OUTING THE DISCRIMINATION TOWARDS LGBT PEOPLE DURING THE HIRING PROCESS: WHAT ABOUT THEIR WELL-BEING?

EXPLORANDO LA DISCRIMINACIÓN HACIA LAS PERSONAS LGBT DURANTE EL PROCESO DE CONTRATACIÓN: ¿QUÉ PASA CON SU BIENESTAR?

José Giovanni Luiggi-Hernández 1, Gabriel E. Laborde 3, Joyce González Dominguez 3, Gloria M. Carraquillo Sánchez 2, Marieli Piñero Meléndez 4, Dánae M. Castro Medina 3, Camil D. González Rentas 4

1 Duquesne University, 2 University of Puerto Rico, Medical Sciences, 3 University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras, 4 Carlos Albizu University, San Juan

ABSTRACT
This study explored perception of discriminatory behaviors that LGBT people experienced during recruitment and selection processes for employment and evaluated the relationship between these experiences and psychological wellbeing. The sample was made up of 157 participants self-identified as LGBT. Most of these participants (62.2%) reported to have experienced discrimination in these processes. We used frequencies, descriptive statistics, and correlational statistics to analyze the relation between psychological wellbeing and its dimensions with the perception of discriminatory behaviors scale. The most significant relation was between positive relations, and we did not find correlations with psychological wellbeing. Joking about LGBT people was the most frequent behavior reported which can be understood as a socially accepted conduct.
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RESUMEN
Este estudio exploró las percepciones de conductas discriminatorias experimentadas por las personas LGBT durante el proceso de reclutamiento y selección para empleo y evaluó la relación entre estas experiencias y el bienestar psicológico. La muestra constó de 157 participantes auto-identificados/as como LGBT. La mayoría de estos participantes (62.2%) reportó haber experimentado discriminación en estos procesos. Utilizamos frecuencias, estadísticas descriptivas, y análisis de correlación para analizar la relación entre el bienestar psicológico y sus dimensiones con la escala de conductas discriminatorias. La relación más significativa fue entre las relaciones positivas y no encontramos correlaciones con el bienestar psicológico. Bromas acerca de las personas LGBT fue el comportamiento más frecuente reportado, probablemente porque suele ser una conducta socialmente aceptada.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Discrimen, Orientación Sexual, Identidad de género, Puerto Rico, Bienestar Psicológico, Empleo.
INTRODUCTION

In 1982, Ann Hopkins was a senior officer at Price Waterhouse who had excelled at her job, and as a result was approached for partnership. Slightly more than 1% of the partners were female and out of the 88 candidates for partnership (of which 47 were admitted as partners), Ann was the only female. She was not accepted, although her officials regarded her as competent, intelligent, productive, and creative. After inquiring on the reason for the denial she learned that she was perceived as manly, tough, not at all feminine or ladylike, and that if she wanted to become a partner the following year she had to “walk more femininely, talk more femininely, dress more femininely, wear make-up, have her hair styled, and wear jewelry” (Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins, 490 U.S. 228, 1989).

Then, Ann Hopkins decided to sue on the basis of sex discrimination under Title VII. Was Ann really a victim of sex discrimination? After all, she was not denied the partnership because she was a woman; they acknowledged that they were willing to make a woman a partner. But not just any woman: only a feminine one. (We will continue the discussion of this case on the Legal Context section.)

During 2013, Puerto Rico’s media was covering the debate about what became Law 22 of 2013, an amendment to Law 100 of 1959, which protected sexual orientation and gender identity from employment discrimination. The argument that most amazed our research team was the lack of data in Puerto Rico to demonstrate discrimination in recruitment and selection processes. The argument that most amazed our research team was the lack of data in Puerto Rico to demonstrate discrimination in recruitment and selection processes. We researched and found two studies on discrimination and work, one was cited on the Senate Bill 238, By way of exclusion: Homophobia and Citizenship, conducted by Toro-Alfonso (2008). This was an extensive study about rejection; discrimination and exclusion toward LGBT in governmental agencies and its sample were employees and people looking for services. The other study sample was comprised of LGB employees and it investigated the relation among different variables, including sexual identity coping (Rosario-Hernández, Rovira Millán, Luna Cruz, Neris & Acevedo, 2009).

The previous findings lead us to design a study with the following objectives: 1) Identify discriminatory behaviors perceived in the recruitment and selection employment process. 2) Evaluate psychological wellbeing by using the Carol Ryff’s Psychological Well Being; and 3) Explore the relationship between perception of discriminatory behavior and psychological well-being. We decided to explore the discrimination experienced by LGBT individuals in the recruitment and selection employment process in Puerto Rico, and their psychological wellbeing, in order to obtain more data to support legislation against discrimination and create public awareness of this social issue.

We selected this process, in part because: 1) The recruitment and selection process is one of the most regulated by laws and policies, 2) In the last century, industrial psychologists played a major role developing methods and techniques to select the right candidates to specific jobs, without discrimination based on characteristics of protected classes such as gender, race, and etcetera. We assume this process as a stable one, representing an adequate starting point for researching discrimination towards a recently protected group.

The previous paragraphs elaborates on our reason to study discrimination experimented by LGBT individuals at the hiring process, but why psychological well-being? Some of us are interested on Clinical Psychology and others on Occupational Health Psychology, and this is a concept studied by both areas. Also, as we will later discuss on this paper, psychological well-being is rarely the topic of LBGT studies.
Most research make emphasis on illness and the ones conducted from the eudaimonic wellbeing perspective rarely use descriptive statistics.

