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While sexual orientation diversity can potentially serve as a source of competitive advantage, researchers have largely failed to fully articulate the theoretical linkage between this diversity form and organizational effectiveness. As such, we propose a theoretical framework to understand these dynamics. Sexual orientation diversity is posited to positively contribute to organizational effectiveness through three mechanisms: enhanced decision making capabilities, improved marketplace understanding, and goodwill associated with engaging in socially responsible practices. We also propose two approaches to leveraging the benefits of sexual orientation diversity: targeting the categorization process and creating a proactive and inclusive diversity culture. Contributions and implications are discussed.
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Historically, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) persons have faced considerable prejudice and discrimination in the workplace. In the United States, there are no federal laws outlawing managers from basing personnel decisions on one’s sexual orientation, and fewer than half of all states have such policies (Human Rights Campaign, 2009). Thus, sexual minorities frequently do not receive legal protections from discrimination related to hiring, training, promotions, and termination. Perhaps not surprisingly, research also suggests people who are LGBT frequently face treatment discrimination in the workplace. Consider, for instance, that employees who
are LGBT frequently report sexual orientation and gender identity discrimination (Badgett, Lau, Sears, & Ho, 2007; Ragins, 2004), earn up to 30% less than their heterosexual counterparts (Blanford, 2003) and are encouraged (both explicitly and implicitly) not to disclose their sexual orientation in the workplace (Ragins, Singh, & Cornwell, 2007). These experiences negatively affect sexual minorities’ work experiences (Button, 2001; Ragins & Cornwell, 2001) as well as their mental and physical health (Smith & Ingram, 2004; Waldo, 1999).

While observed across multiple contexts, heterosexism is in many ways particularly heightened in sport and sport organizations (Griffin, 1998; Sartore & Cunningham, 2009b). For instance, Cunningham (2010b) found that nearly half of all National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division III athletic departments had low levels of sexual orientation diversity. Qualitative studies of coaches (Krane & Barber, 2005) and professors (Sartore & Cunningham, 2010) also indicate that most sexual minorities do not disclose their sexual orientation at work for fear of negative repercussions. Furthermore, studies of players’ parents illustrate that many parents expressed high levels of sexual prejudice and were unwilling to allow their children to be on a team led by a coach who was LGBT (Sartore & Cunningham, 2009a).

While these examples point to explicit forms of sexual prejudice, implicit prejudice is also present in sport. This is recently evidenced by Cunningham, Sartore, and McCullough’s (2010) experimental study, where persons reviewing job applications rated applicants who were LGB as lacking in moral fiber (e.g., low in ethics, morality, and trustworthiness), even though these applicants were highly skilled and, thus, qualified for the job. The personal attributions were important because they were highly predictive of whether the applicant would be recommended for the position. Collectively, this research suggests that, in many sport organizations, employees who are LGBT face antagonism, hostility, and prejudice, all of which can truncate their career opportunities and limit the sexual orientation diversity within these entities.

Interestingly though, the very heterosexism and sexual prejudice that limits sexual orientation diversity within sport organizations might also impede the organization’s performance. There is a growing body of research showing that differences among employees, based on both demographics and deep-level characteristics, can positively impact the information shared, decision making capabilities, and overall performance (van Knippenberg, De Drue, & Homan, 2004; van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007). While most of this literature focuses on diversity dimensions other than sexual orientation, there is emerging research examining this possibility. For instance, Cunningham (in press) collected data from NCAA athletic departments and found that sexual orientation diversity was positively associated with organizational performance when the department had a proactive,
Sexual orientation diversity can be a source of competitive advantage, but these benefits primarily exist in inclusive contexts. Indeed, Anderson (2011) has made similar arguments in his research of openly gay athletes who play high school or college sports in the United States.

