

2017

Workplace Antidiscrimination Policy Effect on Transgender Employee Job Satisfaction

Stacie Christian
Walden University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>

 Part of the [Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons](#), and the [Psychology Commons](#)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu.

Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Stacie Christian

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee

Dr. Amy Hakim, Committee Chairperson, Psychology Faculty
Dr. Melody Richardson, Committee Member, Psychology Faculty
Dr. Richard Thomlinson, University Reviewer, Psychology Faculty

Chief Academic Officer
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2017

Abstract

Workplace Antidiscrimination Policy Effect on Transgender Employee Job Satisfaction

by

Stacie Christian

MS, University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, 1989

BS, University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, 1984

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Organizational Psychology

Walden University

March 2017

Abstract

Not all organizations in Wisconsin have transgender inclusive antidiscrimination policies. Leadership can use the results of this study to understand the effect of antidiscrimination policies on transgender employee job satisfaction. Quantitative data were collected from transgender employees aged 18 years or older who were employed but not self-employed in the state of Wisconsin. The relationship between the presence and absence of transgender inclusive antidiscrimination policy and job satisfaction was addressed by creating an anonymous online survey that contained demographic questions, the 1997 Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the Job in General (JIG). Participants were notified of the study using fliers disseminated via community service groups and events, web magazines, social media, and personal contact. Participants ($n = 38$) self-selected to participate. Fourteen participants reported that their workplace had transgender inclusive antidiscrimination policy (37%), 12 participants (31.5%) reported no such policy, and 12 participants (31.5%) were not aware of the presence of this policy. Data were analyzed to determine correlations between job satisfaction facets within the JDI and the JIG and the presence of antidiscrimination policy that includes employees who are transgender. Results revealed that the job satisfaction of employees whose workplaces had transgender inclusive antidiscrimination policies was highest when correlated to promotion opportunities, $r = .854$ followed by the employee's viewpoints about their actual work, $r = .832$, people in the workplace, $r = .820$, with the lowest correlation for the supervision facet, $r = .808$. These findings contribute to positive social change by promoting antidiscrimination policies for transgender employees, increasing job satisfaction, and reducing turnover.

Workplace Antidiscrimination Policy Effect on Transgender Employee Job Satisfaction

by

Stacie Christian

MS, University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, 1989

BS, University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, 1984

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Organizational Psychology

Walden University

March 2017

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to the students in the Pride Center at the University of Wisconsin–Green Bay who have shared their life experiences and future dreams to be full participants in their communities. This path led me to better understand the need for antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender employees so employees can be treated equally without regard to their gender identity.

Acknowledgments

Thank you for all of the support provided to me by my wife, Julie, our children, Becky and Annie, sons-in-law Andrew and Gideon, and grandchildren, Aaren, Devon, Amelia, and Simon. Thank you to my late father Richard, and my mother Wendy for generating my interest in completing my doctorate degree. Thank you to my chair, Dr. Amy Hakim, committee member, Dr. Melody Richardson, and my friend, Dr. Tohor Akakpo, for offering their guidance and encouragement to complete this dissertation.

Thank you to all of those whose insights and experiences provided me the ability to learn more about what it means to be transgender in the workplace.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	iv
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Background	2
Problem Statement	5
Purpose of Study	7
Research Questions and Hypothesis	8
Theoretical Framework for the Study	9
Nature of the Study	10
Definitions	10
Assumptions	13
Scope and Delimitations	13
Limitations	14
Significance	14
Summary	15
Chapter 2: Review of Literature	17
Introduction	18
Literature Search Strategy	18
Theoretical Foundation	23
Presence of Antidiscrimination Policy	24
Antidiscrimination Policies	25
Literature Review Related to Key Variables and/or Concepts	27

Independent Variable	27
Dependent Variable	27
Mediating Variables	28
Gender Identity Known or Not Known by Individual at Work	28
Employee Transitioned Prior to Employment at Current Organization	29
Employee Plans to Transition While Employed at Current Organization	29
Moderating Variables.....	30
Job Description Index	31
Summary and Conclusion	32
Chapter 3: Research and Design and Methodology Introduction.....	35
Research Design and Rationale	35
Methodology	37
Population	37
Sampling and Sampling Procedures	37
Procedures for Recruitment, Participation, and Data Collection	39
Instrumentation and Operationalization of Constructs	40
Job Descriptive Index	40
Job in General	41
Threats to Validity	41
Delimitations.....	43
Ethical Procedures	43
Summary.....	44

Chapter 4: Results

Introduction.....	46
Demographics	48
Results.....	52
Job Descriptive Index	52
Job in General	64
Summary	68
Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendation	71
Introduction.....	71
Summary of Nature of Research Study.....	71
Sample Characteristics.....	73
Interpretation of Findings	74
Limitations of the Research	76
Recommendations for Future Research	77
Implications for Practice.....	77
Conclusion	78
References.....	81

List of Tables

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Sample.....	49
Table 2. Job Descriptive Index Work Facet Correlation to Transgender Inclusive Antidiscrimination Workplace Policy Statistics	53
Table 3. Job Descriptive Index Promotion Facet Correlation to Transgender Inclusive Antidiscrimination Workplace Policy Statistics	54
Table 4. Job Descriptive Index Supervision Facet Correlation to Transgender Inclusive Antidiscrimination Workplace Policy Statistics	55
Table 5. Job Descriptive Index People in Workplace Facet Correlation to Transgender Inclusive Antidiscrimination Workplace Policy Statistics	56
Table 6. Job Descriptive Index Promotion Facet Correlation to Transgender Inclusive Antidiscrimination Workplace Policy Statistics	58
Table 7. Job Descriptive Index Supervisor Facet Correlation to Transgender Inclusive Antidiscrimination Workplace Policy Statistics	59
Table 8. Job Descriptive Index Supervisor Facet Correlation to Transgender Inclusive Antidiscrimination Workplace Policy Statistics	61
Table 9. Job in General Correlation to Hypothesis Statistics	63
Table 10. Job in General Correlation to Hypothesis.....	64

Chapter 1: Introduction

Introduction

In 1993, Minnesota was the first state to pass a law banning discrimination based on gender identity (Colin, Koch, & Jost, 2006; Taylor, Lewis, Jacobsmeier, & DiSarro, 2012). Previous research that has addressed workplace experiences among employees who are transgender is limited, but some of the data gathered provided information regarding (a) transition and career-decision making processes (Budge, Tebbe, & Howard, 2010; Brewster, Mennicke, Velez, & Tebbe, 2014); (b) the application of models to measure workplace experiences (Brewster, Velez, DeBlaere, & Moradi, 2012); (c) interview selection bias (Nadler, Lowery, Grebinoski, & Jones, 2014); (d) health care professionals workplace experiences (Eliason, De Joseph, Dibble, Deevey, & Chinns, 2011); (e) the internal and external factors that organizations chose to use transgender antidiscrimination policy (Taylor, Lewis, Jacobsmeier, & DiSarro, (2012); f) the negative effect of workplace discrimination on job satisfaction (Fassinger, Stanislaus, Shullman, & Stevenson, 2010); and (g) how transgender individuals who are employed report a higher amount of experiences with transphobia, internalized transphobia, and stigma related to mental health than transgender individuals who are unemployed (Mizock & Mueser, 2014). Research that has addressed whether the presence or absence of workplace antidiscrimination policy in the workplace affects the transgender employee job satisfaction is limited as the research has primarily focused on the need for policy but not the effect; research has also focused on only gay, lesbian, and bisexual employees but not transgender employees (Huffman, Watrous-Rodriguez, & King, 2008; Sellers, 2014); Goldberg, Badgett, & Ramos, 2010; Mallory, Herman, & Badgett, 2011). The current

topic is under-researched, especially with regard to the lack of quantitative research analysis (Hamzelou, 2014; McFadden, 2015; Taylor et al., 2012).

More than 4% of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) individuals are employed in the United States (Mallory, & Sears, 2015). Nearly 50% of transgender employees who worked in Midwestern cities indicated that they experienced discrimination in the workplace (Budge et al., 2010). In the Upper Midwest, Wisconsin has an antidiscrimination law for sexual orientation only; Minnesota, Illinois, and Iowa have antidiscrimination laws for both sexual orientation and gender identity; Michigan, Nebraska, and North and South Dakota do not have antidiscrimination laws for either sexual discrimination or gender identity (Human Rights Campaign, 2015c). In this study, I have provided an increased understanding of the relationship between the presence and absence of antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender employees on the job satisfaction of transgender employees.

Background

Approximately 90% of the transgender participants who completed the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force survey reported they experienced discrimination on the job or they personally made changes to avoid discrimination. Of the 47% who reported adverse work experiences, (a) 44% indicated they were overlooked for a position; (b) 26% reported being fired for being transgender, and (c) 23% indicated they were denied promotions (Bailey, 2014).

Only 18 states and Washington, DC, have laws that prohibit workplace discrimination for employees who are transgender, whereas 32 states do not have state statutes that protect individuals from being fired for being transgender (Human Rights

Campaign, 2015b). U.S. Executive Order 13087 offered protection for civilian employees who are being paid by federal monies (Nadler et al., 2014). Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 mandates that private employers with 15 or more employees, labor unions, all federal, state and local governments, and employment agencies may not discriminate in the workplace on the basis of “race, color, sex or ethnic origin.” Title VII does not include the individuals in the military (U.S. Department of Labor, 2014). In addition, Title VII initially was not interpreted to include protection for individuals who are LGBT, but recently a few lawsuits resulted in the interpretation that Title VII did protect transgender employees in those cases. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), which is the agency that enforces Title VII, recently indicated that employees who are receiving federal money as civilian employment, who believe they have been discriminated owing to their gender identity or sexual orientation, can now file a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity counselor at their place of work (U.S. Office of Personnel Management, EEOC, Office of Special Counsel, & Merit Systems Protection Board, 2015).

In 1994, the Employment Non-Discrimination Act (ENDA) was introduced to the U.S. Senate with inclusion of the same mandates as Title VII, but it also included workplace protection for all LGBT individuals. ENDA has been introduced to the United States Senate 16 times from 1994 to 2013 but has not passed Congress. Most recently, on July 1, 2014, the Department of Labor announced it would include transgender employees in its workplace antidiscrimination policy, and on July 31, 2014, President Obama signed an executive order that provided protection based on gender identity and

sexual orientation for organizations that have contracts with the federal government (Human Rights Campaign, 2014).

Fortune 500 corporations have a higher rate of antidiscrimination policies that include sexual orientation and gender identity than non-Fortune 500 corporations: 99% have antidiscrimination policies for sexual orientation, and 84% have antidiscrimination policies for gender identity (Human Rights Campaign, 2015b). Non-Fortune 500 and municipal and county governments may choose to include antidiscrimination policy or they may choose to not include this policy based on the law of the state where they provide employment. For example, only 225 county governments and municipalities in the United States had transgender inclusive antidiscrimination policy as of January 28, 2015, and only 43 of these are located in the Upper Midwest (Human Rights Campaign, 2015a).

Transgender employees indicated that they tend to not voice their concerns in the workplace owing to their fear of discrimination, harassment, and termination, and they have reported a decrease in overall job satisfaction from the date they started employment if they perceived discrimination in their workplace (Bell, Özbilgin, Beauregard, & Sürgevil, 2011; Brewster et al., 2012). Female-to-male persons reported concerns with both leadership and horizontal discrimination via microaggressions and macroaggressions in the workplace including conflict regarding which restrooms they could use, dress codes that did not include their needs, lack of health care that covered their medical needs, misuse of pronouns, and overall lack of policies that added overall discrimination or discomfort at their place of employment (Dispenza, Watson, Barry Chung, & Brack, 2012). The concept of suppression of one's diverse identity in the workplace has less than

positive consequences. Diverse employees who suppressed their identity experienced a reduction in perceived discrimination and job satisfaction and an increase in turnover (Madera, King, & Hebl, 2012).

The presence of antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender employees does not guarantee implementation. Sellers (2014) studied 154 municipalities that had antidiscrimination policy that included transgender individuals, including employees, as of July 2011. The results suggested that the policies would be able to provide protection for the employees, but many of the municipalities did not have safeguards in place to ensure consistent enforcement. Colvin (2007) surveyed 74 municipalities that had transgender inclusive antidiscrimination workplace laws and identified that a lower proportion of these municipalities actually implemented enforcement of the laws. Colvin recommended that community members should advocate and take measures to insist that antidiscrimination policies be followed because municipalities who have followed antidiscrimination policies have provided an improved workplace for their employees. In addition, Colvin suggested that further research should be conducted on the private sector implementation of these laws and indicated a need to collect empirical data to prove if implementation of antidiscrimination policy decreases discrimination of transgender employees.

Problem Statement

The research problem addressed whether a relationship exists between organizations either having or not having transgender inclusive antidiscrimination policy and the effect on job satisfaction among transgender employees. Initial research on job satisfaction addressed experiences of employees while undergoing transition from male-

to-female or female-to-male while employed and sought data that addressed barriers, gender transition, and career experiences (Budge et al., 2010). Other research that focused on workplace experiences among employees who are transgender focused on general concerns such as discrimination, harassment, termination, a decrease in overall job satisfaction from the first date of employment if discrimination was perceived by the employee in their workplace, and behavior changes made by transgender employees to avoid both perceived or actual workplace discrimination and harassment (Budge et al., 2010; Bell et al., 2011; Grant et al., 2011). Knauer (2012) reported, using a literature review, several inconsistencies in laws in the United States, such as the ability to purchase bus boarding passes or work in some states without being fired, which affected transgender employees' ability to travel as part of their work. Other key research in the area of transgender workplace experiences focused on the need to have applicable measures that applied to employees who were transgender and asserted need to continue to apply the newly developed survey in research that included a broader base of participants from varying socioeconomic, ethnic, and racial backgrounds (Brewster et al., 2012).

Dispenza et al. (2012) reported that although an increasing amount of research exists on the workplace experiences of gay, lesbian, and bisexual employees, specific research concerning transgender employees is in its early stages and more research is needed. In addition, although some research has addressed that facets of job satisfaction such as research that focuses on how transgender inclusive antidiscrimination policy affects the job satisfaction among transgender employees is limited and further research that pertains to transgender employees' workplace experiences is recommended

(Brewster et al, 2012, 2014; Budge et al., 2010; Schmidt, Githens, Rocco, & Kormanik, 2012). Furthermore, Taylor et al. (2012) indicated that research on transgender inclusive antidiscrimination not only is limited but has focused on public administration only, and they suggested a need for quantitative research specifically focused on transgender antidiscrimination policy owing to an increase in antidiscrimination laws. Through qualitative research Brewster et al. (2014) explored further transgender employees' workplace experiences while transitioning and focused on providing insight how to increase job satisfaction through implementing policies and practices that addressed transitioning in the workplace.