We decided to study the relation between well-being and discrimination following Ryff, Keyes and Hughes (2003) finding – perceived discrimination is a negative predictor of eudaimonic well-being. Also, Wilson, DeJoy, Vandenberg, Richardson and McGrath (2004), who presented a model of healthy work organizations, found that the employee’s perceptions and expectations play a role in health and well-being. We examine perceived discrimination, assuming that those perceptions have an impact on well-being.

Literature review

Definitions of discrimination

Although there are various articles that examine this topic, two definitions of workplace discrimination influenced us the most. The first, defined by Chung (2001) “unfair and negative treatment of workers or job applicants based on personal attributes that are irrelevant to job performance.” (p.34). Second, by Wood, Braken and Niven (2012), establishes that “workplace discrimination can range from being systematic denial of people’s rights on the grounds of their gender, religion, ethnicity, age, sexual orientation or other criteria, to more informal verbal abuse which makes reference to such characteristics.” (p. 617).

Legal Context

The Supreme Court of the United States reviewed Ann Hopkins’ case and acknowledge sex and gender stereotyping as a form of sex discrimination. The reasoning used to include sex stereotyping as a form of sex discrimination was that the law intended to eliminate the stereotypes associated with a gender from the spectrum of qualities and qualifications considered by an employer when considering an employee or prospective employee (Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins, 490 U.S. 228, 1989).

Although Ann was not a member of the LGBT community, her case, Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins, provided gays, lesbians, and transgender individuals a cause of action for discrimination in the workplace, but only when such discrimination was the product of sex stereotyping. A gay employee who “looks effeminate” or a lesbian applicant who “acts manly” are examples of what is protected under the Supreme Court’s interpretation of sex discrimination under Title VII.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 regulates employment, and among other things, prohibits an employer from denying employment to a prospective employee, firing an employee, or taking adverse action against an employee (such as reducing shifts, paying a lower wage, giving a memo, etc.), on the basis of one of several protected categories. These categories are: race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. Subsequently, Congress has also enacted laws prohibiting the same kind of actions against people with disabilities and based on age.

Five years earlier, Puerto Rico had enacted Law 100 of June 30, 1959 (Ley contra el discrimen en el empleo de 1959, 29 P.R. Laws Ann. §§ 146, et. seq) (Law 100). Law 100 initially protected against the same type of adverse actions as Title VII would five years later, but also included age, social origins, social condition, and political views. It would subsequently be amended to include as protected categories victims of domestic violence, victims of sexual aggression, and military personnel.

But not all gay and lesbian workers are discriminated because they’re perceived as effeminate or manly, and thus protected under the Court’s interpretation of sex discrimination. Victor was Liquors Sales and
Marketing Director at B. Fernández y Hnos. Victor was openly gay and referred to, by coworkers as “la loca” (the queer) and “the gay director”. He was fired and replaced by a less experienced person. He sued for discrimination under Law 100 and the Court refused to look into his claim, sustaining that it was not illegal to discriminate against gay people (Portugués Santa v. B. Fernández & Hnos., Inc. 438 F.Supp.2d 33, 2006).

Efforts to protect gay and lesbian workers from employment discrimination under federal law have been led in Congress since 1994, with legislation being presented in Congress after Congress, but failing (Employment Non Discrimination Act, H.R. 1755 of the 113th Congress). In Puerto Rico, such efforts began in 1995 (Proyecto del Senado 1271, 1993-1996), with that bill failing along with similar ones to extend protections under Law 100 for the basis of sexual orientation in 2001, 2006, and 2009 (Proyecto de la Cámara 1388, 2001-2004, Proyecto del Senado 1585, 2005-2008, and Proyecto de la Cámara 1725, 2009-2012). Finally, in 2013, a Senate bill was approved by both houses of the Puerto Rico legislature and signed into law to protect gay, lesbian, and transgender workers from discriminatory practices, Law 22 of 2013 (Law 22).

Law 22 amends Law 100 (Ley contra el discrimen en el empleo de 1959, 29 P.R. Laws Ann. §§ 146, et seq.) and adds two new categories to the list of protected categories, sexual orientation and gender identity. This law defines sexual orientation as the capacity of each person to feel an emotional, affective, or sexual attraction to people of a gender different than his/hers, or of his/her same gender, or of more than one gender. While the same law defines gender identity as the way in which a person identifies herself/himself, recognizes herself/himself, as with gender, which may or may not correspond to her/his biological or assigned sex at birth.

With Law 22, Puerto Rican law now prohibits an employee from being fired, suspended, discriminated against with regards to salary, compensation, terms, conditions, work privileges, and from being refused employment or re-employment on the basis of his sexual orientation or gender identity (Ley contra el discrimen en el empleo de 1959, 29 P.R. Laws Ann. §§ 146, et seq.).

An employee (current, former, or prospect) will no longer need to be discriminated against based on sex stereotype in order to have a remedy at law. However, it is important to emphasize that it is the person who suffered discrimination who has the obligation to prove that it was their sexual orientation or gender identity that played a substantial role in the adverse employment action. The refusal to employ a person who happens to be gay, the firing of an employee who happens to be transgender, the suspension of an employee who happens to be a lesbian are insufficient to prove a discriminatory action. In order to prevail in a suit under Law 100, it is important that the discriminated victim provides the facts to support that the action was taken based on his/her sexual orientation or gender identity. These actions vary from jokes made by a supervisor, harassment (verbal or physical) by coworkers about the employee’s sexual orientation and management inaction. For example, this may also include derogatory comments by a manager about transgender individuals or a female employee receiving a memo because she acts to manly.

