

Coming out in the classroom: still an occupational hazard?

Sair do armário em sala de aula: um risco ocupacional?

Eros R. DeSouza¹

Mark Olson²

Abstract: In 2002, Russ, Simonds, and Hunt reported that coming out in the classroom was hazardous to gay instructors in the United States. We replicated their study in the same medium-sized North American university with a sample of 222 college students (71.7% White, 53.2% women, mean age = 19.66) who listened to a talk by a male speaker. Unknown to these students, we experimentally manipulated the sexual orientation of the speaker. In one section of a general education course, the speaker mentioned three times in passing the name of his same-sex partner (gay condition). In another section of the same course, the speaker mentioned three times the name of his other-sex partner (heterosexual condition). Immediately after the talk, students evaluated the speaker. Analyses using *t*-tests on teacher credibility ratings showed that students consistently rated the speaker in the heterosexual condition more positively than the speaker in the gay condition, which mirror Russ et al.'s findings published 15 years earlier. Chi-square analyses on the themes derived from the written comments showed mixed results. Students perceived the gay speaker as having "poor speech" skills, but they also perceived him to be more "honest and open" than the heterosexual speaker. Implications are discussed.

Keywords: Teacher Sexual Orientation; Teacher Credibility.

Resumo: Em 2002, Russ, Simonds e Hunt relataram que revelar a orientação sexual na sala de aula era perigoso para professores homossexuais nos Estados Unidos. Replicamos este estudo na mesma universidade norte-americana de porte médio com uma amostra de 222 estudantes universitários (71,7% brancos, 53,2% mulheres, idade média = 19,66) que ouviram uma palestra de um professor visitante. Esses alunos não sabiam que manipulamos experimentalmente a orientação sexual deste professor. Em uma seção, o professor mencionou três vezes de passagem o nome de seu parceiro do mesmo sexo (condição gay). Em outra seção do mesmo curso, o mesmo professor mencionou três vezes o nome de seu parceiro de outro sexo (condição heterossexual). Imediatamente após a palestra, os alunos avaliaram o professor visitante. As análises sobre classificações de credibilidade do professor mostraram que os alunos avaliaram consistentemente o professor na condição heterossexual mais positivamente do que o mesmo professor na condição homossexual, o que reflete os resultados de Russ et al. publicados 15 anos antes. As análises sobre os temas derivados dos comentários escritos mostraram resultados mistos. Os alunos perceberam o professor gay negativamente com um estilo de "fala pobre", mas também perceberam que ele era mais "honesto e aberto" do que o professor heterossexual. As implicações são discutidas.

Palavras-chave: Orientação Sexual do Professor; Credibilidade do Professor.

In the United States, the workplace continues to become demographically more diverse in terms of race/ethnicity, national origin, religion, disability, sex/gender, and sexual orientation (PALUDI; PALUDI; DESOUZA, 2011). It is important to highlight that sexual orientation is not a protected group across all 50

¹ Department of Psychology, Illinois State University. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Eros DeSouza, Department of Psychology, Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois 61690-4620. E-mail: erdesou@ilstu.edu

² Department of Social Work, Illinois State University.

states in the United States. In fact, 31 states lack discrimination laws against sexual orientation and gender identity bias in the workplace (LOPEZ, 2015). Consequently, many lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) workers continue to experience widespread and persistent employment discrimination that leads to decreased physical and emotional well-being (DESOUZA; WESSELMANN; ISPAS, 2017; MYER, 2003), as well as lower wages and career advancement, lower job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and productivity (RUGGS et al., 2015; SEARS; MALLORY, 2014).

Discrimination is often subtle rather than overt. The effects of subtle discrimination may actually be worse than the overt type due to the greater frequency and accumulating effects, and ambiguity of the former compared to the latter (YOO; STEGER; LEE, 2010). Jones et al. (2016b) conducted a meta-analytic study comparing the effects of subtle discrimination with those of overt discrimination. The authors reported that the effect sizes for subtle discrimination were not statistically different from those for overt discrimination across all psychological, physical, health, and work-related variables investigated. Jones et al. added that “across all correlate domains, effect sizes for subtle discrimination were larger in absolute magnitude relative to those of overt discrimination” (2016b, p. 1605). The authors concluded that the ambiguous nature of subtle discrimination impairs cognitive performance (e.g., internal attributions, such as “it is not them, it is me,” that interfere with being on task), occurs in higher frequency, and is more chronic than its overt counterpart.

