

JOURNAL OF Social Issues
A Journal of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues

WILEY

Inclusion and protection in tension: Reflections on gathering sexual orientation and gender identity data in the workplace

Jojanneke van der Toorn[1,2] | **Sofia E. Bracco**[3] | **Waruguru Gaitho**[4] | **William S. Ryan**[5] | **Sharon G. Horne**[6,7] | **Joel R. Anderson**[8] | **Emily A. Leskinen**[9]

[1]Institute of Psychology, Leiden University, Leiden, Netherlands

[2]Organizational Behavior Group, Utrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands

[3]Department of Psychology, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden

[4]Centre for Gender Studies, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

[5]Department of Psychology, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada

[6]Department of Counseling and School Psychology, University of Massachusetts Boston, Boston, USA

[7]Department of Psychology, University of South Africa, Pretoria, South Africa

[8]Australian Research Centre in Sex, Health and Society, La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia

[9]Social Science and Human Services, Ramapo College of New Jersey, Mahwah, USA

Correspondence
J. van der Toorn, Leiden University and Utrecht University, Netherlands.
Email: j.m.vandertoorn@uu.nl

Sofia E. Bracco, Waruguru Gaitho, and William S. Ryan contributed equally and are listed in alphabetical order.

Funding information
The research chair of the first author at Leiden University is supported by the Workplace Pride Foundation

Abstract

This article addresses the complex issue of sexual orientation and gender identity (SOGI) data collection in workplaces, highlighting the intricate balance between fostering inclusion and mitigating potential harm and exclusion.[1] This tension manifests uniquely across diverse cultural, legal, and organizational settings. We review existing literature, offer practical guidance for decision-makers, and outline future research avenues. While SOGI data collection in workplaces can enhance diversity,

[1]While existing literature primarily addresses data collection on sexual orientation and gender identity, similar considerations likely extend to the collection of data on gender expression and sex characteristics. Therefore, when we use the acronym SOGI, it may also be interpreted as encompassing SOGIESC.

equity, and inclusion (DEI) initiatives and elevate the visibility of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex, and queer (LGBTIQ+) employees, challenges include the risk of discrimination, privacy concerns, and linguistic complexities. To address these, researchers and practitioners must consider the purpose, language, and cultural context of data collection, involving LGBTIQ+ stakeholders, and conducting reconnaissance studies. Future research opportunities lie in understanding employee willingness to share SOGI data, motivations of human resource (HR) and DEI professionals, and the impact on organizational culture. Reimagining LGBTIQ+ research to ease the tension between inclusion and protection, we conclude that responsible SOGI data collection demands a nuanced approach that prioritizes inclusion and equity while addressing privacy concerns and potential harm.

INTRODUCTION

In 2021, for the first time, the census of England and Wales included voluntary questions about citizens' sexual orientation and gender identity (Booth & Goodier, 2023). While respondents were generally willing to answer these questions—the response rate was 92.5% for sexual orientation and 94% for gender identity—the decision to include them was the subject of much debate, taken after extensive research and deliberation. Before that, Nepal and India were the first countries to allow census respondents to identify as male, female, or "third gender" in 2011 (Guyan, 2022; Park, 2016) and Kenya the first country to include intersex people (defined as "people born with physical characteristics that do not fit typical definitions of male or female") in the census in 2019 (Guyan, 2022). The inclusion of such categories has not been without controversy in each case and few countries followed suit.

Discussions on whether and how to collect data on sexual orientation and gender identity (SOGI) in governmental and organizational contexts are becoming increasingly common, at least in certain parts of the world including many European, North American, and Australasian countries. These debates highlight a tension. On the one hand, data collection can have benefits: it could grant the symbolic benefit of recognizing lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex, and queer+ (LGBTIQ+) identities and workers and provide the practical benefit of documenting discrimination and identifying inequalities and potential solutions. On the other hand, it entails risks: there is potential for data misuse, privacy infringement, inadvertent "othering"[2] and exclusion, erasure of indigenous constructions of sexual orientation and gender identity and, in many countries, the possibility of legal and social repercussions due to the criminalization and pathologizing of LGBTIQ+ people (e.g., Guyan, 2022; Horne, 2020; Müller et al., 2021). The tension between the aim of inclusion and equity and the risk of exclusion, compromised safety, and harm is far from straightforward, and manifests in different ways in different contexts.

[2] Othering refers to the action of treating someone as "other" from the ingroup, usually in a negative manner.

Because of its inherent connection to economic power and insecurity, the organizational context raises the stakes and heightens this tension. On the one hand, organizations have the potential to act on results of collected data and implement targeted interventions at a pace not typically possible in academic research or at the level of larger governmental institutions. On the other hand, the delineated context of the organization and the granularity of collected data mean that individuals, especially those of minority groups, may be more easily identifiable, bringing privacy concerns to the forefront.

In the current article, we aim to (1) examine this tension in the context of the workplace by reviewing and applying insights from the scholarly literature; (2) derive practical recommendations for researchers, organizational practitioners, and policymakers to make well-informed decisions regarding data collection; and (3) provide directions for future research on the topic.

Challenges of identifying as LGBTIQ+ in the workplace

Even in countries with high levels of social acceptance and legal protection of LGBTIQ+ people, LGBTIQ+ employees face significant work-related challenges (Cubrich, 2020; European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights [FRA], 2020; Fric, 2017; Government Equalities Office [GEO], 2018; van der Toorn & Gaitho, 2021; Velez et al., 2021). For example, LGBTIQ+ individuals have been shown to experience bias and discrimination when accessing the labor market (e.g., Fric, 2017; Hong et al., 2020) and in their jobs (FRA, 2020; GEO, 2018; Kim et al., 2022); such experiences are worse for those who are also stigmatized on the basis of other intersecting identity dimensions (e.g., LGBTIQ+ individuals of color; Cech & Rothwell, 2020). These challenges are rooted in the pervasive heteronormativity,[3] and associated heterosexism, that characterizes most societies (van der Toorn et al., 2020). In a heteronormative society, heterosexuality is presumed as the default sexual orientation, prevailing over other possible sexualities (Warner, 1991). Within the workplace, this manifests as *heteroprofessionalism*, which posits that our understanding of "professionalism" in the workplace is shaped by norms associated with masculinity, whiteness, cisgender identity, and heterosexuality (Bizzeth & Beagan, 2023; Mizzi, 2013, 2016). Simply put, professionalism is equated with presenting as heterosexual and cisgender, thereby establishing an implicit expectation for employees to adhere to cis-hetero norms to be perceived as professional. As a result, queer employees may face unjust labels of inherent unprofessionalism, thereby contributing to social misperceptions about LGBTIQ+ identities as "perverse" or wrong (Mizzi, 2016).

This workplace dynamic is evident in the differential treatment of heterosexual and LGBTIQ+ employees: although Western corporate norms permit heterosexual employees to openly wear wedding rings and display family photos without facing scrutiny, the same standards do not consistently apply to their LGBTIQ+ counterparts (Williams & Giuffre, 2011). Previous research shows that LGBTIQ+ people, particularly gay men and transgender people, typically get paid less than their cisgender heterosexual counterparts (Drydakis, 2022; Owens et al., 2022; Plug & Berkhout, 2008), do not have the same levels of professional development opportunities (Day & Schoenrade, 1997), are given less professional support (Trau & Hartel, 2007), and face discrimination on the job market at every level of the employment process (e.g., résumé content, Tilcsik, 2011; employment interviews, Nadler et al., 2014; estimations of salary worth, Kaufmann,

[3] Heteronormativity denotes the assumption that there are two distinct and opposing genders (women and men) with associated natural roles (masculine and feminine) aligned with their assigned sex (female and male). The concept also entails the assumption that heterosexuality is the expected default (van der Toorn et al., 2020; Warner, 1991).

2015; evaluations of hireability, Bryant-Lees & Kite, 2021; refused employment and/or promotion, Australian Human Rights Commission [AHRC], 2011). Consequently, LGBTIQ+ employees often find themselves in a dilemma: those who can conceal their stigmatized identity face the choice between disclosing their identity—risking discrimination but potentially gaining social support and the psychological benefits of authenticity—or concealing it—potentially avoiding discrimination but enduring psychological distress related to concealment (Pachankis, 2007). For other LGBTIQ+ individuals, attempts to conceal their identity may be futile, as they are perceived as LGBTIQ+ by others (Stenger & Roulet, 2018). As intersexuality is not often recognized in the workplace, intersex individuals may face no options other than to keep their intersexuality private even when LGBT people are provided with organizational support or resources (Frohn et al., 2020; Köllen & Rumens, 2022).

Driven by stigma management considerations, LGBTIQ+ individuals often concentrate in occupations characterized by a substantial degree of task independence and/or social perceptiveness, presumably because these aspects assist in navigating heteroprofessional norms (Tilcsik et al., 2015). The perceived incongruity between the professional sphere and non-heterosexual, non-cisgender LGBTIQ+ identities turns the workplace into a context where the collection of SOGI data may be particularly contested, presenting both unique benefits (e.g., interventions to change these norms) and challenges (e.g., potential for identification and retaliation).

Benefits and challenges of employee data collection on sexual orientation, gender identity, and sex characteristics

Scholarly attention regarding the benefits and challenges of SOGI data collection has primarily focused on data collection in relation to population counting (i.e., census), public health, public schools, socioeconomic status, and medical records (e.g., Guyan, 2021, 2022; National Academies of Sciences, Engineering & Medicine, 2022; Schönpflug et al., 2018; Snapp et al., 2016; Velte, 2020). Little has been written on the topic in the workplace context (for exceptions, see Köllen & Rumens, 2022; van der Toorn & Gaitho, 2021; van der Toorn et al., 2021).

While there are some parallel concerns and benefits for SOGI data collection in the workplace (e.g., data security, misinterpretation of data), there are also unique possibilities and concerns due to the specific social and economic power dynamics associated with employment. One key concern is unemployment. The stigmatization of LGBTIQ+ identities means that their disclosure may come with the risk of job loss or reduced job opportunities. Studies have shown that LGBTIQ+ individuals often face discrimination in hiring processes, career advancement, and workplace treatment, which can lead to higher rates of unemployment and underemployment compared to their non-LGBTIQ+ counterparts (Badgett et al., 2013). Additionally, the fear of being outed at work can create a hostile and stressful work environment, further impacting mental health and job performance (Ragins et al., 2007). The consequences of unemployment are severe, as it not only affects income but also mental well-being, life satisfaction, and overall quality of life (Cotofan et al., 2021; Gedikli et al., 2023). Thus, the collection of SOGI data in the workplace must be handled with extreme care to protect the privacy and rights of LGBTQ+ employees, ensuring that such data is used to foster inclusivity and support rather than inadvertently contributing to discrimination and job insecurity (Cotofan et al., 2021; What Works Wellbeing, 2017). While the tension between the need for organizations to collect data on their constituents–who they are and how they are doing and feeling at work—and employees' right to privacy, is not new (Culnan & Armstrong, 1999), concerns over employee rights to privacy are growing as technology

increases the amount and type of employee data collected within and outside the workplace (Bhave et al., 2020).