Most recently, research on transgender employees' workplace experiences has focused on legal and policies concerning ENDA, municipalities, and aversive discrimination in interviews for employment, implications and the effect of transphobia of employment, and mental health among individuals who are transgender. These researchers suggested a need for further research into the scope of awareness, need for training, and further exploration of the workplace experiences among employees who are transgender (Taylor et al., 2014; Nadler et al., 2014; Mizock & Mueser, 2014). A research gap continues to exist in understanding how the presence or absence of transgender inclusive antidiscrimination policies affects the job satisfaction among transgender employees.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this quantitative research study was to examine whether employees who are transgender are more satisfied with their jobs when the employer has an antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender employees. Because some

organizations have antidiscrimination policies that include transgender employees and others do not, I collected data to determine whether the independent variable of the employer having transgender inclusive antidiscrimination policy or not having transgender inclusive antidiscrimination policy affected the dependent variable of transgender employee job satisfaction. Mediating variables included whether (a) the employee's gender identity was known by several other individuals at work; (b) the employee's gender identity was not known by other individuals at work; (c) the employee transitioned prior to employment at the current organization; (d) the employee transitioned while employed at the current organization; and (e) the employee planned to transition in the future while working for the current organization. Moderating variables included (a) gender noted at birth; (b) gender identity (male-to-female, female-to-male, intersex, genderqueer, two-spirit, androgynous, part-time male, part-time female); (c) gender expression; (d) age; (e) income; (f) race; (g) ethnicity; (h) sexual orientation (lesbian, bisexual, pansexual, asexual, heterosexual, questioning); (i) level of education; and (j) occupational field (manufacturing, education, sales, farming, construction, community service, health care). It was my goal to expand the understanding of how transgender employees may experience job satisfaction within their workplace.

Research Questions and Hypothesis

The research question was: What is the relationship between organizations either having or not having an antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender employees and transgender employee job satisfaction?

*H*₀: There is no difference in job satisfaction between those individuals working in organizations with antidiscrimination policies versus those that work in companies that do not have antidiscrimination policies.

*H*₁: Job satisfaction will significantly differ between those individuals working in organizations with antidiscrimination policies versus those that work in companies that do not have antidiscrimination policies.

Theoretical Framework for the Study

The theoretical framework that I used was Herzberg's (1966) two-factor theory, which consists of (a) motivational factors that encourage employees to have better work performance perhaps through personal achievement, the work itself, or advancement; and (b) job dissatisfiers, called hygiene factors, such as wages and relationship with peers and bosses. Herzberg suggested that the combination of personal satisfaction and personal psychological growth is one component within the motivation factors, whereas the results that occur from the influence of hygiene factors can lead to the dissatisfaction or satisfaction of the employee. When hygiene and motivation factors are combined, four scenarios may occur. The best circumstance occurs if an employee has high hygiene and high motivation, in which employees are the most motivated and have the least amount of complaints. Employees with high hygiene and low motivation have few complaints and employees are motivated by their wage and are not highly motivated personally. Employees with low hygiene and high motivation experience motivation but complain about work salaries and environment. Finally, low hygiene and low motivation lead to employees with many complaints and no motivation to work (Herzberg, 1966).

Nature of the Study

The nature of this study was a quantitative nonexperimental online survey provided to self-identified transgender adults who indicated their gender identity within the transgender spectrum as female-to-male, male-to-female, intersex, androgynous, genderqueer, part-time male, or part-time female, aged 18 years or older, and employed in Wisconsin but not self-employed. Other demographics included socioeconomic status; education; whether they transitioned, are transitioning, or have not transitioned to another gender; gender expression at work; state where employed; race-ethnicity; sexual orientation; and household income. The independent variable was the presence or absence of antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender employees and the dependent variable was the job satisfaction of transgender employees. Mediating variables included whether: (a) the employee's gender identity was known by several other individuals at work; (b) the employee's gender identity was not known by other individuals at work; (c) if the employee has transitioned prior to employment at current organization; (d) the employee has transitioned while employed at the current organization; (e) the employee planned to transition in the future while working for the current organization. Moderating variables included: (a) gender noted at birth; (b) gender identity (male-to-female, female-to-male, intersex, genderqueer, two-spirit, androgynous, part-time male, part-time female); (c) gender expression; (d) age; (e) income; (f) race; (g) ethnicity; (h) sexual orientation (lesbian, bisexual, pansexual, asexual, heterosexual, questioning); (i) level of education; and (j) occupational field (manufacturing, education, sales, farming, construction, community service, healthcare). I measured these variables using a job satisfaction survey, which participants answered anonymously online. Internet

research was appropriate for this research design to ensure confidentiality for the participants (Sue & Ritter, 2012) because nearly 50% of transgender employees have indicated they experience discrimination in the workplace (Budge et al., 2010). I analyzed the data using the SPSS software (IBM, 2014).

Definitions

Some of the terminology that individuals who are transgender may use to self-identity is as follows:

Agender: Persons indicate that they do not have a gender identity; therefore, do not have a gender (Enke, 2012).

Bigender: Persons who identifies as being two genders and may move between them both or have both at the same time (Kuper, Nussbaum, & Mustanski, 2012).

Cisgender: Persons who identify with the gender assigned to them at birth (Schilt & Westbrook, 2009; Brewster et al., 2014).

Cross-dressers: Individual who is deemed to be transgender owing to interest in dressing in traditional dress that is not typical of their gender but of the other binary gender (Brewster et al., 2014; Levitt & Ippolito, 2014).

Female-to-male transsexual: Persons who plan to have or had had gender reassignment surgery from female to male (Barclay & Scott, 2006).

Gender nonconforming: Persons who do not identify with traditional gender identities (Brewster et al., 2014).

Genderqueer/genderfluid: Defines persons who do not identify with being either

only male or only female, in which an individual may have (a) fluidity in their gender, in that they go back and forth two or more genders; (b) may be of two genders; (c) may not identify with any gender; or (d) may have overlap between two or more genders.

Genderqueer was the most commonly selected gender identity in one research study with diverse participant demographics within and outside of the United States (Kuper et al., 2012; Collins, McFadden, Rocco, & Mathis, 2015).

Hijra: Persons to claim to not be male or female but historically dress as females, identify as transgender, and live in communities together. Their land of origin is in southern India but has expanded (Khan et al., 2009; Altaf, Zahidie, & Agha, 2012).

Intersex (intergender): Persons who are born with sexual organs that do not fit the traditional binary parameters (Rubin, 2012).

Male-to-female transsexual: Persons who plan to have or had had gender reassignment surgery from male to female (Barclay & Scott, 2006).

Trans: Term that covers all persons who identify within the transgender spectrum (Collins et al., 2015).

Transgender: Terminology that noted as an “umbrella term” that includes many gender identities including cross-dresser, male-to-female, female-to-male, genderqueer, transsexual, intersex, gender-bender (Budge et al., 2010; Brewster et al., 2014).

Transphobia: Negative behavior or attitude towards persons who do not follow traditional gender behavior or presentation (Levitt & Ippolito, 2014).

Two-spirit: Persons who are indigenous to North America and belong to specific Nations or tribes who have been identified “Two-spirit” persons as having both masculine and feminine attributes. Individual Nations or tribes may have specific names,

whereas others do not have names or identities similar to “Two spirit” (Evans-Campbell, Walters, Pearson, & Campbell, 2012)

Assumptions

I assumed that (a) organizations either have or do not have antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender employees; (b) organizations do have employees who self-identify as transgender; (c) transgender employees work for organizations that or do not have antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender employees; and (d) job satisfaction can vary for employees who are transgender depending on the presence or absence of antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender employees. These assumptions were necessary in the context of this study, which sought to further the understanding of whether employees who are transgender are more satisfied with their jobs when the employer has an antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender employees.

Scope and Delimitations

This dissertation study was limited to the research of job satisfaction among employees’ aged 18 years and older who self-identify as transgender, work in Wisconsin, and who are not self-employed. I focused primarily on employees who work within the state of Wisconsin, which does not have state regulation that requires antidiscrimination workplace policy for transgender employees but does require it for LGB employees. I sought to further explore whether the presence or absence of transgender inclusive antidiscrimination policy affects job satisfaction.

Because state laws vary between the Upper Midwest states in that some but not all states require that organizations have transgender-inclusive antidiscrimination policies, I

explored whether the presence or absence of transgender antidiscrimination policy affected job satisfaction among employees who are transgender. The parameters of job satisfaction include: (a) overall job satisfaction; (b) supervisor satisfaction; (c) satisfaction with coworkers; (d) satisfaction with pay; and (e) satisfaction with job duties, and has (f) the mediating variables addressing gender knowledge know by individuals at work and employee transition plans.

Limitations

Limitations include the inability to include data from participants who (a) may not have access to the internet; (b) may be self-employed; (c) may wish to remain closeted and not want anyone to be aware they are transgender for fear of personal or professional harassment or discrimination; (d) may have lower job satisfaction for reasons other than the absence or presence of antidiscrimination policy, which affected their responses to the survey; (e) may not be aware of the opportunity to participate in this research study owing to not being involved with the organizations that helped to recruit potential participants; and (d) may not be currently employed but may have been employed in the past or near future. I did not go in-depth to examine specific organizations but instead I examined the state of Wisconsin, which may have limited the capture of data.

Significance

This dissertation research study provided data that enhances knowledge of transgender employee job satisfaction Wisconsin. Leadership within organizations can use the results of this research study to better understand the effect of having or not having antidiscrimination policy on job satisfaction of employees who are transgender.

Summary

In 1993, Minnesota was the first state to pass a law banning discrimination of gender identity, and at this time in the Upper Midwest, Wisconsin has an antidiscrimination law for sexual orientation only; Minnesota, Illinois, and Iowa have antidiscrimination laws for both sexual orientation and gender identity; Michigan, Nebraska, and North and South Dakota do not have antidiscrimination laws for either sexual discrimination or gender identity (Budge et al., 2010; Human Rights Campaign, 2015c). Nearly 50% of transgender employees who work in Midwestern cities indicated that they experienced discrimination in the workplace (Colin et al., 2006; Taylor, et al., 2012). Previous research that has addressed the workplace experiences among employees who are transgender is limited, but some of the data gathered provided information on (a) transition and career-decision-making processes; (b) the application of models to measure workplace experiences; (c) interview selection bias; (d) health care professionals' workplace experiences; (e) the internal and external factors for why organizations chose to use transgender antidiscrimination policy; and (f) transgender individuals who are employed report a higher amount of experiences with transphobia, internalized transphobia, and stigma related to mental health than transgender individuals who are unemployed (Budge et al., 2010; Brewster et al., 2012; Brewster et al., 2014; Nadler et al., 2014; Eliason et al., 2011; Taylor et al., 2012; Mizock & Mueser, 2014). Research that has addressed whether the presence or absence of workplace antidiscrimination policy in the workplace affects transgender employee job satisfaction is scarce, because research has focused on gay, lesbian, and bisexual employees but not transgender employees (Huffman et al., 2008). Thus, owing to the gap in research in this area, I

provide an increased understanding of the relationship between the presence and absence of antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender employees on the job satisfaction among transgender employees.

In Chapter 2, I provided a literature review of research on transgender employees in the workplace; antidiscrimination policy in the workplace; antidiscrimination legislation within federal, state, and other municipalities; and pertinent theories and research that addressed job satisfaction, especially as related to employees who are transgender.

Chapter 2: Review of Literature

Introduction

In this study, I addressed whether a relationship exists between organizations either having or not having transgender inclusive antidiscrimination policy and the effect on job satisfaction among transgender employees. The purpose of this quantitative research study was to examine whether employees who are transgender are more satisfied with their jobs when the employer has an antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender employees. Because some organizations have antidiscrimination policies that do include transgender employees, and others do not, I collected data to determine whether the independent variable of the employer having transgender inclusive antidiscrimination policy or not having transgender inclusive antidiscrimination policy affected the dependent variable of transgender employee job satisfaction. Mediating variables included whether: (a) the employee's gender identity was known by several other individuals at work; (b) the employee's gender identity was not known by other individuals at work; (c) if the employee has transitioned prior to employment at current organization; (d) the employee has transitioned while employed at the current organization; (e) the employee planned to transition in the future while working for the current organization. Moderating variables included: (a) gender noted at birth; (b) gender identity (male-to-female, female-to-male, intersex, genderqueer, two-spirit, androgynous, part-time male, part-time female); (c) gender expression; (d) age; (e) income; (f) race; (g) ethnicity; (h) sexual orientation (lesbian, bisexual, pansexual, asexual, heterosexual, questioning); (i) level of education; and (j) occupational field (manufacturing, education, sales, farming, construction, community service, healthcare). My goal was to expand the

understanding of how transgender employees may experience job satisfaction within their workplaces.

Literature Search Strategy

I used the following library databases and search engines: the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay Cofrin library database, Walden University library database, PsychArticles (EBSCO), PyscINFO (EBSCO), GenderWatch (Proquest), PsychNET (APA), SAGE Publications, SAGEPremiere, EBSCOhost Business Source Premier, ProQuest Gender Watch New Platform, PubMed Central Open Access, and ProQuest.

Key search terms and combination search terms were as follows: (a) *transgender in workplace*; (b) *transgender antidiscrimination workplace policy*; (c) *antidiscrimination workplace policy*; (d) *transgender equity policy*; (e) *transgender*; (f) *transgender job satisfaction*; and (g) *LGBT job satisfaction*. These key words were the most helpful in the literature review.

I searched literature published between 2006 and the present. I reviewed a few outliers including Herzberg (1966) and Locke (1976) for the theoretical foundation. The following summary indicates the overall progression of data collected on persons who are transgender in the workplace. Barclay & Scott (2006) focused on transsexuals who transitioned while working and provided insight to management on how to support the employee going through transition. Huffman et al. (2008) provided research on what type of support is welcomed by lesbian and gay employees. Fassinger et al. (2010) addressed affirmation of LGBT leadership and the need for affirmation to provide diversity to the work environment. Goldberg et al. (2010) provide insights on South Dakota employment antidiscrimination legislation. Grant et al. (2011) provided data from the first

comprehensive research on transgender discrimination. Badgett et al., (2013) researched the effect of LGBT-supportive workplace policies on business. Brewster et al. (2014, 2015) provided specific insights on workplace discrimination towards transgender persons. The Human Rights Campaign (2014, 2015a, 2015b) provided insights on the presence or absences of antidiscrimination policy in each state in the United States and other ordinances throughout the United States. Levitt et al. (2014) provided data in identity development. McFadden (2015) researched LGBT careers and human resource development.

Initial research that focused on job satisfaction addressed experiences of employees while undergoing transition from male-to-female or female-to-male when employed and researchers sought data that addressed barriers, gender transition, and career experiences (Budge et al., 2010). Other research on workplace experiences of employees who were transgender focused on general concerns such as peer and leadership discrimination, harassment and termination (Budge et al., 2010; Bell et al., 2011). Brewster et al., (2014) reported that in their research study a few participants reported some workplace experiences that were positive in both how they were treated by employees within their workplace and how they began to affirm themselves due to the positive outcome of their transitions. Levitt and Ippolito (2014) provided a quotation from an employee who they interviewed who talked about having good work performance that caused leadership to suggested the employee enter manager training, but once the human resource department found out the employee was transitioning the co-worker attitudes shifted and the employee was then harassed on the job. Grant et al. (2011) reported from their research data a decrease in overall job satisfaction from the

first date of employment if discrimination was perceived by the employee in their workplace, and noted behavior changes made by transgender employees to avoid both perceived or actual workplace discrimination and harassment. Connell (2014) reports that numerous studies focus on common workplace discrimination, such as the prohibited use of bathrooms by transgender employees who do not have full medical transition, even though they may not intend on having surgery to live as their gender, or other harassment, discrimination, job loss or unemployment problems. Connell (2014) also reported that one research study that she reviewed that problems also occurred with dress codes, workplace identification cards, and anxiety due to employees' perceptions that they might be discriminated against at work. Dispenza et al. (2012) noted that employees who are transgender often are not called by their preferred pronouns or names, and that historically there is more research on male-to-female employee versus female-to-male employee workplace experiences.