States such as California, Colorado, Nevada, Illinois, Minnesota and 12 other states of the United States of America, have state-wide employment non-discrimination legislation that covers sexual orientation and gender identity, and three others whose laws only cover sexual orientation (ACLU, 2015). There are other States whose laws protect sexual orientation or gender identity only for public employment. Additionally, since 2010 countries such as Australia, Great Britain and
Bolivia, have been developing laws that prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity. Likewise, the 2010 Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union on its 21st Article forbids any discrimination, including sexual orientation. This legislation is increasing worldwide and Puerto Rico is part of those countries.

Research On Workplace Discrimination Based On Sexual Orientation And Gender Identity

Researchers in many different fields have studied discrimination against members of the LGBT community within the workplace context, including wage differences, negative treatment and hostile environments, aggression, and exclusion, among other. In terms of earnings and wage differences, research findings have constantly stated that lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals earn less than their heterosexual counterparts (Allegreto & Arthur, 2001; Arabshebani, Marin, & Wadsworth, 2007; Badgett, 2001, 1995; Berg & Lien, 2002; Black, Gates, Sanders, & Lowell, 2000; Black, Makar, Sanders, & Lowell, 2003; Carpenter, 2008a, 2008b, 2005, 2004; Church, 2012; The Williams Institute, 2011, 2007). Other LGBT individuals are discriminated against even before entering the workplace. Research shows that this population is discriminated against in the hiring process (Ahmed, Andersson, & Hammarstedt, 2013; Horvath & Ryan, 2003). The case for transgender people is a lot more crucial. Although non-heterosexuals experience discrimination in the hiring process, and earn less than heterosexuals, many transgender people are unemployed and those who find work are discriminated against in the workplace (Dispenza, Watson, Chung, & Brack, 2012; Kenagy, 2005; Kenagy & Bostwick, 2005; Lombardi, Wilkins, Priesing, & Malof, 2001; The Williams Institute, 2007; Xavier & Simons, 2005).

For a more critical analysis of discrimination, we must understand the importance of intersectionality. This implies that the experience of discrimination and the probability of being discriminated against will be different between those who are of different, not only of sexual orientation or gender identity, but between sex, gender, race, ethnicity, age, and other characteristics. A study on hiring discrimination implied that black male homosexuals were the least likely to be hired followed by black female homosexuals; while white male heterosexuals where more likely to be hired in comparison to these groups, as well as in comparison to white female heterosexuals and homosexuals (Crow, Fok, & Hartman, 1998, 1995). Studies about gender differences between heterosexual and lesbian women have had mixed results. Weichsalbamer’s (2003) experimental study found that for lesbians, indicating their identity reduced the chances of being invited to a job interview by about 13%, but the influence of gender identity in being invited could not be verified. The study also showed that although some lesbians had higher earnings, it could be due to other factors. Embrick, Walther, and Wickens, (2007) research on attitudes and policies in the workplace also enlightened us on how, although laws are being created to protect LGBT individuals in the workplace, society is not necessarily more progressive. This article shows how not only heteronormativity, but also heteromasculinity, is still the desired standard in the workplace and creates negative views toward this population. Chambers (2007) defines heteronormativity as the power of heterosexuality when it operates as a norm. Thus, the idea of masculinity as part of male heterosexuality is heteromasculinity (Chan, 2001; Embrick et al., 2007).

Due to this, many choose not to disclose their sexual orientation in the workplace. Bouzianis, Malcolm, and Hallab (2008) found that the presence and awareness of non-discrimination policies in the workplace was related to the disclosure of their identity, but significant differences were found by sex; women disclosing their identity less
frequently than men. They understood this could be due to the harassment and gender discrimination women face more commonly than men (Bouzianis et al., 2008; Miner-Rubino & Cortina, 2004).

Gay and lesbian individuals cope with discrimination due to heteronormativity and gender stereotypes in different ways. Chung’s (2001) study found different strategies to cope with this kind of situations. He created various categories based on two types of strategies. One was vocational choice, which he divided into self-employment, job tracking, and risk taking. Another was work adjustment, which he divided into two other categories, and created other subcategories. The first of these categories was identity adjustment, which he subdivided into acting, passing, covering, implicitly out, and explicitly out. The second was discrimination management, which was subdivided into quitting, silence, social support, and confrontation. In a later study, these categories were validated, but quitting and silence were combined into one non-assertive strategy (Chung, Williams, & Dispenza, 2009). A study in Puerto Rico suggests that people apply these strategies depending on the demands or necessities of their situation, and those who use non-assertive strategies tend to be less satisfied with their jobs (Rosario-Hernández et al., 2009). The impact of discrimination in LGBT people goes beyond hiring and economic status.

