A Review of the LGBTQ+ Work-Family Interface:
What Do We Know and Where Do We Go from Here?

Lauren D. Murphy¹
Candice L. Thomas¹
Haley R. Cobb¹
Alexius E. Hartman¹

Note: This is a pre-print of an in-press, accepted manuscript. Please cite as:

Murphy, L. D., Thomas, C. L., Cobb, H. R., & Hartman, A. E. (2021, In Press). A review of the LGBTQ+ work-family interface: What do we know and where do we go from here?. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*.

Author Note

¹Saint Louis University, Department of Psychology, 3700 Lindell Boulevard, Morrissey Hall, Saint Louis, MO 63108

A preliminary version of this review has been presented at the 2020 Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology conference in Austin, TX.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Lauren D. Murphy, Department of Psychology, Saint Louis University, St. Louis, MO (USA), lauren.d.murphy@slu.edu

Lauren D. Murphy
lauren.d.murphy@slu.edu
(219) 895-9561

Candice L. Thomas
candice.thomas@health.slu.edu
(314) 977-8271

Haley R. Cobb
haley.cobb@slu.edu
(918) 406-3719

Alexius E. Hartman
alexius.hartman@slu.edu
(402) 460-7875

Abstract

Work-family research has blossomed over the past several decades but mostly remains focused on traditional couples and heteronormative individuals. However, research suggests that LGBTQ+ employees face unique challenges, such as discrimination and stigma, that impact their work-family interface in ways that current work-family research may not be fully capturing. We propose a review and synthesis that summarizes current LGBTQ+ and work-family literature with four primary goals: (1) identify predictors and outcomes of the work-family interface for LGBTQ+ employees, (2) integrate empirical findings and current theory into a recently developed framework to delineate our understanding of LGBTQ+ work-family experiences, (3) provide direction for future research, and (4) provide recommendations on translating the current findings into practice. Our results identify $k = 74$ studies that cover the work-family interface and LGBTQ+ individuals. This comprehensive and integrated review will help inform researchers on how to best address unique research questions for LGBTQ+ employees and provide employers with empirical evidence as they develop inclusive policies, cultures, and workforces.

Keywords: LGBT, work-family, review, sexual orientation

*It is important to note that the current study strives to be all-encompassing and use inclusive language when discussing the LGBTQ+ community. However, the initialism will be shortened throughout the following text when the research discussed studied a limited population of this group (e.g., LGB).

A Review of the LGBTQ+ Work-Family Interface: What Do We Know and Where Do We Go from Here?

Work-family research has grown exponentially over the last few decades and is of interest to scholars across a variety of disciplines (e.g., organizational behavior, management, human resource management, and applied psychology). However, even the most seminal work in this interface does not acknowledge that Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer+ (LGBTQ+) employees and their experiences may vary compared to heterosexual families. LGBTQ+ employees represent a significant subset of employees within the U.S.: approximately 6.28% percent of the workforce in the U.S. identified as lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (Burns et al., 2012). As society grows to embrace and support the LGBTQ+ community, the number of individuals publicly identifying as LGBTQ+, living in same-sex households (U.S. Census Bureau, 2019), and raising children in LGBTQ+ families (Gates, 2015) is increasing. Because of this, organizations can expect a growing obligation to address the needs of non-heteronormative family structures. To properly address LGBTQ+ family experiences, both researchers and employers need to focus more attention on how employees with diverse sexual identities may have needs unique from their heterosexual counterparts. A major goal of our review is to contribute to this area by summarizing what is known about this group thus far, as well as suggest future directions for both research and practice.

The current review expands beyond other reviews concerning similar topics (e.g., King, et al., 2013; McFadden, 2015; Webster et al., 2018) by providing a contemporary, integrated, and exhaustive review of the research on LGBTQ+ work-family interface. Past reviews have given brief overviews of quantitative and qualitative findings and have applied existing work-family theories (e.g., role theory) to LGBTQ+ families (e.g., King et al., 2013). Themes such as identity,

discrimination, and social issues have been systematically applied to offer recommendations for LGBTQ+ employees navigating their minority identity at work (e.g., McFadden, 2015).

However, over the last few years, we have seen both societal (Witeck, 2014) and legal (Pew Research Center, 2015; Widiss, 2016) shifts concerning LGBTQ+ individuals, along with an increase in publications studying the population's work-family experiences. Additional research and changes within laws and societal perspectives warrant an updated and comprehensive catalog of the current literature. More recently, Webster and colleagues (2018) quantified the sparse and scattered relationships in the literature by presenting meta-analytic findings of workplace contextual supports and their influence on individual-level outcomes. We expand on their findings by focusing on the work-family interface and discussing bidirectionality, dyadic relationships, and interpersonal outcomes within a comprehensive theoretical framework.

Building off prior reviews, our systematic and multi-disciplinary review synthesizes the current literature by (1) identifying prominent antecedents and consequences of the work-family interface for LGBTQ+ employees, (2) outlining common trends regarding research on LGBTQ+ employees and their families, (3) expanding on recent theoretical models concerning LGBTQ+ work-family experiences, and (4) providing recommendations for future research and translating the findings into practice.

LGBTQ+ Families: Calls for Inclusion in Research, Family Definitions, and Organizations

Over the last several decades, work-family research has emerged and continues to grow (e.g., Allen & Martin, 2017). Given the increase of mothers in the workforce (U.S. Department of Labor, 2016), the onset of technology creating “overwork” culture (Miller, 2015), and the normalcy of work schedules that blur boundaries (i.e., telecommuting) (Allen et al., 2015), the work-family interface has become a central focus of occupational health psychology. The

literature covers a variety of major themes, such as negative spillover into the family domain (e.g., Crouter, 1984) and the incompatibility of role demands that creates work-family conflict (WFC; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Research has also begun to acknowledge different family types (e.g., single and divorced parents) and shifts in the division of labor (i.e., men's increased household involvement) (e.g., Gerson, 2010). One such example is the focus on maternal wellbeing and implications for children as more and more families are led by dual-earner couples (Allen & Finkelstein, 2014). Although there has been a recent deviation from solely studying traditional family types, work-family scholars are still being nudged to include underrepresented populations in their research and to more accurately understand the current diversity in employees' family and work relationships (e.g., Agars & French, 2016).

Just as researchers work to expand their understanding of heterosexual employees' varying family structures (e.g., single parent families, adoptive families, co-parenting families), LGBTQ+ parents also need to be considered in work-family research; LGBTQ+ family structure is often not legitimized both socially and legally (Agars & French, 2016). The lack of consistent recognition for LGBTQ+ families in the literature is disadvantageous and prevents the dissemination of empirically supported advice to organizations and employees. For example, we know little about how work-life balance policies affect LGBTQ+ employees and their families (Stavrou & Ierodiakonou, 2018), how one's sexual minority identity may create unique WFC (Sawyer et al., 2015), or how existing work-family measures can be interpreted differently across heterosexual and LGB populations (Sawyer, 2012). Without sufficient evidence and understanding, work-family research will continue to fall short for LGBTQ+ employees.

Changes in Family Conceptualization

As of 2018, there are nearly one million same-sex couple households in the U.S. (U. S. Census Bureau, 2019). It is evident that the conceptualization of family is shifting, and a variety of familial structures should be included in the definition of family. From an economic, social, organizational, and legislative standpoint, family is narrowly defined and therefore can be exclusionary to a wide variety of family structures. As researchers, it is necessary that we broaden the scope of this definition in our review and include all familial relationships. Discussing the social construction of family, Beauregard and colleagues (2009) use the definition, “a collective of two or more individuals who are in a relationship of interdependence towards shared vision and goals” (p. 47). We adopt this conceptualization in order to encompass all non-traditional family structures and better understand LGBTQ+ employees’ experiences with respect to the work-family interface. We encourage other work-family researchers to do so as well.

Organizations’ Recognition of LGBTQ+ Family Needs

Public media has recently increased its attention to include the experiences of LGBTQ+ employees and the need to provide inclusive workplace policies. Major US corporations (e.g., Walmart, Apple, AT&T, and Chevron) are striving to provide non-discrimination policies, equal family-related policies, and an inclusive culture with corporate social responsibility (Human Rights Campaign, 2019a). Many of these businesses are taking to social media to report their achievements and express their commitment to working towards LGBTQ+ inclusiveness at their organization (Human Rights Campaign, 2019a). It appears that companies are realizing the power they have to provide resources to help their LGBTQ+ employees, as well as the financial benefit they may receive when appealing to consumers through the adoption and support of a diverse and LGBTQ+-friendly workforce. With this recent public attention and awareness,

organizational research needs to catch-up to help provide evidence-based practice models that properly inform organizations and policy.

Method

We conducted a qualitative review of studies that focus on a sample of LGBTQ+ employees and have considered both an explicit operationalization of at least one work-related construct and at least one relevant family-related construct. A preliminary review took place through Summer and Fall 2019 and involved search strategies that included (1) searching databases (PsycInfo and Web of Science) with a series of iterative and structured keyword searches that correspond to the constructs discussed above (e.g., “work family” AND “lgb”, “work life” AND “lgb”, “work family conflict” AND “lgb”, “work life conflict” AND “lgb”, “work life balance” AND “lgb”), (2) searching the top 25 IO and Work-Family journals, and (3) backward searching highly-cited sources and reviews identified in our database search. We took additional steps to obtain unpublished studies for consideration in our review, including relevant theses and dissertations.

While completing the preliminary search process, all “hits” were screened by title and saved to a database. This process resulted in $k = 110$ sources for potential inclusion in our literature review. All titles and abstracts of these sources were screened for obvious exclusions and unintended duplicates; this process resulted in the exclusion of $k = 64$ studies from our database. The remaining $k = 46$ studies were then subjected to a more in-depth full-text screening by at least two members of the research team to reach a consensus for inclusion. Ultimately, these combined efforts resulted in $k = 32$ studies that were retained for our preliminary review.

A systematic review was then conducted in Winter 2019 to expand on the initial findings. The research team conducted a more thorough search strategy that involved (1) searching

databases (PsycINFO and Web of Science) using an iterative keyword search strategy that broadened our results (e.g., “work family” AND “gay”, “work family” AND “lesbian”, “work family” AND “bisexual”, “work family” AND “trans”, “work family” AND “queer”, “work family” AND “homosexual”, and “work family” AND “same-sex”), (2) an additional database search within Google Scholar for the keyword “work family AND lesbian”, and (3) completing backward and forward searches on the $k = 32$ studies in our preliminary review. This extended literature search resulted in a total of $k = 10,888$ sources to be initially screened by title for inclusion. After titles were screened and duplicates were removed, $k = 202$ sources remained for abstract screening. All “hits” were distributed amongst a research team of faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate students with each source assigned two coders. Coders reached agreement at the 80% threshold, and if agreement was not reached, the two coders discussed the screening decision until consensus was reached. This process resulted in $k = 72$ full papers to be screened. Ultimately, there were $k = 42$ additional unique studies that were included from our expanded review. After the addition of the preliminary search includes, there were $k = 74$ total sources included in this systematic review (see Table 1).

Results from the Review: Trends, Theory, and Findings

Current Trends in LGBTQ+ Work-Family Research

The following sections of this review will outline the identified trends in current research when discussing LGBTQ+ employees and their families (i.e., wage differences, division of labor, and comparisons to heteronormative families). The majority of LGBTQ+ related work-family literature has stuck to investigating these topics over the last several decades, and the focus dominates this review (47% of included studies). Also, a large portion of studies that extend beyond wage differences and division of labor emphasize the similarities that LGBTQ+

employees have with their heterosexual counterparts. The proceeding summaries will consolidate what current trends in research tell us and highlight how they may restrict the implications we can draw.