Fassinger et al. (2010) indicated that the relationship of workplace discrimination and job satisfaction for sexual orientation has been replicated, but did not cite research focused specifically on gender identity and job satisfaction related specifically to the presence or absence of antidiscrimination policy. Research within human resource development has focused primarily on sexual orientation and not on the workplace experiences of employees who are transgender (Collins et al., 2015). One research team did suggest that progressive employers had both antidiscrimination policies that included transgender employees as well as transition plans that provided supportive organizational policies and protocol (Taylor, Burke, Wheatley & Sompayrac, 2011). Knauer (2012) reported in a literature review inconsistency in laws within the United States that would

affect transgender employees such as the ability to purchase bus boarding passes, or work in some states without being fired which affected the employees' ability to travel as part of their work. Mallory et al. (2011) reported that LGBT people in Oklahoma experience workplace discrimination including lower wages, yet their research evidence suggested that organizations with LGBT antidiscrimination policy have a positive impact on the job satisfaction and work productivity of LGBT employees which enhances the organizations' bottom lines. Badgett, Durso, Mallory and Kastanis (2013) had similar results in their research study data in that organizations with LGBT antidiscrimination policies had LGBT employee who experienced less discrimination, were more often "out" at work, and indicated better relationships at work, reduced turnover, better health outcomes and increased job satisfaction.

Other key research in the area of transgender workplace experiences focused on the need to have applicable research measures that applied to employees who were transgender, and the researchers asserted a need to continue to apply their newly developed survey in research studies that included a broader base of participants from varying socioeconomic, ethnic and racial backgrounds (Brewster, et al., 2012).

Dispenza et al. (2012) reported that although there is an increasing amount of research on the workplace experiences of gay, lesbian and bi-sexual employees, specific research concerning transgender employees is in its early stages and more research is needed. In addition, although there is some research that addressed some facets of job satisfaction such as research that specifically addressed how transgender inclusive antidiscrimination policy affects the job satisfaction of transgender employees is limited and further research that pertains to transgender employees' workplace experiences is

recommended (Brewster et al, 2012, 2014; Budge et al., 2010; Schmidt et al., 2012; Collins et al., 2015). Furthermore, Taylor et al., (2012), indicated that research on transgender inclusive antidiscrimination is not only limited, but has been focused on public administration only and needs to expand into the private sector. In addition, they suggested a need for quantitative research specifically focused on transgender antidiscrimination policy owing to an increase in antidiscrimination laws. Through qualitative research Brewster et al., (2014) explored transgender employee's workplace experiences while transitioning and focused on providing insight how to increase job satisfaction through implementing policies and practices that addressed transitioning in the workplace.

Most recently, research in the area of transgender employee's workplace experiences focused on: (a) the legal parameters and policies concerning ENDA; (b) transgender experiences working for municipalities (Taylor et al, 2014); (c) aversive discrimination in interviews for employment and workplace implications; (d) the effect of transphobia on employment (Nadler et al., 2014); and (e) mental health for individuals who are transgender (Mizock & Mueser, 2014). These researchers suggested a need for further research in the understanding of the scope of awareness, the need for training, and to further explore the workplace experiences of employees who are transgender (Taylor et al, 2014; Nadler et al., 2014; Mizock & Mueser, 2014).

In addition, research gaps continue in the understanding of the experiences of racially diverse employees who are transgender. Budge et al. (2010) research consisted primarily of white and Native American participants. Many other researchers pointed out that transgender participants in their research studies tended to be white participants, thus

more research is needed with racially diverse participants (Brewster et al., 2011; Kuper et al., 2012; Levitt & Ippolito, 2014; Connell, 2015). One of the goals for this dissertation research is to collect data from a diverse participant pool, but the primary goal in this dissertation research study is to increase the understanding of how either having or not having antidiscrimination policies affects the job satisfaction of transgender employees.

Another researcher team noted a gap in research on career development for transgender people, and found in their research that transgender persons have indicated that they perceive many professions including careers working with children, engineering, and the military as careers to avoid due to stereotypes concerning their ability to work in these areas (Schneider & Dimito, 2010). This may affect the interest of transgender employees to agree to participate in a workplace survey, or to even work within some types of professions. A research gap continues in the area of understanding how the presence or absence of transgender inclusive antidiscrimination policies affects the job satisfaction of transgender employees. Based on the above, the research will focus on the collection of anonymous online data from individuals who identify as transgender, who are age 18 or older, who are employed but not self-employed in the state of Wisconsin, in order to address the research problem if there is a relationship between organizations either having or not having transgender inclusive antidiscrimination policy and the effect on job satisfaction of transgender employees.

Theoretical Foundation

The theoretical foundation used for this dissertation was Herzberg's (1966) two-factor theory which consists of: (a) motivational factors that are found within employees that encourage them as employees to have better work performance perhaps through

personal achievement, the work itself, or advancement and (b) job dissatisfiers, called hygiene factors, such as wages, relationship with peers and their boss. Herzberg suggested that the combination of personal satisfaction and personal psychological growth is a component within the motivation factors, whereas the results that occur from the influence of hygiene factors can lead to the dissatisfaction or satisfaction of the employee. When hygiene and motivation factors are combined four different scenarios may occur. The best circumstance occurs if an employee has high hygiene and high motivation, in which employees are the most motivated and have the least amount of complaints. Employees with high hygiene and low motivation have very few complaints and employees are motivated by their wage, and are not very highly motivated personally. Employees with low hygiene and high motivation experience a lot of motivation but complain due to work salaries and environment. Finally, having employees with low hygiene and low motivation leads to employees who have many complaints and no motivation to work (Herzberg, 1966). For the purpose of this dissertation, the presence or absence of antidiscrimination policy would qualify as the hygiene factor that would influence the transgender employee's job satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

Presence of Antidiscrimination Policy

In the field of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, job satisfaction is one of the most frequently researched job attitude (Judge & Church, 2000). Many theories have addressed job attitude including Vroom's (1964) valence, instrumentality, expectancy model (VIE model) which focused more on work motivation (Van Eerde & Thierry, 1996); Herzberg's (1966) two-factor theory which does not take into account individual

differences, as it presumes that all employees will react similarly to any changes in the motivation or hygiene factors; Locke's (1969) discrepancy theory which focuses on the employee's negative response to feelings they may have about not meeting their work performance expectations which affects their job satisfaction; and Locke's (1976) range of affect theory which has the premise that what an employee has in their job and what they seek in their job, creates the satisfaction or the dissatisfaction within their job. The premise of range of affect theory can be interpreted as it relates to this dissertation is that if transgender employees' value is having transgender inclusive antidiscrimination policy within the workplace, then if the workplace does indeed have transgender inclusive antidiscrimination policy the employee would have higher job satisfaction than if the organization did not include transgender employees within antidiscrimination policy. Lastly, an expanded equity theory developed by Huseman, Hatfield and Miles (1987) included three types of employee responses-benevolent, equity sensitive and entitled-to personal perceptions of equity which can affect their job satisfaction, which for the purpose of this dissertation might be that employees who are transgender might feel benevolent, equity sensitive or entitled to equitable treatment in the workplace including having antidiscrimination policy in the workplace.

Antidiscrimination Policies

Another variable considered for this dissertation pertained to a premise that there are differences in the job satisfaction experiences depending on one's gender identity. This premise was addressed by several researchers including Gilligan (1993) who suggested that females tend to not communicate in the same way as males therefore they each have different job satisfaction experiences; and Carlson and Mellor's (2004)

research results also indicated that females and males had different job satisfaction experiences. They reported that more men indicated they experienced lower self-definition, the experience of having more personal independence at work, and then they reported having higher job satisfaction. When women experienced higher self-definition, the experience of being connected to others at work, they reported having higher job satisfaction (Carlson & Mellor, 2004). Brewster et al. (2012) were one of the early research teams that reported that transgender affirming workplaces which provided interpersonal relationships and the perception that others feel positive towards transgender persons, are directly related to job satisfaction for transgender employees. Brewster et al. (2012) also noted that their research found that employees who are transgender who experienced discrimination in the workplace experienced a decrease in job satisfaction.

This theory was selected due to the explanation of the impact that motivation factors and hygiene factors play on employee dissatisfaction or satisfaction through the consideration of four different scenarios that can occur when motivation and hygiene are combined (Herzberg, 1966). The utilization of this theory as the foundation for the dissertation assisted in the ability to address personal satisfaction, personal psychological growth, and hygiene factors-such as wage and policy-as they affect employees who are transgender. For the purpose of this dissertation, the presence or absence of antidiscrimination policy would qualify as the hygiene factor that would influence the transgender employee's job satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

The research question is "What is the relationship between organizations either having or not having an antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender employees,

and transgender employee job satisfaction?” This question related to existing theory since it is seeking if antidiscrimination policy affects how the hygiene factor of the presence or absence of antidiscrimination policy effects the job satisfaction of transgender employees. The research question seeks to contribute to the existing knowledge of how transgender employees’ job satisfaction is effected by what occurs within the workplace.

Literature Review Related to Key Variables and/or Concepts

Independent Variable

The independent variable is whether the employer has transgender inclusive antidiscrimination policy or does not having transgender inclusive antidiscrimination policy. Research that has addressed if the presence or absence of workplace antidiscrimination policy in the workplace has an effect on the transgender employee job satisfaction is limited as the research primarily focused on the need for policy but not the effect; or the research focused on gay, lesbian and bi-sexual employees but not transgender employees (Huffman et al., & King, 2008; Sellers, 2014; Goldberg et al., 2010; Mallory et al., 2011). At this point of time, this topic is considered to be under-researched, especially using quantitative research analysis (Hamzelou, 2014; McFadden, 2015; Taylor et al., 2012).

Dependent Variable

Job satisfaction is the dependent variable in the dissertation, thus is one of the primary constructs. Fields (2002) defines job satisfaction as an employee’s attitude about their job based on a number of workplace circumstances. Conflict between work and personal life can lead to diminished job satisfaction (Kazi & Zadeh, 2011), and result in job turnover which cost organizations money (Fassinger et al., 2010; Madera et al.,

2012). Locke (1976) reported that over 3,000 studies have focused on job satisfaction. Locke's range of affect theory (1976) provided a model that addressed job satisfaction by asserting that the employee's job satisfaction is based on the difference between their personal work expectations and what is actually occurring with their job. When applying the range of affect theory to the dissertation topic, if an employee firmly believed that their organization should or should not have transgender inclusive antidiscrimination policy and if the organization has or does not have transgender inclusive antidiscrimination policy, then this may have affected their job satisfaction.

Researchers who used job satisfaction tools in their research with participants who were transgender included Brewster et al, (2012) who revised workplace experience tools into "Transgender forms" that better measured the experiences of people who are transgender using vocabulary that was supportive of individuals who were transgender. Madura et al, (2012) used Cammann, Richman, Jenkins and Klesh's (1983) three point scale to measure general job satisfaction of individuals who were either out about their identities or who did not disclose to others their identities concerning race, gender, sexual orientation and other minority categories. Research directed towards transgender employees historically has not utilized job satisfaction surveys but focused primarily on qualitative research tools using research designed interviews. At this point of time, there is no specific job satisfaction tool to measuring transgender job satisfaction specifically, thus a tool would need to be created for this dissertation, or a standard job satisfaction tool could be utilized.

Mediating Variables

Gender Identity Known or Not Known by Individuals at Work

Organizations that have LGBT supportive policies have employees that reported they are healthier, have higher job satisfaction, are more likely to be out at work, and are less likely to think about leaving the organization (Badgett et al., 2013). On the contrary, LGB employees report lower job satisfaction, greater work stress if they conceal their sexual orientation (Brewster et al., 2012), and transgender employees report similar experiences if they are not out at work (Budge et al., 2010; Brewster et al., 2012; Levitt & Ippolito, 2014).

Employee Transitioning Prior to Employment at Current Organization

The measure whether an employee transitioned prior to employment at the current organization has been utilized by several researchers (Taylor et al., 2011; Kuper et al., 2012; Collins et al., 2015). The utilization of an anonymous online survey may provide a safety net for individuals who currently pass as the gender to which they have transitioned, but who may not want to publicly identify themselves as transgender (Kuper et al., 2012). Employees who transitioned prior to their employment may have differing experiences than those who plan to transition while employed at their current organization, and not including this information in the research study may cause complications in the analysis of the research results (Brewster et al., 2012); Taylor et al., 2011; Kuper et al., 2012).

Employee Plans to Transition While Employed at Current Organization

This variable has been included in several research studies due to the impact that can occur on the employee's actual decision to transition while at work which in turn can either positively or negatively affect their relationship with coworkers, employers, and opportunities for advancement or wage increases as well as what is expected from the

employee for workplace behavior and dress (Taylor et al., 2011; Kuper et al, 2012; Collins et al., 2015).

Moderating Variables

Moderating variables include in the research study include: (a) gender noted at birth; (b) gender identity (male-to-female, female-to-male, intersex, genderqueer, two-spirit, androgynous, part time male, part time female); (c) gender expression; (d) age; (e) income; (f) race; (g) ethnicity; (h) sexual orientation (lesbian, bisexual, pansexual, asexual, heterosexual, questioning); (i) level of education; and(j) occupational field (manufacturing, education, sales, farming, construction, community service, healthcare).

The key constructs recommended by other researchers as being important in research with a focus on transgender employees, and that are consistent with the scope of study for the dissertation include: gender-identity (Brewster et al, 2012, 2014); participants must self-identify on transgender spectrum (Brewster et al., 2014; Levitt & Ippolito, 2014); age, participants must be age 18 or older (Brewster et al., 2014); employment status of working adult (Brewster et al, 2014; Mizock & Mueser, 2014) working at least 20 hours or more a week to rule out college student populations who may not be officially “working adults” (Nadler & Kufahl, 2014). To participate in the research for the focus of the dissertation participants must be employed but not self-employed and employed in the state of Wisconsin, a region that has not been included in much of the research on transgender employee workplace experiences. A Williams Institute (2009) memorandum documenting Wisconsin sexual orientation and gender identity law and documentation of discrimination does include some information taken from lawsuits within Wisconsin that addressed job discrimination, but does not address

job satisfaction and contains data over 5 years old. Current research has included 29 of the 50 states (Brewster et al., 2012, 2012); the northeast region of the United States (Mizock, & Mueser, 2015); Oklahoma (Mallory et al., 2011); the southern part of United States and California (Levitt & Ippolito, 2014); and South Dakota (Mallory & Sears, 2015a) and Alaska (Mallory & Sears, 2015b).

Researchers indicate that more research is needed to understand the experiences of transgender adults of color in the workplace (Fassinger et al., 2010; Kuper et al., 2012; Brewster et al., 2012, 2014; Mizock, & Mueser, 2015). Other demographics include: socioeconomic status (Levitt & Ippolito, 2014); education (Mizock, & Mueser, 2014); if the person has transitioned, are transitioning or have not transitioned to another gender (Collins et al., 2015); gender expression at work; sexual orientation; perceived work climate concerning LGBT (Levitt, & Ippolito, 2014; and household income. One organizational construct is the presence or absence of antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender employees which researchers recommend the need for further research so change can be made in laws to remedy discrimination against the transgender employee (Cravens, 2015; Baley, 2014).