The workplace context is also unique in that people spend a significant amount of their waking hours at work. For instance, the American Time Use Survey by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2024) reports that employed people spend an average of 8.1 h per day working on weekdays. Globally, the average workweek varies, but in many OECD[4] countries, full-time employees work around 36 h per week, translating to about 1854 h per year (World Economic Forum, 2019). This extensive amount of time spent at work makes the workplace a key site of intervention to reduce stigma and improve outcomes for LGBTIQ+ individuals. Drawing on the extant literature on other marginalized identities, we provide an overview of possible benefits and challenges of SOGI-related data collection in the workplace.

Benefits

Research regularly recommends data collection as a necessary component in diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) programs, which are becoming more prevalent in workplaces across Europe, North America, and Australasia (see Kiradoo, 2022). This recommendation is grounded in the empirical orientation of psychological and behavioral studies and in models of organizational change (e.g., Kotter, 1996), learning (Huber, 1991), and decision-making (e.g., Csaszar & Eggers, 2013). Models for understanding and managing workplace diversity call for comprehensive data collection on group memberships as well as attitudes and perceptions of employees (Cox & Blake, 1991). Given that diversity considerations encompass a variety of dimensions, including race, ethnicity, age, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, and religion, collecting demographic data and related constructs would appear obvious (Geletkanycz, 2020).

Data collection is essential to document problems that need to be addressed, such as a lack of diversity, equity, and/or inclusion of LGBTIQ+ individuals within an organization (United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner, 2019). Indeed, Kalev et al. (2006) identified the lack of demographic and other DEI-related data as one of the barriers in establishing best practices in diversity management. Data showing the scope of the problem can help create the sense of urgency that is often required for organizational change (Kotter, 1996), especially where it concerns groups that are often overlooked due to their intersecting minoritized identities (Köllen, 2015) or limited numbers (e.g., intersex and transgender employees). For example, a US-based report on anti-transgender discrimination found that 78% of transgender respondents reported harassment at work and 47% reported discrimination in the hiring, promotion, or job retention because of their gender identity (Grant et al., 2011); the seriousness of the issue would likely not be as apparent without such reporting. Another example is a global research program led by the multinational information technology services and consulting firm Accenture, consisting of online surveys collected among 28,000 employees in 26 markets (Ziegler & Rauh, 2020). Findings demonstrated that, behind the outward signs of progress in these markets (e.g., data suggested fair representation of LGBT+ employees among management), LGBT+ employees experienced often unseen—yet profoundly felt—work-related challenges and harbored private fears while at work. These insights helped the company ask relevant questions about fostering workplace inclusion (e.g., regarding whether the company makes use of different identity-based employee networks

[4] The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) is a collaboration between the governments of 37 market-based economies in developing shared policy standards for promoting sustainable economic growth.

to enhance their overall inclusion efforts for intersectionality; Ziegler & Rauh, 2020, p.15). Such practical examples demonstrate how grasping the pervasiveness and urgency of the issue helps increase awareness and motivates action.

The collection and reporting of demographic data is also consistent with the understanding of transparency as essential to organizational justice[5] (Frazier et al., 2010; Schnackenberg & Tomlinson, 2016). In this case, transparently reporting workplace demographic information can aid in identification of inequities in recruitment, hiring, promotion, or retention (Dahanayake et al., 2018), and, accordingly, allow for the (re)distribution or creation of resources. Knowing which group-based identities are represented in the organization can furthermore be helpful in determining where to concentrate the organization's efforts to reduce inequalities and increase inclusion. For example, Accenture uses an internal dashboard producing a Pride Scorecard, a performance metric tool created to measure, monitor, benchmark, execute, and improve various priorities (including leadership and inclusive culture) identified to promote LGBTIQ+ diversity and inclusion. Dashboard data include employees' voluntarily supplied SOGI data, which to ensure privacy are aggregated and communicated at the country level and used to identify trends and tailor policies.

Collecting demographic information may also be important in determining how policy can best be improved and to track the effectiveness of such changes. For example, after requesting input from its employees and students, Leiden University decided to change the salutation used in official university announcements and communications, switching from gender-specific forms of address to more inclusive ones (i.e., first name and last name). The changed address meant a complete revision of the university's communication guidelines (Leiden University, 2023a, 2023b). By collecting information on employees' gender identity in addition to their salutation preferences, the university was able to gauge support for the change, which extended beyond nonbinary employees.

Many interventions to facilitate organizational diversity, equity, and inclusion do not reach their intended effects or even backfire (Forscher et al., 2019; Kalev et al., 2006; Moss-Racusin et al., 2014; Paluck & Green, 2009). To determine whether interventions and training improve experiences and outcomes for LGBTIQ+ employees, it is helpful to be able to discern their effects on specific subgroups of employees rather than the general workforce, which may better reflect the attitudes of majority group members.

Recent work by Klarenaar and colleagues (2022) suggests why HR departments may choose not to collect SOGI data among employees. While employee satisfaction surveys are commonly used for understanding employee experiences, the interviewed HR professionals rarely probed into employees' sexual orientation and gender identity, limiting their ability to address specific needs and disparities. The researchers identified several barriers to such data collection, including practical, sociocultural, and assumption-driven obstacles. One significant barrier is the assumption by HR professionals regarding employees' willingness to share SOGI data. Moreover, HR professionals themselves are often reluctant to include questions about SOGI, fearing that questions about employees' personal characteristics may violate their privacy. Few HR professionals, however, actually ask their employees how they would feel about such data collection.

The symbolic value of explicitly recognizing SOGI identities by assessing them in workplace surveys should not be underestimated. Previous research has shown the importance of explicitly recognizing and celebrating diverse gender and sexual identities. For example, sexual and gender

[5] The term "organizational justice," coined by Greenberg (1987), refers to the extent to which an organization treats its people fairly.

minorities have been shown to be more attracted to and less inclined to leave organizations that do so (i.e., by espousing an identity-conscious ideology in their diversity statements; Mor et al., 2024) and to be less willing to disclose their sexual orientation in organizations that omit mentioning specific demographic group identities or downplay group differences (i.e., reflecting an identity-blind ideology; Kirby et al., 2023, 2024). The act of inclusive demographic data collection may similarly serve as a visible artifact (Schein, 1996) or a means of signaling an organizational culture that values these identities—and diversity and inclusivity more generally (Connelly et al., 2011). In line with research on social identity threat[6] (e.g., Chaney et al., 2019; Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008), SOGI data collection may be experienced as a safety cue by LGBTIQ+ employees when explicitly framed (and acted on) as a means towards more diversity, equity and inclusion; it can communicate that one's identity is valid, valued, and considered within the organization. Indeed, including more complex identity options in forms (e.g., not only including "man" and "woman" as gender response options, but also "nonbinary," "agender," "gender fluid," "intersex" or an open textbox) seems to facilitate a sense of inclusion among LGBTIQ+ employees (Suen et al., 2020). Conversely, omitting identity options in the demographic section of a survey has been found to elicit negative affect and increase the importance of the omitted identity to group members' sense of self (Fath & Proudfoot, 2024).

Collecting and reporting SOGI data can also serve to increase LGBTIQ+ visibility within the organization. Given that LGBTIQ+ individuals are more likely to conceal their identity in non-supportive workplaces (Chrobot-Mason et al., 2001; Holman et al., 2022; Kirby et al., 2024; Legate et al., 2012), seeing LGBTIQ+ employees represented and making contributions to one's workplace may counteract heteroprofessionalism. This may be particularly important for employees with intersecting marginalized identities, such as disabled queer persons of color who, given their lower numbers in many work contexts, remain hidden and silenced when organizations focus on the majority member employee (Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008).

Collecting and reporting SOGI data may also support individuals in feeling safe to disclose their LGBTIQ+ identity and increase the likelihood that they will benefit from disclosing this information. While much research on disclosing sexual orientation or gender identity at work focuses on negative effects, research by Salter and Sasso (2022) identified numerous benefits to the employees. Based on a predominantly North American sample, Salter and Sasso (2022) found that disclosing one's (lesbian, gay, or bisexual) sexual orientation was associated with positive interpersonal experiences including more positive, authentic relationships with coworkers due to being out (Salter & Sasso, 2022). Several also viewed disclosing their sexual orientation as an opportunity to educate coworkers and counter stereotypes about the LGBTQ+ community. Others reported that disclosing their own identity heightened their awareness of diversity, increased their empathy toward other marginalized groups, and fueled their determination to cultivate a more inclusive environment (Salter & Sasso, 2022).

Challenges

Even when executed with good intentions, SOGI data collection has the potential to reduce inclusion and inflict harm in a number of ways. First, it may increase the potential to identify

[6] The concept of social identity threat builds on social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986): people want to maintain a positive social identity so that they can feel positive about themselves. When such identities are threatened or devalued, people experience negative emotions (Branscombe et al., 1999).

and target employees based on their sexual orientation or gender identity, which could lead to discrimination, harassment, or even violence against LGBTIQ+ persons. For example, data breaches or unintended identity disclosure may expose LGBTIQ+ individuals to discriminatory practices and harassment from colleagues or superiors who hold biased views, creating a hostile work environment (Lemberg, 2017). In addition, SOGI data can be used to deny opportunities for promotion or access to resources and workplace policies (AHRC, 2011; Bryant-Lees & Kite, 2021). Inadvertent LGBTIQ+ identity disclosure can also lead to psychological distress for affected individuals, including anxiety and stress (Ragins, 2004), which may negatively impact their well-being and productivity.