In addition, there is often lack of organizational policies/procedures regarding subtle discrimination, as well as leaders’ and bystanders’ perceptions regarding the seriousness of such incidents in spite of the accumulating empirical evidence to the contrary (JONES et al., 2016b). Thus, claims of subtle discrimination are hard to substantiate, leaving victims dissatisfied with their organization and less likely to report their experience to a designated official (DESOUZA; WESSELMANN; ISPAS, 2017; JONES et al., 2016a). Consequently, some LGBT employees may conceal their sexual orientation in order to avoid employment discrimination, retaliation, or social exclusion (BADGETT, 1996; RAGINS; SINGH; CORNWELL, 2007; RUGGS et al., 2015; SEARS; MALLORY, 2014; SPRADLIN, 1998).

Although discrimination may be avoided by concealing one’s sexual orientation, such strategy has other negative consequences to LGBT employees. Research shows that psychological well-being, self-esteem, resilience, life satisfaction, and positive work attitudes are higher among LGBT individuals who are open and honest about their sexual orientation/identity, i.e., being “out”, compared to those who conceal it, i.e., “being in the closet” (BELL; WEINBERG, 1978; DAY; SCHOENRADE, 1997; GARNETS; KIMMEL, 2003; GRIFFITH; HEBL, 2002; HEREK, 2003; HEREK; GARNETS, 2007; RIGGLE et al., 2008). In addition, closeted LGBT employees may deplete a great deal of cognitive and emotional energy in order to self-monitor and manage public impressions (LEVITT; IPPOLITO, 2014), including actively avoiding workplace-related social gatherings in which they would be expected to bring romantic partners or self-disclose about their personal lives (BADGETT, 1996; LEWIS, 2009; SPRADLIN, 1998). Limited networking opportunities by not attending workplace-related social gatherings may be detrimental to career advancement (RAGINS; SINGH; CORNWELL, 2007).

Coming out in the classroom: still an occupational hazard?

The studies discussed above suggest that coming out in the classroom may be an occupational hazard to LGBT educators as well. In fact, Machado (2014) discussed many reports in the media of LGBT educators in grades K through 12 being summarily fired after coming out. Even progressive administrators, parents, and students question their teachers coming out in the classroom (MACHADO, 2014). For them, such personal details should be kept private. According to this line of thinking, LGBT educators should not have pictures of their spouses on their desk, invite their spouses to school social functions, intervene when a student uses homophobic language in class, or stop heterosexual students bullying others perceived to be gay. The presence of heterosexist norms and language (e.g., referring to heterosexual employees' partners as "spouses" but to LGBT employees' partners as "friends" or "roommates"), including homophobic humor, create a hostile work climate for LGBT employees (DESOUZA; WESSELMANN; ISPAS, 2017). Educators constantly struggle as to whom, how, when and where to disclose their sexual orientation, with many remaining in the closet in a school climate of pervasive homophobia (CONNELL, 2014).

Even in higher education, LGBT faculty may face a chilly work climate. Bilimoria and Stewart (2009) conducted a study investigating the experience of LGBT faculty in higher education. They found that open expressions of anti-gay attitudes were uncommon; however, anti-gay bias was evidenced in respondents' reports of a climate of invisibility in which heterosexuality is assumed, and reports of encouragement from department administrators to conceal a gay or lesbian sexual orientation. While most participants reported that overtly anti-gay bias was not frequently expressed by faculty colleagues, others noted that students and staff were more likely to make openly derogatory remarks regarding LGBT people. Morrison, Morrison, and Franklin (2009) examined blatant and modern homo-negativity (i.e., subtle or covert anti-gay bias) among U.S. and Canadian university students and found high levels of anti-gay prejudice in both countries. Another study with undergraduates across 12 social work programs found that 38% of the total sample agreed that homosexuality is a sin (SWANK; RAIZ, 2010).