Wage Differences

In addition to the well-known gender pay gap, sexual orientation wage differences also exist. Research finds that gay men and women tend to earn less than heterosexual men (Waite & Denier, 2015) and that lesbians earn more than heterosexual women (e.g., Mize, 2016; Skilling, 2014; Waite & Denier, 2015). Extending beyond dichotomous sexual orientation (i.e., heterosexual or not heterosexual), Mize (2016) finds that bisexual men and women earn less than both heterosexual men and women and gay men and women. Beyond the individual employees, heterosexual couples have a larger within-dyad wage gap than same-sex couples (e.g., heterosexual married couples have a distinct breadwinner, whereas same-sex couples do not) (Mize, 2016; Montag, 2010). Heterosexual married couples exhibit the largest within-dyad wage gap, followed by gay couples, lesbian couples, and unmarried couples (Jepsen & Jepsen, 2015). These relationships depict a sexual orientation pay gap and a gender pay gap, where heterosexual women typically earn less than all other working adults.

Employees who identify as LGBTQ+ may experience differences in their wages due to discrimination and family characteristics (e.g., Dang & Frazer, 2004; Montag, 2010) but not all of these wage differences are disadvantageous for the sexual minority group. Interestingly, lesbian women experience a financial benefit when they are parents (Baumle, 2009; Montag, 2010); Lesbian mothers tend to earn significantly more than heterosexual mothers and lesbian women without children. Peplau and Fingerhut (2004) found that lesbian mothers were perceived as more career competent and focused than heterosexual mothers. Besides motherhood, lesbian

women may earn more than heterosexual women because lesbian women have more full-time jobs, work more on average, reside in urban areas, and are less likely to be married (Waite & Denier, 2015). Gay men also experience a financial boon from parenthood (Baumle, 2009), and gay men experience a smaller within-dyad wage gap (i.e., the two partners earn similar wages) when the geographic location is controlled for (Montag, 2010), further extending evidence that demographic variables have a substantial impact on pay for sexual minority groups. For organizations that agree that pay should be commensurate to the job one does and not impacted by one's sex or sexual orientation, it is essential to recognize that wage gaps extend beyond the gender pay gap. Understanding and being transparent about wage differences for LGBTQ+ employees can help promote equal and fair pay across all groups of employees. Future studies can examine how and if wage differences between couples or within couples lead to stigma or WFC, respectively, and can further explore what policies exist to mitigate unequal pay.

Division of Labor

Non-heteronormative families lack traditional masculine and feminine figures that, in heterosexual couples, historically dictated the division of paid, household, and childcare labor decisions. Thus, many have concluded that same-sex couples hold egalitarian beliefs that influence how labor is divided between partners (Auber, 2017; Goldberg, 2005; Goldberg et al., 2012; Jaspers & Verbakel, 2013; Kulik, 2018; Martell & Roncolato, 2019; Patterson, 1995; Patterson et al., 2004; Perlesz et al., 2010; Rothblum, 2017; Smart et al., 2017; Sullivan, 1996; Sweeney et al., 2017), although other factors, such as live-in children, work hours, marriage, and income, are likely to cause differences in labor division as well (Fetters, 2018; Goldberg et al., 2012; Moore, 2008; Perlesz et al., 2010; Smart et al., 2017; Sullivan, 1996; Widiss, 2016). There is strong evidence that gay and lesbian parents do distribute paid and unpaid labor more equally

than heterosexual parents (Goldberg et al., 2012; Jaspers & Verbakel, 2013; Perlesz et al., 2010; Patterson et al., 2004; Smart et al., 2017; Sullivan, 1996), and it may be beneficial; same-sex parents that avoid traditional divisions of labor may experience lower WFC (Rawsthorne & Costello, 2010). Moreover, when compared to heterosexual mothers, lesbian mothers are more likely to work more paid hours (Patterson et al., 2004) and less likely to both begin role specialization (i.e., tendency to become more involved in either the labor market or household) after childbirth (Jaspers & Verbakel, 2013) and have discrepancy between the level of “prestige” in their job and their partner’s job (Patterson et al., 2004).

While it does appear that same-sex parents are more egalitarian in the division of labor than heterosexual couples are, evidence suggests that many same-sex couples still have one primary paid-laborer and one primary household-laborer (Downing & Goldberg, 2011; Goldberg, 2013; Patterson, 1995; Sullivan, 1996). For example, biological lesbian mothers perform more feminine tasks like childcare or housework (Auber, 2017; Downing & Goldberg, 2011; Goldberg, 2005; Moore, 2008; Patterson, 1995; Rawsthorne & Costello, 2010) than non-biological lesbian mothers. Still, when same-sex couples do use role specialization, they tend to negotiate the division of labor using individual preferences instead of relying on traditional gender roles (Goldberg, 2005; Downing & Goldberg, 2011; Patterson et al., 2004; Perlesz et al., 2010). Same-sex couples are still influenced by gender norms, however (Civettini, 2016; Goldberg, 2013; Moore, 2008); many same-sex couples report feeling pressured to avoid role specialization so as to not adhere to stereotypical roles (Goldberg, 2005; Sullivan, 1996), and they may take steps to avoid doing so. Both parents might take less paid hours (Goldberg, 2005) or attempt to reduce differences in earnings (Martell & Roncolato, 2019). Goldberg (2013) suggests that by either dividing paid and unpaid labor equally or relying on perceptions of

fairness and personal preferences when role specialization is needed, same-sex couples are moving towards a more beneficial approach to the division of labor that rejects traditional gender norms.

While this information is relevant to LGBTQ+ work-family experiences, and it does help us to better understand same-sex family dynamics, this area of research does not provide practical information that employers can use to help LGBTQ+ employees reduce negative experiences in their work-family interface. We understand that gender roles influence the division of labor within LGBTQ+ relationships differently, but it appears that there is little organizations can do to assist LGBTQ+ employees in managing these differences. Further, the research in this area is quite saturated; it has clearly been shown through numerous studies that same-sex families are more egalitarian in the division of labor than heterosexual couples, although many same-sex couples still use role specialization. Moreover, lesbian mothers and gay fathers have been the primary subject pool for LGBTQ+ division of labor research, and there is little information available about how gender roles do or do not influence other LGBTQ+-identifying parents in their division of labor decisions. We recommend that future studies looking into division of labor extend to other LGBTQ+ groups, such as transgender or bisexual couples, and examine how these roles are established within families.

Summary of Similar Experiences for Heterosexual and LGBTQ+ Employees

LGBTQ+ families can see similar patterns of decision-making processes and challenges as heterosexual families when managing their work and family roles and report similar levels of traditional WFC (i.e., time-, strain-, and behavior-based) (Badgett, 2008; Brashier et al., 2013; Kim et al., 2019). Like heterosexual parents, LGBTQ+ parents' WFC coping strategies include changing jobs, changing work schedules, reducing hours, requesting flexibility, not taking

promotions, and delaying career aspirations (McKee, 2019; Rawsthorne & Costello, 2010). Similarly, qualitative thematic findings show that dual-earner LGBTQ+ couples manage work-family demands through (1) planning (e.g., strategies, decision making), (2) creating positive social networks, and (3) purposefully bringing their personal and work worlds together. In line with strategy similarities, Shepard (2003) did not find significant group differences in gay and heterosexual men's reported conflict between work and family roles. Work and home satisfaction also have presented insignificant differences for women in same-sex or heterosexual relationships (Horning, 2011). Regarding navigating multiple roles, lesbian employees' role combination experiences tend to align with heterosexual men in which there were no differences between how different role combinations were related to either groups' well-being (Wienke & Hill, 2013). Additionally, perceived parenting skills and intentions did not vary between lesbian and heterosexual women and gay men actually faced less hegemonic masculinity or penalties from their colleagues for being involved with their child (Goldberg & Smith, 2009; Sallee, 2019; Simon et al., 2018). These results suggest that there are many overlapping work-family experiences for heterosexual and non-heterosexual employees, and that future research does not need to exclude LGB couples in their samples when examining general work-family interactions.

LGBTQ+ Employees' Unique Work Experiences

Although research has found that LGBTQ+ WFC experiences are similar to heterosexual experiences, there are notable discrepancies between other aspects of LGBTQ+ and heterosexual employees' work-family experiences. These unique experiences warrant an expansion of the literature to further understand these relationships and to provide research-supported suggestions to organizations. In the following section, we briefly describe findings within the literature that highlight discrepancies in workplace experiences between LGBTQ+ and heterosexual employees

due to stigmatized identities. Then, we elaborate on unique minority stressors ranging from laws and mandates to the workplace itself.

Research has found that sexual minorities may navigate their work and family roles differently; for example, gay men are most likely to occupy the worker-only role compared to heterosexual peers, but those who do enter parenthood are more likely to take agency in carving out time for their children (Sallee, 2019; Wienke & Hill, 2013). Lesbians are most likely to have single-parent status and least likely to be a partnered, non-working parent (Wienke & Hill, 2013). Sexual orientation also has an influence on performance ratings and work attitudes. Kufahl (2014) found that married heterosexual women receive better ratings than married lesbian applicants. Perhaps attributable to feeling limited in job opportunities, undisclosed LG employees actually show greater continuance commitment than disclosed LG and heterosexual employees.

Despite knowing where LGBTQ+ employees coincide or differ in the work-family interface, it is clear that they experience additional workplace stressors (e.g., disclosure decisions, lack of support, negative interference in sexual identity development) due to their specific, stigmatized identities (Sabat et al., 2014; Ragins, 2004; Sawyer et al., 2017). For decades, researchers have been investigating and summarizing these barriers that sexual minorities face while working (e.g., Fassinger, 1996). Aside from experiencing time-, strain-, and behavior-based conflict experienced by most employees, minority-specific stressors can include distal stressors such as actions, words, or microaggressions directed at the marginalized individual. They also encompass proximal stressors such as concealment of one's identity, expectation of stigma, and other subjective experiences (Meyer, 2003). These stressors have been found to influence resource access and career trajectories. The unique pressures of LGB

individuals include experiencing conflict between partner and coworkers to come out at work and avoiding family-related benefits requests (Sawyer et al., 2015). Similarly, lesbian women have reported avoiding the international labor market for reasons such as expectation of stigma, fear of legal constraints, and lack of confidence without their support system in their home country (McNulty, 2013).

To highlight legal and organizational policy discrimination, only 21 of 50 states have legal protection for sexual orientation or gender identity (Human Rights Campaign, 2019b), and it was not until 2015 that the “Final Rule” amended the regulatory definition of spouse under the Family and Medical Leave Act to include individuals in same-sex marriages (U.S. Department of Labor, 2019). In the U.S., a diminutive 15% of the LGBTQ+ population live in states where they may take leave to care for their partner despite legal recognition of the relationship; only 8% of the LGBTQ+ population live in states where they can take leave to care for a child despite a legal or biological tie to the child (Movement Advancement Project, 2019). The US is one of three countries (along with Greece and Switzerland) that offer no paid leave to adoptive parents and is the only OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) country that does not offer paid parental leave (Wong et al., 2019). Of the other 31 countries that have paid parental leave, the leave durations differ for sexual orientation due to gender restrictive language and biological relation requirements. In addition, same-sex adoption is not even legal in all countries (Wong et al., 2019). Finally, LGBTQ+ parents have also reported having mixed experiences with healthcare in which some still experienced discrimination when seeking healthcare for their diverse family types (Shields et al., 2012). It is obvious that there are social and legal elements that place limits on LGBTQ+ employees’ advancement in both work and

family. We outline these challenges as an added emphasis on the importance of understanding existing LGBTQ+ work-family research.