In countries where LGBTIQ+ people and/or practices are criminalized, collected SOGI data have the potential to serve as a tool for state-driven persecution and punishment (see Crehan et al., 2021). Currently, a staggering 80% of the global population reside in countries witnessing curtailments on personal freedoms (Flores et al., 2023). Further, the legal status of LGBTIQ+ people can shift rapidly depending on political contexts. The trajectory of legislation regarding same-sex sexuality in India exemplifies this volatility: decriminalized in 2009, recriminalized in 2012, and subsequently decriminalized again in 2018 (Rao, 2020). Other instances of legal oscillation include the exclusion of nonbiological same-sex parents from birth certificates in Italy following a 2023 ruling (Trzmielak, 2023), the introduction of laws mandating imprisonment for same-sex sexuality in Uganda in 2023 (Ssenyonjo, 2023), the current prohibition of gender-affirming healthcare for minors in 19 US states (Jaffe, 2023), the introduction and overturning of marriage equality legislation in Australia (Anderson et al., 2020), and the use of ambiguous language referring to "non-traditional sexual relations" in Russia and Kyrgyzstan to enforce propaganda bans aimed at suppressing LGBTIQ+ rights and organizations (Andreevskikh, 2023; ILGA Europe, 2023). Similarly, LGBTIQ+ inclusive policies that are introduced within the context of the workplace at one point in time can be abolished at another. This is especially likely in organizational contexts where DEI initiatives lack systematic integration into the structural framework and cultural ethos of the organization, making them vulnerable to shifts in the political climate. A recent example of this was seen in the United States, where Texas banned DEI offices from public colleges and universities (Iyer & Boyette, 2023).

Beyond the possible immediate harm of data misuse affecting individual LGBTIQ+ employees, SOGI data can also be misused at an aggregate level. SOGI data willingly provided by LGBTIQ+ participants may, for instance, be subject to reanalysis to bolster claims that run counter to the best interests of LGBTIQ+ inclusion goals. In some instances, this contradicts the original aims of the study for which participants consented to provide their data (for an example see Sullins, 2022, with a counter-argument presented by Strizzi & Di Nucci, 2023). As highlighted by Leskinen et al. (2024), even peer-reviewed research has been misrepresented to lend support to arguments and measures that are inherently anti-LGBTIQ+. This potential risk underscores the need for heightened vigilance and ethical considerations surrounding the use and interpretation of SOGI data, as their misuse can extend beyond individual repercussions to impact broader initiatives aimed at fostering inclusivity and understanding within the LGBTIQ+ community. With many countries moving toward more authoritarian forms of government (e.g., the countries of the Sahel in West Africa, several countries in South America), the potential for harmful use of SOGI-based workplace measures increases exponentially (for discussions on underrepresented cultures in the SOGI literature see Ahuwalia et al., 2024; Barrientos et al., 2024; Mogotsi et al., 2024).

Collecting and reporting SOGI data can also instill risk and insecurity into the workplace, particularly if the climate is perceived as hostile (Holman et al., 2022). Not all LGBTIQ+ employees are out at work, or they may not be out in all contexts (e.g., King et al., 2014). As a result,

LGBTIQ+ employees may feel psychologically unsafe and unable to respond authentically to SOGI data collection because of fear of discrimination and harm (Ross et al., 2018). This can lead to a feeling of being "othered" from colleagues and excluded within the workplace (Maji et al., 2023). In this case, collecting SOGI data may act as a threat cue rather than a safety cue. In addition to threat, employees may be concerned about sharing identity-related data lest it be used to reinforce negative stereotypes and assumptions about the suitability of LGBTIQ+ people in particular occupations or work roles (Clarke & Arnold, 2018). Also, given the complexities of SOGI-related data collection, representative samples are unlikely—meaning there is a risk that any collected data could inaccurately be taken as an indication of a group average, or that individuals who are identified may be tokenized or expected to behave as representatives for their groups (Camargo, 2023).

These concerns are not misplaced. It is estimated that between 3% and 8% of the world population identifies as gay, lesbian, bisexual, or pansexual (Statista, 2023; World Population Review, 2024). Consequently, in a workplace, the proportion of individuals identifying as LGBTIQ+ is likely small. If data processing lacks robust security measures and careful pseudonymization or anonymization where necessary, there is heightened risk of data becoming identifiable, especially concerning intersectional minoritized identities (Ohm, 2009). Additionally, despite the option for employees to decline participation in SOGI data collection, the hierarchical power structures prevalent in workplaces pose a challenge to ensuring true voluntary participation. Consequently, concerns regarding anonymity, coupled with employees' inherent dependency on the organization or supervisors for their livelihood, create obstacles to the validity of collected SOGI data (Ross et al., 2018).

Finally, while the ostensible aim of collecting SOGI data is to foster inclusivity, the inadvertent contribution to additional othering or marginalization through the selection of questions or response options should be considered (see Lyons et al., 2020). In today's context, SOGI identity labels are complex, culturally-bound, and unstandardized (Ruberg & Ruelos, 2020), thereby complicating an efficient, accurate, and inclusive assessment of SOGI diversity. In many countries, the use of SOGI terminology from different sociocultural contexts (like Europe or North-America) is not applicable and can lead to mis- or under-representation or an inaccurate rendering of SOGI-related experiences in the workplace (Horne, 2020). Moreover, it is difficult to formulate questions in a way that does not flatten queer identities and experiences that are, by definition, uncategorizable (Guyan, 2022). Many queer individuals defy neat categorization within predefined labels of sexual orientation, gender identity, or expression. Posing limited categories to choose from can be exclusionary and overly simplistic for LGBTIQ+ individuals, compelling them to select an identity that inadequately represents their experience or leaves them feeling overlooked and unsupported (Lyons et al., 2021). It may also reinforce the notion that certain identities (i.e., the ones presented as options) hold greater importance or warrant more attention than others (Guyan, 2022). This contributes to the incomplete representation of employees who identify outside of the options provided or who prefer not to disclose their sexual orientation or gender identity. Collectively, these challenges could result in measures that further marginalize these individuals, complicating efforts to advocate for their rights and needs.

Considerations for organizational practitioners and policymakers

For those researching and endeavoring to include LGBTIQ+ individuals in the workplace, it is important to consider the intersection of sexuality and the (capitalist) workplace. According to

what Rao (2020) calls "homocapitalism," there is a troubling and complex relationship between capitalism and queerness, which portrays queer inclusion as a positive force for growth and profit, aligning with neoliberal productivity ideals. In this view, LGBTIQ+ inclusion—often justified through the "business case"—downplays the violence inherent in capitalist oppression. Similarly, Burchiellaro (2021) sees inclusion as a strategic tool for organization control, designed as a capitalist ruse to keep us feeling good—which, according to Fleming (2007), serves as a distraction from more pressing goals of resource redistribution and the dismantling of class oppression. By highlighting the difference between politics of redistribution (redressing economic inequalities) and recognition (redressing marginalized identities), Fleming (2007) makes clear the distinction that marks (but also masks) the inherently proletarianized nature of work in an organization. Sexuality and gender are thus "put to work" in what Burchiellaro (2021) frames as the "reproduction of queer value" (p. 780).

These critical perspectives need careful reflection on the purpose of gathering SOGI data in the workplace, considering what it achieves, reinforces, and reveals in terms of existing tensions. To harness the potential benefits and mitigate drawbacks of SOGI data collection, organizational researchers and practitioners should scrutinize their motivations for collecting data and question how and when it will be stored and used- and to whose benefit (see also Call et al., 2022). Even when organizations choose not to collect SOGI data to protect their employees from potential harm, they can still foster inclusion by clearly communicating the intention behind this decision (see Box 1 for an illustrative example of an organization that implemented this approach).

In the subsequent section, we present and expand upon five questions that researchers should consider when planning the collection, use, and storage of SOGI data.

Why is data collected and who does it serve?

First, it is important to consider the goal(s) of the data collection and who it will serve (Stonewall, 2016). We suggest that data collection should be designed with a "what next" in mind. Understanding the purpose of data collection can help to ensure that the right questions are being asked, that the right people are being included, and that proper follow-up is possible. Is the purpose to count people? Can (and should) queer identities be counted? And what other identifying information will be linked to the SOGI data (e.g., inclusion, absenteeism, pay)? It is also important to consider who will benefit from the data: LGBTIQ+ employees, employers, or policy makers? If it is not evident that data collection will benefit LGBTIQ+ employees, it should be reconsidered. For instance, collecting data to address specific issues related to sexual orientation and gender identity in the workplace—such as discrimination, harassment, or lack of representation—may offset some of the risks inherent in collecting these data. But even these goals should be formulated as specifically as possible. A "purpose-of-study" should be built in that goes beyond vague justifications (e.g., "for diversity and inclusion"). For instance, setting a goal like "to understand how best to create health insurance plans for LGBTIQ+ families wanting to pursue reproductive goals" helps respondents see the link between the data collected and their workplace experiences. It also clarifies the researcher's and organization's stance, potentially alleviating employee concerns about the purpose of data collection. Additionally, it compels organizational practitioners to actively demonstrate their commitment to creating more inclusive and equitable workplaces.

BOX 1 Case study

The following case exemplifies the delicate balancing act organizations face in reconciling the imperative of inclusivity with the imperative of protecting their LGBTIQ+ employees.

In a breakout session on SOGI data collection during a conference hosted by Workplace Pride,[7] a fellow panelist of the first author recounted an incident involving his D & I team at a major multinational manufacturing firm headquartered in the United States. Tasked with overseeing the annual employee survey across the company's global operations, the team encountered a significant dilemma in a country where same-sex sexual behavior was criminally penalized. Faced with the daunting prospect of potentially compromising the safety of LGBTIQ+ employees by including explicit questions on sexual orientation and gender identity, they grappled with upholding their dual mandate of fostering LGBTIQ+ inclusion while not putting their employees at risk of prosecution. In response to this quandary, they devised a nuanced solution: rather than directly posing these sensitive questions in the survey for that specific country, they strategically inserted a disclaimer in the designated section, explicitly stating their deliberate omission of such questions to shield LGBTIQ+ employees from harm and their commitment to LGBTIQ+ inclusion within the organization. While this maneuver deviated from the conventional data collection methodology, it nonetheless represented a creative and principled approach towards advancing their overarching goal of LGBTIQ+ inclusion. Though the survey did not yield data on sexual orientation and gender identity from that specific locale, the team's adaptive response underscored their dedication to safeguarding the well-being of LGBTIQ+ employees worldwide.

How are identities measured and assessed?

Second, it is important to consider the inclusivity of identities being measured and assessed (Badgett et al., 2009, 2014). For example, the labels used should not center around heterosexual or cisgender identities (e.g., by using terms such as "non-heterosexual," "non-cisgender," "other"), as these may be experienced as "othering" by LGBTIQ+ employees. Binary terms to define sexuality and gender, which exclude nonbinary employees, must also be avoided (Morgenroth & Ryan, 2021). The questions' wording should furthermore avoid conflating identity, sex, and gender dimensions (such as by generically asking if someone is LGBT; Glick et al., 2018), which can generate erroneous or incomplete data and lead to LGBTIQ+ employee dropout (Lyons et al., 2020).