Psychopathology and the LGBT population. Research on the gay, lesbian, bisexual, transsexual, and transgender (LGBTT) persons have shown that this population is prone to different psychological issues. For example, Meyer (1995) names the psychosocial stress derived from minority status as minority stress. This is experienced by the LGBT population due to heteronormativity, homophobia, and stigma. Studies have shown how these factors, along with internalized homophobia, and discrimination are related to many mental disorders. The LGBT population has a high prevalence of mental disorders (DeAngelis, 2002; Dentato, 2012; Igartua, Gill, & Montoro, 2003; Mays & Cochran, 2001; Mustanski, Garofalo, & Emerson, 2010). A study on the lifetime prevalence of mental disorders and suicidal thoughts of LGB people revealed that 69.8% would be diagnosed with a mental disorder: 44.3% would be diagnosed with any anxiety disorder, 22% with social phobia, 30.7% with mayor depressive disorder, 38.4% with any substance abuse disorder, and 8.3% would have attempted suicide (Meyer, Dietrich, & Schwartz, 2008). Within this population, the most common mental disorders are depression, anxiety, substances abuse, and suicidal thoughts. (Almeida, Johnson, Corliss, Molnar, & Azrael, 2009; DeAngelis, 2002).

Men who have sex with men are prone to be diagnosed with social anxiety disorder compared to men who only have sexual relations with the opposite-sex (Sandfort, de Graaf, Bijl, & Schnabel, 2001). Minority stress and discrimination have been found to be predictors of this disorder (Burns, Kamen, Lehman, & Beach, 2012; Meyer, 2003). These factors have also been found to be predictors of depressive symptoms for gay men (Hatzenbuehler, Nolen-Hoeksema, & Erickson, 2008). Although in 1990, Rothblum expressed that there has not been enough research about depression on lesbians, not much has changed, not only regarding depression but also for other mental and physical disorders. Most research found on suicidal actions or thoughts alone have been done on LGBT youth, but population studies have indicated that there is a high percentage of suicide attempts (Mays & Cochran, 2001; Meyer, Dietrich & Schwartz, 2008; Mustanski, Garofalo & Emerson, 2010) However, not all psychological research is based on psychopathology.

Positive Psychology and wellbeing. Most mental health research on the topic of sexual minorities has focused on the mental illness
or distress they experience, which is partially related to social factors, but less research has been done about positive aspects of their psychological state. As we stated previously, Ryff et al. (2003) found perceived discrimination as a negative predictor of eudaimonic well-being. Well-being is a concept broadly studied from the positive psychology perspective. Positive Psychology aims to (adopting theories from humanistic psychologists) enhance research and practice on the positive aspects (i.e., strengths, virtues, etc.) of people (Ryan & Deci, 2001; Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). There are multiple theoretical approaches to conceptualize well-being, the two most influential are the hedonic and eudaimonic.

Ryan & Deci (2001) wrote an article clearly defining the two concepts and their differences. As the name implies, the theoretic background of hedonic wellbeing comes from the both old and contemporary philosophical tradition of hedonism, which promotes the seeking of pleasure and happiness. To some, hedonism is the equivalent of wellbeing (Kehneman, 1999). Researchers of the hedonic tradition assess subjective wellbeing (SWB), composed of life satisfaction, the presence of positive mood, and absence of negative mood. Ryan and Deci (2001) also mentioned, however, that proponents of eudaimonic wellbeing, from Aristotle to current theorists, argue that subjective happiness is not equivalent to wellness. For some theorists of eudaimonic wellbeing, this wellness is representative of an individual's potential, actualization and positive psychological functioning. This concept of wellness is considered psychological well-being (PWB) and its assessment is multidimensional, where six aspects are measured: self-acceptance, positive relations with others, autonomy, environmental mastery, purpose in life, and personal growth (Keyes, Shmotkin, & Ryff, 2002). This construct of wellbeing is based on theories of humanistic-existential psychology and analytic psychology (Ryff, 1989).

Dimensions of psychological well-being can be summarized following Ryff's (1989) conceptualization and operationalization. Self-acceptance is to have a “positive attitude toward oneself”, Positive Relations is to have “warm, trusting interpersonal relationships”, Autonomy refers to have “self-determination, independence, and the regulation of behavior from within”, Environmental Mastery is “the individual's ability to choose or create environments suitable for his or her psychic condition”, Purpose in life is “the feeling there is purpose in and meaning to life”, and Personal Growth is “to develop one's potential.

Ryff's Psychological Well Being scale is widely used in an extensive range of studies, from themes like development, aging, health & biological psychology, work, family and relationships. It has also been used to study the wellbeing of LGB individuals in midlife and the relationship between eudaimonic wellbeing and heterosexist events in lesbian and bisexual women (Riggle, Rotosky & Danner, 2009; Selvidge, Matthews & Bridges, 2008). Another example is its application in a study that focused on the psychological wellbeing in injured soccer players (Rivas et al., 2012) and the connection between psychological wellbeing and being in a paid and unpaid job (Lindfors, Berntsson, & Lundberg, 2006). Ryff (2013) herself wrote an article documenting the great scope of topics in which the scale has been used.

In Puerto Rico, research on both wellbeing from a positive psychology perspective and LGBT issues is scarce. Although research about LGBT persons has been on the rise, especially on the topics of stigma, homophobia, and HIV/AIDS, there is much to be studied about their mental health and wellbeing. The eudaimonic approach to wellbeing, or psychological wellbeing in relation to sex and education has been
studied in Puerto Rico among a sample of university students (Rosa-Rodriguez, Negrón Cartagena, Maldonado Peña, Quiñones Berios, & Toledo Osorio, 2015; Rosa-Rodriguez & Quiñones-Berrios, 2012). Research on the strengths of gay and bisexual youth in Puerto Rico has shown that even though the sample had high levels of depression, they also showed low levels of drug consumption, unprotected sexual behavior, and had high satisfaction of social support (Toro-Alfonso, Varas-Díaz, Andújar-Bello, & Nieves-Rosa, 2006).