Job Description Index and Job in General Index

One of the job satisfaction tools is the Job Description Index (JDI) developed by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969), which has six categories including: work, pay, and potential for promotions, supervision and co-workers. Researchers have noted that the rigor of the psychometrics and several scale updates make the JDI a widely used satisfaction scale (Cooper-Hakim, Viswesvaran, & Chockalingam, 2005; Bowling, Hendricks, & Wagner, 2008; Lake, Gopalkrishnan, Sliter & Withrow, 2006). Another job

satisfaction tool is the Job in General Scale (JIG) developed by Ironson, Smith, Brannick, Gibson, and Paul (1989) which contains 18 global questions about the feelings employee have towards their jobs. This tool is associated with measures about the employee's intention to leave, overall life satisfaction, identifying with the organization, and trust in leadership. Researchers will use both the JDI and the JID to measure employee satisfaction and job satisfaction (Lake, et al., 2006).

The participants will answer quantitative, non-experimental survey questions anonymously online. Internet research is appropriate for this research design to ensure confidentiality for the participants (Sue & Ritter, 2012) as evidenced by research data which indicated that 90% of transgender employees have indicated they experience discrimination in the workplace or they personally made changes to avoid discrimination (Bailey, 2014).

Summary and Conclusion

Research that addresses the concept of transgender employees in the workplace initially focused on qualitative studies regarding workplace barriers for employees who underwent transition while working (Budge et al., 2010); discrimination by leadership and peers including harassment and termination (Budge et al, 2010; Bell et al., 2011). Brewster et al. (2014) reported that participants noted both positive and negative workplace experiences, and if positive how it personally affirmed them. Levitt and Ippolito (2014) noted that one participant was asked to enter manager training but then was harassed on the job when human resources and co-workers learned that the participant was transitioning. Other research pertained to the lack of co-workers using the preferred pronouns or names for individuals who are transgender (Dispenz et al., 2012);

and other researchers noted gaps in research concerning transgender employees workplace experiences (Dispenza et al., 2012; Schmidt et al., 2012; Collins et al., 2015) including support for transitioning while working, and an overall limited research regarding organizational policies and protocols for transgender employees (Taylor, et al., 2011) as well as differences in laws that protect transgender employees from harassment or termination (Knauer, 2012; Mallory et al., 2011; Mallory & Sears, 2015a, 2015b; Taylor et al., 2012).

Research gaps continue in the understanding of the experiences of racially diverse employees who are transgender (Budge et al., 2010; Brewster et al., 2011; Kuper et al., 2012; Levitt & Ippolito, 2014; Connell, 2015). Thus one goal for the dissertation is to collect from a diverse participant pool, although the primary goal is to increase the understanding of how either having or not having antidiscrimination policies affects the job satisfaction of transgender employees. Job satisfaction has been a common research topic (Judge & Church, 2000), but research specifically focused on transgender employees is limited and can be expanded to advance the knowledge in this area (Brewster et al., 2012, 2014).

The theoretical foundation is based on two-factor theory (Herzberg, 1966) because it provides insight on both motivation and hygiene factors which may affect job satisfaction of employees. The JDI (Smith, et al., 1969) combined with the JIG (Ironson et al., 1989) when combined have offered effective measurement to determine the overall job satisfaction of employees (Lake, et al., 2006). The dissertation is based on two-factor-theory, then the collection of data from participants who are employed and transgender who complete the JDI and the JIG, will fill the gap in understanding if the presence or

absence of antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender employees has any effect on their job satisfaction.

Chapter 3 will review the independent variables as they related to the dependent variable of job satisfaction. The research design and its connection to the research questions will be addressed. In addition, time and resource constraints, sampling and the sampling procedures and the procedures for recruitment of the participants will also be discussed in chapter 3.

Chapter 3: Research Design and Methodology

Introduction

The purpose of this quantitative research study was to examine whether employees who are transgender are more satisfied with their jobs when the employer has an antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender employees. Some organizations have antidiscrimination policies that include transgender employees and others do not. I collected data to determine whether the independent variable of the employer having transgender inclusive antidiscrimination policy or not having transgender inclusive antidiscrimination policy affected the dependent variable of transgender employee job satisfaction. My goal was to expand the understanding of how transgender employees may experience job satisfaction in their workplaces.

This chapter focuses on the research design and its connection to the research questions. I also address time and resource constraints, sampling and the sampling procedures, and the procedures for recruitment of the participants. In addition, I present information on ethical procedures that I used for this dissertation.

Research Design and Rationale

The independent variable was the presence or absence of antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender employees. The dependent variable was the job satisfaction of transgender employees. Mediating variables included: (a) the employee's gender identity was known by one other individual at work; (b) the employee's gender identity was known by two or more individuals at work; (c) the employee's gender identity was not known by other individuals at work; (d) the employee transitioned prior to employment at current organization; (e) the employee transitioned while employed at

current organization; (f) employee planned to transition in the future while working for current organization; (g) the employee had plans to leave current workplace, and then planned to transition to a different gender in the future. Moderating variables included (a) age; (b) gender noted at birth; (c) current gender identity (male-to-female, female-to-male, intersex, genderqueer, two-spirit, androgynous, part-time male, part-time female); (d) gender expression; (e) race and ethnicity; (f) sexual orientation (lesbian, bisexual, pansexual, asexual, heterosexual, questioning); (g) level of education; (h) occupational field (manufacturing, education, sales, farming, construction, community service, healthcare); and (i) income.

The research design was a quantitative nonexperimental online survey provided to self-identified transgender adults. This research design was used to examine the research question: What is the relationship between organizations either having or not having an antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender employees, and transgender employee job satisfaction? By allowing participants to complete an online survey, their participation and the answers to the questions about personal job satisfaction were confidential and not shared with their employers.

Time constraints concerning the dissertation include the time it took to recruit participants via already established contacts with regional transgender community and education service organizations, university and college resource centers, health care community centers that focus on transgender clients, affirming religious organizations, community social organizations and social media. In addition, time constraints can occur based on the number of responses from potential participants, and their willingness to participate within the established timeframe. At this point of time, there are not any

resource constraints as preliminary interest of community groups and organizations, university and college contacts, and many members of the transgender community are very interested in participating in this dissertation research.

This design choice is consistent with research designs that have addressed workplace issues for transgender employees such as workplace attitudes and behavior towards employees who are transgender, transitioning in the workplace, transgender employees' workplace experiences. The importance of anonymity of the participant names and identities to protect them from potential discriminatory behavior from others within the workplace, the need to utilize vocabulary and language that specifically defines transgender identity and recognizes their experiences and concerns about the workplace while treating the participants with dignity, and the ability to provide the results in a way that administrators, public officials, organizational leaders, human resource directors and others can understand and then use to make effective change to provide workplace equity for individuals who are transgender.

Methodology

Population

The target population are self-identified transgender adults who indicated their gender identity within the transgender spectrum as female-to-male (FtM), male-to-female (MtF), intersex, androgynous, genderqueer, part time male, or part time female; aged 18 or older; and employed in Wisconsin but not self-employed. The size of the target population was not exactly known, but is estimated at 3720.

Sampling and Sampling Procedures

The quantitative research plan for this dissertation utilized a nonprobability, convenience sample design. A convenience sample design was used since the participants were selected from volunteers who will anonymously participate in the online research study. Purposive sampling was not used for this study in order to reduce researcher bias that might occur if the samples were selected based on subjective judgment of the researcher. Quota samples were not selected since the sampling population is difficult to know due to “closeting” of this population, the reliability of the quota sample would be reduced. This type of design was selected to reduce the risk of participants’ experiencing discrimination within the workplace if it is known they are participating in a research study with a focus on transgender workplace discrimination.

Information that described the criteria concerning the research study and how to contact the researcher was sent to transgender resource centers within Wisconsin who distributed the information via social media, bulletin, boards and community events. The estimated number of LGBT employees in the State of Wisconsin was 124,000, although the National Survey of Family Growth or other census surveys did not ask questions about transgender status so the actual number of employees who are transgender is not known (Sears, Mallory & Hunter, 2009; Hasenbush, Flores, Kastaanis, Sears and Gates, 2014). But, research suggests that 3.6% of adults in the United States self-identified as LGB and 0.3% as transgender (Gates, 2011; Hasenbush et al., 2014). Using both Sears et al. (2009) and Gates (2011) data, it may be possible to estimate the potential total of employees who are transgender by this formula: $124,000 \times .03 = 3720$. Since there was not an actual number of how many transgender employees over the age of 18 years are in

Wisconsin, and assuming that not all employees in this population were interested in participating in a research study, the population and sample size was hypothetical.

Selecting the sample size was achieved by the use of three calculations. Using a sample size calculator using a confidence level of 4, with a confidence level of 95%, the sample size determined to needed was 597, which could have been challenging to find enough individuals within population that might actually be employed and interested in completing a survey (Creative Research Systems, 2015). An a-priori sample size calculator offered a different sample size. An anticipated effect size (Cohen's d) of 0.5 with the statistical power level of 0.8, and the probability level of 0.05, the minimum total sample size for (a one-tailed hypothesis) was 102, the minimum sample size per group (one-tailed hypothesis) was 51; the minimum total sample size (two-tailed hypothesis) was 128; and the minimum sample size per group (two-tailed hypothesis) was 64 (Statistics Calculators, 2015). Finally, a G*Power calculation with a two-tail linear multiple regression, with effect size (f^2) of 0.15, error probability of 0.05, with a confidence level of 0.95, the total sample size was 89 (G*Power, 2014). The G*Power calculation had been selected as it was more realistic for this population.

Procedures for Recruitment, Participation, and Data Collection

The participants were recruited through a flier which invited the recipients to share the flier with individuals who might have qualified to participate in the research study. These fliers were sent to resource centers located in Wisconsin that provided service to individuals within the transgender community. The flier contained information about the anonymous online research study and who qualified to participate in the study. The flier included a link for potential participants to contact the researcher if needed, and

an explanation of the study which indicated the focus on learning more about workplace experiences of individuals who self-identified as transgender. The participants who responded to the invitation by entering in to the website link read a document that informed them of their right to volunteer to participate, their ability to withdraw at any time, that they would be completing the survey anonymously, and who to contact if they have any emotional or psychological concerns from completing the survey. Interested persons used the link to complete an initial demographic survey with questions asking (a) if they self-identified as transgender; (b) if they were age 18 or older; (c) if they were employed, but not self-employed; (d) if they were employed in Wisconsin. If the participants' stated affirmative to all of these questions, they received directions via e-mail on how to participate in the survey, directions on how to drop out of the survey, and a contact name if they needed assistance. The participants were able to complete the survey anonymously online. Consent was assumed if they completed the survey.

Other demographics collected within the survey included: age; gender identity; socioeconomic status; education; if they have transitioned, were transitioning or had not transitioned to another gender; gender expression at work; name of the state where they were employed; race/ethnicity; sexual orientation and income. Once the participants completed the study, they were notified that a final summary of completed research study would be posted on the researcher Face book page.

Instrumentation and Operationalization of Constructs

Job Descriptive Index

One of the instrumentation selected for this dissertation was the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) with the latest 1997 update (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1975; Balzer, Kihm,

Smith, Irwin, Bachiochi, Robie, et al., 1997) which was used to measure job satisfaction of employees who are transgender. The JDI had 72 items that are listed within subscales called facets that focused on satisfaction with (a) pay (9 items); (b) opportunities for promotion (9 items); (c) relationships with coworkers (18 items); (d) supervision (18 items); (e) job in general (18 items). The reliability estimates (Cronbach's α) for scores on the 1997 update subscales were the following: .90 for work; .86 for pay; .87 for opportunities for promotion; .91 for supervision; and .91 for people at your present job/colleagues which are considered desirable for psychometric properties (Balzer et al., 1997). Additional demographic information will be asked along with the JDI and JIG. The JDI and JIG do not require specific permission to use.

The JDI was downloaded from the Bowling Green State University website free of charge for this dissertation research study (Bowling Green State University, 2015). The JDI has been extensively used in the United States to measure job satisfaction (DeMeuse, 1985).

Job in General

The second instrumentation selected is the job in general (JIG). JIG measured general global satisfaction. The reliability estimates the JIG scores for the (Cronbach's α) value at .92 (Balzer et al., 1997). Similar to the JDI, the JIG does not require specific permission to use and will be downloaded from the Bowling Green State University website and can used free of charge for this dissertation research study (Bowling Green State University, 2015). The JIG has been extensively used in the United States to measure job satisfaction (DeMeuse, 1985).

Threats to Validity

Threats to internal and external validity could be (a) participants not answering the questions truthfully, (b) participants not knowing whether their workplace had antidiscrimination policy or not, and answering incorrectly or not at all to this question; (c) participants dropping out or not completing the questionnaire; (d) if a participant appeared to be in an outlier of appearing or not appearing to be transgender to employer or co-workers this might have affected their overall work experience and may or may not generalize to the transgender population (e) the passing of a national, state, regional or organizational antidiscrimination policy for transgender employees during the time the participants completed the survey may have affected their answers, but this did not occur within Wisconsin, but may or may not have occurred within the organization in which they worked.

The statistical analysis assisted in locating any outliers that might have arose from external internal threats to validity. First, the data collected on the Qualtrics program was downloaded to SPSS. The data included all of the variable names and labels, and the labels of the values. The analysis plan included data cleaning where the data was collected and screened for outliers by using z-scores which were located under the description tabulations in the SPSS (IBM, 2014). There were not any outliers that were higher or lower than all of the other scores so there was no need for modifications in the variables (Laureate Education Inc., 2013).

The normality of values was completed to see if the distribution of the scores was a bell-shaped curve for the mean = median = mode. It was assumed that there was a normality of the variables since the variables were not kurtosis or skewed. Histograms

were interpreted. The final value was not greater than 2, and no missing data was replaced since the missing data was less than 5% of the total.

For the hypothesis (H_1), that job satisfaction will significantly differ between those individuals working in organizations with antidiscrimination policies versus those that work in companies that do not have antidiscrimination policies; the criterion was the presence or absence of antidiscrimination policies that included transgender employees with the predictor of job satisfaction. A parametric test of significance was used as the assumption was that the observations are drawn from a normally distributed population, and an interval scale was used to measure the predictors and a 2-tailed significance test of Pearson's r was completed to search for correlations. The probability value (p) is zero under the null hypothesis.

Delimitations

The results of this study may not apply to other regional experiences of transgender employees due to variations in laws, regional and cultural viewpoints and experiences. In addition, the results of this study would not apply to transgender employees who are self-employed as it is assumed they may have control over the workplace environment and experiences than individuals who are not self-employed. It is possible that some individuals may have identified with terms other than what may be selected as identifiers for this study, thus the demographics included "other transgender" as an option when the participants were self-identifying within the demographics.

Ethical Procedures

The treatment of human participants in this dissertation study followed the protocol of the Institutional Review Board which included the provision of recruitment

materials to the community service providers that clearly outlined how participants were to be recruited, and how they may have withdrawn from the study at any point of time, and who they could have contacted if they have any questions or concerns. Participants had the ability to not choose to participate, or could withdraw at any point of time.