Summary of Trends

Thus far, this review has highlighted several important topics that emphasize the need for a comprehensive catalog of all we know concerning the experiences in sexual minorities' work and family domains. It has been noted that (1) work-family research has progressed to include LGBTQ+ employees but needs to expand its efforts, (2) organizations are starting to pay more attention to the needs and implications of their LGBTQ+ employees, (3) current trends in the literature are not fully encompassing all of the relationships that need to be studied, and (4) LGBTQ+ employees have unique work experiences that include minority stressors from institutional, organizational, and interpersonal levels. Our next goal for this review is to identify specific predictors and outcomes of the work-family interface for LGBTQ+ employees while integrating their relationships into current theory and a recently developed framework.

Integrated Research Findings within Theory

We now move beyond describing the problem and towards understanding why, how, and when these work-family experiences occur for LGBTQ+ individuals. In order to do so, we begin by providing an overview of the prevalent and dominant theories identified in this area of research. Next, we will provide an updated conceptual model for research to move forward and test new, proposed relationships.

Prevalent Theories in the Current Literature

Our review found that a wide array of theories across a broad spectrum of perspectives (organizational behavior, communication, feminist, stress, humanistic psychology, psychoanalytic, etc.) have been used to examine the work-life interface for LGBTQ+ employees. Across the 74 sources we reviewed, there were 23 different theories cited as the primary

justification for the hypotheses, while over a third of the papers did not cite a theory at all.

Although there are a few exceptions, such as the Life-Span, Life-Space Approach (Super, 1990), Language Convergence, Meaning Divergence Theory (Dougherty et al., 2009), and Neoclassical Economic Human Capital Theory (Stockdale & Nadler, 2012), the majority of theories used fall into three broad categories: (1) frameworks that focus on minority experiences (e.g., Minority Stress Theory; Meyer, 1995; 2003), (2) employee strain-based theories (e.g., Conservation of Resources Theory; Hobfoll 1989); Job Demands-Resources Theory (Demerouti et al., 2001)), and/or (3) work-family theories (e.g., models of work-family fit, (Voydanoff, 2005; 2007) or spillover/crossover (e.g., Bakker & Demerouti, 2013). Of these, minority stress-based theories were the most heavily cited theories in the articles included within our review; over an eighth of the articles (e.g., Dispenza, 2015; Goldberg & Smith, 2013) used Minority Stress Theory (Meyer, 1995; 2003) to understand how work and family roles interact for LGBTQ+ employees. Blended with this, intersectionality theories (Crenshaw, 1989), stigma-based perspectives, and Queer theory (Oswald et al., 2005; 2009) were also examined (e.g., McKee, 2019; Sawyer, 2012; Sawyer et al., 2017; Ryan & Briggs, 2019). Within these frameworks, LGBTQ+ employees are likely experiencing stressors that are unique to marginalized individuals and this minority-based strain is a product of stigmas developed from cultural and institutional social interactions that are chronic over time (Davis, 2017; Totenhagen et al., 2017).

In addition to minority-based frameworks, general employee stress theories and work-family frameworks are also used to understand LGBTQ+ work-family experiences. Central to this is the idea that both balancing multiple roles and holding a stigmatized identity can be resource-draining; the demand of hiding one's stigmatized identity requires an individual to use many personal (i.e., self-esteem, identity) and energetic resources (i.e., effort to keep sexual

orientation hidden) which, viewed through the Conservation of Resource Theory (Hobfoll, 1989) or the Job Demands-Resources Theory (Demerouti et al., 2001), can lead to increased strain. Similar to heteronormative employees, the outcomes resulting from the work-family experience are therefore a combination of the demands, resources, fit between work-family resources/demands (Voydanoff, 2005; 2007), and the complex environmental conditions (Bronfenbrenner, 1986) that an LGBTQ+ employee encounters (Goldberg & Smith, 2013; Richardson et al., 2012). As such, work-family perspectives, such as those looking at WFC (Frone, 2003), enrichment (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006), and role enhancement (Marks, 1977) all have been applied to LGBTQ+ employees (e.g., Stygles, 2016; Wienke & Hill 2013). Taking this one step further, work-family outcomes for LGBTQ+ employees can also spillover to different life domains and crossover to other individuals they interact with. Spillover-crossover models of the work-family interface (Bakker & Demerouti, 2013) are prevalent within general work-family research (including all types of employees) and have been replicated within LGBTQ+ populations (e.g., Totenhagen et al., 2017; Williamson et al., 2017). Although these theories provide some insight into the work-family experiences for minority employees and employees in general, they are insufficient for understanding the full spectrum of experiences and challenges that LGBTQ+ employees face when managing the work-life interface.

Moving Towards a More Integrative Theoretical Approach

Throughout the process of synthesizing the work-family literature pertaining to the LGBTQ+ population, it became apparent that developing a new, unique conceptual model would not be most beneficial to research. Instead of piecemealing together sporadic and range-restricted antecedents and outcomes into a new model, we have mapped our included studies onto Sawyer et al.'s (2017) empirically supported conceptual model of stigma-based WFC. The majority of

variables reported in studies included in this review fall into the theoretical constructs regarding traditional and unique work-family experiences outlined by Sawyer and colleagues (2017). The following sections will break down the overall framework and discuss empirical relationships that fit into each. Specifically, we discuss the (a) antecedents, (b) work-family domain interactions, and (c) outcomes that are both in alignment with traditional, heterosexual work-family research (see Figure 1) and those that are unique to LGBTQ+ employees (see Figure 2). Following the mapping of findings onto this conceptual model, we suggest extensions to this model based on remaining relationships and articles that were not well explained with the current framework.

Traditional Work-Family Antecedents, Conflict, and Outcomes

Similar to heterosexual employees, LGBTQ+ employees' work-family experiences are influenced by a variety of factors that may manifest as WFC. Both quantitative and qualitative findings within this review's included studies are outlined in Figure 1. Work-related variables (e.g., work status, work schedule/flexibility, policies and benefits, job autonomy), family-related variables (e.g., partner support, family arrangements), and individual difference variables (e.g., personality, physical health) have all been reported as antecedents to WFC as traditionally defined (i.e., time-, strain-, and behavior-based). Furthermore, both work-family interference and family-work interference have been associated with psychological (e.g., anxiety, depression, wellbeing), work (e.g., turnover, work satisfaction), and family (e.g., relationship satisfaction) outcomes. The summation of these relationships reflects how many findings concerning LGBTQ+ employees' overlap with how the work-family interface is traditionally reported for heterosexual employees. Building on this work, the proceeding sections outline relationships that

extend beyond traditional work-family experiences and models LGBTQ+ employees unique experiences (see Figure 2).

Unique Work-Family Antecedents, Conflict, and Outcomes

Unique Work-Family Antecedents: Discrimination Due to Stigmatized Group

Membership. LGB employees perceive themselves to belong to a stigmatized family when they feel negative responses from society at large and feel less represented in their workplace (Sawyer et al., 2017). Workplace discrimination due to a stigmatized sexual identity has been a prevalent finding in work-family research. Many LGBTQ+ employees note that they find their organization to privilege traditional heteronormative families while ignoring what constitutes a family for them (Dixon & Dougherty, 2014). These minority stressors are associated with important individual and couple-level outcomes for LGBTQ+ employees.

Looking at the individual, there is evidence that minority stress at work for LGBTQ+ employees is associated with negative work outcomes. For example, LGBTQ+ individuals who reported increased levels of sexuality-based harassment and discrimination in the workplace have also reported decreased job satisfaction and life satisfaction (Davis, 2017). For men, workplace discrimination towards gay men is significantly associated with decreases in their job satisfaction (Manley, 2005) and these proximal minority stressors have been shown to have direct and unique contributions to career development for men in same-sex dual-earner relationships (Dispenza, 2015). For women, the negative impact of minority stressors on lesbian employees has also been shown: Shachar and Gilbert (1983) found that lesbians often experience additional inter-role conflict at work because they do not feel accepted in a heterosexual, male-dominated work environment.

Similarly, a review of formal organizational documents (e.g., policy and benefits) revealed that both lesbian and gay employees commonly face exclusionary language and social norms that exclude their family structure (Hornsby & Munn, 2009). This is harmful because language that is not analogous to lesbian or gay relationships can discourage the use of benefits. Similarly, interactions between gender, marital status, and sexual orientation also impact hiring and salary decisions where married heterosexual women received better ratings than married lesbian applicants and single lesbian applicants receive higher ratings than gay single applicants (Kufahl, 2014). Furthermore, participants in Kufahl's (2014) study who reported high on ambivalent sexism and homophobia were likely to suggest lower starting salaries and give applicants lower ratings. Overall, these studies suggest that the experience of workplace discrimination and minority stressors due to LGBTQ+ status or family structure are likely negatively impacting individual workplace affect, experiences, benefits, and employability.

In addition, the experience of minority stress is related to spillover-crossover experiences and dyadic relationship outcomes. Experiences of minority stress processes, for example, have a negative effect on the romantic relationships of lesbians and their partners (Holman, 2019). Similarly, internalized homophobia also has a negative association with one's assessment of their dyadic adjustment at home (e.g., consensus, relationship satisfaction, dyadic cohesion, and affect expression) (Dispenza, 2015; Boita, 2006). However, Totenhagen and colleagues (2017) found contradicting evidence where sexual minority stressors were not significantly associated with decreased relationship quality for either partner. But, when analyzing lagged effects, they did find significant actor effects with men who experienced sexual minority stress and reported lower relationship quality the next day. Together, these papers suggest that there are likely important relationship-level impacts of experiencing LGBTQ+ minority stressors at work.

Unique Work-Family Conflict & Domain Management: Stigma-Based. In addition to traditional WFC and domain management experiences, LGBTQ+ employees experience additional inter-role conflict from stigma-based experiences at work. Specifically, the research thus far suggests that there are three additional stigma-based inter-role experiences that LGBTQ+ employees may be facing (lack of formal invites to work events, lack of same-sex partner benefits, and heterosexist pressure to suppress family information at work) and two unique domain management strategies that are commonly utilized to help address stigma-based work-family experiences (physical separation of work and family and suppression and differential disclosure of family information at work).

Lack of Formal Invites to Work Events. Reinert and Yakaboski's (2017) qualitative study discusses how lesbian faculty noted that feeling invited and included in work social events was important to them and a contributor to feeling that their workplace supported them. The women also noted that although invitations were extended, expectations of stigmatization persisted and they sometimes were discomforted when attending functions because they felt different (Reinert & Yakaboski, 2017). Other research has found that when LGB workers' same-sex partners were invited to company social events, they were more committed to their organization, had fewer turnover intentions, and had marginally more organizational-based self-esteem (Ragins & Cornwell, 2007).

Lack of Same-Sex Partner Benefits. Institutional barriers (e.g., legal policies and social norms) have been reported to inhibit gay couples' abilities to be successfully active in both work and family domains (Campbell, 2013). The usage and availability of family-friendly policies have been found to be significant in explaining behavior-based WIF (Tuten & August, 2006). Mercier (2006) also found that benefits were a central theme to the relationships between work

and home environments. In some cases, HR policies relevant to sexual orientation were directly linked with participants' decision on whether or not to work there (Stygles, 2016). Although not always significantly related to all work outcomes (i.e., job satisfaction; Manley, 2005), the majority of research measuring LGBTQ friendly benefits have been associated with increased commitment, reduced turnover intentions, and organization-based self-esteem (Ragins & Cornwell, 2007). Benefits offered by gay-friendly workplaces are also pivotal for the ease of transition into parenthood (Reimann, 2001). Unfortunately, even when equitable benefits are offered, there can be a very high percentage of employees who are not aware of their workplace policies' existence or their specific rights at work (Boita, 2006).