We highlight three points from this recent literature. First, while sexual prejudice still exists in some contexts, there is also evidence that it is decreasing in others, such as the teams in Anderson’s (2011) work. This is likely due to the decreased stigma, relatively (historically) speaking, of being LGBT. Indeed, as attitudes and social norms toward persons who are LGBT have improved (see Herek, 2009), overt forms of prejudice and discrimination have decreased (see Crandall, Eshleman, & O’Brien, 2002, for a thorough treatment of this issue). Second, and related to this point, sexual orientation diversity can be a source of competitive advantage for a sport organization. Finally, the degree to which sexual orientation diversity positively contributes to a team’s or organization’s success appears to be dependent upon the degree of LGBT inclusiveness in that entity. Unfortunately, research related to these points, and particularly the latter two, is scarce, particularly within the sport context (see also Cavalier, this issue). Therefore, the purpose of this theoretical article is to remedy this situation by fully articulating the relationship between sexual orientation diversity and group (organizational) performance. We offer a theoretical foundation for how sexual orientation diversity can improve performance and then specify conditions under which the benefits of sexual orientation diversity are likely to materialize.

**BENEFITS OF SEXUAL ORIENTATION DIVERSITY**

There are a host of benefits associated with increased sexual orientation among employees. In examining the existing literature, we grouped them into three major themes: enhanced decision making capabilities, improved marketplace understanding, and goodwill associated with social responsibility. These factors should ultimately result in performance gains.

**Decision Making Capabilities**

Group diversity brings about a host of benefits, but one of the most cited is improved decision making capabilities. van Knippenberg and his colleagues (van Knippenberg et al., 2004; van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007) have advocated as much in their *categorization-elaboration model*. According to this theory, diverse groups consist of people from different backgrounds, who have experienced life in varied ways, and as a result have distinctive
points of view and ways of approaching problems and tasks. These characteristics are thought to then improve the decision-making, the elaboration of information, and problem-solving capabilities of the group. Ultimately, this enables diverse groups to outperform their more homogeneous counterparts. Jehn, Northcraft, and Neale’s (1999) research is illustrative of these effects, as they found that group diversity was positively associated with performance in large part because these groups spent more time debating and discussing how to complete the task.

Traditionally, diversity scholars have suggested that only task-related diversity forms (e.g., differences in tenure or functional background) allow for these positive effects, while other diversity dimensions, such as sexual orientation diversity, would result in emotional conflict and performance losses (Horwitz & Horwitz, 2007; Pelled, 1996). Ely and Thomas (2001) characterized this rationale as a discrimination and fairness perspective, whereby supposedly nontask-related diversity forms “are relevant only insofar as they trigger others’ negative reactions; they are therefore a potential source of negative intergroup conflict to be avoided in the service of a task” (p. 268).

A different—and we argue, a more positive and realistic—viewpoint is what Ely and Thomas termed the integration and learning perspective, which holds that all diversity forms, including sexual orientation diversity, can be a source of enrichment and understanding. The latter is also consistent with the categorization-elaboration model (van Knippenberg et al., 2004), as all diversity forms can result in the elaboration of task-relevant information and improve group performance.

But is there support for the notion that sexual orientation diversity is related to performance gains or that employees who are LGBT bring unique perspectives to the group? Although scant, there is emerging evidence for this position. Consider, for instance, that most employees who are LGBT have experienced sexual prejudice during their life (Herek, 2009; Meyer, 2003). Facing such stress has a number of negative health and psychological outcomes, but also enables persons who are LGBT to develop “crisis competence” (Friend, 1991) that can be effectively implemented in the workplace. Having experienced sexual prejudice might also enable sexual minorities to critically analyze social structures and power positions (Anderson, 2000; Pastrana, 2006). From a different perspective, Synder’s (2006) work suggests that employees who are LGBT frequently display distinctive leadership styles that include creative problem solving and engender employee engagement, both of which should allow for performance gains. From still another standpoint, sexual minorities are apt to travel more than heterosexuals. This is important because people who travel frequently, particularly when it is abroad, demonstrate enhanced cross-cultural skills and global competence, empathy for viewpoints of others, and decreased prejudice (Kitsantas, 2004; Lindsey, 2005), all of which positively contribute to the workplace. Collectively, this literature supports the notion that employees who are LGBT
bring unique competencies, backgrounds, and experiences to the workplace (see also Fassinger, Shullman, & Stevenson, 2010), all of which are likely to improve group performance.

Improved Marketplace Understanding

According to various estimates, sexual minorities represent between 4 and 17% of the United States population (Lubensky, Holland, Wiethoff, & Crosby, 2004). Putting these figures in perspective, consider that, according to the U.S. Census Bureau, the U.S. population in 2010 approximated 310 million people, meaning that between 12.4 and 52.7 million U.S. citizens at that time were LGBT. The lower estimate (4%) is close to the proportion of Asian Americans, while the upper estimate exceeds the proportion of African Americans or Latinos in the United States. Research also suggests that sexual minorities make a substantial economic impact, amounting to about $600 billion in spending annually (Day & Greene, 2008). Collectively, these figures suggest that persons who are LGBT constitute a sizeable proportion of the U.S. population and, therefore, are a potentially lucrative target market.