One of the primary ethical concerns for the topic of this research was that the participants needed to have their information to be confidential as outside knowledge of the information they provided could cause them to experience discrimination at their workplace or in their personal environments. Therefore, it was necessary to both collect and keep their data as anonymous participants. The data was collected online using a system that collected their answers but not any identifying information, and the data is be stored in a locked file cabinet in the researcher's home office to which no one else can gain access. The data will be destroyed once the dissertation process is completed.

Summary

The purpose of this quantitative research study was to focus on the independent variable of the presence or absence of antidiscrimination policy that included transgender employees as it related to the dependent variable of job satisfaction. The goal of this study was to expand the understanding of how transgender employees may experience job satisfaction within their workplace. Participants were recruited by contacting community centers and service groups that provided services to individuals who are transgender and requested assistance in getting information to eligible and interested participants who then completed an anonymous online survey. The survey they completed was the JDI and JIG, and demographic questions. I am responsible to maintain confidentiality of the participants' data as this type of information may cause

discriminatory problems both within their workplace and in their personal environments if confidentiality is not maintained.

Chapter 4 will address the data collected from the research study. The results of the data collected, including tables and figures will be reviewed, the findings will be interpreted, limitations of the study discussed, and recommendations for future studies and the implications of potential impact will be addressed.

Chapter 4: Results

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the data analysis and results of this study, which examined whether employees who self-identified as transgender were more satisfied with their jobs when the employer had an antidiscrimination policy that included transgender employees. The research question was: What is the relationship between organizations either having or not having an antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender employees and transgender employee job satisfaction? The hypotheses were as follows:

H_0 : There is no difference in job satisfaction between those individuals working in organizations with antidiscrimination policies versus those that work in companies that do not have antidiscrimination policies.

H_1 : Job satisfaction will significantly differ between those individuals working in organizations with antidiscrimination policies versus those that work in companies that do not have antidiscrimination policies.

In this chapter, I focus on the analysis and results of this research study. I also address the time frame for the data collection and the recruitment and response rates. I then review discrepancies in data collection from the plan in Chapter 3. In addition, there will be information on the demographic characteristics of the sample followed by the analysis of the key variables and concepts with the conclusion providing a summary of key findings.

Data Collection

I collected data in the course of a 3-month period from June 8, 2016, to September 9, 2016. I collected a total of 44 responses, of which 38 of the participants eligible to participate completed the entire survey, short of the proposed goal of 89 participants. During this period, fliers containing an announcement for the need for participants which included access information to the anonymous online survey, were disseminated via U.S. postal mail, e-mail, and social media to community and health organizations, LGBT-friendly bars/eateries, and individuals who have contact with persons who are transgender and who might be eligible and interested in participating in the research study. These contacts often replied that they shared this information with others and they would ask their contacts to also share the information on the fliers to potential participants in organizational meetings, websites, social media, and community events. During the same period, a notice was posted in an LGBT web magazine with a statewide reader base, fliers were distributed and discussed in LGBT organizational and community-based meetings and social/support groups, and more than 150 fliers were disseminated from several organizational tables at summer Pride events in Milwaukee, Green Bay, and Madison, Wisconsin, to individuals who indicated they would help share the information or perhaps participate.

The response rates were the highest after the fliers were disseminated at each of the three Pride events. The participant response after each Pride event increased by 6 to 8 participants within the week following the event, whereas it increased by 2-4 participants from each group mailing or e-mail within the week of distribution. The decision to stop collecting data after 44 participants entered data into the survey and to not pursue the

proposed goal of 89 participants occurred after the participation activity stopped. In addition, the feedback from the organizations/community groups that handed out the fliers internally at and the Pride events was that many of the individuals who stopped to inquire and would were interested to fill out the survey since they identified as transgender, were either not employed, self-employed, or worked outside of Wisconsin due to difficulty of being able to get work. These organizations indicated that perhaps 89 was not a goal that could readily be met based on feedback from their customer base and the event participants that they were not aware of anyone else they could share the research flyer with since so many transgender people they know are self-employed or not employed.

Demographics

Thirty-eight of the 44 participants were qualified candidates for the sample and completely answered the anonymous online survey except for 3 candidates who did not completely answer the JDI. All of these participants were 18 years-old or older and self-identified as being transgender. Categories reported by participants as their current gender identity included male (31.6%), man (2.6%), female (28.9%), part time female (2.7%), genderqueer (10.5%), agender (2.7%), nonbinary (7.9%), genderfluid (7.9%), epicene (2.7%) and demiboy (2.7%). The majority of the participants self-identified as White/European American (86.7%) whereas other participants reported they were Native American (2.7%), Asian or Asian American (5.2%), or Black or African American (2.7%). Several participants had completed some college credit-but did not have a degree (34.1%), earned a bachelor's degree (12%) or other degrees. Although a number of participants reported that no one at their work were aware of their gender identity

(23.7%), a larger majority indicated coworkers were aware of their gender identity in that at least one co-worker knew their gender identity (7.9%) or two or more coworkers knew their gender identity (68.4%). Fourteen participants reported that their workplace had workplace antidiscrimination policy that included employees who were transgender (37%), 12 participants (31.5%) reported that there was no workplace antidiscrimination policy that included transgender employees, and 12 participants (31.5%) said they were not aware of the presence or absence of such policy. Table 1 displays all of the demographic characteristics collected in the online survey.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Sample

Demographic characteristics (N = 38)	(n)	%
Current gender identity		
Male	12	31.6
Man	1	2.7
Part-time male	0	.0
Female	11	28.9
Part-time female	1	2.7
Intersex	0	.0
Genderqueer	4	10.5
Two-spirit	0	.0
Androgynous	0	.0
Agender	1	2.7
Nonbinary	3	7.9
Genderfluid	3	7.9
Epicene	1	2.7
Demiboy	1	2.7

(table continues)

Demographic characteristics (N = 38)	(n)	%
Race/ethnicity		
White or European American	33	86.7
Hispanic or Latino/Latino/Latinx	0	.0
Black or African American	1	2.7
Asian or Asian American	2	5.2
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	.0
Native American	1	2.7
Another noted: Jewish	1	2.7
Legal gender at birth		
Male	13	34.2
Female	24	63.1
Another gender	1	2.7
Current gender expression		
Male	18	47.4
Female	7	18.4
Bigender	4	10.6
Gender nonconforming	7	18.4
Androgynous	2	5.2
Sexual orientation		
Lesbian	5	13.2
Bisexual	11	28.9
Pansexual	10	26.4
Asexual	0	.0
Heterosexual	4	10.5
Not sure	4	10.5
Queer	4	10.5
Education level		
Some high school-no diploma	1	2.7
High school diploma or equivalent	4	10.5
Some college credit, no degree	13	34.1
Trade/technical/vocational training	1	2.7
Associate degree	1	2.7
Bachelor's degree	12	31.4
Master's degree	5	13.2
Doctorate degree	1	2.7

(table continues)

Demographic characteristics (N=38)	(<i>n</i>)	%
Occupational field		
Manufacturing	3	7.9
Education	5	13.2
Sales	7	18.4
Community service	6	15.8
More than one of the above	4	10.5
Information technology	4	10.5
Advertising	1	2.7
Science	1	2.7
Farming	0	.0
Construction	0	.0
Health care	0	.0
Another field: Did not indicate	7	18.4
Income US Dollars		
0–19,999	13	34.1
20,00–39,999	15	39.5
40,00–59,999	3	7.9
60,00–79,999	3	7.9
80,000–99,999	1	2.7
100,000–119,999	2	5.2
120,000–139,999	0	.0
140,000 or more	1	2.7
Coworker(s) aware of gender identity		
Yes at least one is aware	3	7.9
Yes, two or more aware	26	68.4
No one is aware	9	23.7
Plans for transition to another gender		
No plans for transition	4	10.5
Plan to do so in future, date not set	11	28.9
Transitioned prior to current workplace	10	26.4
Plan to transition in future at current workplace	8	21.0
Plan to leave current workplace, change gender and start employment at new workplace	3	7.9
Not sure	2	5.3

Results

Job Descriptive Index

Tests completed in a statistical analysis of the data collected from the survey to locate outliers indicated there was no need for modifications of the variables. Normality of values was completed. The score distributions created a bell-shaped curve and there were no variables that were kurtotic or skewed. Histograms were completed to examine if there were statistical outliers. No outliers were noted as the distances between the points in the histograms were equal. Within the JDI several segments of data were missing within 3 of the participants' surveys. As the missing data could not be estimated with assurance of validity the statistical correlation was completed for each facet using the participants' that completed the questions within each JDI facet set. Table 2 displays the means and standard deviations that were conducted using the data completed by 35 participants who answered all of the "work" facet questions within the Job Descriptive Index. Table 3 displays the means and standard deviations conducted for the 37 participants that completed answered the "opportunities for promotions" facet. Table 4 displays the mean and standard deviations for the 34 participants that completed the "supervision" facet, and Table 5 displays the mean and standard deviations for the 36 participants that "people in the workplace" facet. The presence of antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender has the highest standard deviation under the promotion facet (.854), second highest under the work facet (.832), third highest for people in the workplace (.820), with the lowest standard deviation for the supervision facet (.808).

Table 2

Job Descriptive Index Work Facet Correlation to Transgender Inclusive Antidiscrimination Workplace Policy Statistics

	Item statistics		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	N
JDI-Fascinating	1.80	.584	35
JDI-Routine	1.20	.473	35
JDI-Satisfying	1.49	.562	35
JDI-Boring	1.69	.631	35
JDI-Good	1.37	.598	35
JDI-accomplishment	1.57	.698	35
JDI.-Respected	1.71	.710	35
JDI-Exciting	1.89	.631	35
JDI-Rewarding	1.66	.684	35
JDI-Useful	1.37	.598	35
JDI-Challenging	1.51	.507	35
JDI-Simple	1.54	.505	35
JDI-Repetitive	1.40	.604	35
JDI-Creative	1.66	.539	35
JDI-Dull	1.77	.646	35
JDI-Uninteresting	1.60	.553	35
JDI-Can see results	1.43	.608	35
JDI-Uses my abilities	1.37	.598	35
Antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender	1.89	.832	35

Table 3

Job Descriptive Index Promotion Facet Correlation to Transgender Inclusive Antidiscrimination Workplace Policy Statistics

	Descriptive statistics		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	N
Opportunities for good promotion	1.97	.654	36
Opportunities for promotion somewhat limited	1.39	.688	36
Opportunities for promotion on ability	1.61	.645	36
Opportunities for promotion is Dead-end job	1.61	.599	36
Opportunities good chance for promotion	1.86	.683	36
Opportunities for promotion Very limited	1.50	.561	36
Opportunities for promotion-Infrequent promotions	1.33	.586	36
Opportunities for-regular promotions	1.92	.439	36
Opportunities-fairly good chance for promotion	1.69	.577	36
Antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender	1.89	.854	36

Table 4

Job Descriptive Index Supervision Facet Correlation to Transgender Inclusive Antidiscrimination Workplace Policy-Statistics

	Descriptive Statistics		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	N
Supervision-Supportive	1.44	.705	34
Supervision-Hard to please	1.76	.554	34
Supervision-Impolite	1.74	.511	34
Supervision-Praises good work	1.50	.663	34
Supervision-Tactful	1.68	.768	34
Supervision-Influential	1.88	.729	34
Supervision-Up-to-date	1.79	.729	34
Supervision-Unkind	1.94	.422	34
Supervision -Has favorites	1.56	.660	34
Supervision -Tells me where I stand	1.62	.697	34
Supervision-Annoying	1.79	.538	34
Supervision-Stubborn	1.74	.567	34
Supervision-Knows job well	1.35	.597	34
Supervision -Bad	1.88	.478	34
Supervision -Intelligent	1.32	.589	34
Supervision-Poor planner	1.82	.626	34
Supervision -Around when needed	1.38	.551	34
Supervision -Lazy	2.00	.348	34
Antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender	1.88	.808	34

Table 5

Job Descriptive Index People in Workplace Facet Correlation to Transgender Inclusive Antidiscrimination Workplace Policy-Statistics

Descriptive Statistics			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	N
People-Stimulating	1.42	.604	36
People-Boring	1.81	.525	36
People-Slow	1.86	.424	36
People-Helpful	1.36	.593	36
People-Stupid	2.00	.338	36
People-Responsible	1.25	.554	36
People-Likeable	1.22	.540	36
People-Intelligent	1.36	.593	36
People-Easy to make enemies	1.89	.465	36
People-Rude	1.81	.467	36
People-Smart	1.31	.525	36
People-Lazy	1.89	.523	36
People-Unpleasant	1.94	.410	36
People-Supportive	1.50	.655	36
People-Active	1.50	.655	36
People-Narrow interests	1.69	.624	36
People-Frustrating	1.86	.543	36
People-Stubborn	1.81	.624	36
Antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender	1.89	.820	36

To search for multicollinearity to determine the strength of relationship between the facets and the hypothesis, two-tailed Pearson correlations were completed for all 5 facets of the JDI categories and with the variable of having transgender inclusive antidiscrimination policy in the workplace. Missing data was less than 5% of the total, so data did not have to be replaced by estimating a value. Significant correlation relationships were demonstrated within the JDI facets of “opportunities for promotion” which is displayed in Table 6, “supervision” which is displayed in Table 7, and “people in the workplace” which is displayed in Table 8. Some examples of statistically significant correlations at the .01 level for “promotion” include “opportunities for promotion on ability” and opportunities “good chance for promotion” (.523), and “opportunities-fairly good chance for promotion” and opportunities for promotion based on ability” (.670). There were several statistically significant correlations to the hypothesis within the opportunities for promotion facet including .01 level “opportunities-good chance for promotion” (.326), “opportunities for promotion on ability” (.673), thus suggesting that more employees who reported that opportunities for promotion can occur and that it is due to one’s ability also had a correlation to the presence of antidiscrimination policy. There were no significant correlations to supervision and the presence of antidiscrimination policy in the workplace nor were there correlations to the people in the workplace and the presence of antidiscrimination policy in the workplace.