Heterosexist Pressure to Suppress Family Information at Work. LGBTQ+ families have differing experiences from traditional families because they undergo invisibility and hypervisibility simultaneously (Dixon & Dougherty, 2014). Organizational norms and typical discourse amongst members of an organization create expectations of traditional family structures. Those whose families deter from traditional expectations are rarely acknowledged, which may lead to experiences of invisibility. However, feelings of being perceived to be different than others heighten hypervisibility. Gay men particularly have unique expectations where they have to deal with juggling job and family demands while also experiencing gendered assumptions of parenthood (Sallee, 2019). By suppressing information about one's family, LGBTQ+ employees' significant resources (e.g., self-esteem, energy) are drained while trying to mask the invisible identity one holds (Williamson et al., 2017).

Physical Separation of Work and Family. In order to manage their stigmatized family identity, LGB employees often engage in identity management behaviors to either avoid or reduce experienced conflict (Sawyer et al., 2017). Identity management behaviors can entail the

physical separation of work and family, lying about family information at work, and disclosing family information to specific coworkers (Sawyer et al., 2017). Identity management strategies are likely to be enacted when individuals experience workplace discrimination, higher internalized heterosexism, and lack of awareness of LGBT-friendly workplace policies (Boita, 2006; Holman, 2019).

Border management strategies are used to protect against and provide support for minority stress and workplace discrimination (Holman, 2019). Preliminary evidence found that matching with one's partner in workplace identity management strategies is important for relationship satisfaction (Boita, 2006). For lesbian couples, border management strategies were used to regulate the effects that workplace discrimination may have on their relationship. Rigid border management between work and home life were helpful for lesbian couples to protect the relationship from stressors, and permeable borders helped couples support each other (Holman, 2019).

Hennekam and Ladge (2017) explored the complex processes and stages that lesbian couples who carry their own children experience as they enter motherhood. Their identity transition process was influenced by workplace climate and stigmatization of being a lesbian mother: non-birth mothers benefit from motherhood earlier because they are not as penalized for their mother identity; however, they are less likely to benefit later on because their coworkers do not see them as a real mother. Conversely, birth mothers may experience penalization earlier because they have little choice over disclosing their motherhood and then sexual identity, but the extent of this experience differs by diversity climates of their organization.

Suppression and Differential Disclosure of Family Information at Work. Everyday discourse can be just as impactful as formal policy for LGBTQ+ employees finding how to

negotiate their work-family interface (Dixon & Dougherty, 2014). LG employees who reported being more “out” at work also reported higher levels of affective commitment, higher job satisfaction, higher perceived top management support, lower role ambiguity, lower role conflict, and lower work-home conflict (Day & Schoenrade, 1997). Previous research has indicated that being “out” is positively related to perceptions of managerial support and played an important and unique role in reducing lesbian mothers' WFC (Tuten & August, 2006). For inter-role conflict, lesbians were likely to cope by disclosing their identity to change others' expectations (Shachar & Gilbert, 1983). However, in order to feel comfortable in their disclosure process, the work environment is crucial in regard to discrimination (Reimann, 2001).

Dual-earner lesbian and gay couples intersect their careers and relationships by navigating disclosure in the workplace, confiding in their circle, and integrating their identities which could minimize their sense of marginalization (O’Ryan & McFarland, 2010). O’Ryan and McFarland (2010) reported that being more “out” and having support made dual-earner lesbian and gay couples feel safer and more confident in their relationships. Women who were primary providers for their family were much less likely to disclose their sexuality than lesbians who shared providing for their household with their partner. Being a lesbian mother made the disclosure process more complicated because disclosure is necessary to receive benefits. Non-birth mothers had to confront their invisibility as mothers especially when they were not “out” at work (Reimann, 2001).

Williamson and colleagues' (2017) work analyzed dyadic relationships for disclosure and work-family outcomes. They found that employees' disclosure to supervisor is positively associated with partner's family satisfaction and negatively associated with partner's family interference with work. Moreover, disclosure to coworkers is positively associated with partner's

family satisfaction. There were no gender differences for crossover effects; however, spillover effects showed that the negative relationship between supervisor disclosure and FIW was stronger for women than men. In addition, job satisfaction is lower for men when they have lower levels of disclosure to their coworkers. The authors state that these findings implicate that by not fully disclosing one's identity, significant resources (e.g., self-esteem, energy) are drained to mask the invisible stigma one holds. Ultimately, this leads to increased strain and lower wellbeing for both the employee and their partner.

Unique Work-Family Outcomes: Added Psychological Strain. In addition to strain-based outcomes from traditional WFC and interactions, there is evidence that LGBTQ+ employees may be experiencing additional strain outcomes due to their stigmatized identities. For example, sexuality-based harassment and discrimination in the workplace decrease LGBTQ+ employees' job satisfaction, life satisfaction, career satisfaction (Davis, 2017; Dispenza, 2015; Manley, 2005). Lesbian partners experienced negative outcomes due to the other partner's direct experience with minority stressors (Holman, 2019). Gay men who reported conflict between work and family also reported worse mental health (e.g., anxiety and depression symptoms; Shepard, 2003; Goldberg & Smith, 2013).

Suggested Extensions to Current Theoretical Model

In addition to the traditional and unique experiences that map onto Sawyer and colleagues' (2017) model, our review uncovered a few papers that offer potential extensions to the framework, such as positive inter-role relationships and multilevel (e.g., couple and family level) relationships and crossover.

Positive Inter-role Relationships. A new category that captures the benefits of inter-role relationships could add additional insight on work-family outcomes for LGBTQ+ employees.

Although conflict can arise, most individuals experience increased wellbeing by engaging in multiple roles (i.e., employee, partner, parent; Wienke & Hill, 2013). For example, through participation in both work and family, lesbian mothers simultaneously identify with maternal, paternal, male, and female identities (Hadley & Stuart, 2009). This finding aligns with the “role enhancement” hypothesis (Marks, 1977) which argues that holding a variety of roles comes with receiving a variety of resources (i.e., social support, self-esteem) that can improve overall wellbeing and coping with role demands (e.g., Adelman, 1994; Kostianinen et al., 2009). Similarly, personal resources (e.g., finances, social class, social networks, income level) have repeatedly been linked to improved abilities to manage navigating one’s work and family roles (Campbell, 2013; Richardson et al., 2012; McKee, 2019; Boita, 2006). Adding these positive resources and inter-role relationships to the work-family framework helps provide a more holistic view of how work and family are interacting for LGBTQ+ employees.

Border Management for Couple-Level Outcomes. Different border management styles further assist in holding multiple roles. Set apart from the rest of the studies included in this review, Holman (2018) proposes a multi-theoretical approach to explain how minority stressors at work can have an effect beyond the individual level and extend to couple-level and family-level outcomes. This framework combines minority stress theory (Meyer, 2003) and work-family border theory (Clark, 2000), in which work-family border theory explains how employees find balance and manage the figurative borders between their home and work domains. Looking at Clark’s (2000) theoretical framework on top of minority stress theory, we can look beyond individual relationships and into other individuals involved in between-domain stress transmissions. Holman’s (2019) study, for example, concluded that lesbian couples use rigid border management between work and home life to help protect their relationship from stressors

and permeable borders to support each other. Due to these findings, multilevel examinations of work-family interindividual crossover and border management strategies should be better incorporated into work-family research for LGBTQ+ employees to help us understand how family members and partners are also affected by minority stress and work-family experiences.

In line with this, previous research has found minority stress to be related to dyadic couple level outcomes. For example, internalized homophobia has been found to decrease relationship quality (e.g., Balsam & Szymanski, 2005), and one partner's report of poor psychological health has been associated with the other partner's decreased relationship satisfaction (Otis et al., 2006). LeBlanc and colleagues (2015) also pose an integrated stress framework that investigates how minority stressors may be experienced by individual partners and jointly by couples due to their stigmatized same-sex relationship. Dyadic minority stress processes are considered to emerge as a result of relational experiences of individual minority stressors between partners. This framework is unique as it brings together status- and role-based stress from one's sexual minority status and relationship status. Couple level stress (stressors, stigma, discrimination, concealment, and internalized homophobia) mediates the relationship between individual partner stressors and other relational stress (conflict, sexual dysfunction, relationship dissatisfaction, lack of trust, and lack of desired intimacy), as well as both partners' mental health. Together, these models and findings about minority stress suggest that there are likely multi-level interactions occurring within the work-family interface for LGBTQ+ employees that need to be incorporated into LGBTQ+ work-family frameworks.

Discussion

Recommendations for Practice

Our review identified two primary themes in the work-family experiences for LGBTQ+ employees: (1) LGBTQ+ employees are facing the same work-family experiences and processes

that heterosexual employees are facing and (2) there are additional, unique factors that LGBTQ+ employees face that impact how they navigate work and family roles. This suggests that to optimally support LGBTQ+ employees, organizations need a dual approach to providing work-family support: ensure that LGBTQ+ employees are integrated in overall employee work-family initiatives (to support for general work-family role interactions) and provide additional supports that are uniquely tailored to their work-family needs (to support for LGBTQ+ specific work-family role interactions).

Work-family focused interventions, particularly those that help the organization and supervisor be perceived as family supportive, can be successful in reducing employee strain and promoting positive spillover (e.g., Hammer et al., 2011; Odle-Dusseau et al., 2016). Because of the overlap in many of the challenges, supportive factors, and outcomes for LGBTQ+ employees' work-family interactions with heterosexual employees, it is essential that organizational interventions, policies, benefits, and supports designed to facilitate work-family success are accessible and inclusive for LGBTQ+ employees. However, our findings suggest that this inclusion may not be occurring. There is currently a lack of formal governmental policy support for LGBTQ+ employees (e.g., Human Rights Campaign, 2019b); many LGBTQ+ employees may not have equal access to family leave and family benefits as their heterosexual coworkers. Similarly, the phrasing of organizational policies and workplace conversations about work-family benefits/supports can prevent LGBTQ+ employees from accessing benefits/supports or from feeling like these benefits/supports are available to them (even if the organization is not intentionally excluding them) (e.g., Dixon & Dougherty, 2014; Hornsby & Munn, 2009). To optimally support LGBTQ+ employees, organizations need to not only offer work-family

support (supportive supervision, family leave benefits, etc.), but do so in a way that is explicitly inviting and inclusive to LGBTQ+ family structures.

Providing a “one size fits all” work-family program may help alleviate some of the stressors LGBTQ+ employees are facing (just as it would for heterosexual employees), but our review also suggests that there are still significant workplace barriers (e.g., workplace stigma) that would remain unaddressed by this type of program and are likely negatively impacting LGBTQ+ employees’ work-family experiences. Acknowledging family diversity and providing education and support for the diverse family types is an important component of supporting LGBTQ+ employees (Badgett, 2008). A large meta-analysis by Bezrukova and colleagues (2016) found that diversity-based trainings were more successful when the training was part of a larger set of diversity initiatives at the organization, conducted across time (versus a single time point), and covered both skill development and problem awareness. Incorporating best-practices from diversity and inclusion initiatives into programs developed to support LGBTQ+ employees could be a way for managers and organizations to help promote inclusive climates and breakdown existing barriers/stigmas to work-family balance for LGBTQ+ employees. Similarly, improving general organizational climates for minorities and non-traditional family structures, through trainings (targeted at first-line supervisors or employees generally) could be a way for organizations to reduce some of the unique stressors that make work-family integration more challenging for LGBTQ+ employees.