A related consideration is whether the descriptions and labels used are culturally grounded. In some cultural contexts, sexual orientation is considered behavior-based (e.g., having a same gender/sex partner) rather than identity-based (e.g., identifying as part of the LGBTIQ+ community), and thus should be assessed as such.

[7] Workplace Pride is a not-for-profit foundation dedicated to improving the lives of LGBTIQ+ people in workplaces worldwide supporting the research chair of the first author.

The consequences of improper SOGI data collection methods are significant. When LGBTIQ+ employees feel "othered" or misrepresented, it can lead to lower response rates, inaccurate data, and a lack of trust in organizational initiatives (Bradford et al., 2019). For example, using terms like "non-heterosexual" can alienate employees who do not identify their sexuality in opposition to heterosexuality but as a distinct identity instead (Matsuno & Budge, 2017).

Finally, those collecting data should avoid imputing data or assigning responses by proxy, which is likely to erase LGBTIQ+ identities (for a discussion on inclusive measures, see Li et al., 2024). Imputing data or making assumptions about an individual's identity based on other information can lead to misrepresentation and marginalization of the very groups the data collection aims to understand and support. For example, assuming someone's gender identity or sexual orientation based on their name, appearance or partner gender can result in inaccuracies and reinforce binary, cisnormative, and heterosexist biases (Forsch-Villaronga et al., 2021; Miller, 2018). Similarly, collapsing or reassigning self-disclosed identities (e.g., pansexual, queer) into other labels or broader categories (e.g., bisexual or LGBTIQ+) is problematic. Accurate and respectful data collection requires allowing individuals to self-identify in a manner that reflects their true identities. This approach not only improves data quality but also ensures that the diverse experiences of LGBTIQ+ employees are captured and understood.

At the same time, including more distinct categories can increase the risk of individuals being identified. If information is reported in a non-aggregated way, it may be possible to identify individuals based on their responses. Therefore, although aggregation across categories provides less opportunity for nuanced understanding of different experiences, this may be necessary both for privacy as well as for statistical power where specific LGBTIQ+ identity categories are not well-represented. This trade-off is crucial for maintaining confidentiality while still striving to capture the diversity within the LGBTIQ+ community.

Balancing these concerns is particularly challenging given that many LGBTIQ+ individuals as well as queer scholars have resisted the categorization and quantification of these identities (Drabinski, 2013), emphasizing that identities are always intersectional and multiple. As well, labels have changed over time, creating further challenges in cleanly categorizing and comparing individuals (Levitt, 2019). These issues highlight the inherent challenge to norms of demographic categorization presented by queer identities (Ruberg & Ruelos, 2020).

In what context are data collected?

Another important consideration is the context in which data are collected, including the cultural and sociopolitical environment, workplace culture, and norms regarding privacy and identity disclosure. Cultural context can have a significant impact on the advantages and disadvantages of collecting SOGI-related data in the workplace. In some cultures, there may be more openness and acceptance of diverse sexual orientations and gender identities, while in others there may be greater stigma and discrimination against LGBTIQ+ people (Van Assche et al., 2021). In cultures with greater acceptance and support for LGBTIQ+ individuals, including SOGI-specific rights and protections, collecting SOGI-related data may be viewed more positively; employees may feel more comfortable disclosing their sexual orientation and gender identity, which in turn can lead to a more open and supportive workplace environment (see Ahuwalia et al., 2024; King et al., 2008). On the other hand, in cultures with greater stigma and discrimination against LGBTIQ+ individuals, collecting SOGI data may be viewed more negatively, as it could potentially expose employees to harassment, bullying, and discrimination. In high-risk environments, even the mere

act of collecting SOGI data can expose individuals to significant harm, including persecution, violence, and legal repercussions. In these environments, data collection conveys grave risk and decisions of whether or not to collect SOGI data may be straightforward as the security and privacy of LGBTIQ+ individuals should be prioritized. Data collection in such contexts should either not occur at all or only occur if truly necessary and collected with the utmost care. Here, the conflict between the imperatives of inclusivity and protection loses importance, as the imperative of safeguarding privacy to ensure safety takes precedence.

That being said, it is critical that researchers refrain from the use of broad, general descriptions about the culture of any given context. There is a tendency to defer to nebulous categorizations of cultures, for example, "conservative" or "homophobic," instead of paying attention to the dynamic, localized expressions of dominant ideas and relationships between groups and individuals. Workplaces can vary widely within a single city, despite being arguably immersed in a similar culture (Hårsman & Quigley, 1998). That is, organizational culture and geographic culture may be at odds in unpredictable ways. For example, an employee may expect a more LGBTIQ+ inclusive environment at an international organization's offices, even if those offices are in a city with more restrictive LGBTIQ+ policies and culture, and thus experience homophobia more explicitly, whereas an employee working in the same city but at a domestic company may not perceive the same level of homophobia given different expectations. Following the example above, the insistence by international organizations' headquarters that queer-inclusive policies should be applied evenly across country offices may be met with resistance, feel like an imposition of Western ideals, and be begrudgingly applied by department heads in a mocking manner, creating a hostile environment for LGBTIQ+ employees (see Maake et al., 2023, for an example). A domestic company may value the employee in question and make space—without introducing LGBTIQ+ terminology explicitly—for what they deem is their inherent individuality, thereby creating a more accepting environment. Any research project must thus resist the urge to lump together entire regions' cultures as either accepting or homophobic/transphobic, and instead strive to deduce the various factors that impact LGBTIQ+ individuals' experiences within their specific workplace contexts.

Furthermore, cultures differ in the extent to which privacy is valued (Engström et al., 2023). In cultural contexts where privacy is highly valued, collecting SOGI-related data may be viewed as intrusive and inappropriate, even if the intentions are well-meaning. Employees may be hesitant to disclose their personal information, regardless of whether or not they identify as LGBTIQ+ or support the organization's diversity and inclusion initiatives. Employers must be aware of cultural differences in privacy norms, how this may impact data collection and reporting, and ensure that employees are fully informed about how their personal data will be collected, stored, and used.

How are data collected, processed, and stored?

It is important to consider how data is collected, processed and stored, and how the individuals providing the data will be protected in each of these stages. Participation in data collection should be voluntary at all times (Kulk et al., 2022). Furthermore, it is important to ensure that employees have autonomy over their own responses, for example by allowing them to withdraw or alter their responses over time. Especially if data are not collected anonymously but confidentially, employees should be able to determine how and for what purpose the data is used, and for how long. In addition, robust security measures should be used for data processing and

storage, and careful pseudonymization or anonymization utilized where necessary. These procedures may be quite familiar to researchers who are used to getting ethics approval for their work but may be less intuitive for others designing surveys to collect SOGI data within the workplace.

Another way to protect employees from risks associated with the collection of SOGI-related data could be the implementation of a qualitative rather than quantitative approach whereby data are collected through interviews and focus groups and participants' identities and backgrounds are not described in detail. Avoiding quantifications of people's identities can be a useful strategy when faced with employees whose intersecting identities make them easy to identify (e.g., nonbinary people of color, disabled lesbians).

Who is involved in the data collection?

Finally, it is important to consider who is collecting the data. In line with the principle of "nothing about us without us" (Charlton, 1998), practitioners should make sure that LGBTIQ+ researchers, employees, and community members are involved in the data collection process, as well as prioritize bottom-up input from employees and community networks (Klarenaar et al., 2022). The International Labour Organization (2022) suggests involving LGBTIQ+ employees, including the trade union and LGBTIQ+ employee resource group if they exist. This will help ensure that inclusive and culturally grounded labels are used, and that individuals have autonomy over their own responses. Such efforts can include collecting pilot data, consulting with local LGBTIQ+ organizations about appropriate language use, sharing with employees the planned purposes of the data collection, and involving employees and staff at multiple levels of the organization.

Reconnaissance studies provide much needed information on the context the organization(s) operates in, and allow for the identification of gaps in research, issues that have been overresearched, and potential areas of contention, urgency or controversy. Reconnaissance studies are a more common concept (and practice) in the fields of geography, geology, and public health; they are typically carried out by way of secondary analysis of existing data as well as preliminary visits and analyses of the field or context in question. With regard to LGBTIQ+ workplace inclusion, reconnaissance studies would function as an inbuilt mechanism to allow organizations/companies/researchers to explore the current landscape of a country or city (political, social, economic etc.), challenge assumptions about the utility and feasibility of undertaking such a study, as well as present an opportunity to begin building trust by creating relationships with allied stakeholders in any given context, thereby increasing the chances of success of the project.

Thus, SOGI-related data collection should be informed by context and current policy to address the purpose of data collection and how the collection will be achieved, as well as the stakeholders involved, the ultimate use of the data, and its long-term security. Recommendations include assessing: (a) level and degree of protections of SOGI people and related data in both the political landscape and the organization; (b) the benefit and purpose of data collection for community members; (c) human subjects protections to ensure the data is secure, including options for anonymous, qualitative, and/or other methods to protect confidentiality; (d) commitment from LGBTIQ+ community members who may consult on the data collection and offer safeguards or supports; and (e) data safeguards during data analysis, results dissemination, and long-term storage and use.

Avenues for future research

Beyond the practical and ethical considerations outlined above, the collection of SOGI data in workplaces offers intriguing research avenues for social scientists. One such area of exploration involves investigating employees' willingness to share SOGI-related data and understanding the psychological factors that either facilitate or hinder this openness. Recent empirical work in the Netherlands (Klarenaar et al., 2022) revealed that HR professionals estimated their employees' willingness to share SOGI-related data as low, relying on assumptions about their motivations without direct inquiry. However, as the high response rates to SOGI census questions in England and Wales suggests, people may be more willing to respond to SOGI questions than previously assumed. Research can illuminate these motivations and discern the specific conditions under which LGBTIQ+ employees are more versus less willing to share SOGI data. Attention to local laws and policies, as well as potential differences among various LGBTIQ+ subgroups, is crucial in this exploration (also see Hässler et al., 2024).

Another research avenue is investigating the motivations underlying HR professionals' willingness to collect SOGI data and the factors influencing it. Beliefs regarding the privacy needs of employees may be grounded in genuine care or paternalism, heterosexism, cisgenderism, and/or motivations to legitimize inaction. Therefore, research can explore the extent to which HR professionals' privacy beliefs influence their decisions about whether and how to collect SOGI data. Since privacy beliefs differ between cultural contexts and over time (Engström et al., 2023), future research could consider this variability and its correlates, which include (changing) legal protections, workplace climate, and societal attitudes towards SOGI-related data collection. This research can help identify the cultural and legal factors that influence privacy beliefs and SOGI-related data collection practices.