Anderson and Kanner (2011) examined undergraduates' perceptions of professors' syllabi of a human sexuality course by manipulating the professors' sexual orientation through their membership in the "Association of Lesbian and Gay Psychologists" (gay condition) or membership only in the "American Psychological Association" (heterosexual condition). Anderson and Kanner found that lesbian and gay professors were evaluated based on their political ideology (being politically biased) compared to their heterosexual counterparts who were not judged based on their political ideology, suggesting that students use different criteria for LGBT instructors when evaluating their ability to teach.

Anderson and Kanner's (2011) study was based only on a course syllabus and not on face-to-face interaction. Russ, Simonds, and Hunt (2002) examined the influence of instructor sexual orientation on perceptions of teacher credibility among undergraduates who listened to a speaker during class time. Russ et al. trained a 25-year old male confederate to give a talk on cultural influences on communication processes to mostly first-year students enrolled in introductory communication classes. In half of the classes, he mentioned three times in passing the name of his same-sex partner, thus establishing his sexual orientation as gay (gay condition). In the other half of the classes, the speaker mentioned three times the name of his

other-sex partner (heterosexual condition). In both conditions, it was the same speaker and content. The only variation was the sexual orientation of the speaker. Russ et al. found that students evaluated the gay speaker as less credible and his character less favorable (e.g., being dishonest) compared to the heterosexual condition. In-depth qualitative analysis of students' written comments also showed anti-gay bias, with students writing positive comments only about the heterosexual speaker while criticizing the gay speaker's credibility.

The above studies suggest that although the academic culture has become less blatantly discriminatory toward LGBT individuals, college students still retain a large degree of subtle bias that can ultimately affect LGBT instructors' wellbeing, the educational process (e.g., teacher credibility), and the institution of higher education itself (e.g., less organizational commitment and increased turnover of qualified LGBT instructors). Thus, the purpose of the current study was to replicate Russ et al.'s (2002) study using the same procedures and measures with data collected 15 years later. We hypothesized the following.

Hypothesis 1: Students would rate the instructor as (a) less competent and (b) perceive his character less positively in the gay condition than in the heterosexual condition.

Hypothesis 2: We also expected the written responses to the open-ended questions to mirror the teaching evaluations ratings, with students perceiving the talk (a) more positively when the instructor was heterosexual but (b) more negatively when the instructor was gay.

Method

Participants

We recruited 222 students enrolled in two different sections of the same introductory psychology course at the same Midwestern state university in the United States that Russ et al.'s (2002) collected their sample. In our sample, 71.7% reported to be White, 53.2% reported to be women, 95.1% self-identified as heterosexual, and the mean age was 19.66. Participation was voluntary.

Design and Procedure

We used a cross-sectional experimental design by manipulating the sexual orientation of the male speaker (heterosexual vs. gay) with students enrolled in two different sections of the same course (introduction to psychology), which meets their general education requirement and typically has large numbers of first-year undergraduates. We sought and received approval from our Institutional Review Board (IRB) before data collection. With permission of the classroom instructor, we recruited students during class time. Students present in class on the day of data collection were invited to hear a speaker talk about diversity and to complete an anonymous evaluation form. Students received extra-credit points for their participation. The course instructor introduced the speaker's Graduate Research Assistant (GTA) and then left the classroom. Next, the GTA began the experiment, which had three steps.

In step one, the GTA distributed a written handout describing the study and the rights of research

Coming out in the classroom: still an occupational hazard?

participants according to IRB-approved guidelines. Students who did not wish to participate were free to leave, but all remained.

In step two, the GTA introduced the speaker, a professor in Social Work with extensive training on diversity issues, who would give a talk on diverse populations. It is during the talk that we manipulated the speaker's sexual orientation. In one section, he mentioned the name of his opposite-sex partner three times ("My life partner Jennifer ..."), constituting the heterosexual condition of the experiment. In the other section, using an identical script and talk content, the same speaker mentioned the name of his same-sex partner three times (e.g., "My life partner Jason ..."), thus establishing his sexual orientation as gay (gay condition). After the speaker finished his talk, he left the room and the GTA began step three.