It is important to understand that wellbeing is not the absence of mental illness (Ryan & Deci, 2001). This is noteworthy given that recently, health and illness have been understood as two different dimensions, specifically within psychological and psychiatric practice. People who have been diagnosed with mental disorders can still have positive psychological functioning and have a healthy social and community life (Manderscheid et al., 2010).

After presenting a review of scholarly literature, our theoretical framework basically includes two concepts: discrimination and psychological wellbeing. Our definition of anti-LGBT discrimination in the process of recruitment and selection of employees is denial of employment or negative treatment in the processes of recruitment and selection of a candidate based on their sexual orientation or gender identity (The concepts of sexual orientation and gender identity were defined in the Legal Context section of this article.) In terms of psychological wellbeing, we used the eudaimonic approach, using its six factors to evaluate positive psychological functioning. The eudaimonic method was the theoretical approach to well being used by Ryff, which represents the potential and positive psychological functioning of an individual, including the six factors, which is what we wanted to explore.

**METHOD**

**Participants and Procedure**

Participants of this study were 157 residents of Puerto Rico identified as gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender, 21 or older, who had previously applied for employment. They were recruited through emails, LGBT-oriented websites, and the social networks such as: Facebook, Twitter, and Tumblr. Researchers also contacted LGBT community members to ask them to divulge information and the web link to the study. Due to the nature of social networks, divulging the link to the study created a snowball sampling. The instruments used for this study were administered online using the Survey Monkey website. Results were then sent to a database. Participants were presented with the description of the study and were given the option to decline or consent to participate. The informed consent document provided contact information for mental health emergencies in case the participants suffered psychological distress answering the questionnaire.

The sample of this study was composed of 82 participants born female (52.2%) and 75 born male (47.8%). In terms of sexual orientation, they identified themselves as lesbian (n=54) gay (n=70), bisexual (n=29), or other (n=4). In terms of gender identity, 73 (46.5%) identified as masculine, 78 (49.7%) identified as feminine, and 6 (3.8%) as other, from which only two fell within the category of transgender. Participants applied for employment in public (6%), private (47%) and in both (47%) sectors. Most participants were single 56.6%, 3.2% married, 25.9% live together, 1.6% divorced, and 2.1% separated. The annual income of participants was divided into the following ranges: $0-10,000 (4.5%), $10,001-20,000 (18.5%), $20,001-30,000 (11.1%), $30,000-50,000 (7.9%) and $50,001 or more (5.8%). Regarding religious beliefs, 24.9% reported to be Catholics, 5.3% Protestants, 11.6% other, and 46.7% did not participate of any
religion. In terms of educational level, 13.8% had a high school diploma, 7.9% had completed technical courses, 3.7% had an associate’s degree, 42.9% had a bachelor’s degree, 13.2% had a master’s degree, and 5.2% had a Juris Doctor’s degree or Doctorate’s degree.

Measures

Perception of Discriminatory Behaviors Scale (PDBS). We developed a scale to measure the perception of discriminatory behaviors in the process of recruitment and selection of employees toward LGBT people. It has 10 items, each one representing a specific conduct, with a Likert scale with the following choices: Totally Agree, Agree, Disagree and Totally Disagree. The psychometric techniques used were content validity, conducted by five subject matter experts, and internal consistency, obtaining a Cronbach’s alpha of .85.

Using Shapiro-Wilk we found that our simple was not distributed normally. For these cases, Costello & Osborne (2005) recommend using Principal Axis Factoring Analysis to examine the internal structure of the variables. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) (KMO=.83) indicates that our sample was adequate according to the results. A Principal Axis Factor Analysis was used with an oblique rotation. The Bartlett Test of Sphericity showed a result of $p < .001$. According to Fields (2003) during the process of factor extraction we should retain factors with a eigenvalue greater than 1. We identified two factors greater than 1. The first factor obtained a value of .46 and explained 44.59% of the variance. These two factors explained a 62.63% of the variance.

The Scree Plot graph presented an inflection that justifies the retention of two factors. The Matrix Factors table presented the factorial charges of each item. Fields (2003) mentions that the relation between the variables should be greater than .40, preferably greater than .70. Most of the items surpass .40 except for one, but we consider this item is important in the measurement of discriminatory behaviors. The rotation aids in the interpretation of the retained factors. Fields (2003) state that varimax rotation is the best option for scales without a theoretical model supporting it. In this study, we chose varimax rotation. We observed the Pattern Matrix table, which revealed the factor loading of the items. We observed that items 4-7, 9 & 10 have more weight on the first factor, and items 1-3 & 8 have greater weight on the second factor. The sub-scales of Control and Verbal Harassment presented a reliability of $\alpha = .85$ and $\alpha = .83$ respectively. The discriminatory behavior scale presented a reliability of $\alpha = .85$. The statistic used to measure reliability was Cronbach’s Alpha.

Psychological Well-Being Scale (PWB). The scale used to measure wellbeing was the Spanish version of Ryff’s Psychological Well Being Scale (PWB) (1989), adapted to a Spanish speaking population by Van Dierendonck (2004; Van Dierendonck, Díaz, Rodríguez, Blanco, Moreno-Jiménez, 2008). This version of Ryff’s scale is based in the 6 dimension theoretical model (autonomy, self-acceptance, positive relations, environmental mastery, purpose in life and personal growth; these dimensions were defined in the previous section). This instrument uses a Likert scale with six points that ranges from totally disagree to totally agree. This version of the scale has 39 items: 6 corresponding to Self-Acceptance, 6 to Positive Relations, 8 to Autonomy, 6 to Environmental Mastery, 7 to Personal Growth and 6 to Purpose in Life.