Research can also examine the impact of collecting SOGI data on organizational culture, including the attitudes and beliefs of employees. Collecting SOGI data may influence employees' perceptions of the organization and its commitment to diversity and inclusion. Conversely, it could be perceived by employees that the organization is engaged in "pinkwashing" behaviors (i.e., the extent to which an organization self-promotes as pro-LGBTIQ+ in an attempt to present as inclusion-minded and progressive, often without legitimate benefit to LGBTIQ+ employees; see Smith & Keating, 2017). More research is needed to explore instances when organizations have backtracked on their commitment to LGBTIQ+ diversity and the impact on employees. The social and political context in which the organization operates may also influence these attitudes and beliefs. Therefore, research can explore how SOGI-related data collection practices relate to organizational culture, and the potential benefits and drawbacks of such practices.

Another potential area of research is how SOGI data collection relates to the collection of other identity category data in the workplace, and the impact of these convergences. Drawing from foundational work by Black feminists on intersectionality (Collins, 1990; Crenshaw, 1991), research into how class, race, religion, gender, size, and ability intersect with SOGI in the workplace holds the potential to illuminate the complex, multi-layered realities of multiply-marginalized queer and trans employees in the workplace. It is possible that employees with multiple marginalized identities may be less comfortable sharing identity data because their specific constellation of identities may make them more identifiable and less likely that their data would remain anonymous. On the other hand, designing studies and data collection models that capture not just SOGI identity, but other marginalized identities as they co-constitute each other could potentially be useful in understanding these minority populations' experiences in the workplace. By recognizing how

experiences are shaped not just by queerness but also by other axes of identity, specific interventions to create safer, more inclusive and equitable workplaces can be designed and implemented, instead of relying on generalized assumptions (typically based on White queer male employees) about what LGBTIQ+ workplace inclusion ought to entail. Moreover, a standard approach to SOGI data collection (focused solely on experiences based only on identity categories of sexual and/or gender identity) would miss the nuances rendered by multiple marginalization in this context.

In summary, the study of SOGI data collection can provide valuable insights into a range of research questions related to LGBTIQ+ well-being, privacy beliefs, willingness to share personal information, and the impact of data collection on organizational culture. By exploring these areas, social scientists can help organizations make informed decisions about SOGI data collection practices that balance practical, ethical, and cultural considerations.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, this article underscores the intricate balance between fostering inclusion and mitigating potential harm in the collection of SOGI data in workplaces. While SOGI data collection can enhance DEI initiatives and elevate the visibility of LGBTIQ+ employees, it also entails risks such as privacy infringement and the potential for data misuse. The trade-off between nuanced understanding and maintaining confidentiality is a significant challenge, as is navigating the cultural and sociopolitical contexts that impact data collection practices. Future research must explore employees' willingness to share SOGI data, the motivations of HR professionals, and the impact on organizational culture. Ultimately, responsible SOGI data collection demands a nuanced approach that prioritizes inclusion and equity while addressing privacy concerns and potential harm, ensuring that the benefits of such data collection are realized without compromising the safety and dignity of LGBTIQ+ individuals.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the editors and reviewers for their helpful feedback. The research chair of the first author at Leiden University is supported by the Workplace Pride Foundation.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

POSITIONALITY STATEMENT

The authors of this article bring diverse perspectives shaped by their distinct training and theoretical frameworks, spanning social and organizational psychology, demography, gender studies, law and public health. Furthermore, they come from a variety of social locations. That is, they vary in terms of their academic career stage (encompassing two PhD students, one teaching-stream assistant professor, one associate professor, one senior research fellow and two full professors), represent multiple genders (cisgender, nonbinary, genderqueer, gender-diverse) and sexualities (gay, lesbian, queer, straight), and possess different ability statuses (able-bodied, neurodivergent, chronic health condition) and class experiences (first generation college student, working class upbringing, middle class). While the majority of authors identify as White, one author identifies as Black African. Collectively, they represent four continents and six countries.

ORCID

Jojanneke van der Toorn https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0476-772X
Sofia E. Bracco https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7138-1555
Waruguru Gaitho https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6225-491X
William S. Ryan https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0158-3810
Sharon G. Horne https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8197-7467
Joel R. Anderson https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3649-2003
Emily A. Leskinen https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3445-9886

REFERENCES

Ahuwalia, D. C., Singh, P., Jami, H., Ummak, E., & Osin, E. (2024). From oppressive to affirmative: Situating the health and well-being of LGBTIQ+ people as impacted by systemic and structural transitions in Russia, Turkey, Pakistan and India. *Journal of Social Issues*.

Anderson, J. R., Campbell, M., & Koc, Y. (2020). A qualitative exploration of the impact of the marriage equality debate on same-sex attracted Australians and their allies. *Australian Psychologist*, *55*(6), 700–714. https://doi.org/10.1111/ap.12473

Andreevskikh, O. (2023). *Media and masculinities in contemporary Russia: Constructing non-heteronormativity*. Taylor & Francis. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003353140

Australian Human Rights Commission. (2011). *Addressing sexual orientation and sex and/or gender identity discrimination*. https://humanrights.gov.au/sites/default/files/document/publication/SGI_2011.pdf

Badgett, M. V. L., Baker, K. E., Conron, K. J., Gates, G. J., Gill, A., Greytak, E., & Herman, J. L. (2014). *Best practices for asking questions to identify transgender and other gender minority respondents on population-based surveys*. Williams Institute. https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/publications/geniuss-trans-pop-based-survey/

Badgett, M. V. L., Durson, L. E., & Schneebaum, A. (2013). *New patterns of poverty in the lesbian, gay, and bisexual community*. Williams Institute. https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/publications/lgb-patterns-of-poverty/

Badgett, M. V. L., Goldberg, N., Conron, K. J., & Gates, G. J. (2009). *Best practices for asking questions about sexual orientation on surveys (SMART)*. Williams Institute. https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/publications/smart-so-survey/

Barrientos, J., Nardi, H. C., Mendoza-Pérez, J. C., Navarro, M. C., Bahamondes, J., Pecheny, M., & Radi, B. (2024). Trends in psychosocial research on LGBTIQ+ populations in Latin and Central America: Findings, challenges, and concerns. Journal of Social Issues.

Bhave, D. P., Teo, L. H., & Dalal, R. S. (2020). Privacy at work: A review and a research agenda for a contested terrain. *Journal of Management*, *46*(1), 127–164. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206319878254

Bizzeth, S. R., & Beagan, B. L. (2023). "Ah, it's best not to mention that here": Experiences of LGBTQ+ health professionals in (heteronormative) workplaces in Canada. *Frontiers in Sociology*, *8*, Article e1138628. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2023.1138628

Booth, R., & Goodier, M. (2023, January 6). *England and Wales census counts trans and non-binary people for first time*. The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2023/jan/06/england-and-wales-census-counts-trans-and-non-binary-people-for-first-time

Bradford, J., Reisner, S. L., Honnold, J. A., & Xavier, J. (2019). Experiences of transgender-related discrimination and implications for health: Results from the Virginia Transgender Health Initiative Study. *American Journal of Public Health*, *103*(10), 1820–1829. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2012.300796

Branscombe, N. R., Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (1999). The context and content of social identity threat. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears, & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Social Identity: Context, Commitment, Content* (pp. 35–58). Blackwell Science.

Bryant-Lees, K. B., & Kite, M. E. (2021). Evaluations of LGBT job applicants: Consequences of applying "out". *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, *40*(7), 874–891. https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-01-2019-0048

Burchiellaro, O. (2021). Queering control and inclusion in the contemporary organization: On 'LGBT-friendly control' and the reproduction of (queer) value. *Organization Studies*, *42*(5), 761–785. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840620944557

Call, C. C., Eckstrand, K. L., Kasparek, S. W., Boness, C. L., Blatt, L., Jamal-Orozco, N., Novacek, D. M., Foti, D., & Scholars for Elevating Equity and Diversity (SEED). (2022). An ethics and social-justice approach to collecting and using demographic data for psychological researchers. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *18*(5), 979–995. https://doi.org/10.1177/17456916221137350

Camargo, A. (2023). Developing strategies to improve the sense of belonging and mitigate tokenism. *Clinical Imaging*, *103*, Article e109987. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinimag.2023.109987

Cech, E. A., & Rothwell, W. R. (2020). LGBT workplace inequality in the federal workforce: Intersectional processes, organizational contexts, and turnover considerations. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, *3*(1), 25–60. https://doi.org/10.1177/0019793919843508

Chaney, K. E., Sanchez, D. T., & Maimon, M. R. (2019). Stigmatized identity cues in consumer spaces. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *29*(1), 130–141. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpy.1075

Charlton, J. I. (1998). *Nothing about us without us: Disability, oppression, and empowerment*. University of California Press.

Chrobot-Mason, D., Button, S. B., & DiClementi, J. D. (2001). Sexual identity management strategies: An exploration of antecedents and consequences. *Sex Roles*, *45*(5-6), 321–336. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014357514405

Clarke, H. M., & Arnold, K. A. (2018). The influence of sexual orientation on the perceived fit of male applicants for both male- and female-typed jobs. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *9*, Article e00656. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00656

Collins, P. H. (1990). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. Routledge.