The size and spending capacity of the LGBT market is attractive to sport organizations, and high sexual orientation diversity is likely associated with a better marketplace presence and understanding. That is, as the proportion of employees who are LGBT increases, so too does a sport organization’s ability to understand, tap into, and ultimately capture the LGBT sport market. Of course, in making this argument, we are not suggesting that sexual minorities in the workplace speak for, or have an acute understanding of, all other sexual minorities, nor do we suggest that the LGBT community is a homogeneous market segment. What we suggest, however, is that sport organizations have a better chance of capturing this desired market when they have marketers on staff who are LGBT.

A similar rationale, albeit one focusing on race, is found in other scholarly work and in sport organizations’ initiatives. For instance, Robinson and Dechant (1997) suggested that “the cultural understanding needed to market to these demographic niches resides most naturally in marketers with the same cultural background” (p. 26). More recently, Cunningham (2008a) found that both racial and gender diversity among athletic department employees were positively associated with the attraction of diverse fans. And, in drawing from an industry example, Ervin “Magic” Johnson (a former NBA All Star who is African American) was hired to help NASCAR attract a more diverse fan base. NASCAR chief operating officer George Pyne noted, “Magic will help NASCAR achieve its goals to better educate new audiences and facilitate greater participation among the industry and communities of color” (as cited in “Magic,” 2004). Although focusing on diversity dimensions other the sexual orientation, these studies support our central thesis: Sexual orientation diversity will allow sport organizations to better understand the LGBT marketplace and attract those customers.
Goodwill Associated with Social Responsibility

Finally, customers are likely to reward sport organizations with high sexual orientation diversity because of the goodwill associated with engaging in socially responsible practices. Several scholars (DeSensi, 1995; Doherty & Chelladurai, 1999) have noted that social pressures represent a primary impetus for sport organizations seeking diverse and inclusive workplaces, as there is a “moral obligation for organizations to be accepting of all employees, irrespective of their individual differences” (Cunningham & Fink, 2006, p. 455). If this is the case, then organizations that do have high sexual orientation diversity should be rewarded accordingly from their external stakeholders. These rewards could come in various forms, including attraction of potential employees to organization and customer loyalty.

There is some research to support this rationale. For instance, in drawing from signaling theory (Rynes, 1991), Melton (2010) observed that job applicants were attracted to organizations recognized for their LGBT inclusiveness. These effects held for both applicants who were heterosexual and those who were LGBT, suggesting that inclusive organizational practices are valued among most people, irrespective of their sexual orientation. These findings demonstrate the benefits of having LGBT-inclusive work environments, and being recognized for such efforts (i.e., through the Human Rights Campaign Corporate Equality Index). Furthermore, research from Harris Interactive polls (see www.harrisinteractive.com) suggests that sexual minorities are acutely in tune with organizational practices that affect the LGBT community. Consider the following: a) over two thirds of gay men and lesbians have switched their allegiance to another brand when they perceived the company engaged in practices detrimental to the LGBT community; b) one in four persons who are LGBT have switched to a brand when they perceived the company supported LGBT issues; and c) nearly 66% of sexual minorities will remain with a brand they consider to be LGBT friendly, even if it means paying more for those products and services. These data indicate that external stakeholders pay attention to organizations’ LGBT-related practices and either reward or condemn the companies accordingly. Indeed, Melton, Cunningham, and McCullough (2010) observed as much, as they found that consumers who were LGB indicated that they would be more loyal to a sport organization they perceived to be LGBT friendly.

LEVERAGING THE BENEFITS OF SEXUAL ORIENTATION DIVERSITY

Thus far, we articulated three ways in which sexual orientation could positively contribute to organizational performance. However, simply having a diverse workforce does not necessarily ensure these benefits will be
realized. Sport managers must also take steps to leverage the benefits of sexual orientation diversity. As Kochan et al. (2003) note, “context is crucial in determining the nature of diversity’s impact on performance” (p. 17). Recognizing these dynamics, in this section we outline two primary mechanisms for leveraging the benefits of sexual orientation diversity: a) targeting the social categorization process, and b) creating and sustaining a proactive and inclusive diversity culture.