In step three, students completed the Teacher Evaluation Form, which is described below. After collecting the evaluations, the GTA debriefed students by telling them about the experimental manipulation and giving them a second informed consent form, which allowed students to withdraw their data from the study. None chose to withdraw their participation.

Measures

Teacher Credibility. This instrument consists of the same 12 pairs of bipolar adjectives on a 10-point semantic differential scale used in Russ et al.'s (2002) study. Specifically, teacher credibility has two dimensions, competence and character, with six items in each dimension. Six pairs were reverse-scored in order to minimize response bias. Russ et al. reported an overall Cronbach's alpha of .82. In our study, we averaged the scores that make-up the dimensions and the total score, with higher scores indicating positive evaluations/perceptions. The alphas for the overall teacher credibility measure ($\alpha = .93$), the competence dimension ($\alpha = .88$), and the character dimension ($\alpha = .86$) were above that reported by Russ et al.

Open-ended questions. On a separate page, there were two open-ended questions that were previously used in from Russ et al.'s (2002) study: "What did you like about this speaker and why?" and "What did you NOT like about this speaker and why?"

Demographics. On a separate page, students answered demographic questions (age, gender, race/ethnicity, and sexual orientation).

Results

As in Russ et al.'s (2002) study, we performed *t*-tests to measure differences by the sexual orientation manipulation of the speaker on the teacher credibility dimensions, as well as for each item. We found no statistically significant differences for the competence dimension. However, two items were statistically significant: reliability ($t = 2.29, p < .05; M_{\text{gay condition}} = 7.98$ vs. $M_{\text{heterosexual condition}} = 8.56$) and qualification ($t = 2.34, p < .05; M_{\text{gay condition}} = 8.55$ vs. $M_{\text{heterosexual condition}} = 9.11$). Furthermore, we found statistically significant

differences for the character dimension ($t = 2.04, p < .05; M_{\text{gay condition}} = 8.25$ vs. $M_{\text{heterosexual condition}} = 8.69$). Three items were statistically significant: pleasantness ($t = 2.12, p < .05; M_{\text{gay condition}} = 8.28$ vs. $M_{\text{heterosexual condition}} = 8.90$), unselfishness ($t = 2.26, p < .05; M_{\text{gay condition}} = 7.99$ vs. $M_{\text{heterosexual condition}} = 8.60$), and honesty ($t = 1.96, p < .05; M_{\text{gay condition}} = 8.09$ vs. $M_{\text{heterosexual condition}} = 8.73$). An additional item, virtuousness, approached significance ($t = 1.80, p = .07; M_{\text{gay condition}} = 7.34$ vs. $M_{\text{heterosexual condition}} = 7.85$). The pattern was the same throughout: The heterosexual speaker was perceived more positively than the gay speaker. These findings give partial support to Hypothesis 1a (competence) and full support to Hypothesis 1b (character).

In-depth qualitative analysis of students' written comments followed Strauss and Corbin's (1990) grounded theory and procedures. First, we unitized the data (a unit refers to a complete idea); then, we formed a taxonomy from the data by creating themes; next, two independent coders established inter-coder agreement.

Seventy-seven percent ($n = 172$) of the sample wrote comments concerning what they liked about the speaker. Of these, 55% ($n = 95$) wrote one complete idea, 38% ($n = 65$) wrote two complete ideas, 5% ($n = 9$) wrote three complete ideas, and 2% ($n = 3$) wrote four complete ideas, with a total of 264 complete ideas. Six themes captured these ideas. Two independent coders coded two random sets (about 10% of the total data for each set) of the written responses in order to establish inter-coder agreement. The coders achieved 91.3% inter-coder agreement; disagreements were resolved through consensus. Then, one coder coded the remaining data. The frequency of each theme is presented within parentheses: Friendliness (28%, $n = 75$); expertise (24%, $n = 62$); professionalism (17%, $n = 46$); passion (13%, $n = 33$); openness and honesty (11%, $n = 30$); and interest (7%, $n = 18$). Double chi-square analyses (theme by condition) showed that only "openness and honesty" was statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 16.65, p < .0001$), with 20% in the heterosexual condition vs. 80% in the gay condition endorsing it. A verbatim example includes: "open about his life."