Connelly, B. L., Certo, S. T., Ireland, R. D., & Reutzel, C. R. (2011). Signaling theory: A review and assessment. *Journal of Management*, *37*(1), 39–67. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310388419

Cotofan, M., De Neve, J.-E., Golin, M., Kaats, M., & Ward, G. (2021). Work and well-being during COVID-19: Impact, inequalities, resilience, and the future of work. In J. F. Helliwell, R. Layard, J. Sachs, & J.-E. De Neve (Eds.), *World happiness report* (pp. 153–190). Sustainable Development Solutions Network. https://worldhappiness.report/ed/2021/work-and-well-being-during-covid-19-impact-inequalities-resilience-and-the-future-of-work/

Cox, T. H., & Blake, S. (1991). Managing cultural diversity: Implications for organizational competitiveness. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *5*(3), 45–56. https://doi.org/10.5465/AME.1991.4274465

Crehan, P., Daly, F., Fletcher, L., & Pichler, S. (2021). A global examination of LGBT workplace equality indices. In E. S. Ng, C. L. Stamper, A., Klarsfeld, & Y. J. Han, (Eds.), *Handbook on diversity and inclusion indices* (pp. 230–251). Edward Elgar. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781788975728.00023

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, *43*(6), 1241–1299. https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039

Csaszar, F. A., & Eggers, J. P. (2013). Organizational decision making: An information aggregation view. *Management Science*, *59*(10), 2257–2277. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1120.1698

Cubrich, M. (2020). Understanding the work experiences of gender and sexual minorities: Advances, issues, and new directions in research. *Psychology from the Margins*, *2*, Article 3. https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1006&context=psychologyfromthemargins

Culnan, M. J., & Armstrong, P. K. (1999). Information privacy concerns, procedural fairness, and impersonal trust: An empirical investigation. *Organization science*, *10*(1), 104–115. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.10.1.104

Dahanayake, P., Rajendran, D., Selvarajah, C., & Ballantyne, G. (2018). Justice and fairness in the workplace: A trajectory for managing diversity. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, *37*(5), 470–490. https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-11-2016-0105

Day, N. E., & Schoenrade, P. (1997). Staying in the closet versus coming out: Relationships between communication about sexual orientation and work attitudes. *Personnel Psychology*, *50*(1), 147–163. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1997.tb00904.x

Drabinski, E. (2013). Queering the catalog: Queer theory and the politics of correction. *The Library Quarterly*, *83*(2), 94–111. https://doi.org/10.1086/669547

Drydakis, N. (2022). Sexual orientation and earnings: A meta-analysis 2012–2020. *Journal of Popular Economics*, *35*, 409–440. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00148-021-00862-1

Engström, E., Eriksson, K., Björnstjerna, M., & Strimling, P. (2023). Global variations in online privacy concerns across 57 countries. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, *9*, Article e100268. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2023.100268

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA). (2020). *A long way to go for LGBTI equality*. Luxembourg, Publications Office. https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2020/eu-lgbti-survey-results

Fath, S., & Proudfoot, D. (2024). Devaluation by omission: Limited identity options elicit anger and increase identification. *Psychological Science*, *35*(3), 239–249. https://doi.org/10.1177/09567976231223416

Fleming, P. (2007). Sexuality, power and resistance in the workplace. *Organization Studies*, *28*(2), 239–256. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840606068307

Flores, A. R., Carreño, M. F., & Shaw, A. (2023). *Democratic backsliding and LGBTI acceptance*. Williams Institute. https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/GAI-Democracy-Sep-2023.pdf

Forscher, P. S., Lai, C. K., Axt, J. R., Ebersole, C. R., Herman, M., Devine, P. G., & Nosek, B. A. (2019). A meta-analysis of procedures to change implicit measures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *117*(3), 522–559. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000160

Fosch-Villaronga, E., Poulsen, A., Søraa, R. A., & Custers, B. H. M. (2021). A little bird told me your gender: Gender inferences in social media. *Information Processing & Management*, *58*(3), 102541. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipm.2021.102541

Frazier, M. L., Johnson, P. D., Gavin, M., Gooty, J., & Snow, D. B. (2010). Organizational justice, trustworthiness, and trust: A multifoci examination. *Group & Organization Management*, *35*(1), 39–76. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601109354801

Fric, K. (2017). Access to the labour market for gays and lesbians: Research review. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*, *29*(4), 319–361. https://doi.org/10.1080/10538720.2017.1365671

Frohn, D., Wiens, M., Buhl, S., Peitzmann, N., & Heiligers, N. (2020). *Inter* im office?! Die arbeitssituation von inter* personen in Deutschland unter differenzieller perspektive zu (Endo*) LSBT*Q. [Inter* in the office?! The work situation of inter* individuals in Germany from a differential perspective to (endo*) LGBTQ]*. Institut für Diversity- & Antidiskriminierungs-forschung (Hrsg.). https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.10446.74569

Gedikli, C., Miraglia, M., Connolly, S., Bryan, M., & Watson, D. (2023). The relationship between unemployment and wellbeing: An updated meta-analysis of longitudinal evidence. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *32*(1), 128–144. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2022.2106855

Geletkanycz, M. A. (2020). Social movement spillover: Barriers to board gender diversity posed by contemporary governance reform. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *31*(6), 1014–1038. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2020.101438

Glick, J. L., Theall, K., Andrinopoulos, K., & Kendall, C. (2018). For data's sake: Dilemmas in the measurement of gender minorities. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, *20*(12), 1362–1377. https://doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2018.1437220

Government Equalities Office. (2018). *National LGBT survey: Summary report*. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/722314/GEO-LGBT-Survey-Report.pdf

Grant, J. M., Mottet, L. A., Tanis, J., Harrison, J., Herman, J. L., & Keisling, M. (2011). *Injustice at every turn: A report of the national transgender discrimination survey*. National Center for Transgender Equality and National Gay and Lesbian Task Force. https://transequality.org/sites/default/files/docs/resources/NTDS_Report.pdf

Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *The Academy of Management Review*, *12*(1), 9–22. https://doi.org/10.2307/257990

Guyan, K. (2021). Constructing a queer population? Asking about sexual orientation in Scotland's 2022 census. *Journal of Gender Studies*, *31*(6), 782–792. https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2020.1866513

Guyan, K. (2022). *Queer data: Using gender, sex and sexuality data for action*. Bloomsbury Academic.

Hårsman, B., & Quigley, J. M. (1998). Worker and workplace heterogeneity and residential location: A historical perspective on Stockholm. In L. Lundqvist, L.-G. Mattson, & T. J. Kim (Eds.), *Network Infrastructure and the Urban Environment* (pp. 157–176). Springer.

Hässler, T., Fogwell, N., Gonzalez, A., Anderson, J., & Atwood, S. (2024). Reimagining LGBTIQ+ research—Acknowledging differences across subpopulations, methods, and countries. *Journal of Social Issues*.

Holman, E. G., Ogolsky, B. G., & Oswald, R. F. (2022). Concealment of a sexual minority identity in the workplace: The role of workplace climate and identity centrality. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *69*(9), 1467–1484. https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2021.1917219

Hong, S., Kang, M., Kim, S., Park, H., Lee, S., Lee, H., Lee, H., Jeon, S., Kim, R., Moon, Y., Eom, Y., & Joo, S. (2020). *트랜스젠더 혐오차별 실태조사. [Survey on Status of Transphobia and Discrimination toward Transgenders in South Korea]*. National Human Rights of Commission of Korea (NHRC). https://www.humanrights.go.kr/base/board/read?boardManagementNo=24&boardNo=7606311&menuLevel=3&menuNo=91

Horne, S. G. (2020). The challenges and promises of transnational LGBTQ psychology: Somewhere over and under the rainbow. *American Psychologist*, *75*(9), 1358–1371. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000791

Huber, G. P. (1991). Organizational learning: The contributing processes and the literatures. *Organization Science*, *2*(1), 88–115. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2.1.88

ILGA Europe. (2023, August 23). *Statement: Kyrgzstan targets LGBTQ communities in a new law*. https://www.ilga-europe.org/news/statement-kyrgyzstan-targets-lgbti-law/

International Labour Organization. (2022). *Inclusion of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex and queer (LGBTIQ+) persons in the world of work: A learning guide*. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/—dgreports/—gender/documents/publication/wcms_846108.pdf

Iyer, K., & Boyette, C. (2023, June 15). *Texas governor signs bill to ban DEI offices at state public colleges*. CNN. https://edition.cnn.com/2023/06/15/politics/greg-abbott-texas-dei-office-ban-colleges/index.html

Jaffe, S. (2023). More US states ban teenagers' gender-affirming care. *The Lancet*, *402*(10405), 839–840. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(23)01886-X

Kalev, A., Dobbin, F., & Kelly, E. (2006). Best practices or best guesses? Assessing the efficacy of corporate affirmative action and diversity policies. *American Sociological Review*, *71*(4), 589–617. https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240607100404

Kaufmann, L. M. (2015). Disparity between implicit work-relevant associations and real-world cognitions. *Sensoria: A Journal of Mind Brain and Culture*, *11*(1), 58–69. https://doi.org/10.7790/sa.v11i1.412

Kim, J., Yoon, H., & Shin, Y. (2022). A scoping review on the vocational experience of sexual and gender minority people: Focused on foreign literature since 2017. *The Journal of Career Education Research*, *35*(3), 29–65. https://doi.org/10.32341/JCER.2022.9.35.3.29

King, E. B., Mohr, J. J., Peddie, C. I., Jones, K. P., & Kendra, M. (2014). Predictors of identity management an exploratory experience sampling study of lesbian, gay, and bisexual workers. *Journal of Management*, *43*(2), 476–502. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314539350

King, E. B., Reilly, C., & Hebl, M. (2008). The best of times, the worst of times: Exploring dual perspectives of "coming out" in the workplace. *Group & Organization Management*, *33*(5), 566–601. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601108321834

Kiradoo, G. (2022). Diversity, equity, and inclusion in the workplace: Strategies for achieving and sustaining a diverse workforce. *Advance Research in Social Science and Management*, *1*, 139–151. https://ssrn.com/abstract=4392136

Kirby, T. A., Barreto, M., Korine, R., Hendy, J., Osman, L., Stadie, S., & Tan, D. (2024). To conceal or reveal: Identity-conscious diversity ideologies facilitate sexual minority identity disclosure. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *54*(1), 199–218. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2996

Kirby, T. A., Russell Pascual, N., & Hildebrand, L. K. (2023). The dilution of diversity: Ironic effects of broadening diversity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *0*(0). https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672231184925

Klarenaar, M., Van Ooien, A.-L., van der Toorn, J., Boes, M., Lakens, D., Stelling, L., Simons, M., Funk, M., van Goch, M., Veldhuizen, M., & Tetteroo, D. (2022). *Towards a representation of unheard and unseen individuals in the hospital, workplace, and neighborhood*. Centre for Unusual Collaborations. https://unusualcollaborations.ewuu.nl/uco-projects/the-power-of-one/

Köllen, T. (2015). The impact of demographic factors on the way lesbian and gay employees manage their sexual orientation at work: An intersectional perspective. *Management Research Review*, *38*(9), 992–1015. https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-05-2014-0099

Köllen, T., & Rumens, N. (2022). Challenging cisnormativity, gender binarism and sex binarism in management research: Foregrounding the workplace experiences of trans* and intersex people. *Gender in Management*, *37*(6), 701–715. https://doi.org/10.1108/GM-01-2022-0022

Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Harvard Business School Press.