Targeting the Categorization Process

The social categorization perspective (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987) provides a theoretical foundation for understanding sexual prejudice. According to this perspective, people use various characteristics, such as demographics, attitudes, or other membership categories, to classify themselves and others into social groups. People similar to the self are considered ingroup members while those who differ from the self are considered outgroup members. In general, ingroup members are favored over outgroup members, with positive affect, attitudes, and behaviors varying accordingly. This process creates “us” versus “them” dynamics and subsequent intergroup bias. In the work context, this means that people prefer to be and work around others similar to themselves (Tsui, Egan, & O’Reilly, 1992). They also provide more favorable evaluations of ingroup members (Sartore, 2006) and discriminate against outgroup members (Cunningham & Sagas, 2005).

If categorization and intergroup bias are to blame for prejudice, including sexual prejudice, then one way to reduce such prejudice is to target the categorization process. While a host of options exist (for an overview, see Cunningham, 2004; Pettigrew, 1998), we highlight three here: decategorization, recategorization, and intergroup contact. These approaches are most applicable when focusing on groups, such as project teams or athletic teams.

DECATEGORIZATION

Decategorization refers to the process where the categorization boundaries between ingroup and outgroup members are reduced (Brewer & Miller, 1984). Specifically, following repeated contact with outgroup members, bias should be reduced because of two underlying processes: personalization and differentiation. Personalization occurs when people compare outgroup members in relation to the self and come to see how the two share various characteristics. Differentiation takes place when people see specific outgroup members as distinct individuals—not a member of a larger, homogeneous outgroup. As interactions take place over time, the categorization
boundaries that once separated ingroup and outgroup members start to
dissipate, and bias is reduced.

A number of studies have demonstrated the benefits of decategorization. For instance, Herek and Capitanio (1996) found that as heterosexuals’
interactions and contact with sexual minorities increased, their sexual prejudice decreased. As another example, Jones and Foley (2003) conducted an
experiment to examine the degree to which decategorization could reduce
racial bias among students. In one condition, participants heard a presenta-
tion focusing on anthropology (e.g., origins of humans, the spread of
humans worldwide), the lack of valid evidence associated with using biolog-
ical characteristics to differentiate people, and people’s common ancestry
(all of which allowed for differentiation and personalization). In the other
condition, participants were read Dr. Seuss’ *Oh, The Places You’ll Go!* The
authors found that participants in the decategorization condition were more
likely to perceive similarities between themselves and others, and bias
against outgroup members was reduced accordingly. Within the sport con-
text, Anderson (in press) showed that social contact with an openly gay
teammate upgrades heterosexual athletes’ perspectives on homosexuality.
Collectively, this literature suggests that sport managers would do well
to ensure intergroup contact between sexual minorities and heterosexuals,
particularly when in supportive environments (see also Allport, 1954;
Pettigrew, 1998).

**Recategorization**

While decategorization has the aim of breaking down categorization bound-
aries, the focus of recategorization is to create a larger categorization,
inclusive of both ingroup and outgroup members (Gaertner & Dovidio,
2000). That is, the purpose of recategorization is to encourage “members
of both groups to regard themselves as belonging to a common superor-
dinate group—*one group* that is inclusive of both memberships” (p. 33). If
this occurs, then former outgroup members are now considered ingroup
members and afforded the accompanying favorable attitudes and behaviors.
Thus, a more inclusive “we” replaces the “us” and “them” dynamics, and
bias is reduced as a result of pro-ingroup bias.

A number of laboratory studies have demonstrated the efficacy of this
approach (e.g., Cunningham & Chelladurai, 2004; Dovidio et al., 1997;
Gaertner, Mann, Murrell, & Dovidio, 1989), and more recent field studies
have also done so (Nier et al., 2001). Not only does recategorization allow for
a reduction in bias, but the work experiences of outgroup members improve
as well. For instance, Cunningham (2005) found that, among coaches racially
different from others on the staff, coworker satisfaction was high when the
coaching staff was characterized by a common ingroup identity, but low
when it was not. While this research has focused on nominal groups (in
laboratory studies) or race (in field studies), the effects are also applicable to the current discussion, as the presence of a common ingroup identity should allow sexual minorities to assume ingroup status and experience the consequent improvements in their work experiences.