Forty-three percent ($n = 96$) of the sample wrote comments concerning what they disliked about the speaker. Of these, 84% ($n = 81$) wrote one complete idea, 14% ($n = 13$) wrote two complete ideas, and 2% ($n = 2$) wrote four complete ideas, with a total of 115 complete ideas. Five themes captured these ideas. As before, two independent coders coded two random sets (about 10% of the total data for each set) and achieved 100% inter-coder agreement. Five themes captured what students disliked about the speaker. The frequency of each theme is presented within parentheses: Poor speech (42%, $n = 48$); boring (17%, $n = 20$); worthless (15%, $n = 17$); unclear (14%, $n = 16$); and miscellaneous (12%, $n = 14$). The miscellaneous theme refers to responses that did not fit in any of the other themes and were too few to form their own separate theme. There were enough participants in the cells only for the poor speech theme, which was statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 21.50, p < .0001$), with 25% in the heterosexual condition vs. 75% in the gay condition endorsing it. A verbatim example includes: "Lack certain speech skills." Overall, the qualitative findings do not support Hypothesis 2a (positive comments), but they support Hypothesis 2b (negative comments).

Discussion

Overall, our study, conducted 15 years after Russ et al.'s (2002), generally replicated Russ et al.'s findings. Russ et al. found that students rated the heterosexual speaker more positively across both dimensions of teacher credibility (competence and character). Our findings fully supported the character dimension (Hypothesis 1b), including four items that make-up such dimension. That is, the heterosexual speaker was rated as more virtuous, honest, pleasant, and unselfish than the gay speaker. These findings indicate that the sexual orientation of the speaker in the gay condition affected students' teacher evaluations based on his character in a negative way compared to when the same speaker gave the same talk in the heterosexual condition.

The findings for the competence dimension are partially consistent with Russ et al.'s (2002). Although the competence dimension was not significant as a whole, two items that make-up such dimension were statistically significant. That is, the heterosexual speaker was rated as more reliable and qualified than the gay speaker, giving some support to Hypothesis 1a.

Interestingly, the open-ended comments revealed mixed results. On one hand, students wrote substantially more comments to the effect that the gay speaker gave a "poor speech" (negative feedback) compared to the heterosexual speaker, supporting Hypothesis 2b. This finding is congruent with Russ et al.'s (2002) findings in which 68% of the students wrote negative comments regarding the gay instructor's presentation, whereas the heterosexual speaker received only positive comments, although it was the same speaker and content. On the other hand, across five positive themes, participants wrote positive comments at similar proportions for the gay and heterosexual speaker. In fact, in one theme (openness and honesty), the gay speaker received substantially more positive comments than the heterosexual speaker; these findings do not support Hypothesis 2a.

One possibility for the lack of support for Hypothesis 2a is that it may be a manifestation of overcorrection (ABERSON; DORA, 2003) in order to mask one's prejudice toward gays and lesbians and appear egalitarian. Such manifestations may occur in complex ways. For example, Ewing, Stukas, and Shehan (2003) examined students' reactions to weak vs. strong lectures given by lesbian/gay lecturers or by lecturers whose sexual orientation was unspecified. Ewing et al. found that undergraduates rated a strong lecture more negatively than a weak lecture given by lesbian/gay lecturers compared to lecturers whose sexual orientation was unspecified. Ewing et al. concluded that prejudice is sometimes shown through denial of positive evaluations, or by overcorrecting for weak performance by outgroup members, or by being ambivalent.