Table 6

Correlation Matrix for JDI Promotions Facet and Hypothesis

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
1.Opportunities for good promotion	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	1										
2.Opportunities for promotion somewhat limited	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	-.102	1									
3.Opportunities for promotion on ability	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.553 .516**	-.100	1								
4.Opportunities for promotion is Dead-end job	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.001 .045	.561	-.033	1							
5.Opportunities good chance for promotion	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.796 .183	.161	.849	.004	1						
6.Opportunities for promotion Very limited	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.285 -.039	.158	.001	.982	-.037	1					
7.Opportunities for promotion-Infrequent promotions	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.822 -.274	.001	.017	.001	.829	-.095	.522**	1			
8.Opportunities for-regular promotions	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.106 .390*	.023	.051	.001	.580	.001	.737	-.111	1		
9.Opportunities-fairly good chance for promotion	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.019 .356*	.927	.280	.461	.041	.737	.519	-.282	.009	1	
10.Antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.033 -.261	.252	.000	.271	.053	.016	.096	.957	-.102	-.303	1
		.124	.661	.088	.134	.191	.488	.375	.556	.073		

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

c. Listwise N=36

Table 7

Correlation Matrix for JDI Supervisor Facet and Hypothesis

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1. Supervision-Supportive	Pearson <i>r</i>	1																		
	Sig. (2-tailed)																			
2. Supervision-Hard to please	Pearson <i>r</i>	.041	1																	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.817																		
3. Supervision-Impolite	Pearson <i>r</i>	-.507**	.523**	1																
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.002																	
4. Supervision-Praises good work	Pearson <i>r</i>	.681*	.000	-.313	1															
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	1.000	.071																
5. Supervision-Tactful	Pearson <i>r</i>	.608*	.029	-.302	.506**	1														
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.869	.082	.002															
6. Supervision-Influential	Pearson <i>r</i>	.340*	.155	-.005	.376*	.255	1													
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.049	.383	.979	.028	.146														
7. Supervision-Up-to-date	Pearson <i>r</i>	.300	-.049	.012	.219	.365*	.637**	1												
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.085	.785	.946	.213	.034	.000													
8. Supervision-Unkind	Pearson <i>r</i>	.090	.198	.487**	.000	.033	.174	.255	1											
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.613	.261	.003	1.000	.853	.326	.146												

(table continues)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
9. Supervision - Has favorites	Pearson	-	.288	.452**	-.104	.188	.078	-.006	.339*	1										
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.155	.381	.099	.007	.559	.286	.662	.975	.050										
10. Supervision -Tells me where I stand	Pearson	.416*	.231	.048	.558**	.498**	.446**	.258	.333	.281	1									
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.015	.189	.789	.001	.003	.008	.141	.054	.108										
11. Supervision- Annoying	Pearson	-.073	.341*	.677*	-.127	-.019	.168	.198	.745*	.248	.188	1								
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.682	.048	.000	.473	.913	.342	.263	.000	.157	.288									
12. Supervision- Stubborn	Pearson	-.002	.278	.483*	-.040	.076	-.078	-.062	.692*	.407*	.273	.709*	1							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.990	.111	.004	.821	.670	.663	.726	.000	.017	.119	.000								
13. Supervision- Knows job well	Pearson	.555*	-.016	-.181	.536*	.521*	.377*	.450*	.205	.023	.407*	.139	.284	1						
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.928	.305	.001	.002	.028	.008	.245	.899	.017	.434	.103							
14. Supervision -Bad	Pearson	.069	.350*	.489*	.000	-.107	.133	.189	.866*	.215	.225	.728*	.664*	.150	1					
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.699	.042	.003	1.000	.547	.453	.284	.000	.222	.201	.000	.000	.397						
15. Supervision -Intelligent	Pearson	.595*	-.038	-.110	.660*	.641*	.444*	.442*	.201	.066	.458*	.217	.264	.786*	.032	1				
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.830	.537	.000	.000	.008	.009	.255	.709	.006	.219	.131	.000	.859					
16. Supervision- Poor planner	Pearson	.182	.226	.228	.219	.067	.219	.051	.418*	.246	.188	.428*	.462*	.172	.536*	.160	1			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.303	.198	.194	.213	.708	.214	.776	.014	.161	.287	.011	.006	.332	.001	.367				
17. Supervision -Proud when needed	Pearson	.645*	.105	-.168	.456*	.516*	.417*	.503*	.100	-.105	.392*	.069	.140	.774*	.061	.728*	-.062	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.554	.343	.007	.002	.014	.002	.575	.553	.022	.698	.431	.000	.732	.000	.728			

(table continues)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
18. Supervision	Pearson	.247	.629*	.341*	.131	.113	.119	.000	.000	.264	.250	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.139	.158		1
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.049	.459	.523	.501	1.000	1.000	.132	.154	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000		.433	.373	
19. Antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender	Pearson	.254	.004	.069	.113	.035	.130	.215	.157	-.157	-.082	.291	.195	.277	.199	.337	.257	.172	.000	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.148	.982	.698	.524	.846	.463	.222	.376	.375	.643	.095	.270	.112	.260	.051	.142	.330	1.000	

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

c. Listwise N=36

Table 8

Correlation Matrix for JDI People in Workplace Facet and Hypothesis

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
People-Stimulating	Pearson <i>r</i>	1																		
	Sig. (2-tailed)																			
People-Boring	Pearson <i>r</i>	-.098	1																	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.571																		
People-Slow	Pearson <i>r</i>	-.102	.517**	1																
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.553	.001																	
People-Helpful	Pearson <i>r</i>	.765**	.048	-.022	1															
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.779	.898																
People-Stupid	Pearson <i>r</i>	.140	.322	.398*	.143	1														
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.415	.055	.016	.407															
People-Responsible	Pearson <i>r</i>	.705**	.172	.152	.674**	.457**	1													
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.316	.377	.000	.005														
People-Likeable	Pearson <i>r</i>	.759**	.157	.014	.812**	.156	.763**	1												
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.361	.936	.000	.362	.000													
People-Intelligent	Pearson <i>r</i>	.765**	.140	.091	.756**	.285	.761**	.634**	1											
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.414	.596	.000	.092	.000	.000												
People-Easy to make enemies	Pearson <i>r</i>	.068	.612**	.499**	.150	.182	.333*	.329	.046	1										
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.694	.000	.002	.383	.288	.047	.050	.790											
People-Rude	Pearson <i>r</i>	-.211	.424**	.580**	-.255	.362*	-.138	-.277	-.049	.293	1									
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.217	.010	.000	.133	.030	.422	.102	.778	.083										
People-Smart	Pearson <i>r</i>	.489**	.014	.196	.462**	.322	.418*	.358*	.737**	-.091	.249	1								
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.934	.252	.005	.055	.011	.032	.000	.597	.143									
People-Lazy	Pearson <i>r</i>	-.211	.440**	.573**	-.236	.162	.000	-.112	-.143	.418*	.494**	.232	1							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.216	.007	.000	.166	.346	1.000	.514	.404	.011	.002	.174								

(table continues)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
People-Unpleasant	Pearson <i>r</i>	.096	.745**	.611**	.085	.206	.189	.186	.202	.716**	.538**	.081	.370*	1						
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.577	.000	.000	.623	.228	.271	.277	.237	.000	.001	.638	.026							
People-Supportive	Pearson <i>r</i>	.542**	.042	.051	.699**	.129	.591**	.646**	.626**	.282	-.047	.457**	-.167	.213	1					
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.810	.766	.000	.453	.000	.000	.000	.096	.787	.005	.330	.213						
People-Active	Pearson <i>r</i>	.542**	.125	-.051	.773**	.129	.591**	.646**	.626**	.188	-.140	.374*	-.167	.106	.867**	1				
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.469	.766	.000	.453	.000	.000	.000	.273	.415	.025	.330	.537	.000					
People-Narrow interests	Pearson <i>r</i>	-.335*	.511**	.267	-.234	.271	-.186	-.132	-.311	.372*	.476**	-.056	.331*	.378*	-.105	-.175	1			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.046	.001	.116	.170	.110	.278	.444	.065	.025	.003	.747	.049	.023	.543	.308				
People-Frustrating	Pearson <i>r</i>	.007	.404*	.658**	-.017	.312	.024	.011	-.017	.390*	.454**	.153	.549**	.478**	-.040	-.121	.377*	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.966	.015	.000	.920	.064	.891	.950	.920	.019	.005	.372	.001	.003	.816	.483	.023			
People-Stubborn	Pearson <i>r</i>	.070	.317	.434**	-.114	.271	-.021	-.038	-.036	.317	.552**	.099	.282	.515**	-.175	-.245	.430**	.593**	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.687	.059	.008	.509	.110	.905	.827	.833	.059	.000	.564	.095	.001	.308	.150	.009	.000		
Antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender	Pearson <i>r</i>	.269	.147	-.128	.202	.103	.314	.251	.320	-.108	.017	.147	-.163	.151	.053	.213	-.012	-.164	.124	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.112	.391	.458	.237	.550	.062	.140	.057	.530	.924	.391	.342	.380	.758	.213	.943	.339	.471	

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

c. Listwise N=36

Job in General

Table 9 displays the descriptive mean and standard deviations for the JIG facets which depict the standard deviation for the correlation of the hypothesis (noted as “Antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender”) and the JIG facets at .831. To test the hypothesis, two-tailed Pearson correlations were completed for each of the 18 facets within the JIG and with the hypothesis. Missing data was less than 5% of the total, so data did not have to be replaced by estimating a value. The JIG correlation to the hypothesis is displayed in Table 10.

Statistically significant positive correlations at the .01 level for both the presence and absence of job satisfaction were noted between the JIG facets of work. The correlation of work facets of “work on present job is pleasant” and “good” (.640) and my work are “good” correlated with “better than most” (.468) are both examples of the presence of job satisfaction. Significant positive correlations at the .01 level that demonstrated absence of job satisfaction include my job is “waste of time” and “worse than most” (.658) and “undesirable” and “worse than most” (.562). The only statistically significant correlation to the hypothesis was the facet “better than most” (.371) thus suggesting that more employees who reported that their job in general is better than most also had a correlation to the presence of antidiscrimination policy.

Table 9

Job in General Index Correlation to Hypothesis-Statistics

Descriptive Statistics			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
JIG -Pleasant	1.32	.574	38
JIG -Bad	1.92	.359	38
JIG-Great	1.95	.613	38
JIG-Waste of time	1.92	.487	38
JIG-Good	1.26	.503	38
JIG-Undesirable	1.84	.547	38
JIG-Worthwhile	1.58	.758	38
JIG -Worse than most	1.95	.324	38
JIG-Acceptable	1.13	.475	38
JIG-Superior	1.95	.399	38
JIG-Better than most	1.47	.603	38
JIG-Disagreeable	1.92	.487	38
JIG-Makes me content	1.79	.777	38
JIG-Inadequate	1.84	.594	38
JIG-Excellent	2.00	.569	38
JIG -Rotten	1.97	.283	38
JIG-Enjoyable	1.61	.718	38
JIG -Poor	1.95	.399	38
Antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender	1.89	.831	38

Table 10

Job in General Correlation to Hypothesis

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1. JIG -Pleasant	Pearson <i>r</i>	1																		
	Sig. (2-tailed)																			
2. JIG -Bad	Pearson <i>r</i>	-.138	1																	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.409																		
3.JIG-Great	Pearson <i>r</i>	.279	.104	1																
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.090	.536																	
4. JIG-Waste of time	Pearson <i>r</i>	-.005	.582**	.258	1															
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.976	.000	.118																
5. JIG-Good	Pearson <i>r</i>	.640**	-.032	.221	-.354*	1														
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.851	.182	.029															
6. JIG-Undesirable	Pearson <i>r</i>	-.267	.486**	.055	.460**	-.238	1													
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.105	.002	.742	.004	.150														
7. JIG-Worthwhile	Pearson <i>r</i>	.376*	.073	.358*	.054	.369*	-.295	1												
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.020	.662	.027	.748	.023	.072													
8. JIG -Worse than most	Pearson <i>r</i>	-.053	.892**	.122	.658**	-.078	.562**	.017	1											
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.750	.000	.467	.000	.640	.000	.918												
9. JIG-Acceptable	Pearson <i>r</i>	.339*	.221	.024	.163	.417**	.186	.158	.222	1										
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.037	.182	.884	.328	.009	.263	.343	.181											
10. JIG-Superior	Pearson <i>r</i>	.310	.159	.209	-.022	.340*	-.039	.282	.187	.038	1									
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.058	.341	.207	.896	.037	.816	.086	.262	.823										
11. JIG-Better than most	Pearson <i>r</i>	.336*	-.072	.215	-.053	.468**	-.013	.093	-.007	.248	.331*	1								
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.039	.666	.194	.751	.003	.939	.577	.965	.133	.043									

(table continues)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
12. JIG-Disagreeable	Pearson <i>r</i>	-.005	.273	.167	.315	-.023	.358*	.127	.315	.163	.117	-.145	1							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.976	.097	.316	.054	.890	.027	.447	.054	.328	.484	.384								
13. JIG-Makes me content	Pearson <i>r</i>	.395*	-.061	.487**	-.045	.353*	-.208	.626**	-.045	.077	.312	.334*	.312	1						
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.014	.715	.002	.788	.030	.211	.000	.788	.645	.056	.040	.056							
14. JIG-Inadequate	Pearson <i>r</i>	.150	.447**	.274	.517**	-.129	.504**	-.032	.517**	.171	-.036	-.314	.423**	-.133	1					
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.368	.005	.097	.001	.442	.001	.851	.001	.303	.830	.055	.008	.427						
15. JIG-Excellent	Pearson <i>r</i>	.330*	.132	.620**	.195	.189	.087	.501**	.146	.000	.357*	.315	.195	.672**	.160	1				
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.043	.429	.000	.241	.257	.604	.001	.381	1.000	.028	.054	.241	.000	.338					
16. JIG -Rotten	Pearson <i>r</i>	.052	.776**	.147	.572**	.050	.496**	.073	.866**	.227	.226	.075	.572**	.097	.456**	.167	1			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.755	.000	.377	.000	.766	.002	.664	.000	.170	.172	.655	.000	.563	.004	.315				
17. JIG-Enjoyable	Pearson <i>r</i>	.507**	-.019	.566**	-.014	.445**	-.094	.382*	.024	.156	.303	.443**	.140	.622**	.040	.661**	.080	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.908	.000	.932	.005	.574	.018	.884	.348	.065	.005	.400	.000	.811	.000	.632			
18. JIG -Poor	Pearson <i>r</i>	.074	.536**	.209	.674**	-.198	.456**	.103	.604**	.180	.152	-.118	.674**	.138	.534**	.238	.704**	.114	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.657	.001	.207	.000	.233	.004	.537	.000	.279	.363	.480	.000	.410	.001	.151	.000	.495		
19. Antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender	Pearson <i>r</i>	.128	-.029	.042	-.155	.262	-.097	.099	-.021	.310	.309	.371*	.179	.258	.075	.171	.103	.245	.064	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.444	.865	.803	.354	.112	.562	.553	.900	.058	.059	.022	.281	.118	.655	.304	.540	.138	.701	

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

c. Listwise N=36

Summary

The hypothesis concerning the presence of antidiscrimination policy that includes employees who are transgender and job satisfaction was examined using two-tailed Pearson correlations. The means, standard deviations and Pearson r were completed for each of the 18 facets within the JDI and with the hypothesis, and for each of the 5 facets within the JIG and the hypothesis. The focus of this research study is to determine if having antidiscrimination policy that includes employees who are transgender are more satisfied with their jobs.

The timeframe for the data collection occurred over two three months. Support for the dissemination of the flier informing potential participants of the availability of the study was present, and hundreds of fliers were disseminated by mail, social media and in person to several LGBT community centers and other individuals, via large scale advertisements in large state-wide website publications, and through three Pride Center events through vendor booths. Responses by participants tended to occur within three to four days after the dissemination of the fliers. The decision to stop the anonymous online survey came as a result of the discontinuation of participation, and because of the advice of LGBT community members and leaders who indicated that the overall response from potential participants was either they had already participated, informed everyone they knew about the study, and the remaining individuals that they were aware of would not qualify for the study because they were either unemployed, employed outside of the state of Wisconsin, were under the age of 18, or were self-employed. Thus the goal of 89 participants was deemed to be optimistic, and the participant group of 44 provided the data within this research study.