Overall, our review suggests that LGBTQ+ employees are likely encountering stigma-based stressors and work-family experiences that exacerbate the difficulty of juggling work and family demands. Because of this, organizational interventions and actions, from co-workers to organizational leaders, should target improving organizational climate in ways that minimize

stigma-based experiences at work, provide support to employees who are experiencing stigma, and encourage the inclusion of all family types and sexualities. Visibility as an inclusive and accepting organization can also benefit the organization itself by increasing positive employee (wellbeing, work-related attitudes, and job performance) and organizational (better reputation, increased productivity, and decreased turnover) outcomes (Aryee et al., 1998; Halpern, 2005; Houston & Waumsley, 2003; Hill et al., 1998; Carless & Wintle, 2007).

In addition to larger-scale organizational initiatives, trainings, and policy, there are many interpersonal interventions and actions that can help support LGBTQ+ employees' work-family experiences. Coworkers and supervisors can act as allies to LGBTQ+ employees as they navigate the disclosure process and integrate their work and family roles. Individuals who feel their family type is invisible within their organization can benefit from discursive opportunities that allow for supervisors, coworkers, and other members of their workplace to generate a deeper understanding of their work-family experiences (Dixon, 2018). Similarly, organizations and HR managers can also offer support by providing resource groups and ensuring that LGBTQ+ employees are represented within leadership positions (Badgett, 2008).

There is evidence that tailoring work-family initiatives to the work-family conditions and needs of the employees is necessary for organizational intervention success. Kossek and colleagues (2019), for example, found that the implementation of a work-family program for workplace caregivers was only associated with improved strain outcomes for employees who had caregiving responsibilities at home. Similarly, Hammer et al. (2011) found that trainings to increase family supportive supervisor behavior were most helpful for employees that were experiencing high levels of WFC. From this, LGBTQ+ specific work-family initiatives will likely be most beneficial when they take into account the specific needs and barriers that

employees are facing at that organization. Providing social events that invite employees' significant others is likely less helpful, for example, among single LGBTQ+ employees than partnered employees. Human resource personnel, leadership, and consultants aiming to improve work-life experiences for LGBTQ+ employees, therefore, need to first examine their organizational culture and the unique work-family needs for their employees. Thus, our recommendations for practice include building a better understanding of the family structures and needs that are present in a company's employees.

Finally, to provide employees with the work-family supports that are beneficial to them, organizations need to know what work-family needs exist; to do this, employees need to feel comfortable disclosing their family status and discussing needs. The communication structure and organizational climate must be inclusive and supportive of diverse family structures for employees to speak up about their work-family needs. Access to benefits (and organizational awareness that benefits/supports are needed) naturally requires disclosure of family status and the further a particular family structure deviates from "traditional" heterosexual families the more necessary it is to communicate the family structure to receive relevant support (Dixon, 2018). However, as our review shows, the disclosure and identity management processes that LGBTQ+ employees experience can be a significant stressor. Creating work environments and relationships that allow for safe conversations about family structure and work-family needs is, therefore, a critical component of supporting LGBTQ+ employees.

Recommendations for Future Research

Although research attention on work-family experiences for LGBTQ+ employees has recently been increasing, our review identified several methodological and content gaps that remain. From this, we discuss four recommendations for future research:

Increase Use of Theory

First, current literature on LGBTQ+ employees' work-family interface is primarily deficient of a strong theoretical foundation. When an article did provide a theoretical framework while discussing the background of the study, the theory was mainly used to explain why LGBTQ+ employees may have negative or unique experiences, but very few studies directly tested and expanded on theory itself. To help us better understand the mechanisms and processes involved in LGBTQ+ work-family experiences, a stronger theoretical focus and integration needs to occur. Through our review, we have provided an expanded theoretical framework based on Sawyer and colleagues' (2017) model that we think can help with this. Future research in this area should work to directly test and expand on this and other relevant frameworks. Through this theoretically grounded work, future research can expand on the mechanisms, supports, and boundary conditions of our reported model – all of which will help guide research-based practice.

Expand Focus to Include Wider Contextual Content

Second, taking Roth's (2015) approach to investigating LGBTQ+ individuals' work-life balance through contextual influences, we suggest future researchers study relationships at different system levels (e.g., Bronfenbrenner, 1997). Existing research focuses primarily on the individual, micro-level. However, employees are naturally embedded in a larger context than just their workspace. Therefore, expanding the focus to look at how larger contextual factors may interact with individual experiences (both looking at each level separately as well as interactions across levels) is necessary for promoting successful policy and practice. For example, research at the macro-system level (societal norms, culture, tradition, laws) can help push organizations to implement anti-discriminatory workplace policies. Similarly, at the exo-system level (e.g., Pride

committees, role models, community homophobia, workplace homophobia), we can study how contextual characteristics close to the LGBTQ+ individual affect their development and identity expression at work. Whereas, meso-system level research (e.g., partner, family, child) can assist in developing a better understanding of dyadic and couple level relationships.

Examine These Relationships over Time

Third, our review found that the majority of research on LGBTQ+ work-family experiences has relied on cross-sectional methodologies. Although these designs can be useful in helping us to understand the basic relationships that are occurring and describe the challenges that LGBTQ+ employees may be facing, they do not allow us to examine how these experiences unfold over time or understand the mechanisms and pathways for how work-family demands are being (un)successfully managed. Now that we have a basic understanding of what the work-family interface looks like for LGBTQ+ employees, future research needs to begin to incorporate more longitudinal and experience sampling methodologies. Taking an event-based perspective, for example, would help us to understand how the process of disclosure or benefit requests goes and how that process impacts future work-family behaviors and experiences. As such, negative experiences when an employee is requesting parental leave may be impactful on the way that the employee discloses family information and requests benefits in the future (in addition to more general workplace cognitive, affective, and behavioral responses). Longitudinal designs where we can track within-person changes over time are necessary to fully examine this process. Similarly, looking at how these demands and relationships change across the lifespan or as an employee progresses through different family stages (e.g., single, partnered, parenthood, eldercare, empty-nest...) would allow us to better understand the dynamic process of work-life integration for LGBTQ+ employees.

Incorporate Additional Stakeholders

Finally, the primary focus in existing research is on the LGBTQ+ employee, using self-report methods to understand their experiences. Moving forward, we recommend that future research expands this focus to include a wider array of stakeholders and supplement self-report employee data with other-reports and objective information. Including dyadic perspectives between the employee and their supervisor, for example, would help us to better understand how work-family support is being negotiated and provided, how the disclosure processes are occurring, and which challenges the supervisor may be facing in trying to provide support for these employees (e.g., potential lack of knowledge of family structure styles or needs). Similarly, while our review suggests that the organizational climate and support from others at work are important in the work-family experiences for LGBTQ+ employees, we know little about the experiences of coworkers as they interact to support (or not support) LGBTQ+ employees. Taking a multi-source perspective that includes coworkers and supervisors will allow for a more holistic view of the barriers and supports that exist within an organization and help strengthen theory, guide future research, and promote more successful organizational interventions.

Conclusion

LGBTQ+ individuals play a significant role in the workforce and their unique work-family experiences need to be better understood. This systematic review provides a summation of existing research on these experiences and offers recommendations for future work. Wage differences, division of labor, and the comparison between heterosexual and LGBTQ+ employees has received most of the coverage in this research area. Outside of these heavily covered trends, LGBTQ+ employees experience important and unique work-family outcomes through workplace and legal stressors. There have been several key theories (e.g., Minority

Stress Theory; Meyer, 1995; 2003) utilized in current research, but there is a need to take a more integrative approach. To better understand the full picture of LGBTQ+ work-family experiences, a model (extended from Sawyer et al., 2017) that maps work-family antecedents, conflict, and outcomes is proposed. Variables that are traditionally recognized as well as variables that are unique to the LGBTQ+ work-family interface are included in the model. Further, recommendations for practice and future research are provided. Various work-family initiatives and interventions exist that practitioners could focus on to support employees (e.g., organizing diversity-based trainings, improving culture, providing resource groups) but practitioners should aim to better understand the needs of their employee base before deciding which resources to implement. Future research in this area should target an increased use of theory, examine experiences across system levels and over time, and include perspectives from other key individuals that influence the work-family interface of LGBTQ+ employees.

References

*Article included in the review

- Adelmann, P. (1994). Multiple roles and psychological well-being in a national sample of older adults. *Journal of Gerontology*, 49(6), 277–285. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronj/49.6.S277>
- *Agars, M. D., & French, K. A. (2016). Considering underrepresented populations in work and family research. In T. D. Allen & L. T. Eby (Eds.), *Oxford Library of Psychology. The Oxford Handbook of Work and Family* (pp. 362–375). Oxford University Press.
- Allen, T. D., & Finkelstein, L. M. (2014). Work-family conflict among members of full-time dual-earner couples: An examination of family life stage, gender, and age. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 19(3), 376–384. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0036941>
- Allen, T. D., & Martin, A. (2017). The work-family interface: A retrospective look at 20 years of research in JOHP. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 259-272. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000065>
- Allen, T. D., Golden, T. D., & Shockley, K. M. (2015). How effective is telecommuting? Assessing the status of our scientific findings. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 16(2), 40–68. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1529100615593273>
- Aryee, S., Luk, V., & Stone, R. (1998). Family-responsive variables and retention-relevant outcomes among employed parents. *Human Relations*, 51(1), 73-87. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1016953900821>
- *Auber, V. W. (2017). *Division of child care, parenting roles, and parent-child relationship quality in same-sex headed families* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

- *Badgett, M. V. L. (2008). Bringing all families to work today: Equality for gay and lesbian workers and families. In A. Marcus-Newhall, D. F. Halpern & S. J. Tan (Eds.), *The changing realities of work and family: A multidisciplinary approach*, (pp. 140-154). Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444305272.ch7>
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2013). The spillover-crossover model. In J. G. Grzywacz, & E. Demerouti (Eds.), *New Frontiers in Work and Family Research* (pp. 54-70). Psychology Press.
- Balsam, K. F., & Szymanski, D. M. (2005). Relationship quality and domestic violence in women's same-sex relationships: The role of minority stress. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 29(3), 258-269. <https://doi.org/10.1111%2Fj.1471-6402.2005.00220.x>
- *Baumle, A. K. (2009). The cost of parenthood: Unraveling the effects of sexual orientation and gender on income. *Social Science Quarterly*, 90(4), 983-1002. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6237.2009.00673.x>
- *Beauregard, T. A., Ozbilgin, M., & Bell, M. P. (2009). Revisiting the social construction of family in the context of work. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 24(1), 46-65. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683940910922537>
- Bezrukova, K., Spell, C. S., Perry, J. L., & Jehn, K. A. (2016). A meta-analytical integration of over 40 years of research on diversity training evaluation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 142(11), 1227-1274.
- *Boita, J. A. (2006). *Dual earner couples: Predicting relationship satisfaction among women with female partners* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Pennsylvania State University.