Kulk, S., Van der Velde, M., Van der Toorn, J., & Veldhuizen, M. (2022). *P.INC privacy and D&I policy guide*. Utrecht University. https://www.uu.nl/sites/default/files/UYA%20-%20Kulk%2C%20van%20der%20Velde%2C%20van%20der%20Toorn%2C%20%26%20Veldhuizen%2C%202022_EN-comp.pdf

Legate, N., Ryan, R. M., & Weinstein, N. (2012). Is coming out always a "good thing"? Exploring the relations of autonomy support, outness, and wellness for lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *3*(2), 145–152. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550611411929

Leiden University. (2023a, June 6). *Gender-inclusive communication: check the new tips and guidelines*. https://www.staff.universiteitleiden.nl/announcements/2023/06/gender-inclusive-communication-check-the-new-tips-and-guidelines?cf=social-and-behavioural-sciences&cd=psychology

Leiden University. (2023b, June 6). *Help desks switch to inclusive salutation: 'Times change, and we change with them.'* https://www.staff.universiteitleiden.nl/news/2023/06/help-desks-switch-to-inclusive-salutation-times-change-and-we-change-with-them?cf=social-and-behavioural-sciences&cd=psychology

Lemberg, A. (2017). Hackers made me lose my job!: Health data privacy and its potentially devastating effect on the LGBTQ population. *Golden Gate University Law Review*, *47*, 175–203. http://digitalcommons.law.ggu.edu/ggulrev/vol47/iss2/10

Leskinen, E. A., Horne, S. G., Ryan, W. S., & van der Toorn, J. (2024). The opportunities and limits of open science for LGBTIQ+ research. *Journal of Social Issues*..

Levitt, H. M. (2019). Applications of a functionalist theory of gender: A response to reflections and a research agenda. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *43*(3), 309–316. https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684319851467

Li, K. C., van Berlekom, E., Atwood, S., & Wang, Y.-C. (2024). Towards inclusive and equitable LGBTIQ+ measurement: Assessing gender and sexual orientation measures and scale validity in national surveys across 21 Countries. *Journal of Social Issues*..

Lyons, A., Anderson, J., Rasmussen, M. L., & Gray, E. (2020). Toward making sexual and gender diverse populations count in Australia. *Australian Population Studies*, *4*(2), 14–29. https://doi.org/10.37970/aps.v4i2.69

Lyons, A., Rasmussen, M. L., Anderson, J., & Gray, E. (2021). Counting gender and sexual identity in the Australian census. *Australian Population Studies*, *5*(1), 40–48. https://doi.org/10.37970/aps.v5i1.80

Maake, T. B., Rugunanan, P., & Smuts, L. (2023). Negotiating and managing gay identities in multiple heteronormative spaces: The experiences of Black gay mineworkers in South Africa. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *70*(6), 1138–1161. https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2021.2015954

Maji, S., Singh, T., Hooda, M., & Sarika, K. (2023). "As if I use a filter, and it has become a part of me": Discriminatory workplace experiences of lesbian and gay employees of India. *The Qualitative Report*, *28*(6), 1741–1758. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2023.5928

Matsuno, E., & Budge, S. L. (2017). Non-binary/genderqueer identities: A critical review of the literature. *Current Sexual Health Reports*, *9*(3), 116–120. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11930-017-0111-8

Miller, A. E. (2018). Searching for gaydar: Blind spots in the study of sexual orientation perception. *Psychology & Sexuality*, *9*(3), 188–203. https://doi.org/10.1080/19419899.2018.1468353

Mizzi, R. C. (2013). "There aren't any gays here": Encountering heteroprofessionalism in an international development workplace. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *60*(11), 1602–1624. https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2013.824341

Mizzi, R. C. (2016). Heteroprofessionalism. In N. M. Rodriguez, W. J. Martino, J. C. Ingrey, & E. Brockenbrough (Eds.), *Critical concepts in queer studies and education: An international guide for the twenty-first century* (pp. 137–147). Palgrave Macmillan US. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-55425-3_15

Mogotsi, I., Otubea Otchere, Y., Botchway, I., & Muthoni, Y., Gariseb, R., & Ramalepe, L. M. (2024). Psychosocial correlates of LGBTQ+ experiences in selected African countries: Reimagining LGBTIQ+ research. *Journal of Social Issues*..

Mor, K., Gündemir, S., & Van der Toorn, J. (2024). Celebrating the "invisible": The role of organizational diversity approaches on attracting and retaining LGBTQ+ talent. *Journal of Business and Psychology*..

Morgenroth, T., & Ryan, M. K. (2021). The effects of gender trouble: An integrative theoretical framework of the perpetuation and disruption of the gender/sex binary. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *16*(6), 1113–1142. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620902442

Moss-Racusin, C. A., van der Toorn, J., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. F., Graham, M. J., & Handelsman, J. (2014). Scientific diversity interventions. *Science*, *343*(6147), 615–616. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1245936

Müller, A., Daskilewicz, K., Kabwe, M. L., Mmolai-Chalmers, A., Morroni, C., Muparamoto, N., Muula, A. S., Odira, V., & Zimba, M., & the Southern and Eastern African Research Collective for Health (SEARCH). (2021). Experience of and factors associated with violence against sexual and gender minorities in nine African countries: A cross-sectional study. *BMC Public Health [Electronic Resource]*, *21*(1), 357. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-10314-w

Nadler, J. T., Lowery, M. R., Grebinoski, J., & Jones, R. G. (2014). Aversive discrimination in employment interviews: Reducing effects of sexual orientation bias with accountability. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, *1*(4), 480–488. https://doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000079

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2022). *Measuring sex, gender identity, and sexual orientation*. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/26424

Ohm, P. (2009). Broken promises of privacy: Responding to the surprising failure of anonymization. *UCLA Law Review*, *57*, 1701–1765. https://ssrn.com/abstract=1450006

Owens, B., Mills, S., Lewis, N., & Guta, A. (2022). Work-related stressors and mental health among LGBTQ workers: Results from a cross-sectional survey. *PLoS ONE*, *17*(10), Article e0275771. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0275771

Pachankis, J. E. (2007). The psychological implications of concealing a stigma: A cognitive-affective-behavioral model. *Psychological Bulletin*, *133*(2), 328–345. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.133.2.328

Paluck, E. L., & Green, D. P. (2009). Prejudice reduction: What works? A critical look at evidence from the field and the laboratory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *60*, 339–367. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163607

Park, A. (2016). *Reachable: Data collection methods for sexual orientation and gender identity*. Williams Institute. https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/SOGI-Data-Collection-Mar-2016.pdf

Plug, E., & Berkhout, P. (2008). *Sexual orientation, disclosure and earnings*. IZA Discussion Paper No. 3290. https://hdl.handle.net/10419/34955

Purdie-Vaughns, V., & Eibach, R. P. (2008). Intersectional invisibility: The distinctive advantages and disadvantages of multiple subordinate-group identities. *Sex Roles*, *59*(5-6), 377–391. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9424-4

Purdie-Vaughns, V., Steele, C. M., Davies, P. G., Ditlmann, R., & Crosby, J. R. (2008). Social identity contingencies: How diversity cues signal threat or safety for African Americans in mainstream institutions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *94*(4), 615–630. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.94.4.615

Ragins, B. R. (2004). Disclosure disconnects: Antecedents and consequences of disclosing invisible stigmas across life domains. *Academy of Management Review*, *33*, 194–215. https://doi.org/10.2307/20159383

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

Rao, R. (2020). Queer in the time of homocapitalism. In R. Rao (Ed.), *Out of time: The queer politics of postcoloniality* (pp. 136–173). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190865511.003.0005

Ross, M. W., Iguchi, M. Y., & Panicker, S. (2018). Ethical aspects of data sharing and research participant protections. *American Psychologist*, *73*(2), 138–145. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000240

Ruberg, B., & Ruelos, S. (2020). Data for queer lives: How LGBTQ gender and sexuality identities challenge norms of demographics. *Big Data & Society*, *7*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951720933286

Salter, N. P., & Sasso, T. (2022). The positive experiences associated with coming out at work. *Equality, Diversity, & Inclusion*, *41*(2), 224–240. https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-11-2020-0322

Schein, E. H. (1996). Culture: The missing concept in organization studies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *41*(2), 229–240. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2393715

Schnackenberg, A. K., & Tomlinson, E. C. (2016). Organizational transparency: A new perspective on managing trust in organization-stakeholder relationships. *Journal of Management*, *42*(7), 1784–1810. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314525202

Schönpflug, K., Klapeer, C. M., Hofmann, R., & Müllbacher, S. (2018). If queers were counted: An inquiry into European Socioeconomic Data on LGB(TI)QS. *Feminist Economics*, *24*(4), 1–30. https://doi.org/10.1080/13545701.2018.1508877

Smith, M., & Keating, C. (2017). Homonationalism and the comparative politics of LGBTQ rights. In M. Brettschneider, S. Burgess, & C. Keating (Eds.), *LGBTQ politics: A critical reader* (pp. 458–476). New York University Press. https://doi.org/10.18574/nyu/9781479849468.003.0032

Snapp, S. D., Russell, S. T., Arredondo, M., & Skiba, R. (2016). A right to disclose: LGBTQ youth representation in data, science, and policy. *Advances in Child Development and Behavior*, *50*, 135–159. https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.acdb.2015.11.005

Ssenyonjo, M. (2023). Sexual orientation and the criminalisation of private consensual sexual acts between adults of the same gender. *International Human Rights Law Review*, *12*(2), 143–212. https://brill.com/view/journals/hrlr/12/2/article-p143_001.xml

Statista. (2023). *LGBT+ identification worldwide 2023*. Statista Research Department. https://www.statista.com/statistics/1270166/lgbt-identification-worldwide/

Stenger, S., & Roulet, T. J. (2018). Pride against prejudice? The stakes of concealment and disclosure of a stigmatized identity for gay and lesbian auditors. *Work, Employment and Society*, *32*(2), 257–273. https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017016682459

Stonewall. (2016). *Do ask, do tell: Capturing data on sexual orientation and gender identity globally*. https://www.stonewall.org.uk/sites/default/files/do_ask_do_tell_guide_2016.pdf

Strizzi, J. M., & Di Nucci, E. (2023). Ethical and human rights concerns of sexual orientation change efforts: Commentary on Sullins (2022). *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *52*(3), 865–867. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-022-02446-w

Suen, L. W., Lunn, M. R., Katuzny, K., Finn, S., Duncan, L., Sevelius, J., Flentje, A., Capriotti, M. R., Lubensky, M. E., Hunt, C., Weber, S., Bibbins-Domingo, K., & Obedin-Maliver, J. (2020). What sexual and gender minority people want researchers to know about sexual orientation and gender identity questions: A qualitative study. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *49*(7), 2301–2318. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-020-01810-y

Sullins, D. P. (2022). Sexual orientation change efforts do not increase suicide: Correcting a false research narrative. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *51*(7), 3377–3393. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-022-02408-2

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behaviour. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7–24). Nelson-Hall.