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 shows the frequencies of discriminatory experiences in the process of recruitment and selection. The most frequently experience reported by the participants was hearing jokes (48%) or negative comments (37%) about LGBT people, being asked questions about their
sexual orientations (34%), and being sexually harassed (21%). The least frequently reported experiences were being physically assaulted (1 participant), not being interviewed because of their sexual orientation or gender identity (7%), being placed in another position (10%), and being asked to conceal their sexual orientation or gender identity (10%). It was also reported that 16% were asked to control their gestures, 12% were told or found out they were not hired because of their sexual orientation or gender identity. We found that 63% of participants had perceived at least one discriminatory behavior. These numbers were created after dichotomizing the perception of discriminatory behaviors items in the scale, in order to present presence or absence of the conduct.

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics of the psychological wellbeing scale. The maximum score for each dimension and the scale are 36 for self-acceptance, positive relations with others, environmental mastery, and purpose in life, 48 for autonomy, 42 for personal growth, and 234 for psychological wellbeing. Mean results indicate that the positive functioning of the participants of our study was high. In terms of the dimensions of the scale, purpose in life and positive relations had the lowest scores; self-acceptance, environmental mastery, and autonomy had similar scores, while personal growth had the highest score.

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics of the psychological wellbeing scale. The maximum score for each dimension and the scale are 36 for self-acceptance, positive relations with others, environmental mastery, and purpose in life, 48 for autonomy, 42 for personal growth, and 234 for psychological wellbeing. Mean results indicate that the positive functioning of the participants of our study was high. In terms of the dimensions of the scale, purpose in life and positive relations had the lowest scores; self-acceptance, environmental mastery, and autonomy had similar scores, while personal growth had the highest score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I heard employees say jokes about LGBT people.</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I heard derogatory remarks by employees about LGBT people.</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The employees made questions about my sexual orientation or gender identity.</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They asked me to conceal my sexual orientation or gender identity.</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They asked me to control my gestures.</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was physically assaulted during the processes of applying for a job because of my sexual orientation or gender identity.</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The patron placed me in a different position to the one that I applied for because he/she thought it was more appropriate for me due to my sexual orientation or gender identity.</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been sexually harassed because of my sexual orientation or gender identity.</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was told that I wouldn’t be interviewed because of my sexual orientation or sexual identity.</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was told or I learned that I wasn’t hired because of my sexual orientation or gender identity.</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics of the psychological wellbeing scale. The maximum score for each dimension and the scale are 36 for self-acceptance, positive relations with others, environmental mastery, and purpose in life, 48 for autonomy, 42 for personal growth, and 234 for psychological wellbeing. Mean results indicate that the positive functioning of the participants of our study was high. In terms of the dimensions of the scale, purpose in life and positive relations had the lowest scores; self-acceptance, environmental mastery, and autonomy had similar scores, while personal growth had the highest score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Acceptance</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Relations</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mastery</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose in Life</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Wellbeing</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>178.2</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Behaviors and Scale

Table 3 presents the correlations for psychological wellbeing (and its dimensions) and each discriminatory experience. All statistically significant correlations found were negative and low. Hearing employees say jokes about LGBT people was correlated with positive relations with others ($r = -.177, p = .007$), personal growth ($r = -.137, p = .04$), and autonomy ($r = -.145, p = .029$). Hearing derogatory remarks has correlated with positive relations with others ($r = -.213, p = .001$). Questioning the person’s sexual orientation or gender identity was correlated with positive relations with others ($r = -.155, p = .019$). Being physically assaulted was related to personal growth ($r = -.156, p = .032$). In terms of the overall perception of discriminatory behavior scale, we found a relation with positive relations with others ($r = -.178, p = .006$). The other items were not significantly correlated with psychological wellbeing or any of its dimensions.

When comparing the Psychological Wellbeing total score in our sample with other studies that measured well-being in Puerto Rico, we observed that participants reported a higher score. For example, Rosa-Rodriguez, Negrón Cartagena, Maldonado Peña, Quiñones Berrios, Toledo Osorio (2015) examined psychological well-being and perceived social support in college students. Their psychological well-being mean score was of 80.04. Therefore we believe it is necessary to study the mechanisms used by people from LGBT community to maintain good psychological well-being. For this, we would need to use another approach such as a qualitative design.

### TABLE 3.
Pearson Correlations Between Psychological Wellbeing, Dimensions, and Perception of Discriminatory Behaviors and Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-Acceptance</th>
<th>Positive Relations</th>
<th>Environmental Mastery</th>
<th>Personal Growth</th>
<th>Purpose in Life</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Psychological Wellbeing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.154</td>
<td>-.235**</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>-.185</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>-.188*</td>
<td>-.195*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>-.254**</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>-.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-.190*</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>-.167</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>-.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>-.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>-.150</td>
<td>-.241**</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>-.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>-.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>-.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>-.234**</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>-.124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) I heard employees say jokes about LGBT people. 2) I heard derogatory remarks by employees about LGBT people. 3) The employees made questions about my sexual orientation or gender identity. 4) They asked me to conceal my sexual orientation or gender identity. 5) They asked me to control my gestures. 6) I was physically assaulted during the processes of applying for a job because of my sexual orientation or gender identity. 7) The employer placed me in a different position to the one that I applied for because he/she thought it was more appropriate for me due to my sexual orientation or gender identity. 8) I have been sexually harassed because of my sexual orientation or gender identity. 9) I was told that I wouldn’t be interviewed because of my sexual orientation or sexual identity 10) I was told or I learned that I wasn’t hired because of my sexual orientation or gender identity. 11) Overall Perception of Discriminatory Behavior Scale *) Correlation is significant at the .05 level. **) Correlation is significant at the .01 level.
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to explore the kind of discriminatory experiences LGBT people in Puerto Rico live through in the process of recruitment and selection of employees, and analyze if there is a relationship between these experiences and psychological wellbeing. The results of this study are consistent with those found by Toro-Alfonso (2008), which evidenced discrimination against LGBT people in governmental agencies. In our study, one of the most frequent perceived behaviors reported was joking about LGBT people. This behavior is one that is culturally accepted in Puerto Rico. Moreover, Toro-Alfonso (2008) states:

“Homophobia is deeply rooted in our country and it constitutes a formidable factor of discrimination, marginalization and exclusion. In fact, it seems that homophobia still exists as a socially accepted prejudice. The frequency of jokes, epithets and murals with hate messages evidence how much we tolerate it and, at times, encourage it.”

In the Puerto Rican context, as well as the United States and other countries (Gross, 1994; Hart, 2000; Peña Zerpa, 2013) these types of jokes are not only common place within colloquial discourse, but also gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender characters are used in literature, film (Rangelova, 2009), radio, and television programs to mock this population (Muñiz Ortiz, 2013). Characters in televised programming are partially responsible for the perpetuation of misconceptions and stereotypes (Hart, 2000) because media is an important component in the construction of social reality (Gross, 1994).

This marginalization and stigma can also be seen on the other more frequent perceived behaviors. Some of the frequent perceived behaviors were derogatory remarks about LGBT people, being asked to conceal their sexual orientation or gender identity and being asked to control their gestures. These results are compatible with a study realized by Embrick, Walther and Wickens (2007), which found that two of the general attitudes of workers and management toward homosexuality are: outright disgust and asking to hide one’s sexual orientation or gender identity. They also found that 90% of their participants would not hire someone they perceived as homosexual. For the purpose of this study, we did asked if the participant knew that he or she would not pass the interview because of his or her sexual orientation or gender identity. We also asked if the interviewer let the participant know, or if the participant found out that the employer did not hire him or her because of his or her sexual orientation or gender identity. In our sample 12.2% states not being hired due to their sexual orientation or gender identity.  This coincides with previous findings. One explanation could be that “managers would not consider hiring homosexuals because of their concern about the company’s image” (Embrick et al., 2007).

Tilesik (2011) brings to our attention another possible explanation. This article, which was realized by the Pew Research Center, revealed that half of the Americans have an unfavorable opinion of gay men and one-third has a very unfavorable view. Also, 20% expressed feeling uncomfortable around homosexuals. Therefore, we infer that a contributing factor for LGBT community discrimination in recruitment and selection processes is due to this popular impression. According to the findings in this research, even when these are low correlations, when people from the LGBT community perceive discriminative behavior directed toward them in the workplace, it is possible that their psychological well-being is affected.

About 21% of our sample declared being sexually harassed during recruitment or selection processes. Sexual harassment
consists of demands for sexual favors, comments, jokes, or other behavior that creates a hostile environment for the person that is targeted (Bruner & Dever, 2014). Therefore, we believe that because the harassment can be portrayed as a “joke” or “just a comment” it becomes easier for the perpetrator not being accountable for their harassing behavior. Harassment is related to discrimination because the victim usually has characteristics that makes them vulnerable. The main difference is that harassment involves negative actions based on the victim’s attribute (race, gender, sexual orientation), whereas discrimination also involves unequal treatment and limiting opportunities due to this attributes (Rospenda, Ehmke & Zlatoper, 2009).

Although harassment has pervasive consequences, its prevalence has been systematically found in research. For example, a systematic review of 75 studies, published between 1989 and 2009, examine the prevalence of sexual assault victimization among a total of 139,635 gay or bisexual men, and lesbian or bisexual women in the United States (Rotherman, Exner, & Baughman, 2011). The authors specify different types of sexual assault and found that at least one of those categories was experienced by a percentage as high as 85%. This study highlights how often homosexuals and bisexuals experience sexual assault, and our participants sampled in our study were not the exception.

In Puerto Rico a similar situation may occur. Toro-Alfonso (2012) argues that violence and discrimination towards LGBT people has become socially accepted. Therefore, these types of actions may be tolerated and are often justified. This might also happen with sexual harassment. We believe more research must be conducted on this topic within the workplace. Perhaps, a qualitative approach could provide in depth information to explore these actions and its consequences.

The other perceived discriminatory behavior with a high frequency in our study was: "being questioned about sexual orientation or gender identity (33.5%)". In our review of literature, there were no studies with a particular similar discriminatory behavior. That is why we recommend further study on this specific discriminatory conduct. In contrast, only one person within the sample reported being physically assaulted, but we believe it is alarming. We recommend that specific actions should be taken to prevent this sort of incident from happening in the future, instead of being reactive and letting more people experience these actions, be injured or even murdered.

Weichselbaumer (2003) conducted a labor market experiment in which women’s job applications were sent as a response to job advertisements. The goal was to identify if there were differences in the hiring process based on gender identity and sexual orientation. The research found that there was a strong negative effect on lesbian orientation and hiring chances. Lesbians who indicated their sexual orientation reduced their invitation rate by 12-13%. Although our methodology was different, we also identified discrimination in the hiring process based on sexual orientation.