- *Brashier, E., Hughes, J. L., & Cook, R. E. (2013). A comparison of women in lesbian and heterosexual dual-income couples: Communication and conflict. *Psi Chi Journal of Psychological Research*, 18(4), 170–175. <https://doi.org/10.24839/2164-8204.JN18.4.170>
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *American Psychologist*, 32(7), 513– 531. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.32.7.513>
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1986). Ecology of the family as a context for human development: Research perspectives. *Developmental Psychology*, 22(6), 723–742. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.22.6.723>
- Burns, C., Barton, K., & Kerby, S. (2012). *The state of diversity in today's workforce*. Center for American Progress. https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/issues/2012/07/pdf/diversity_brief.pdf
- *Campbell, W. L. (2013). *Experiences of work-family balance for gay men in committed relationships with young children* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Indiana University.
- Carless, S. A., & Wintle, J. (2007). Applicant attraction: The role of recruiter function, work-life balance policies and career salience. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 15(4), 394-404. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2389.2007.00398.x>
- *Civettini, N. (2016). Housework as non-normative gender display among lesbians and gay men. *Sex Roles; A Journal of Research*, 74(5-6), 206-219. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-015-0559-9>
- Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human relations*, 53(6), 747-770. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726700536001>

- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1989(1), 139-167.
- Crouter, A. (1984). Spillover from family to work: The neglected side of the work-family interface. *Human Relations*, 37, 425-442.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/001872678403700601>
- *Dang, A., & Frazer, S. (2004). *Black same-sex households in the United States*. National Gay and Lesbian Task Force.
https://freemarry.3cdn.net/2bdef0808f248f1a4d_y4m6b0opx.pdf.
- *Davis, B. L. (2017). *LGBQ workplace discrimination, microaggressions, and relational supports: A work-life approach* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Cleveland State University.
- *Day, N. E., & Schoenrade, P. (1997). Staying in the closet versus coming out: Relationships between communication about sexual orientation and work attitudes. *Personnel Psychology*, 50(1), 147-163. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1997.tb00904.x>
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499-512.
<https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.86.3.499>
- *Dispenza, F. (2015). An exploratory model of proximal minority stress and the work-life interface for men in same-sex, dual-earner relationships. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 93(3), 321-332. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1002/jcad.12030>

- *Dispenza, F. (2017). Career and romantic partnership role salience between sexual minority men living with and without a chronic illness/disability (CID). *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 18(2), 157-164. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/men0000051>
- *Dixon, J. (2018). Looking out from the family closet: Discourse dependence and queer family identity in workplace conversation. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 32(2), 271-275. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318917744067>
- *Dixon, J., & Dougherty, D. S. (2014). A language convergence/meaning divergence analysis exploring how LGBTQ and single employees manage traditional family expectations in the workplace. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 42(1), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00909882.2013.847275>
- Dougherty, D. S., Kramer, M. W., & Klatzke, S. R. (2009). Language convergence, meaning divergence: A meaning centered communication theory. *Communication Monographs*, 76(1), 20–46. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03637750802378799>
- *Downing, J. B., & Goldberg, A. E. (2011). Lesbian mothers' constructions of the division of paid and unpaid labor. *Feminism & Psychology*, 21(1), 100-120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0959353510375869>
- *Fassinger, R. E. (1996). Notes from the margins: Integrating lesbian experience into the vocational psychology of women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 48(2), 160-175. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1996.0016>
- *Fetro, M. N. (2018). *Men's and women's time use: comparing same-sex and different-sex couples* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Bowling Green State University.

Frone, M. R. (2003). Work-family balance. In J. C. Quick, & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *Handbook of occupational health psychology* (pp. 143-162). American Psychological Association.

<http://doi.org/10.1037/10474-007>

Gates, G. J. (2015). Marriage and family: LGBT individuals and same-sex couples. *The Future of Children*, 25(2), 67-87. <https://doi.org/10.1353/foc.2015.0013>

Gerson, K. (2010). *The unfinished revolution: How a new generation is reshaping family, work, and gender in America*. Oxford University Press.

*Goldberg, A. E. (2005). *The transition to parenthood for lesbian couples: The creation and construction of roles and identities* (Publication No. AAI3179875.) [Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

*Goldberg, A. E. (2013). “Doing” and “undoing” gender: The meaning and division of housework in same-sex couples. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 5, 85-104. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12009>

*Goldberg, A. E., & Sayer, A. (2006). Lesbian couples’ relationship quality across the transition to parenthood. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68(1), 87-100. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00235.x>

*Goldberg, A. E., & Smith, J. Z. (2009). Perceived parenting skill across the transition to adoptive parenthood among lesbian, gay, and heterosexual couples. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 23(6), 861-870. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017009>

*Goldberg, A. E., & Smith, J. Z. (2013). Predictors of psychological adjustment in early placed adopted children with lesbian, gay, and heterosexual parents. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 27(3), 431–442. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032911>

- *Goldberg, A. E., Smith, J. Z., & Perry-Jenkins, M. (2012). The division of labor in lesbian, gay and heterosexual new adoptive parents. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 74(4), 812-828.
<https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2012.00992.x>
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 76-88.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1985.4277352>
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(1), 72-92.
<http://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2006.19379625>
- *Hadley, E., & Stuart, J. (2009). The expression of parental identifications in lesbian mothers' work and family arrangements. *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, 26(1), 42-68.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014676>
- Halpern, D. F. (2005). How time-flexible work policies can reduce stress, improve health, and save money. *Stress and Health*, 21(3), 157-168. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.1049>
- Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E. E., Anger, W. K., Bodner, T., & Zimmerman, K. L. (2011). Clarifying work-family intervention processes: The roles of work-family conflict and family-supportive supervisor behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(1), 134-150.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020927>
- *Hennekam, S. A., & Ladge, J. J. (2017). When lesbians become mothers: Identity validation and the role of diversity climate. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 103, 40-55.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2017.08.006>

Hill, E. J., Miller, B. C., Weiner, S. P., & Colihan, J. (1998). Influences of the virtual office on aspects of work and work/life balance. *Personnel Psychology*, 51, 667-683.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1998.tb00256.x>

Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress.

American Psychologist, 44(3), 513-524. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513>

*Holman, E. G. (2018). Theoretical extensions of minority stress theory for sexual minority individuals in the workplace: A cross-contextual understanding of minority stress processes. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 10(1), 165-180.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12246>

*Holman, E. G. (2019). The effects of minority stressors in the workplace on same-sex relationships: A collective case study of female couples. *Journal of Lesbian*

Studies, 23(2), 196-223. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10894160.2019.1520541>

*Horning, K. K. (2011). *How working mothers negotiate work-family conflict: An exploration of work satisfaction, home life satisfaction, and partner supportiveness* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of San Diego.

*Hornsby, E. E., & Munn, S. L. (2009). University work—life benefits and same-sex couples.

Advances in Developing Human Resources, 11(1), 67-81.

<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1523422308329199>

*Hosking, W., Lyons, A., & van der Rest, B. (2017). The mental health impact of physical appearance concerns in the context of other life domains among Australian gay men. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 46(5), 1453-1464.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-016-0791-6>

Houston, D. M., & Waumsley, J. A. (2003). *Attitudes to flexible working and family life*. JRF Policy Press.

Human Rights Campaign. (2019a). *Corporate equality index 2019: Rating workplaces on lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer equality*.

<https://www.hrc.org/campaigns/corporate-equality-index>

Human Rights Campaign. (2019b). *State maps of laws & policies “Employment.”*

<https://www.hrc.org/state-maps/employment>.

*Jaspers, E., & Verbakel, E. (2013). The division of paid labor in same-sex couples in the Netherlands. *Sex Roles*, 68(5-6), 335-348. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-012-0235-2>

*Jepsen, C., & Jepsen, L. K. (2015). Labor-market specialization within same-sex and difference sex couples. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 54(1), 109-130.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/irel.12078>

*Kim, S. Y., Velez, B., Daheim, J., & Lei, N. (2019). Validation of the work family conflict scale for sexual minority employees. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 27(4), 594-609.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072718788329>

*King, E. B., Huffman, A. H., Peddie, C. I. (2013). LGBT parents and the workplace. In A. Goldberg & K. Allen (Eds.), *LGBT-parent families* (pp. 225-237). Springer.

Kossek, E. E., Thompson, R. J., Lawson, K. M., Bodner, T., Perrigino, M. B., Hammer, L. B., Buxton, O. M., Almeida, D. M., Moen, P., Hurtado, D. A., Wipfli, B., Berkman, L. F., &

Bray, J. W. (2019). Caring for the elderly at work and home: Can a randomized organizational intervention improve psychological health? *Journal of Occupational*

Health Psychology, 24(1), 36-54. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000104>

Kostianinen, E., Martelin, T., Kestila, L., Martikainen, P., & Koskinen, S. (2009). Employment, partner, and mother: Women's three roles and their implications for health. *Journal of Family Issues*, 30(8), 1122–1150. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X08329597>

*Kufahl, K. M. (2014). *Discrimination based on marital status, gender, and sexual orientation: Implications for employment hiring decisions* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville.

*Kulik, L. (2018). Explaining egalitarianism in gender-role attitudes: The impact of sex, sexual orientation, and background variables. *Asian Women*, 34(2), 61-87. <https://doi.org/10.14431/aw.2018.06.34.2.61>

*LeBlanc, A. J., Frost, D. M., & Wight, R. G. (2015). Minority stress and stress proliferation among same-sex and other marginalized couples. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 77(1), 40-59. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12160>

*Manley, E. D. (2005). *Dual-career gay male couples: The influence of career factors on workplace and relationship satisfaction* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. The University of Memphis.

Marks, S. R. (1977). Multiple roles and role strain: Some notes on human energy, time and commitment. *American Sociological Review*, 42(6), 921-936. <http://doi.org/10.2307/2094577>

*Martell, M. E., & Roncolato, L. (2019). Share of household earnings and time use of women in same-sex and different-sex households. *Eastern Economic Journal*, 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41302-019-00145-4>

- McFadden, C. (2015). Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender careers and human resource development: A systematic literature review. *Human Resource Development Review, 14*(2), 125-162. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484314549456>
- *McKee, A. W. (2019). *Gay men and fatherhood: Expanding masculinity and challenging heteronormativity* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Washington State University.
- *McNulty, Y. (2013). Women as female breadwinners in non-traditional expatriate families: Status-reversal marriages, single parents, split families, and lesbian partnerships. In K. Hutchings, & S. Michailova (Eds.), *Research handbook on women in international management* (pp. 332-366). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- *Mercier, L. R. (2006). Lesbian parents and work: Stressors and supports for the work-family interface. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services, 19*(2), 25-47.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10538720802131675>
- Meyer, I. H. (1995). Minority stress and mental health in gay men. *Journal of Health Sciences and Social Behavior, 36*(1), 38-56. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2137286>
- Meyer, I. H. (2003). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: Conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychology Bulletin, 129*(5), 674–697. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.129.5.674>
- Miller, C. C. (2015, May 28). *The 24/7 work culture's toll on families and gender equality*. The New York Times. <https://www.nytimes.com/2015/05/31/upshot/the-24-7-work-cultures-toll-on-families-and-gender-equality.html>
- *Mize, T. D. (2016). Sexual orientation in the labor market. *American Sociological Review, 81*(6), 1132-1160. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122416674025>

*Montag, J. (2010). Gender gap among same-sex couples. *SSRN eLibrary*.

http://doku.iab.de/veranstaltungen/2010/ws_graduate2010_Montag.pdf

*Moore, M. R. (2008). Gendered power relations among women: A study of household decision making in Black, lesbian stepfamilies. *American Sociological Review*, 73(2), 335–356.