It is also possible that coming out in the classroom gave the gay speaker an edge when presenting on diversity. In other words, this finding suggests that being a member of an underprivileged group may have given the gay speaker additional credibility or insight to discuss issues related to diversity. With regard to covering diversity issues in the classroom, Nelson-Laird (2011) surveyed 7,101 faculty members from 100 U.S. colleges and universities. Most instructors reported that they included diversity issues in their courses in some way. Interestingly, women and faculty of color tended to do so more often than their male and

European-American counterparts. At any rate, we echo Nelson-Laird's (2014) assertion that increasing discussions on diversity should be an educational imperative among all instructors. Moreover, LGBT faculty may provide opportunities, as role models and mentors, for LGBT undergraduates with newly emerging sexual identities to participate in higher education and reduce alienation, as well as promote positive educational and social outcomes for all students, such as increasing critical thinking and conflict resolution skills and decreasing sexual prejudice among heterosexual students (ANDERSON; KANNER, 2011). Concerning the latter, a meta-analytic study supported the contact hypothesis as an effective way to reduce prejudice toward many outgroup members/targets (PETTIGREW; TROPP, 2008). A recent experimental study showed the positive effects of cooperative contact; that is, disclosing one's sexual orientation helped reduce heterosexual undergraduates' negative attitudes toward homosexuals (GRAHAM; FRAME; KENWORTHY, 2014). Note that social contact theory works best when out-group members have opportunities to demonstrate their expertise and move beyond simple interactions—something that LGBT faculty members do in the classroom, possibly increasing familiarity with and empathy toward LGBT individuals among heterosexual students.

The literature suggests that there is still ambivalence toward LGBT people, including blatant and modern homo-negativity (subtle anti-gay bias), among college students in North America (ANDERSON; KANNER, 2011; MORRISON; MORRISON; FRANKLIN, 2009). In our own study, students appeared ambivalent toward the speaker. For instance, students' written comments showed a positive attitude toward the gay speaker's openness and honesty; however, students rated the heterosexual speaker as more honest than the gay speaker. The ratings also showed stronger anti-gay bias concerning the speaker's character compared to his competence. We speculate that it may be harder to show one's anti-gay bias when a gay speaker has the proper credentials, including relevant experiences (competence dimension). Furthermore, the speaker in our study has a PhD and was 53 years old at the time the study was conducted, being 28 years older (more experienced) than the speaker in Russ et al.'s (2002) study who was a 25-year-old male graduate student. These factors may have contributed to the somewhat different results between the two studies, as it was harder to discount his expertise in our study than in Russ et al.'s study. It may be easier to rationalize one's prejudice toward LGBT people by focusing on the character of a stigmatized group member.

Conclusions

Our findings suggest that coming out in the classroom is still an occupational hazard for LGBT faculty due to a double standard when evaluating professors based on their sexual orientation, possibly leading some LGBT faculty to hide their sexual orientation in order to avoid discrimination. That is, students give professors anonymous teaching evaluations, which can threaten LGBT faculty members' livelihoods and careers because supervisors use such evaluations as a means to determine merit pay and promotion. Ragins et al. (2007) found that fear of coming out in the workplace was mainly due to unsupportive supervisors and co-workers. Thus, having supportive administrators and colleagues as allies may neutralize negative evaluations from students solely based on the faculty member's sexual orientation. DeSouza et

Coming out in the classroom: still an occupational hazard?

al. (2017) suggest the importance of having heterosexual colleagues as allies who provide organizational supportiveness to LGBT issues, highlighting the significance of a supportive work climate, so that LGBT individuals feel safe to disclose their sexual/gender identity to others. Schneider, Wesselmann, and DeSouza (2017) argue for more studies on the motivation of allies, cautioning that allies' effectiveness may be limited based on others' perceptions of their motives, as some allies may be perceived as not having a genuine concern for LGBT individuals but appear to do so due to self-serving or professional motivations, and may even take on a paternalistic/patronizing role.