**INTERGROUP CONTACT**

While decategorization seeks to break down categorization boundaries and recategorization seeks to build up a more inclusive categorization, proponents of intergroup contact argue for maintaining and even emphasizing categorization boundaries. Specifically, Brown and Hewstone (2005; Hewstone & Brown, 1986) argue that intergroup contact should result in bias reductions when people interact with typical outgroup members. If the outgroup member is not prototypical, then any pleasant experiences can be chalked up as an anomaly (Allport, 1954) and bias reduction will be limited to the specific individual. However, when contact is with a “typical” outgroup member and group identities are salient, prejudice reduction should be extended to other members of that specific outgroup. Binder et al.’s (2009) compelling multinational, longitudinal analysis provides strong empirical support for these dynamics.

Another element of intergroup contact theory is mutual group differentiation, whereby people realize the strengths that outgroup members possess (Hewstone & Brown, 1986; see also van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007). Thus, group differences remain salient, but bias is reduced because outgroup members are valued for being different and the unique perspectives they bring to the group. For instance, Ely and Thomas (2001) found that employees who worked in settings characterized by pro-diversity beliefs felt valued and respected, were likely to engage in meaningful communications concerning diversity, and perceived their differences from others as “a potential source of insight and skill” (p. 257). In a laboratory study, Homan, van Knippenberg, Van Kleef, and De Dreu (2007) found that heterogeneous groups with pro-diversity beliefs were more likely to interact in a positive manner with one another, which in turn, resulted in reliable performance gains relative to their counterparts. Cunningham’s research is also supportive of these processes, as he found that pro-diversity attitudes were associated with desired athletic department outcomes (Cunningham, 2008a) and satisfaction with peers in a diverse physical activity class (Cunningham, 2010a).

In short, sport managers and coaches have a host of options when seeking to reduce sexual prejudice in groups. Depending on the approach employed, bias is reduced by breaking down categorization boundaries, creating a superordinate identity, or by emphasizing the differences but valuing the unique contributions of the outgroup members. As Pettigrew (1998) highlights, these approaches need not be mutually exclusive, but can be...
used in tandem. The primary point is that for the benefits of sexual orientation diversity to materialize, the sexual prejudice present in many groups and teams needs to be diminished, and sport managers can do this by targeting the categorization process.

Proactive and Inclusive Diversity Culture

While categorization-based strategies are primarily aimed at leveraging the benefits of sexual orientation diversity in groups and teams, sport managers can also target organization-wide diversity by addressing the organization’s diversity culture. As Schein (1990) notes, organizational culture represents the pattern of assumptions, values, and beliefs that shape employee activities and provide them a template for what is considered valid and appropriate. While several frameworks exist (e.g., DeSensi, 1995; Doherty & Chelladurai, 1999), Fink and Pastore’s (1999) is one of the most comprehensive. It has also been subjected to empirical testing. Thus, we provide an overview of their model and offer ways it can be used to leverage the benefits of sexual orientation diversity.

Fink and Pastore (1999) suggested that sport organizations have one of four diversity cultures: noncompliance, compliance, reactive, and proactive. As the proactive culture is most desired, we limit our discussion to this form. Organizations with a proactive diversity culture a) adopt a broad view of diversity, such that it encompasses both demographic and deep-level differences; b) value differences people bring to the workplace; c) systemically integrate diversity and inclusion principles; d) encourage open organizational dialogue; e) have a diverse group of people in leadership positions; f) and actively work to leverage the benefits of diversity.

Fink and Pastore argued that these workplaces would not only enjoy diversity-related benefits (e.g., greater workplace diversity) but also experience non-diversity specific benefits as well (e.g., employee satisfaction), and their subsequent research is supportive of this contention (Fink, Pastore, & Riemer, 2001, 2003).