<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F000312240807300208>

Movement Advancement Project. (2019, September 25). *Equality maps: Family laws*.

http://www.lgbtmap.org/equality-maps/fmla_laws

Odle-Dusseau, H. N., Hammer, L. B., Crain, T. L., & Bodner, T. E. (2016). The influence of family-supportive supervisor training on employee job performance and attitudes: An organizational work–family intervention. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 21(3), 296-308. 10.1037/a0039961

*O’Ryan, L. W., & McFarland, W. P. (2010). A phenomenological exploration of the experiences of dual-career lesbian and gay couples. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 88(1), 71-79. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2010.tb00153.x>

Oswald, R. F., Kuvalanka, K. A., Blume, L. B., & Berkowitz, D. (2009). Queering “the family.” In S. A. Lloyd, A. L. Few, & K. R. Allen (Eds.), *Handbook of feminist family studies* (pp. 43–55). Sage Publications. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412982801.n4>

Oswald, R., Blume, L., & Marks, S. (2005). Decentering heteronormativity: A model for family studies. In V. L. Bengtson, A. C. Acock, K. R. Allen, P. Dilworth-Anderson, & D. M. Klein (Eds.), *Sourcebook of family theory & research* (pp. 143–165). Sage Publications. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412990172.n6>

Otis, M. D., Riggle, E. D., & Rostosky, S. S. (2006). Impact of mental health on perceptions of relationship satisfaction and quality among female same-sex couples. *Journal of Lesbian Studies*, 10(1-2), 267-283. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1300/J155v10n01_14

*Patterson, C. J. (1995). Families of the baby boom: Parents' division of labor and children's adjustment. *Developmental Psychology*, 31(1), 115-123.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/00121649.31.1.115>

*Patterson, C. J., Sutfin, E. L., & Fulcher, M. (2004). Division of labor among lesbian and heterosexual parenting couples: Correlates of specialized versus shared patterns. *Journal of Adult Development*, 11(3), 179-189.
<https://doi.org/10.1023/B:JADE.0000035626.90331.47>

*Peplau, L. A., & Fingerhut, A. (2004). The paradox of the lesbian worker. *Journal of Social Issues*, 60(4), 719-735. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0022-4537.2004.00382.x>

*Perlesz, A., Power, J., Brown, R., McNair, R., Schofield, M., Pitts, M., Barrett, A., & Bickerdike, A. (2010). Organising work and home in same-sex parented families: Findings from the Work Love Play study. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy*, 31(4), 374–391. <https://doi.org/10.1375/anft.31.4.374>

Pew Research Center. (2015, June 26). Same-sex marriage, state by state.

<https://www.pewforum.org/2015/06/26/same-sex-marriage-state-by-state/>

Ragins, B. R. (2004). Sexual orientation in the workplace: The unique work and career experiences of gay, lesbian and bisexual workers. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 23, 35–120. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0742-7301\(04\)23002-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0742-7301(04)23002-X)

- *Ragins, B. R., & Cornwell, J. M. (2007). We are family: The influence of gay family-friendly policies on gay, lesbian and bisexual employees. In L. Badgett & J. Frank (Eds.), *Sexual orientation discrimination* (pp. 123-135). Routledge.
- *Rawsthorne, M., & Costello, M. (2010). Cleaning the sink: Exploring the experiences of Australian lesbian parents reconciling work/family responsibilities. *Community, Work & Family*, 13(2), 189-204. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13668800903259777>
- *Reimann, R. (2001). *Queer families, queer politics: Challenging culture and the state*. Columbia University Press.
- *Reinert, L. J., & Yakaboski, T. (2017). Being out matters for lesbian faculty: Personal identities influence professional experiences. *NASPA Journal About Women in Higher Education*, 10(3), 319-336. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19407882.2017.1285793>
- *Richardson, H. B., Moyer, A. M., & Goldberg, A. E. (2012). "You try to be superman and you don't have to be": Gay adoptive fathers' challenges and tensions in balancing work and family. *Fathering, A Journal of Theory Research and Practice about Men as Fathers*, 10(3), 314-336. <https://doi.org/10.3149/fth.1003.314>
- *Roth, K. (2015). *Systematic review of literature concerning lesbian and gay work-life balance*. [Unpublished honors thesis]. University of Tennessee in Knoxville.
- *Rothblum, E. D. (2017). Division of workforce and domestic labor among same-sex couples. In R. Connelly, & E. Kongar (Eds.), *Gender and time use in a global context* (pp. 283-303). Palgrave Macmillan.
- *Ryan, A. M., & Briggs, C. Q. (2019). Improving work-life policy and practice with an intersectionality lens. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-01-2019-0049>

- Sabat, I. E., Lindsey, A. P., Membere, A., Anderson, A., Ahmad, A., King, E., & Bolunmez, B. (2014). Invisible disabilities: Unique strategies for workplace allies. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 7(2), 259-265. <https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12145>
- *Sallee, M.W. (2019). Complicating gender norms: Straight versus gay and queer fathers in student affairs. *The Review of Higher Education*, 42(3), 1233-1256. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2019.0035>
- *Sawyer K., Thoroughgood C., & Cleveland J. (2015) Challenging heteronormative and gendered assumptions in work–family research: An examination of lgb identity-based work–family conflict. In M. Mills (Eds.), *Gender and the work-family experience* (pp. 77-98). Springer.
- *Sawyer, K. (2012). *Heterosexual bias in the measurement of work-family conflict for same-sex couples* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Pennsylvania State University.
- *Sawyer, K. B., Thoroughgood, C., & Ladge, J. (2017). Invisible families, invisible conflicts: Examining the added layer of work-family conflict for employees with LGB families. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 103, 23-39. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2017.08.004>.
- *Shachar, S. A., & Gilbert, L. A. (1983). Working lesbians: Role conflicts and coping strategies. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 7(3), 244-256. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1983.tb00838.x>
- *Shepard, W. D. (2003). *Masculine gender role conflict and psychological well-being: A comparative study of heterosexual and gay men* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of North Texas.
- *Shields, L., Zappia, T., Blackwood, D., Watkins, R., Wardrop, J., & Chapman, R. (2012). Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender parents seeking health care for their children: A

- systematic review of the literature. *Worldviews on Evidence-Based Nursing*, 9(4), 200–209. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6787.2012.00251.x>
- *Simon, K. A., Tornello, S. L., Farr, R. H., & Bos, H. M. (2018). Envisioning future parenthood among bisexual, lesbian, and heterosexual women. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, 5(2), 253-259. <https://doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000267>
- *Skilling, H. (2014). *Maternity risk and the lesbian pay gap: Evidence from the US Decennial Census and American Community Survey* [Master's thesis, University of Caterbury]. Semantic Scholar.
- *Smart, M. J., Brown, A., & Taylor, B. D. (2017). Sex or sexuality? Analyzing the division of labor and travel in gay, lesbian, and straight households. *Travel Behaviour and Society*, 6, 75-82. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tbs.2016.07.001>
- *Stavrou, E., & Ierodiakonou, C. (2018). Expanding the work–life balance discourse to LGBT employees: Proposed research framework and organizational responses. *Human Resource Management*, 57(6), 1355-1370. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21910>
- Stockdale, M., & Nadler, J. (2012). Paradigmatic assumptions of disciplinary research on gender disparities: The case of occupational sex segregation. *Sex Roles*, 1-9. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s111199-012-0228-1>
- *Stygles, K. N. (2016). *Queering academia: Queer faculty mothers and work-family enrichment* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Bowling Green State University
- *Sullivan, M. (1996). Rozzie and Harriet? Gender and family patterns of lesbian coparents. *Gender & Society*, 10(6), 747-767. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089124396010006005>

Super, D. E. (1990). A life-span, life-space approach to career development. In D. Brown & L. Brooks (Eds.), *Career choice and development* (pp. 167–261). Jossey-Bass.

*Sweeney, K. K., Goldberg, A. E., & Garcia, R. L. (2017). Not a “mom thing”: Predictors of gatekeeping in same-sex and heterosexual parent families. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 31(5), 521-531. <https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000261>

*Totenhagen, C. J., Randall, A. K., Cooper, A. N., Tao, C., & Walsh, K. J. (2017). Stress spillover and crossover in same-sex couples: Concurrent and lagged daily effects. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*, 13(3), 236-256.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1550428X.2016.1203273>

*Tuten, T. L., & August, R. A. (2006). Work-family conflict: A study of lesbian mothers. *Women in Management Review*, 21, 578–587.
<http://doi.org/10.1108/09649420610692525>

U.S. Census Bureau. (2019). *American community survey “Table 1: Household characteristics of opposite-sex and same-sex couple households.”*
<https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/same-sex-couples/ssc-house-characteristics.html>

U.S. Department of Labor. (2016). Facts overtime.
https://www.dol.gov/wb/stats/facts_over_time.htm

U.S. Department of Labor. (2019). *Finale rule to revise the definition of “spouse” under the FMLA.* <https://www.dol.gov/whd/fmla/spouse/>

*Ueno, K., Grace, J., & Šaras, E. D. (2019). Sexual orientation, partnership status, and work patterns among US young adults. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 62, 100411. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rssm.2019.100411>.

- Voydanoff, P. (2005). Toward a conceptualization of perceived work-family fit and balance: A demands and resources approach. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67(4), 822-836.
<http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2005.00178.x>
- Voydanoff, P. (2007). *Work, family, and community: Exploring interconnections*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- *Waite, S., & Denier, N. (2015). Gay pay for straight work: Mechanisms generating disadvantage. *Gender & Society*, 29(4), 561-588.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0891243215584761>
- *Waite, S., & Denier, N. (2016). Self-employment among same-sex and opposite-sex couples in Canada. *Canadian Review of Sociology*, 53(2), 143-175.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/cars.12103>
- Webster, J. R., Adams, G. A., Maranto, C. L., Sawyer, K., & Thoroughgood, C. (2018). Workplace contextual supports for LGBT employees: A review, meta-analysis, and agenda for future research. *Human Resource Management*, 57(1), 193-210.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21873>
- *Widiss, D. A. (2016). Legal recognition of same-sex relationships: New possibilities for research on the role of marriage law in household labor allocation. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 8(1), 10-29. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12123>
- *Wienke, C., & Hill, G. J. (2013). The relationship between multiple roles and well-being among gay, lesbian, and heterosexual adults. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*, 9(4), 305-329.
<http://doi.org/10.1080/1550428X.2013.799417>
- *Williamson, R. L., Beiler-May, A., Locklear, L. R., & Clark, M. A. (2017). Bringing home what I'm hiding at work: The impact of sexual orientation disclosure at work for same-

sex couples. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 103, 7-22.

<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2017.08.005>.

Witeck, B. (2014). Cultural change in acceptance of LGBT people: Lessons from social marketing. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 84(1), 19-22.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/h0098945>

*Wong, E., Jou, J., Raud, A., & Heymann, J. (2019). Comparing the availability of paid parental leave for same-sex and different-sex couples in 34 OECD countries. *Journal of Social Policy*, 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047279419000643>

Table 1. Summary of studies included in the literature review

Citation	Design	Sample Description	Research Question(s)
<i>Studies Mapped onto Conceptual Model</i>			
Boita (2006)	CS Survey	n=236 women in dual earner same-sex relationships	How do workplace and societal factors affect the relationship satisfaction of women in same-sex dual earner relationships?
Brashier, Hughes, & Cook (2013)	CS Survey	n=132 dual income heterosexual women; n=112 dual income lesbian women	How do heterosexual and lesbian dual income couples differ in social support, communication, work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict?
Campbell (2013)	Qualitative	n=8 gay father couples	How is work-family balance conceptualized for gay fathers?
Davis (2017)	CS Survey	n=385 LGBQ individuals	Does perceived social support attenuate the relationship between heterosexism at work and work-life interference, life satisfaction, and job satisfaction?
Day & Schoenrade (1997)	CS Survey	n =900 lesbian, gay, and heterosexual individuals	Do LG employees who attempt to conceal their identity experience less positive work attitudes and work-family outcomes than their more openly LG or heterosexual counterparts?
Dispenza (2015)	CS Survey	n=170 men in same-sex dual earner relationships	To what degree is internalized homophobia and expectation of stigma associated with dyadic adjustment and career development satisfaction when “outness” is controlled?
Dispenza (2017)	CS Survey	n=81 gay men without chronic illness; n=58 gay men with a chronic illness	How do gay men in dual earner relationships differ in their reported career and romantic partnership life role salience when living with and without chronic illness?
Dixon & Dougherty (2014)	Qualitative	n=31 heterosexual individuals; n=39 LGBTQ individuals	How do LGBTQ employees’ nontraditional family structures affect their workplace experiences?