The findings of the study revealed that job satisfaction varies widely among the participants. There were several significant correlations among the data within the correlation analysis of the JDI survey. For example, the comparison of the JDI and the presence of antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender employees has the highest standard deviation under the promotion facet (.854), second highest under the work facet (.832), third highest for people in the workplace (.820), with the lowest standard deviation for the supervision facet (.808). Some examples of statistically significant correlations at the .01 level for “promotion” include “opportunities for promotion on ability” and opportunities “good chance for promotion” (.523), and “opportunities-fairly good chance for promotion” and opportunities for promotion based on ability” (.670). There were several statistically significant correlations to the hypothesis within the opportunities for promotion facet including .01 level “opportunities-good chance for promotion” (.326), “opportunities for promotion on ability” (.673), thus suggesting that more employees who reported that opportunities for promotion can occur and that it is due to one’s ability also had a correlation to the presence of antidiscrimination policy. There were no significant correlations to supervision and the presence of antidiscrimination policy in the workplace nor were there correlations to the people in the workplace and the presence of antidiscrimination policy in the workplace. These results suggest that the ability to be promoted has the highest correlation to the hypothesis and job satisfaction.

Significant correlation results for the JIG and the hypothesis occurred in only one facet of the 17 facets, which denoted the job as “better than most”. The correlation was not significant in the other 17 facets such as a pleasant workplace, a great workplace, a

workplace that is a waste of time, rotten, superior, etc. The findings of this study suggest that there are specific facets that may affect job satisfaction as it pertains to the presence of antidiscrimination policy that is inclusive of employees who are transgender, but not every facet of job satisfaction is affected.

Chapter 5 will present conclusions, recommendations for future research and to discuss the social impact as it pertains to the research question, key variables and concepts presented in chapter 3. Initially a summary of the research study is presented which is followed by sample characteristics, conclusions, a general discussion, and implications for practice. Finally, recommendations for future research and the significance for social impact are addressed.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions and Recommendations

Introduction

The purpose of Chapter 5 is to discuss conclusions, recommendations for future research, and the social effect pertaining to the research question, key variables, and concepts presented in Chapter 3. I begin with a summary followed by sample characteristics, conclusions, a general discussion, and implications for practice. Finally, I address recommendations for future research and potential social effect of the findings.

Summary of Nature of Research Study

The purpose of this anonymous online quantitative research study was to examine whether employees who identified as transgender were more satisfied with their jobs when the employer had an antidiscrimination policy that included transgender employees. I collected data to determine whether the independent variable of the presence or absence of transgender-inclusive antidiscrimination policy affected the dependent variable of transgender employee job satisfaction. Fassinger et al. (2010) indicated that the relationship between workplace discrimination and job satisfaction for sexual orientation has been replicated, but the author did not cite research focused specifically on gender identity and job satisfaction related specifically to the presence or absence of antidiscrimination policy. Research within human resource development has focused primarily on sexual orientation and not on the workplace experiences of employees who are transgender (Collins et al., 2015).

Furthermore, Taylor et al. (2012), indicated that research on transgender inclusive antidiscrimination is not only limited but has been focused on public administration only and needs to expand into the private sector. In addition, Taylor et al. suggested a need for

quantitative research specifically focused on transgender antidiscrimination policy owing to an increase in antidiscrimination laws. Because of the gap in literature regarding job satisfaction for transgender employees as it relates to antidiscrimination policy, I conducted research to provide an increased understanding of employees who are transgender, older than 18 years, and employed but not self-employed in the state of Wisconsin, which, by state law, requires workplace antidiscrimination policy for lesbian, gay, and bisexual employees but not for transgender employees.

The quantitative survey was comprised of demographic questions and the JDI and JIG which contains questions focused on job satisfaction and it was made available on the Qualtrics online survey system. Both the JDI and the JIG have been extensively used in the United States to measure job satisfaction (DeMeuse, 1985). Fliers that provided information about the anonymous research study and a link to access the survey were distributed via hard copy and electronic copy to LGBT community centers and leadership, support and social groups, congregations that indicated they were LGBT affirming, bars and businesses focused on LGBT community, campus Pride Centers, health care and service providers, web magazines, via social media. Several fliers were also handed out by organizations at LGBT events and parades in Green Bay, Madison and Milwaukee. Follow up fliers were sent via e-mail and mail to larger organizations one month after the initial contact as a reminder about the study. Frequent contact occurred between several of these organizations/support groups and the researcher provided feedback on perceived general interest of potential participants and if there were a need for more fliers for dissemination.

The response rate increased within a few days of each distribution of the flier, especially the week after distribution at public LGBT events, but would drop to zero the week following each mass distribution. Although the sample goal of 89 was not reached, and only 38 eligible participants entirely completed the survey, the researcher received several requests for notification when the research is completed due to the interest of its membership. Feedback received from community groups and members indicate that many of their customers indicated they were self-employed or not employed due to perceived discrimination they experienced in seeking employment, thus it was difficult for them to locate more individuals who were eligible to participate in this survey.

The data was downloaded from Qualtrics to the SPSS system. Tests were completed for a statistical analysis of the data collected from the survey to locate outliers. There was no need for modifications of the variables. Normality of values was completed including histograms, and the data distribution created a bell-shaped curve of which no variables were kurtotic or skewed. Within the JDI several segments of data were missing within 3 of the participants' surveys. As the missing data could not be estimated with assurance of validity the statistical correlation was completed for each facet using the participants' that completed the questions within each JDI facet set.

Sample Characteristics

Thirty-eight of the 44 participants who completed the online survey qualified as candidates for the sample. All of these participants were 18 years of age or older and self-identified as being transgender. Participants reported their current gender identity as male (31.6%), man (2.6%), female (28.9%), part time female (2.7%), genderqueer (10.5%), agender (2.7%), nonbinary (7.9%), genderfluid (7.9%), epicene (2.7%) and demiboy

(2.7%). Almost 87% of the participants reported they were White/European American (86.7%) whereas other participants reported they were Native American (2.7%), Asian or Asian American (5.2%), or Black or African American (2.7%). Approximately 34% of the participants did not have a degree but completed some college credit or earned a bachelor's degree (12%) or other degrees. The reported income of the participants ranged from under \$20,000 to over \$140,000 per year. The participants reported varying goals regarding transition as the following: no plan for transitioning (10.5%); plan to transition in future-date not set (28.9%); transitioned prior to current place of employment (26.4%); transitioned while employed at my current workplace (21%), plan to transition in future at current workplace (7.9%); plan to leave current workplace, transition, and then start employment at new place (5.3%).

Interpretation of Findings

Findings in this research study extend the knowledge in this field in the understanding of how many employees are aware if their workplace has antidiscrimination policy that includes them. Fourteen participants reported that their workplace had workplace antidiscrimination policy that included employees who were transgender (37%), 12 participants (31.5%) reported that there was no workplace antidiscrimination policy that included transgender employees, and 12 participants (31.5%) said they were not aware of the presence or absence of such policy. One research team suggested that progressive employers have antidiscrimination policy that includes employees who are transgender (Taylor, et al., 2011), and that having such policies have a positive impact on both work productivity and job satisfaction which enhances the financial success of the organization (Connell, 2014).

In addition, findings in this research study confirmed that a larger majority, but not all transgender employees have shared their gender identity with at least one individual at work. Although a number of participants reported that no one at their work were aware of their gender identity (23.7%), a larger majority indicated coworkers were aware of their gender identity in that at least one co-worker knew their gender identity (7.9%) or two or more coworkers knew their gender identity (68.4%). One research group suggested that organizations with antidiscrimination policy that includes employees who are transgender often had more “out” employees at work that reported better work relationships, reduced turnover, better health outcomes and increased job satisfaction (Mallory & Kastanis, 2013).

The findings of the study revealed that job satisfaction varies widely among the participants, but there were several significant correlations among the data within the correlation analysis of the JDI survey and the presence of antidiscrimination policy. The data suggests that job satisfaction of the participants who worked with organizations with antidiscrimination policy was the highest among employees who were satisfied first with the promotion opportunities followed by the employee’s viewpoints about the actual work they conduct. The data also showed that the employees, who reported that the opportunities for promotion at their workplace can occur due to one’s ability, also had a significant correlation to the presence of antidiscrimination policy. There were no significant correlations to supervision and the presence of antidiscrimination policy in the workplace nor were there correlations to the people in the workplace and the presence of antidiscrimination policy in the workplace. These results suggest that the ability to be promoted has the highest correlation to the hypothesis and job satisfaction.

Limitations of the Research

The primary limitation of this research study stems from the challenge of trying to locate 89 participants who were over the age of 18, not self-employed, and employed in the state of Wisconsin. Feedback from community service groups and other individuals in the transgender community was that probably more people could be located who are self-employed or unemployed. If this research sample was expanded to include individuals who had been employed in the past year more participants could have participated in this research study. Other limitations include the inability to include data from participants who: (a) did not have internet access; (b) did not want anyone to be aware they were transgender for fear of personal or professional harassment or discrimination; (c) had lower job satisfaction for reasons other than the absence or presence of antidiscrimination policy; (d) were not be aware of the opportunity to participate in this research study due to not being involved with the organizations that helped to recruit potential participants.

One of the goals for this dissertation research was to collect data from a diverse participant pool. Although there was some diversity in the participant pool, several of the participants that did not entirely complete the survey, or who were eliminated from the data because they were not currently employed noted race or ethnicity other than white. In addition, feedback was received from a few support groups that several members who were people of color indicated they were not able to find employment in their communities thus were self-employed or not employed at that time.

One last limitation of this research study is that the participants were not asked if it was important to them or not if their workplace had antidiscrimination policy that

included transgender employees. This information could have provided further insight on the correlation of antidiscrimination policy on job satisfaction.

Recommendations for Future Research

In this research study participants were not asked if it was important to them or not if their workplace had antidiscrimination policy that included transgender employees. Participants' responses from employees who had transitioned or planned to transition suggest that some employees are willing to transition at the current workplace. But several participants who planned to transition were not going to transition at their current place of employment. The question lends itself if they do not feel they can transition at work because they fear being discriminated at their workplace, or perhaps that they wish to go to a place of employment that does have antidiscrimination policy. This research study does not sufficiently answer that question and it is recommendation that further research be conducted in this area. In addition, this research study does not include responses from transgender employees who are unemployed or self-employed which could add to further knowledge. Thus, it is not known from this research study if those individuals would want antidiscrimination policy in the workplace if they were to be employed in the workplace or anything about their experiences if they had been previously employed in the workplace. Research in this area would expand the understanding if antidiscrimination policy is important for potential job satisfaction of individuals who are not currently employed, but were either were employed or wish to be employed by an organization other than their own in the state of Wisconsin.

Implications for Practice

This dissertation research study provides data that enhances knowledge in the area of employee job satisfaction of transgender individuals in Wisconsin, as well as an increased understanding that not every employee who is transgender is aware of the presence or absence of antidiscrimination policy in their workplace. Leadership within organizations can utilize the results of this research study to better understand the effect of having antidiscrimination policy on job satisfaction of employees who are transgender. The literature review and data from this research study suggest that when transgender employees are afforded the opportunity to work in a workplace environment that clearly articulates their inclusion in antidiscrimination policy, and are provided equal treatment for promotion and other workplace opportunities, they will have reduced turnover and increased job satisfaction.

Conclusion

Previous research on the topic of transgender employees in the workplace focused on qualitative studies regarding workplace barriers for employees who underwent transition while working (Budge et al., 2010); discrimination by leadership and peers including harassment and termination (Budge et al., 2010; Bell et al., 2011). Brewster et al. (2014) reported both positive and negative workplace experiences. Levitt and Ippolito (2014) noted that one participant asked to enter manager training was harassed on the job when human resources and co-workers learned that the participant was transitioning. Other research pertained to the lack of co-workers using the preferred pronouns or names for individuals who are transgender (Dispenz et al., 2012); and other researchers noted gaps in research concerning transgender employees workplace experiences (Dispenza et

al., 2012; Schmidt et al., 2012; Collins et al., 2015) as well as differences in laws that protect transgender employees from harassment or termination (Knauer, 2012; Mallory et al., 2011; Mallory & Sears, 2015a, 2015b; Taylor et al., 2012). Research gaps noted included the understanding of the experiences of racially diverse employees who are transgender (Budge et al., 2010; Brewster et al., 2011; Kuper et al., 2012; Levitt & Ippolito, 2014; Connell, 2015) and the job satisfaction of transgender employees (Judge & Church, 2000; Brewster et al., 2012, 2014).

The theoretical foundation for this research study is based on two-factor theory (Herzberg, 1966) because it provides insight on both motivation and hygiene factors which may affect job satisfaction of employees. The JDI (Smith, et al., 1969) when combined with the JIG (Ironson et al., 1989) have offered effective measurement to determine the overall job satisfaction of employees (Lake, et al., 2006). Data for this dissertation research study was collected from participants who were 18 years old, transgender, employed in the state of Wisconsin but not self-employed, who then completed demographic questions, the JDI and the JIG in an anonymous online survey. This data has contributed to the overall knowledge of the topic of job satisfaction of employees who are transgender and its relationship to the presence of antidiscrimination policy that includes transgender employees. In addition, several participants reported a lack of awareness if their workplace policy included transgender employees within the antidiscrimination policy. Badgett, Durso, Mallory and Kastanis (2013) reported that organizations with LGBT antidiscrimination policies had LGBT employees who experienced less discrimination, were more often “out” at work, and indicated better

relationships at work, reduced turnover, better health outcomes and increased job satisfaction.

To summarize, the literature review and data from this research study suggest that when transgender employees are afforded the opportunity to work in a workplace environment that clearly articulates their inclusion in antidiscrimination policy, and are provided equal treatment for promotion and other workplace opportunities, they will have reduced turnover and increased job satisfaction. In addition, further research is needed to fill a gap in the understanding of the workplace experiences of transgender employees of color, as well as those who may have been previously employed but currently seeking employment, or who are self-employed to better understand their experiences with job satisfaction.

References

- Altaf, A., Zahidie, A., & Agha, A. (2012). Comparing risk factors of HIV among hijra sex workers in Larkana and other cities of Pakistan: An analytical cross sectional study. *BMC Public Health*, *12*(1), 279-287. Retrieved from <http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2458/12/279>
- Badgett, M. V. L., Durso, L. E., Millory, C., & Kastanis, A. (2013). The business impact of lgbt-supportive workplace policies. UCLA: The Williams Institute. Retrieved from <http://escholarship.org/us/item/3vt6t9zx>
- Bailey, M. (2014). Transgender workplace discrimination in the age of gender dysphoria and ENDA. *Law & Psychology Review*, *38*, 193-210. Retrieved from <http://web.a.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.uwgb.edu:2048/ehost/detail/detail?sid=beaf3e6a-c620-43b0-8495-375b2f02102b%40sessionmgr4009&vid=0&hid=4109&bdata=JkF1dGhUeXBIPWlwLHVpZCZzaXRIPWVob3N0LWxpdmUmc2NvcGU9c2l0ZQ%3d%3d#db=a9h&AN=97431668>
- Balzer, W. K., Kihm, J. A., Smith, P. C., Irwin, J. L., Bachiochi, P. D., & Robie, C., et al. (1997). *User's manual for the job descriptive index (jdi; 1997 revision) and the job in general (jig) scales*. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University.
- Barclay, J. M., & Scott, L. J. (2006). Transsexuals and workplace diversity: A case of 'change' management. *Personnel Review*, *35*(4), 487-502. doi:10.1108/00483480610670625
- Bell, M. P., Özbilgin, M. F., Beauregard, T. A. & Sürgevil, O. (2011). Voice, silence, and diversity in 21st century organizations: Strategies for inclusion of gay, lesbian,

bisexual, and transgender employees. *Human Resource Management*, 5(1), 131-146. doi:10.1002/hrm.20401

Bowling Green State University. (2015). *Job description index*. Retrieved from <http://www.bgsu.edu/arts-and-sciences/psychology/services/job-descriptive-index.html>

Bowling, N. A., Hendricks, E. A., & Wagner, S. H. (2008). Positive and negative affectivity and facet satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 23(3), 115-125. doi:10.1007/s10869-008-9082-0

Brewster, M. E., Velez, B. L., DeBlaere, C., & Moradi, B. (2012). Transgender individuals' workplace experiences: The applicability of sexual minority measures and models. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 59(1), 60-70. Retrieved from <https://ezproxy.uwgb.edu:2443/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/886596191?accountid=14788>

Brewster, M. E., Velez, B. L., Mennicke, A., & Tebbe, E. (2014). Voices from beyond: A thematic content analysis of transgender employees' workplace experiences. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, 1(2), 159-169. Retrieved from <https://ezproxy.uwgb.edu:2443/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/1541644238?accountid=14788>

Budge, S. L., Tebbe, E. N., & Howard, S. L. (Eds.). (2010). The work experiences of transgender individuals: Negotiation the transition and career decision-making processes. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 57(4), 377-393.