In drawing from Fink and Pastore’s (1999) work, we argue that sexual orientation diversity is likely to interact with the organization’s diversity culture to predict subsequent outcomes. That is, while there might be direct benefits of having a proactive diversity culture, the advantages are most likely to materialize when it is coupled with a diverse workforce. This rationale is consistent with Doherty and Chelladurai’s (1999) position and has also been supported in empirical assessments. Ely and Thomas (2001), for instance, found that diversity most strongly impacted organizational performance when the culture was one of integration and learning, akin to Fink and Pastore’s proactive culture. Cunningham’s work with both racial diversity (Cunningham, 2009a) and sexual orientation diversity (Cunningham, in press) shows that athletic departments with high employee diversity and
a proactive culture far outperform their peers on objective measures of performance. Of note in Cunningham’s work, when the diverse workforce is not matched with a proactive culture, the performance gains do not materialize. Collectively, this literature suggests that to truly realize the benefits sexual orientation diversity can bring to an organization, a proactive and inclusive diversity culture must be in place.

DISCUSSION

Although heterosexism and sexual prejudice are prevalent in many sport organizations, there are other areas of sport where this is not the case, and in fact, sexual prejudice is decreasing (Anderson, 2009, 2011). This pattern has implications beyond the playing field, as sexual orientation diversity can potentially serve as a source of competitive advantage. Thus, the prejudice directed toward and exclusion of sexual minorities, in addition to being socially reprehensible (Day & Greene, 2008), is likely also serving to limit how effective these sport organizations can be. While some research examining this issue is emerging (Anderson, in press; Cavalier, this issue; Cunningham, in press), a thorough theoretical treatment of the topic is lacking. To remedy this shortcoming, we achieved two aims with this theoretical article. First, we offered a rationale for how and why sexual orientation diversity positively contributes to organizational effectiveness, highlighting the decision making capabilities, improved marketplace understanding, and goodwill associated with engaging in socially responsible practices. Second, in recognizing that “context is crucial in determining the nature of diversity’s impact on performance” (Kochan et al., 2003, p. 17), we articulated two approaches to leveraging the benefits of sexual orientation diversity—targeting the categorization process and creating a proactive and inclusive diversity culture.

Our framework highlights the need for additional understanding in two areas: a) attracting employees who are LGBT to the workplace, and b) creating and sustaining a proactive and inclusive diversity culture. Several options exist for sport organizations seeking greater sexual orientation diversity. First, recruiters can attend LGBT-specific events and conferences, such as the annual Reaching Out MBA Conference (see www.reachingoutmba.org), in efforts to attract sexual minorities to their organization (see Ho, 2006). They can also attend or sponsor LGBT-inclusive athletic events, such as the Gay Games or Out Games. Offering partner benefits might also prove beneficial, as research has demonstrated a positive association between firm growth and LGBT-inclusive policies (Human Rights Campaign, 2009). Finally, it is possible that being diverse in other areas, such as race or gender, might attract employees who are LGBT to the workplace (Cunningham, 2010b). Pugh, Dietz, Brief, and Wiley (2008) argue that visible diversity forms can
serve as an “extracted cue in which people develop a larger sense of what is occurring” (p. 1424). In this way, job applicants who are LGBT might perceive the sport organization as inclusive and, therefore, be attracted to that workplace, when they see racial minorities and women in the workplace, particularly in leadership positions. Indeed, because young job applicants who are LGBT are not subject to the same degree of self-censorship (Savin-Williams, 2005), they are likely to seek out sport organizations that are inclusive and shun those that are not.

Various authors have also addressed the creation and maintenance of inclusive diversity cultures. Examination of this literature underscores the importance of valuing all forms of diversity (Fink & Pastore, 1999); systemically integrating diversity initiatives throughout the organization (Cunningham, 2009b; Fink & Pastore, 1999); having strong support from leaders and coworkers (Cunningham, 2008b, 2009b; Huffman, Watrous-Rodriguez, & King, 2008); developing and enforcing organizational policies that affirm sexual orientation and gender identity diversity (Button, 2001; Human Rights Campaign, 2009); ensuring that the organization is a “safe haven” for people to express their sexual identity (Ragins, 2004); and providing diversity training (Homan et al., 2007).

Finally, as with all frameworks, there is a need to test our predictions. Past diversity researchers have predominantly employed qualitative (e.g., Anderson, 2011), cross-sectional (e.g., Cunningham, in press), and experimental (e.g., Homan et al., 2007) research designs, and all approaches have offered unique contributions to the understanding of how diversity impacts work outcomes. Given the prevalence of sexual orientation diversity and its potential to positively impact organizational effectiveness, any and all efforts to better understand these relationships is desired.
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