Tilcsik, A. (2011). Pride and prejudice: Employment discrimination against openly gay men in the United States. *The American Journal of Sociology*, *117*(2), 586–626. https://doi.org/10.1086/661653

Tilcsik, A., Anteby, M., & Knight, C. R. (2015). Concealable stigma and occupational segregation: Toward a theory of gay and lesbian occupations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *60*(3), 446–481. https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839215576401

Trau, R. N. C., & Härtel, C. E. J. (2007). Contextual factors affecting quality of work life and career attitudes of gay men. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, *19*(3), 207–219. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10672-007-9046-y

Trzmielak, N. (2023). *Rainbow recipes: Creating empathic communicative spaces with Italian LGBTQIA+ parents and exploring their doing family* [Master's thesis, Aalto University]. https://aaltodoc.aalto.fi/server/api/core/bitstreams/0d72638e-5bcf-47dc-ae6a-31460dbd9e88/content

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2024). *American time use survey - 2023 results*. U.S. Department of Labor. https://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/atus.pdf

United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner. (2019, May 14). *Data collection and management: An essential component in creating awareness and providing effective measures to address violence and discrimination based on SOGI*. https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/2022-01/Report_on_data_summary.pdf

Van Assche, J., Bahamondes, J., & Sibley, C. (2021). Religion and prejudice across cultures: A test of the threat-constraint model. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *12*(3), 287–295. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550620920966

van der Toorn, J., & Gaitho, W. (2021). LGBTIQ+ workplace inclusion: A global issue requiring a transdisciplinary and intersectional approach. *Tijdschrift voor Gender Studies*, *24*(3/4), 376–387. https://doi.org/10.5117/TVGN.2021.3/4.010.TOOR

van der Toorn, J., Pliskin, R., & Morgenroth, T. (2020). Not quite over the rainbow: The unrelenting and insidious nature of heteronormative ideology. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, *34*, 160–165. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2020.03.001

van der Toorn, J., Veldhuizen, M., & Kulk, S. (2021). Researching the tension between privacy and inclusion in organizations: Promises and pitfalls of a transdisciplinary approach. *Tijdschrift voor Genderstudies*, *24*(1), 53–63. https://doi.org/10.5117/TVGN2021.1.004.VAND

Velez, B. L., Adames, C. N., Lei, N., & Kerman, M. E. (2021). A content analysis of psychological research on vocational issues among sexual minority people. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, *8*(3), 344–364. https://doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000496

Velte, K. C. (2020). Straightwashing the census. *Boston College Law Review*, *61*(1), 69–112.

Warner, M. (1991). Introduction: Fear of a queer planet. *Social Text*, *29*, 3–17. https://www.jstor.org/stable/466295

What Works Wellbeing. (2017). *Unemployment, (re)employment and wellbeing*. https://whatworkswellbeing.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/unemployment-reemployment-wellbeing-briefing-march-2017.pdf

Williams, C., & Giuffre, P. (2011). From organizational sexuality to queer organizations: Research on homosexuality and the workplace. *Sociology Compass*, *5*(7), 551–563. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2011.00392.x

World Economic Forum. (2019). *Average workweek hours in different countries*. https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2019/03/average-work-week-hours-country-wise/

World Population Review. (2024). *LGBTQ+ population by country*. https://worldpopulationreview.com/country-rankings/lgbtq-population-by-country

Ziegler, M., & Rauh, C. (2020). *Visible growth; Invisible fears. Getting to equal 2020: Pride*. Accenture. https://www.accenture.com/content/dam/accenture/final/a-com-migration/pdf/pdf-128/accenture-getting-equal-2020-visible-growth-invisible-fears.pdf#zoom=40

How to cite this article: van der Toorn, J., Bracco, S. E., Gaitho, W., Ryan, W. S., Horne, S. G., Anderson, J. R., & Leskinen, E. A. (2024). Inclusion and protection in tension: Reflections on gathering sexual orientation and gender identity data in the workplace. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12632

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

Jojanneke van der Toorn (she/her) is professor by special appointment of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Workplace Inclusion at Leiden University and associate professor of social and organizational psychology at Utrecht University. She received her PhD in Social Psychology from New York University in 2010 and worked as a postdoctoral associate at Yale University (2010–2012) and as an assistant professor at Leiden University (2012–2016) before arriving at her current positions. Jojanneke's expertise centers on diversity and inclusion at work, in particular with regard to LGBTIQ+ employees. On the one hand, she focuses on organizational programs and practices: what are blindspots in diversity and inclusion policy, what is their influence on job seekers, employees, and organizations as a whole, and in which way can these patterns be broken? On the other hand, she examines the psychological processes through which majority *and* minority group members contribute to the maintenance of group-based inequalities at work and in society. In her work, Jojanneke tries to bridge science and society with the aim of contributing to effective and evidence-based diversity policy and equitable workplaces. Jojanneke is research leader of the Netherlands Inclusivity Monitor, management committee member of the EU COST Action on "LGBTI+ social and economic (in)equalities," and is consulting editor for the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* (JPSP). Her work has received several distinctions, including the Gratama Science Prize for young and excellent researchers, and, as part of the SOCION consortium, she was recently awarded a prestigious NWO Summit Grant for research on social cohesion.

Sofia E. Bracco (she/they) is a PhD candidate and Marie Skłodowska-Curie Fellow at the Psychology Department of Stockholm University, and part of the European Training Network G-VERSITY—Achieving Gender Diversity as an Early Stage Researcher. Their current research project focuses on the way trans and gender diverse people are represented in news media across countries with different levels of legal protection and social acceptance of gender minorities; then, the effects of these representations on people's and employers' attitudes will be investigated. The final aim of their PhD is improving the inclusion of trans and gender

diverse people in the workplace. Previously, she worked as a research assistant at the Psychology Department of the University of Padova, Italy, where she received her master's degree in Social and Organizational Psychology in 2020 with a thesis on gender conspiracy theories. Her main areas of interest and expertise are gender and sexual minorities, gender beyond the binary, queer theory, intergroup relations and prejudice, parasocial contact, and media representations.

Waruguru Gaitho (she/they) is a human rights lawyer, advocate of the High Court of Kenya, and academic currently undertaking a PhD at the University of Cambridge. Her sociolegal research project focuses on legal mobilization by Black LBQ+ activists in Kenya and South Africa, delving into questions of legal consciousness, the politics of organizing, and the complex interplay between law and social movements in queer lawfare. Previously, they were a lecturer of law at the University of Leiden and hold an Advanced Masters in European and International Human Rights Law (*cum laude*) from the same institution. In addition to her career in academia, she engaged in and continues to be invested in LGBTIQ+ advocacy, in particular the struggle for the decriminalization of same-sex relations in Kenya and the fight for non-discrimination, equality, freedom, and joy for queer Africans generally.

William S. Ryan (he/they) is an assistant professor, teaching stream, in the Department of Psychology at the University of Toronto. Dr. Ryan received his PhD in Psychological & Brain Sciences from the University of California, Santa Barbara in 2017. Dr. Ryan's research is based in Self-Determination Theory, a motivational framework that posits that individuals have a natural, or intrinsic, motivation to grow and learn. This natural tendency flourishes when basic psychological needs for competence, relatedness, and autonomy are met. His research examines the question of how social contexts and interactions support and thwart these needs impacting motivation, health, and wellness. Dr. Ryan's work often focuses on these processes in the workplace context and among members of stigmatized groups, including LGBTQ+ individuals. Dr. Ryan is also passionate about supporting students' motivation and well-being through support of these psychological needs within and beyond the classroom.

Sharon G. Horne, PhD, is a white lesbian/genderqueer professor of counseling psychology and co-director of training for the PhD Program in Counseling Psychology at the University of Massachusetts Boston. She received her PhD in Counseling Psychology from University of Georgia and was tenured faculty at University of Memphis prior joining the faculty at UMass Boston. From 2012 to 2022, they provided leadership as an elected APA Representative to the *International Psychology Network for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex Issues* (IPsyNet). In addition, she chaired the policy committee that drafted the *IpsyNet Statement and Commitment on LGBTI Concerns*, an LGBTI-affirmative declaration that has been endorsed by 43 national and inter-regional psychology organizations and translated into 13 languages. Dr. Horne is a Global Fulbright Scholar (2018–2023), whose research examines policy related concerns of mental health access and treatment of sexually and gender diverse individuals in Colombia, South Africa, and the Philippines as well as other countries. She has conducted research on LGBTQ+ and gender issues in postcommunist countries and was an Open Society Foundation Academic Fellow with the Psychology Department of American University of

Central Asia in Kyrgyzstan for 10 years. She primarily focuses on the impact of anti-LGBTQ+ legislation and policies on psychological health.

Joel R. Anderson (he/him) is a White gay male who is employed as an associate professor at Australian Catholic University and a senior research fellow at the Australian Research Centre in Sex, Health and Society (at La Trobe University in Melbourne, Australia. He received his PhD in Experimental Social Psychology in 2016 from Australian Catholic University. Prior to assuming his current positions, he worked as a research associate in the Centre for Ethical Leadership (at Melbourne University) before completing a Postdoctoral Research Fellowship at the University of Geneva, Switzerland. His research typically revolves around intergroup processes between cis-heterosexual groups and sexual minority and gender diverse groups, including sexual and transprejudices, stereotypes, dehumanization, and objectification. He is in the final stages of completing a fellowship exploring the nature and scope of LGBTQA+ conversion practices in Australia, with a focus on exploring the ideology underpinning practices that attempt to suppress or change sexual or gender identities to cisgender and heterosexual. He has recently been awarded a prestigious DECRA award (Discovery Early Career Researcher Award) by the Australian Research Council to complete a three-year fellowship exploring the antecedents and impacts of internalizing sexual prejudices.

Emily A. Leskinen (she/they) is an associate professor of social science and is affiliated with the Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies program at Ramapo College of New Jersey. They have a BA from St. Olaf College, an MA in Social Science from the University of Chicago, an MSW from the University of Michigan, and PhD in Psychology with a graduate certificate in Women's Studies from the University of Michigan. As an applied social/organizational psychologist, Dr. Leskinen takes an intersectional, interdisciplinary approach to examining social inequalities and injustices. Dr. Leskinen has conducted research on gender-based harassment, organizational and campus climate, and social attitudes and health behaviors. They are particularly interested in using evidence-based research to create social change. Ultimately, they strive to conduct research that informs legal and public policy and addresses social injustices by improving the lives of LGBTIQ+ folks, women, people of color, and other minoritized groups. Dr. Leskinen received the Journal of Management 2018 Scholarly Impact Award and the 2012 Distinguished Publication Award from the Association for Women in Psychology.