Our study has limitations. The face-to-face interaction occurred only during one class period and not during an entire semester. It is feasible that through longer contact with a gay instructor such familiarity may substantially reduce heterosexual students' prejudice (PETTIGREW; TROPP, 2008), possibly affecting the evaluations of the gay instructor in a positive way. In addition, we examined college students' perceptions only in regards to a gay vs. a heterosexual male instructor; thus, we cannot generalize our findings to lesbian or transsexual faculty members. Future studies should include undergraduates' perceptions of teacher credibility by examining lesbian and transsexual faculty members coming out in the classroom, including whether students' perceptions are more negative for transsexual faculty members, at different stages of transitioning, than for gay men or lesbians. For example, a recent U.S. national survey in a sample of 6450 self-identified transgender respondents showed that, because of their being transgender or gender non-conforming status, 44% were denied a job; of those who were employed, 50% experienced harassment at work; 26% lost their job; and 23% were denied a promotion (GRANT et al., 2011), suggesting that they are more discriminated against than gay men or lesbians.

References

- ABERSON, C. L.; DORA, J. Reactions to gay men: contact and overcorrection in an employee selection simulation. *Current Psychology*, v. 22, n. 2, p. 164–174, jun. 2003.
- ANDERSON, K. J.; KANNER, M. Inventing a gay agenda: students' perceptions of lesbian and gay professors. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, v. 41, p. 1538–1564, 2011.
- BADGETT, M. V. L. Employment and sexual orientation: disclosure and discrimination in the workplace. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Social Services*, v. 4, p. 29–52, 1996.
- BELL, A. P.; WEINBERG, M. S. **Homosexualities: a study of diversity among men and women**. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978.
- BILIMORIA, D.; STEWART, A. J. "Don't ask, don't tell": the academic climate for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender faculty in science and engineering. *NWSA Journal*, v. 21, p. 85–103, 2009.
- CONNELL, C. **School's out: gay and lesbian teachers in the classroom**. Oakland: University of California Press, 2014.
- DAY, N. E.; SCHOENRADE, P. Staying in the closet versus coming out: relationships between communication about sexual orientation and work attitudes. *Personnel Psychology*, v. 50, p. 147–163, 1997.
- DESOUZA, E. R.; WESSELMANN, E. D.; ISPAS, D. Workplace discrimination against sexual minorities: subtle and not-so-subtle. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences / Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration*, v. 34, n. 2, p. 121–132, jun. 2017.

- EWING, V. L.; STUKAS, A. A. J.; SHEEHAN, E. P. Student prejudice against gay male and lesbian lecturers. **Journal of Social Psychology**, v. 143, p. 569–579, 2003.
- GARNETS, L. D.; KIMMEL, D. C. **Psychological perspectives on lesbian, gay, and bisexual experiences**. New York: Columbia University Press, 2003.
- GRAHAM, H. E.; FRAME, M. C.; KENWORTHY, J. B. The moderating effect of prior attitudes on intergroup face-to-face contact. **Journal of Applied Social Psychology**, v. 44, p. 547–556, 2014.
- GRANT, J. M. et al. **Injustice at every turn: a report of National Transgender Discrimination Survey**. Washington, DC: National Center for Transgender Equality and National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, 2011.
- GRIFFITH, K. H.; HEBL, M. R. The disclosure dilemma for gay men and lesbians: “coming out” at work. **Journal of Applied Psychology**, v. 87, n. 6, p. 1191–1199, 2002.
- HEREK, G. M. Why tell if you’re not asked? Self-disclosure, intergroup contact, and heterosexuals’ attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. **University of Chicago Press**, 2003. Em GARNETS, L. D.; KIMMEL, D. C. **Psychological perspectives on lesbian, gay, and bisexual experiences** (pp. 270-298). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- HEREK, G. M.; GARNETS, L. D. Sexual orientation and mental health. **Annual Review of Clinical Psychology**, v. 3, p. 353–375, 2007.
- JONES, K. P. et al. Subtle discrimination in the workplace: a vicious cycle. **Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice**, v. 10, n. 1, 2016a.
- JONES, K. P. et al. Not so subtle: a meta-analysis of the correlates of subtle and overt discrimination. **Journal of Management**, v. 42, n. 6, p. 1588–1613, 10 set. 2016b.
- LEVITT, H. M.; IPPOLITO, M. R. Being transgender: navigating minority stressors and developing authentic self-presentation. **Psychology of Women Quarterly**, v. 38, n. 1, p. 46–64, 18 mar. 2014.
- LEWIS, A. P. **Destructive organizational communication and LGBT workers’ experiences**. New York: Routledge, 2009.
- LOPEZ, G. **How most states allow discrimination against LGBTQ people**. Disponível em: <www.vox.com/2015/4/22/8465027/lgbt-nondiscrimination-laws>. Acesso em: 20 set. 2015.
- MACHADO, A. **The plight of being a gay teacher**. Disponível em: <www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2014/12/the-plight-of-being-a-lgbt-teacher/383619/%0D>. Acesso em: 20 nov. 2015.
- MORRISON, M. A.; MORRISON, T. G.; FRANKLIN, R. Modern and old-fashioned homonegativity among samples of Canadian and American university students. **Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology**, v. 40, p. 523–542, 2009.
- MYER, I. H. Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: Conceptual issues and research evidence. **Psychological Bulletin**, v. 129, p. 674–697, 2003.
- NELSON-LAIRD, T. F. Measuring the diversity inclusivity of college courses. **Research in Higher Education**, v. 52, p. 572–588, 2011.
- NELSON-LAIRD, T. F. **Reconsidering the inclusion of diversity in the curriculum**. Disponível em: <<https://www.aacu.org/diversitydemocracy/2014/fall/nelson-laird%0D>>. Acesso em: 12 nov. 2016.
- PALUDI, M. A.; PALUDI, C. S.; DESOUZA, E. R. **Handbook on workplace discrimination: legal, management and social science perspectives, Vol. 1**. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger Security International/ABC-CLIO, 2011.
- PETTIGREW, T. F.; TROPP, L. R. How does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? meta-analytic tests of three mediators. **European Journal of Social Psychology**, v. 38, p. 922–934, 2008.