Retrieved from

<https://ezproxy.uwgb.edu:2443/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/763254570?accountid=14788>

- Camman, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, G. D., Jr., & Klesh, J. R. (1983). Assessing the attitudes and perceptions of organizational members. In S. E. Seashore, E. E. Lawler III, P. H. Mirvis, & C. Camman (Eds.), *Assessing organizational change: A guide to methods, measures, and practices* (pp. 71-138). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Carlson, J. H., Mellor, S. (2004). Gender-related effects in the job-design-job-satisfaction relationship: An interactional approach. *Sex Roles, 51*(3-4), 237-247. doi:10.1023/B:SERS.0000037767.72299.bd
- Colin, T. J., Koch, K., & Jost, K. (2006). Transgender issues. *CQ Researcher, 16*(17), 385-408. doi:10.1177/1077800407301777
- Collins, J. C., McFadden, C., Rocco, T. S., & Mathis, M. K. (2015). The problem of transgender marginalization and exclusion critical actions for human resource development. *Human Resource Development Review, 14*(2), 205-226. doi:10.1177/1534484315581755
- Colvin, R. A. (2007). The rise of transgender-inclusive laws, how well are municipalities implementing supportive nondiscrimination public employment policies? *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 27*(4), 336-360. doi:10.1177/1077800407301777
- Connell, C. (2014). Transgender employment experiences: Gendered perceptions and the law. *Contemporary Sociology: A Journal of Reviews, 43*(5), 662-663. doi:10.1177/0094306114545742g

- Cooper-Hakim, A., Viswesvaran, C., & Chockalingam, C. (2005). The construct of work commitment: Testing an integrative framework. *Psychological Bulletin*, *131*(2), 241-259. Retrieved from <https://ezproxy.uwgb.edu:2443/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/614403279?accountid=14788>
- Creative Research Systems. (2015). *Sample size calculator*. Retrieved from <http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm>
- DeMeuse, K. P. (1985). A compendium of frequently used measures in industrial/organizational psychology. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, *23*, 53-59.
- Dispenza, F., Watson, L. B., Barry Chung, Y., & Brack, G. (2012). Experience of career-related discrimination for female-to-male transgender persons: A qualitative study. *Career Development Quarterly*, *60*(1), 65-81. doi:10.1002/j.2161-0045.2012.00006.x
- Eliason, M., De Joseph, J., Dibble, S., Deevey, S., & Chinns, P. (2011). Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer/questioning nurses' experiences in the workplace. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, *27*(4), 237-244. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.profnurs.2011.03.003>
- Enke, A. (2012). *Transfeminist perspectives in and beyond transgender and gender studies*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Evans-Campbell, T., Walters, K. L., Pearson, C. R., & Campbell, C. D. (2012). Indian boarding school experience, substance use, and mental health among urban

- two-spirit American Indian/Alaska natives. *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse*, 38(5), 421-427. doi:10.3109/00952990.2012.701358
- Fassinger, R. E., Stanislaus, T., Shullman, S. L., & Stevenson, M. R. (2010). Toward an affirmative lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender leadership paradigm. *American Psychologist*, 65(3), 201-215. doi:10.1037/a0018597
- Fields, D. L. (2002). *Taking the measure of work: A guide to validated scales for organizational research and diagnosis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- G*Power. (2014). *G*Power: statistical power analyses for windows and mac*. Retrieved from www.gpower.hhu.edu/
- Gilligan, C. (1993). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Goldberg, Naomi G; Badgett, M V Lee; & Ramos, C. (2010). The impact of employment nondiscrimination legislation in South Dakota. *The Williams Institute*. UCLA: The Williams Institute. Retrieved from <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/4x60f1vb>
- 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*. Washington DC: National Center for Transgender Equality and National Gay & Lesbian Task Force.
- Hamzelou, J. (2014). Out in the open? *New Scientist*, 224(2994), 50-51. Retrieved from <http://web.b.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.uwgb.edu:2048/ehost/detail/detail?vid=1&sid=6d61eb47-ab39-4b52-b986->

d7033f2d4ae4%40sessionmgr1&bdata=JkF1dGhUeXBIPWlwLHVpZCZzaXRIP
 WVob3N0LWxpdmUmc2NvcGU9c2l0ZQ%3d%3d#AN=99300622&db=a9h

Health and access to care and coverage for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals in the U.S. (2016). *Medical Benefits*, 33(14), 6-9. Retrieved from <https://ezproxy.uwgb.edu:2443/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/1807689076?accountid=14788>

Hansenbush, A., Flores, A. R., Kastanis, A., Sears, B., & Gates., G. J. (2014). The lgbt divide: A data portrait of lgbt people in the Midwestern, mountain & southern states. UCLA: The Williams Institute. Retrieved from <http://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/LGBT-divide-Dec-2014.pdf>

Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. Cleveland: World Publishing Company.

Hueman, R., Hatfield, J., & Miles, E. (1987). A new perspective on equity theory: The equity sensitivity construct. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(2), 232-234. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/258531>

Huffman, A. H., Watrous-Rodriguez, K. M., & King, E. B. (2008). Supporting a diverse work-force: What type of support is most meaningful for lesbian and gay employees? *Human Resource Management*, 47(2), 237-253. Retrieved from <http://web.b.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.uwgb.edu:2048/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=1&sid=317f445f-6c45-466b-874f-7c347a37d9b3%40sessionmgr2>

Human Rights Campaign. (2014). *HRC blog*. Retrieved from <http://www.hrc.org/blog/entry/president-obama-signs-executive-order-pressing-contractors-to-obey-labor-la>

- Human Rights Campaign. (2015a). *Cities and counties with non-discrimination ordinances that include gender identity*. Retrieved from <http://www.hrc.org/resources/entry/cities-and-counties-with-non-discrimination-ordinances-that-include-gender>
- Human Rights Campaign. (2015b). *Corporate equality index, 2016*. Retrieved from http://hrc-assets.s3-website-us-east-1.amazonaws.com//files/assets/resources/CEI_Criteria_Revisions_2016rev.pdf
[oversight/diversity-and-inclusion/reference-materials/addressing-sexual-orientation-and-gender-identity-discrimination-in-federal-civilian-employment.pdf](http://hrc-assets.s3-website-us-east-1.amazonaws.com//files/assets/resources/CEI_Criteria_Revisions_2016rev.pdf)
- Human Rights Campaign. (2016). *Statewide employment laws and policies*. Retrieved from http://www.hrc.org/state_maps
- Huseman, R., Hatfield, J., & Miles, E. (1987). A new perspective on equity theory: The equity sensitivity construct. *Academy of Management Review*, *12*(2), 232-234.
doi:10.5465/amr.1987.4307799
- IBM. (2014). *Spss software*. Retrieved from <http://www01.ibm.com/software/analytics/spss/>
- Ironson, G., Smith, P., Brannick, M., Gibson, M., & Paul, K. (1989). Construction of a job in general scale: A comparison of global, composite and specific measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *74*(2), 193-200. Retrieved from <http://web.b.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.uwgb.edu:2048/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=4ba65ac1-13f6-4633-ab15-cc78455b878f%40sessionmgr105&vid=1&hid=116>

- Judge, T. A., & Church, A., H. (2000). Job satisfaction: Research and practice. In C. L. Cooper & E. A. Locke (Eds). *Industrial and organizational psychology: Linking theory with practice* (pp. 166-198). Oxford., UK: Blackwell.
- Kazi, G., & Zadeh, Z. (2011). The contributions of individual variables: Job satisfaction and job turnover. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 3(5), 984-991.
Retrieved from <http://journal-archives8.webs.com/984-991.pdf>
- Khan, S. I., Hussain, M. I., Parveen, S., Bhuiyan, M. I., Gourab., G., Sarker, G., F., ... & Sikder, J. (2009). Living on the extreme margin: social exclusion of the transgender population (hirja) in bangladesh. *Journal of Health, Population, and Nutrition*, 27(4), 441-151. Retrieved from <http://web.a.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.uwgb.edu:2048/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=70179d79-9f05-4fdd-b578-78ca79b8f34f%40sessionmgr4010&vid=1&hid=4201>
- Knauer, N. J. (2012). Legal consciousness and lgbt research: The role of the law in the everyday lives of lgbt individuals. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 59(5), 748-756. doi: 10.1080/00918369.2012.673947
- Kuper, . E., Nussbaum, R., & Mustanski, B. (2012). Exploring the diversity of gender and sexual orientation identities in an online sample of transgender individuals. *Journal of Sex Research*, 49(2/3), 244-254. doi:10.1080/00224499.2011.596954
- Lake, C. J., Gopalkrishnan, P., Sliter, M. T., & Withrow, C. (2006). *The job descriptive index: Newly updated and available for download*. Retrieved from <http://www.siop.org/tip/july10/06jdi.aspx>

- Laureate Education Inc., (2013). *Data cleaning and dealing with assumptions*. Retrieved from http://mym.cdn.laureate-media.com/Walden/RSCH/8250/02/mm/data_cleaning_and_dealing_with_assumptions.html
- Levitt, H. M., Horn, S. G., Puckett, J., Sweeney, K. K., & Hampton, M. L. (2015). Gay families: Challenging racial and sexual/gender minority stressors through social support. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies* 11(2), 173-202. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1550428X.2014.958266>
- Levitt, H. M. & Ippolito, M. R. (2014). Being transgender: The experience of transgender identity development. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 61(12), 1727-1758. doi:0.1177/0361684313501644
- Lock, E. A. (1969). What is job satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4, 309-336. doi.10.1016/0030-5073(69)90013-0
- Lock, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago; Rand McNally.
- Madera, J. M., King, E. B., & Hebl, M. R. (2012). Bringing social identity to work: The influence of manifestation and suppression on perceived discrimination, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 18(2), 165-170. doi:10.1037/a0027724
- Mallory, C., Herman, J. L., & Badgett, L. M.V. (2011). Employment discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people in Oklahoma. *UCLA: The Williams Institute*. Retrieved from <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/79w0b14t>

- Mallory, C., & Sears, B. (2015a). Employment discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity in South Dakota. *UCLA: The Williams Institute*. Retrieved from <http://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/South-Dakota-ND-August-2015.pdf>
- Mallory, C., & Sears, B. (2015b). Employment discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity in Alaska. *UCLA: The Williams Institute*. Retrieved from <http://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/research/workplace/employment-discrimination-based-on-sexual-orientation-and-gender-identity-in-alaska/>
- McFadden, C. (2015). Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender careers and human resource development: A systematic literature review. *Human Resource Development Review, 14*(2), 125-162. doi:10.1177/1534484314549456
- Mizock, L., & Mueser, K. T. (2014). Employment, mental health, internalized stigma, and coping with transphobia among transgender individuals. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity, 1*(2), 146-158. Retrieved from <https://ezproxy.uwgb.edu:2443/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/1541644237?accountid=14788>
- 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. Retrieved from <https://ezproxy.uwgb.edu:2443/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/1634728905?accountid=14788>

- National Gay and Lesbian Task Force. 2011. Jurisdictions with explicitly transgender-inclusive nondiscrimination laws. Retrieved from:
http://www.thetaskforce.org/static_html/downloads/reports/fact_sheets/all_jurisdictions_w_pop_10_11.pdf
- Prati, G., & Pietrantonio, L. (2014). Coming out and job satisfaction: A moderated mediation model. *Career Development Quarterly*, 62(4), 358-371.
doi:10.1002/i.2161-0045.2014.00088.x
- Ridolfo, H., Miller, K., & Maitland, A. (2012). Measuring sexual identity using survey questionnaires: How valid are our measures? *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, 9(2), 113-124. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s13178-011-0074-x>
- Rubin, D. A. (2012). An unnamed blank that craved a name: A genealogy of intersex as gender. *Signs: Journal of Women In Culture & Society*, 37(4), 883-908.
- Schilt, K., & Westbrook, L. (2009). Doing gender, doing heteronormativity: 'Gender normals,' transgender people, and the social maintenance of heterosexuality. *Gender & Society*, 23(4), 440-464. doi:10.1177/0891243209340034
- Schmidt, S. W., Githens, R. P., Rocco, T. S., & Kormanik, M. B. (2012). Lesbians, gays, bisexuals, and transgendered people in human resource development. *Human Resource Development Review*, 11(3), 326-348. doi:10.1177/1534484312447193
- Schneider, M. S., & Dimito, A. (2010). Factors influencing the career and academic choices of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 57(10).
- Sellers, M. D. (2014). Discrimination and the transgender population: Analysis of the functionality of local government policies that protect gender identity.

Administration & Society, 46(1), 70-86.

Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin., C. L. (1975). *The job descriptive index*, Psychology Department, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH.

Statistic Calculators. (2015). *A-priori sample size calculator for student t-tests*. Retrieved from: <http://www.danielsoper.com/statcalc3/calc.aspx?id=47>

Sue, V. M., & Ritter, L. A. (2012). *Conducting online surveys*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Taylor, S., Burke, L. A., Wheatley, K., & Sompayrac, J. (2011). Effectively facilitating gender transition in the workplace. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 23(2), 101-116. doi. 10.1007/210672-010-9164-9

Taylor, J. K., Lewis, D. C., Jacobsmeier, M. L., & DiSarro, B. (2012). Content and complexity in policy reinvention and diffusion: Gay and transgender-inclusive laws against discrimination. *State Politics & Policy Quarterly*, 12(1), 75-98.

United States Office of Personnel Management, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Office of Special Counsel, & Merit Systems Protection Board. (June 2015). Addressing sexual orientation and gender identity discrimination in federal civilian employment. Retrieved from <http://permanent.access.gpo.gov/gpo60391/addressing-sexual-orientation-and-gender-identity-discrimination-in-federal-civilian-employment.pdf>

Van Eerde, W., & Thierry, H. (1996). Vroom's expectancy models and work-related criteria: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(5), 575-586.

doi:10.1037/0021-9010.81.5.575

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York, NY: Wiley.