What about their wellbeing? Despite the fact that there is a broad range of research using eudaimonic wellbeing, not much is reported utilizing descriptive statistics. In terms of lesbian and bisexual women’s wellbeing, Selvidge, Matthews and Bridges (2008) reported a higher psychological wellbeing than our study, but both studies showed wellness in most of participants. Selvidge’s et al. (2008) study also found that the relationship between heterosexist events and psychological wellbeing was not strong. These studies cannot support the minority stress theory, but we propose that it might be due to the construct of eudaimonic wellbeing in LGBT samples. It has also been found that psychological wellbeing correlates more strongly with gender non-conformity that with
sexual orientation (Rieger & Savin-Williams, 2012). In Toro-Alfonso’s (2006) study about the strengths of LGBT youth, he found that more than half reported having social support. We believe this social support, which could come from Puerto Rico’s cultural context, may be a protective factor against the detrimental effects of discrimination, thus ameliorating eudemonia.

In terms of the dimensions of the psychological wellbeing scale, purpose in life was the category with the lowest scores, and no correlations were found. We find interesting that Ryff, Keyes and Hughes (2003) indicate that inequality and perceived discrimination toward minorities could have a positive effect in this existential dimension, but we did not find a relation between this dimension and perceived discriminatory behaviors. The low scores obtained in purpose of life and not finding correlations with this dimension, could be related to different factors, for example cultural ones. Nevertheless, we did not measure cultural factors that could be associated to this using a scale (e.g. Hofstede) and we propose further study on this topic.

The dimension with the second lowest score was positive relations with others. Ryff (1989) states that low scorers of this dimension “have few close, trusting relationships with others; find it difficult to be warm, open and concerned about others; are isolated and frustrated in interpersonal relationships; are not willing to make compromises to sustain important ties with others”. We are concerned about positive relations with others because although it shows relatively high scores, it has the most significant negative correlations with perception of discriminatory behaviors. This could imply worsening their odds of having positive relations when exposed to more discriminatory actions. It could also affect one of the strengths this population has, which, according our revision of literature is conceived as social support (Toro-Alfonso et al., 2006).

Limitations and Concluding Remarks

We identified various limitations in our study. The first one is that the questionnaires were administrated via Internet. This technique was beneficial because of the anonymity and its logistical advantages. Hence, we consider it a limitation because it might have excluded LGBT people without Internet access. This may also explain the fact that there was little participation from the transsexual community. In further studies a larger sample should be obtained, and discrimination in the workplace based on sexual orientation could be examined by each sexual orientation and gender identity. A qualitative approach could also provide information on how the discrimination behavior is experienced by the participants.

The second one is related to the possible validity issues of the Ryff Psychological Well-Being Scale, because it has not been culturally adapted to the Puerto Rican population, the obtained scores might have been different when compared to other studies. Dana (2000) emphasizes in using an emic approach in the process of measuring and evaluation. She states that drawing conclusions based on dominant populations (e.g. eurocentric) could lead us to erroneous assumptions, due to the fact that we will be assuming that the scale we used is universal.

Future research could center the attention on specific actions of discrimination toward the LGBT community in the workplace. For example, research about the fact that members of the LGBT community are being questioned about their sexual orientation or gender identity in the workplace. Additional research should be conducted to follow-up the Law 22 after being approved. Researchers could explore if discrimination behaviors prevails in the workplace towards the LGTB people, the psychological well-being consequences of this actions, and if there is more awareness of this situation. Future studies should also explore why
employers do not prefer or will not hire LGBT people in Puerto Rico.

CONCLUSION

We measured discrimination in the recruitment and selection process of employment and examined the relationship between having experienced discrimination and the participant’s well-being. This study allowed us to identify the most frequent types of perceived discriminatory behaviors during this specific process. The results of our study provide more data to support legislation against discrimination and help to create social awareness in order to develop public policy and organizational practices that promote equal treatment among job applicants and employees. We encourage further quantitative and qualitative research on discrimination at the workplace, from a multidisciplinary perspective.

REFERENCES


Systematic Data Sources. *Demography*, 37(2), 139-154.


Employment Non Discrimination Act, S. 815 (2013)


Ley contra el discrimen en el empleo de 1959, 29 P.R. Laws Ann. §§ 146, et. Seq


Manderscheid, R. W., Ryff, C. D., Freeman, E. J., McKnight-Eily, L. R., Dhingra, S., & Strine, T.W. (2010). Evolving Definitions of Mental Illness...
and Wellness. Preventing Chronic Disease: Public Health Research, Practice, and Policy, 7(1), 1-6.


Proyecto del Senado 1271 (1993-1996)

Proyecto de la Cámara 1388 (2001-2004)

Proyecto del Senado 1585 (2005-2008)

Proyecto de la Cámara 1725 (2009-2012)

Portugués Santa v. B. Fernández & Hnos., Inc. 438 F.Supp.2d 33, 2006


Rosa-Rodríguez, Y., Neágron Cartagena, N., Maldonado Peña, Y., Quiñones Berrios, A., & Toledo Osorio, N. (2015). Dimensiones de bienestar psicológico y apoyo social percibido con relación al
sexó y nivel de estudios universitarios. Advences en Psicología Latinoamericana, 33(1), 31-43. Doi: dx.doi.org/10.12804/apl33.01.2015.03