Coming out in the classroom: still an occupational hazard?

- RAGINS, B. R.; SINGH, R.; CORNWELL, J. M. Making the invisible visible: fear and disclosure of sexual orientation at work. **Journal of Applied Psychology**, v. 92, p. 1102–1118, 2007.
- RIGGLE, E. D. B. et al. The positive aspects of being a lesbian or gay man. **Professional Psychology: Research and Practice**, v. 39, n. 2, p. 210–217, 2008.
- RUGGS, E. N.; MARTINEZ, L. R.; HEBL, M. R., LAW, C. L. Workplace “trans”-actions: how organizations, coworkers, and individual openness influence perceived gender identity discrimination. **Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity**, v. 2, p. 404–412, 2015.
- RUSS, T.; SIMONDS, C.; HUNT, S. Coming out in the classroom... an occupational hazard?: The influence of sexual orientation on teacher credibility and perceived student learning. **Communication Education**, v. 51, n. 3, p. 311–324, 2002.
- SCHNEIDER, K. T.; WESSELMANN, E. D.; DESOUZA, E. R. Confronting subtle workplace mistreatment: the importance of leaders as allies. **Frontiers in Psychology**, v. 8, 23 jun. 2017.
- SEARS, B.; MALLORY, C. Employment discrimination against LGBT people: existence and impact. Bloomberg BNA, 2014. In DUFFY, C. M.; VISCONTI, D. M. **Gender identity and sexual orientation discrimination in the workplace**. Arlington, VA: Bloomberg BNA.
- SPRADLIN, A. L. The price of “ passing”: a lesbian perspective on authenticity in organizations. **Management Communication Quarterly**, v. 11, p. 598–605, 1998.
- STRAUSS, A.; CORBIN, J. **Basics of qualitative research: grounded theory procedures and techniques**. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1990.
- SWANK, E.; RAIZ, L. Attitudes toward gays and lesbians among undergraduate social work students. **Affilia: Journal of Women and Social Work**, v. 25, n. 1, p. 19–29, 2010.
- YOO, H. C.; STEGER, M. F.; LEE, R. M. Validation of the Subtle and Blatant Racism Scale for Asian American College Students (SABR-A2). **Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology**, v. 16, p. 323–334, 2010.