Limitations and future research

Due to the sensitive nature of this research topic, there are several limitations to our study. It may be that Ffrom a conceptual and practical standpoint, ~~one might say that coming out is the goal,~~ workplace disclosure benefits the individual; if so,~~positive behaviour may be equated with workplace disclosure, and negative behaviour is equal to lack of~~ behaviour that corresponds with workplace disclosure and vice versa can be considered positive or negative respectively. ~~workplace disclosure.~~ However, people vary in the extent to which they want to be open about their personal ~~lives~~life and in their individual need~~s~~ to keep ~~some things~~aspects of it private. For ~~people~~those with a ~~higher~~greater need for privacy, workplace disclosure may actually increase stress. Therefore, depending on the person's privacy~~,~~ or boundary preferences, workplace disclosure may not always be ~~what is best for the target.~~optimal.

Another concern ~~that may arise is~~centres on the fine ~~differentiation~~distinction between the individual's effort ~~of the target~~ to come out~~disclose~~ ~~and~~compared with ~~the~~his or her actual behaviour.~~ of the target.~~ On ~~The~~the scale we used, we asked ~~the~~participants how hard they ~~try~~tried to ~~keep~~hide their ~~identities~~identity ~~a secret~~from four targets at work. We must consider, however, that~~One could say that~~ an individual may try ~~really~~very hard~~to keep his/her identity a secret, but fail to do so,~~ and fail or ~~he/she may~~even not try at all, ~~but that does not' necessarily mean~~yet not necessarily ~~that the individual is~~be open about it.~~ or disclosing.~~

~~As described, our data~~We note that limitations inherent to the data, which was collected ~~came~~from a single source ~~in~~over a single time interval, ~~frame.~~ were partially addressed.~~Nevertheless,~~ We followed~~as~~ Podsakoff, MacKenzie, and Podsakoff's (2012) guidelines~~recommended, we eliminated~~for eliminating item ambiguity and ~~guaranteed~~guaranteeing response anonymity.~~ Moreover, we calculated~~and performed a

1

confirmatory factor analysis in order to address the mono-method bias. Yet, it is possible for individuals to be open with some people and not with others; ~~individuals can also fluctuate in the extent to which they are open with people over time.~~ openness can also fluctuate over time. In other words, workplace disclosure is not an 'all or nothing', 'in' or 'out' phenomenon~~;~~ it is a continuous process comprised of smaller workplace disclosure episodes with various people over time. As Mollering (2013) suggested, ~~that~~ other process-like phenomena, such as crises, are ~~entangled~~ implicated with trusting. We propose that self-disclosure is a process of how people develop the preliminary outcome of 'trust' in different ways of studying trust. Therefore, future research should focus on a longitudinal analysis ~~as well as combining it~~ combined with in-depth interviews ~~regarding~~ to explore the ~~process of~~ self-disclosure~~.~~ process more deeply. ~~Also, due to the sensitivity and anonymity of the data, we~~ In order to protect the anonymity of the participants, we could not identify who belonged to the same organisations or groups and thus ~~had no way to~~ control for the possibility of nested data ~~bias. (respondents from the same organisation). Nevertheless,~~ However, to compensate, we disseminated the ~~survey was disseminated~~ questionnaire in various networks as well as in multinational corporations where ~~the survey was answered~~ it was completed by employees ~~situated~~ in different locations and countries~~., thus reducing the probability for nested data.~~

Another possible limitation ~~of this study~~ pertains to the generalisability of the results to the overall LGBTQ population~~: at large; the~~ The profiles of LGBTQ individuals who are members of LGBTQ ERGs or are readers of LGBTQ media may differ from those LGBTQ individuals who are not. ~~One may be concerned with~~ One may also question why the preponderance of ~~male~~ respondents in our sample~~.~~ are male, but we note that ~~Yet, comparing to~~ other studies~~.~~ ~~show~~ it seems that the ratio of males to females is ~~constantly~~ consistently higher in LGBT samples. ~~For instance, in~~ In the National Health Statistics Report of the

Commented [AM4]: [AM4]: On pp. 5 and 9 the name appeared with an accent.

Commented [AM5]: [AM5]: המשפט תקין מבחינת השפה, אבל כפי שמנוסח, אינו מובן לי.

Commented [AM6]: [AM6]: אני חושבת שמה שכתבתי ברור יותר, אבל אם אינו מדוייק, ניתן לחזור לניסוח המקורי.

Commented [AM7]: [AM7]: LGBTQ?

Centres for Disease Control (Ward, Dahlhamer, Galinsky, & Joestl, 2014), there were 20~~%~~ ~~percent~~ more males than females who self-identified as gay~~,~~ or lesbian. Similarly, ~~Chalabi (2013)~~ using data from the Office for National Statistics ~~data~~ in the UK~~,~~ ~~suggested~~ Chalabi (2013) found that '~~(W)~~hile 1.5% of men in the UK say they're gay, only 0.7% of women say the same'.

As in other studies,~~Due to privacy issues,~~ our sample~~, similar to previous studies,~~ is ~~therefore~~ based on respondents who ~~engaged in~~exhibited some degree of disclosure (Law et al., 2011; Ragins, Singh, & Cornwell, 2007). To reduce this potential sampling bias, we intentionally used different types of online media to reach out to respondents (e.g., company ERGs, LGBTQ rights media, commercial sites, advocacy groups, and so forth). ~~Still, if possible, it~~It would nonetheless be worthwhile ~~for future researchers to select~~to use a random sampling approach within the LGBTQ population~~.~~ in future research.

~~One more limitation of this study is the~~Like other studies (e.g., Ambrose & Schminke, 2003; Tan & Tan, 2000), ours shows a ~~high~~strong correlation between both types of trust~~;~~. the percentage of additional variance each type of trust accounted for, more than the other, was only 1%.~~which previous studies have also shown (e.g., Ambrose & Schminke, 2003; Tan & Tan, 2000). The study has shown that despite the high correlation among the two constructs,~~ Nonetheless, the results also show that participants ~~still~~do differentiate between the two~~.~~ constructs~~The results do highlight~~ and that ~~the unique contribution of~~each type ~~of trust~~contributes uniquely~~,~~ ~~yet, the percent of additional variance in both types of trust accounted for beyond the other type of trust was only 1%. One might ask if they are truly unique and distinct, then why test them separately. Technically, according to~~Though ~~familiar~~the commonly used statistical techniques show there is no multicollinearity between the two~~.~~ ~~Nevertheless,~~ we ~~are concerned~~suggest that ~~current~~available measures are not sensitive enough to capture the fine differences in the ~~relevant~~given contexts. ~~While we~~

3

~~understand the technical issues, we do not want those technicalities to digress from~~We urge that in order not to lose sight of the essential issue and context (Johns, 2006) of the foci of trust~~.~~. ~~Therefore, we call for constructing and developing~~ more sensitive ~~measurements~~instruments ~~in order to facilitate~~must be developed.~~better distinction.~~

~~In spite of the limitations, the research findings presented here provide~~Our study offers new insights into the relationship between organisational trust, organisational policies and practices, and negative workplace manifestations of disclosure. This study emphasises the importance of the external and internal social environments in understanding employee attitudes and behaviours in the organisation.

Implications and conclusion

~~This study has important practical implications. Findings from previous~~Previous studies point to the benefits ~~that~~to organisations ~~can obtain by fostering~~that foster a supportive climate in which employees feel comfortable and safe being true to themselves. This research shows the importance of employee trust in the organisation ~~for enabling employees~~to ~~feel~~feeling comfortable about disclosing ~~their~~sexual- and gender-identity at work. This is an effect that goes above and beyond simply ~~enacting~~enforcing organisational-level antidiscrimination policies and practices. ~~What makes these conclusions especially interesting to managers, is that because LGBTQ identity is concealable, it is likely that most large organisations do employ sexual and gender minority staff, whether they are visible or not. Hence, while for~~Though it may be difficult for some managers, ~~supervising a more diverse workforce may signify an additional challenge,~~ learning how to supervise ~~encourage~~ their diverse employees~~'~~ can increase their engagement, and in turn, ~~and contribution appears to bring~~their value to ~~their~~the organisation.

4

Top management teams (that reflect the organisation in general, see for example Hambrick & Mason, 1984; Kickul, Gundry, & Posig, 2005) should be encouraged to increase the perceived and actual trustworthiness of the organisation and line managers in the eyes of the LGBTQ staff. This ~~task~~ can be accomplished by making visible progress in all the relevant dimensions of trustworthiness: competence, concern, openness~~,~~ and reliability (Mishra & Mishra, 1996). ~~Specifically, the dimension of competence~~Competence can be enhanced by ensuring that managers demonstrate professionalism in the way they handle issues concerning sexual diversity~~.;~~ ~~the dimension of concern~~Concern can be improved by expressing support~~supportive~~ for LGBTQ employees and by taking concrete steps to eradicate heterosexism. ~~Furthering openness can be achieved~~Openness can be furthered by being transparent about the criteria for selection and promotion~~,~~ and by openly discussing areas for improvement. Finally, ~~strengthening reliability can be attained by maintaining~~to increase reliability, the top managers must consistently ~~consistency in applying~~apply all of the above and ~~by~~ continually ~~communicating~~communicate the concrete steps the organisation is taking to become more inclusive.

Acknowledgement

References