Goldberg & Sayer (2006)	Multiple Time Points	n=29 lesbian couples	What influence do personality variables, work context variables, social context variables, and couple characteristics have on lesbian's relationship quality while they transition to parenthood?
Goldberg & Smith (2009)	Multiple Time Points	n=47 lesbian couples; n=31 gay couples; n=56 heterosexual couples	Do changes of perceived parenting skill across the transition of parenthood differ for lesbian, gay, and heterosexual couples?
Goldberg & Smith (2013)	CS Survey	n=47 dual earner lesbian couples and 39 dual earner gay male couples	How are work conditions, supportive workplace resources, and "outness" at work associated with mental health of dual-earner LG parents?
Hadley & Stewart (2009)	Case Study	n=13 lesbian mothers	Through participation in both work and family, how do lesbian mothers identify with their different identities?
Hennekam & Ladge (2017)	Qualitative	n=14 pregnant lesbian couples	What are the complex processes and stages that lesbian couples who carry their own children experience as they enter motherhood?
Holman (2019)	Qualitative	n=3 lesbian couples	How do minority stress processes in the workplace affect lesbian women's relationships?
Horning (2011)	Mixed Method	n=442 lesbian and heterosexual women; n=12 lesbian women	Do women in same-sex relationships and opposite-sex relationships differ in their life and work satisfaction and what contributes to those differences?
Hornsby & Munn (2009)	Document Analysis	NA	What are the recent changes in work-life practices, benefits, and policy pertaining to sexual orientation and work-life policies at public universities?
Hosking, Lyons, van der Rest (2017)	CS Survey	n=776 gay men	What are the associations with gay men's mental health outcomes and satisfaction and importance of different work and life domains?
Kim, Velez, Daheim, & Lei (2018)	Instrument Validation	n=295 LGBTQ+ individuals	Do WIF and FIW scales represent salient, reliable dimensions of WFC for sexual minority employees?
Kufahl (2014)	Experimental	n=365 heterosexual and LGBTQ individuals	How does gender, marital status, and sexual orientation interact and affect hiring decisions?
Manley (2005)	CS Survey	n=270 gay men	How do career variables impact work or relationship variables?

McKee (2019)	Qualitative	n=37 gay men	What are the multiple stages of gay men's journey throughout fatherhood? What are their strategies and challenges for achieving work family balance?
Mercier (2006)	Qualitative	n=21 lesbian mothers	What are the work-family issues experienced by lesbian parents?
O'Ryan & McFarland (2010)	Qualitative	n=5 lesbian couples; n=4 gay couples	How do dual earner lesbian and gay couples intersect their careers and relationships?
Ragins & Cornwell (2007)	CS Survey	n=534 LGB individuals	How do same-sex partner benefits and invitations to social events influence LGB employees' organizational commitment, organizational self-esteem, and turnover intentions?
Reimann (2001)	Qualitative	n=25 lesbian couples	How do lesbians' work environments influence their disclosure process when providing for their nontraditional families?
Reinert & Yakaboski (2017)	Qualitative	n=5 lesbian mothers	How do lesbian mother faculty navigate their work and life roles working in a higher education environment?
Richardson, Moyer, & Goldberg (2012)	Qualitative	n=70 gay adoptive fathers	In regard to roles of gender and sexual orientation, what are gay adoptive fathers' experiences of work-family balance by particular demands and resources?
Sallee (2019)	Qualitative	n=24 gay and queer fathers	How do gay fathers working in student affairs go about parenthood and work while faced with ideal worker norms and hegemonic masculinity?
Sawyer (2012)	Mixed Method	Study 1: n=41 LGB individuals; Study 2: n=28 LGB and heterosexual individuals	How is the conceptualization and measurement of WFC inherently biased to the heterosexual experience?
Sawyer, Thoroughgood, & Ladge (2017)	Qualitative	n=53 employees of an LGB family; n=12 matched pairs of individuals with LGB and heterosexual family structures	Do LGB employees face a unique, additional layer of work family conflict?

Shachar & Gilbert (1983)	CS Survey	n=79 lesbian women	How do lesbian women cope with inter-role and intra-role conflict?
Shepard (2003)	CS Survey	n=96 heterosexual men; n=102 gay men	How does restricted affectionate behavior, restricted emotionality, and conflict between work and family affect men's mental health?
Simon, Tornello, Farr, & Bos (2018)	CS Survey	n=108 heterosexual women; n=88 LB women	How do heterosexual and lesbian women vary in parenting desires, parenting self-efficacy, or idealization of parenthood?
Stygles (2016)	Qualitative	n=7 LBQ mothers	How do queer mothers working in academia navigate their home and work lives?
Totenhagen, Randall, Cooper, Tao, & Walsh (2017)	Diary Study	n=81 same-sex couples	What are the concurrent or lagged effects of common external stressors and sexual minority stressors on couples' relationship quality?
Tuten & August (2006)	CS Survey	n=58 lesbian mothers	How does being "out" at work play a role in how lesbian mothers experience work-family conflict compared to heterosexual women?
Wienke & Hill (2013)	Archival	n=904 LGBTQ individuals; n=17,283 heterosexual individuals	How are multiple roles related to wellbeing and how do these relationships differ for individuals of different sexual orientation?
Williamson, Beiler-May, Locklear, & Clark (2017)	Multiple Time Points, Multiple Sources	n=89 same-sex couples	How do lower levels of sexual orientation disclosure to supervisor and to coworkers impact the wellbeing of both the employees and their partner?
<i>Current Trends: Division of Labor</i>			
Auber (2017)	CS Survey	n=86 same-sex couples	To what extent is variation in division of childcare related to parent-child relationships?
Civettini (2016)	CS Survey	n=116 cohabitating lesbian women; n=128 cohabitating gay men	How do women and men in same-sex co-residential relationships display gender through housework?

Downing & Goldberg (2011)	Qualitative	n=30 lesbian couples	What are the different ways in which lesbian biological and nonbiological mothers contribute to paid and unpaid labor?
Fettro (2018)	Archival	N/A	How do same-sex and opposite-sex couples differ in their leisure time?
Goldberg (2005)	Qualitative	n=34 lesbian couples	As lesbian mothers transition to parenthood for the first time, how do they divide labor and change their roles over time?
Goldberg, Smith, & Perry-Jenkins (2012)	Mixed Method	n=55 lesbian couples; n=40 gay couples; n=65 heterosexual couples	Does division of childcare and housework change over time for adoptive lesbian, gay, and heterosexual couples?
Jaspers & Verbakel (2013)	Archival	n=998 gay couples; n=1,033 lesbian couples	Do same-sex couples have a more egalitarian division of paid labor than opposite-sex couples?
Kulik (2018)	CS Survey	n=114 non-heterosexual individuals; n=114 heterosexual individuals	Are LGBTQ+ individuals' gender role attitudes more egalitarian than heterosexual individuals' gender role attitudes?
Martell & Roncolato (2019)	Archival	n=189 cohabiting lesbians; n=24,417 married heterosexual women; n=1420 cohabiting heterosexual women	Do lesbian women and heterosexual women in relationships respond differently to variation in household earnings?
Moore (2008)	Mixed Method	n=32 Black lesbian women	How do black lesbian women in unique family structures balance their work and nonwork roles?
Patterson (1995)	Mixed Method	n=26 lesbian mother couples	Does lesbians' division of labor have an influence on their satisfaction with parental division of labor, satisfaction with their relationships, and their children's psychological adjustment?
Patterson, Sutfin, & Fulcher (2004)	CS Survey	n=33 lesbian mother couples; n= 33 heterosexual parents	How does sexual orientation, work hours, and ideological variables influence division of labor for lesbian and heterosexual parents?

Perlesz, Power, Brown, McNair, Schofield, Pitts, Barrett, Bickerdike (2010)	CS Survey	n=317 individuals cohabitating with same-sex partner; n=958 individuals cohabitating with opposite-sex partner	How do demographic variables, couples' work patterns, and decision-making regarding role-delineation in work and parenting influence same-sex parents' decisions about balancing work and home?
Rawsthorne & Costello (2010)	Qualitative	n=17 lesbian parents	What arrangements do lesbian parents make to meet their home/work responsibilities and what factors facilitate or inhibit them?
Smart, Brown, & Taylor (2017)	Archival	n=133 partnered gay men; n=168 partnered lesbian women; n=50,599 heterosexual men and women	How does household labor and household-serving travel vary by family type?
Sullivan (1996)	Qualitative	n=34 lesbian couples	Do lesbian co-parents adopt egalitarian division of household, childcare, and paid labor?
Sweeney, Goldberg, & Garcia (2017)	Multiple Timepoints, Mixed Method	N=57 lesbian couples; n=51 gay couples; n=82 heterosexual couples	For adoptive couples, does sexual orientation, gender, job autonomy, and perceived parenting skill have influence on gatekeeping behaviors?
Ueno, Grace, & Saras (2019)	Archival	n=7854 sexual minority and heterosexual women; n=6853 sexual minority and heterosexual men	Do sexual minority women have higher rates of participation in the labor force, work hours, number of jobs in work history compared to heterosexual women?
<i>Current Trends: Wage Differences</i>			
Baumle (2009)	Archival	N/A	Using knowledge concerning parenthood's effects on employment outcomes, are lesbian mothers treated more like women without children?
Jepsen & Jepsen (2015)	Archival	n=2780 female roommates; n=6420 lesbian couples; n=26841 male roommates; n=6200 gay couples; n=34439 different-sex roommates;	How do different household types differ in earnings, work hours, and participation in the labor force?

		n= 2,143,870 married heterosexual couples; n=185,461 unmarried different sex- couples	
Mize (2016)	Archival	n=5873 sexual minority women; n=5,632 sexual minority women	Do sexual minorities face an income penalty and how are bisexual men and women disadvantaged in the labor market?
Montag (2010)	Archival	n=826 married gay men; n=1,124 married lesbian women; 15,634 married heterosexual individuals; n=4,662 single men; n=8041 single women	Is there a gender gap in hourly earnings for individuals in same-sex relationships?
Peplau & Fingerhut (2004)	Experimental	n=162 women and n=22 heterosexual undergraduate students	What are potential reasons as to why lesbian workers make more than their heterosexual women coworkers?
Skilling (2014)	Archival	n=12,204 lesbians; n=163,834 cohabitating heterosexual women; n=243,299 married women	Does maternity risk contribute to pay gaps between lesbian and heterosexual women workers?
Waite & Denier (2015)	Archival	N/A	How do motherhood penalties, fatherhood premiums, labor force participation, and job industry influence sexual minority earning gaps?
Waite & Denier (2016)	Archival	n=22,27,745 heterosexual men; n=18,950 gay men; n=20,66,650 heterosexual women; n=17,250 lesbian women	Do demographic, human capital, and family variables influence differences in rates of self-employment between sexual minorities and heterosexual individuals?
<i>Qualitative Reviews, Conceptual Papers, Book Chapters, Theoretical Paper</i>			

Agars & French (2016)	Book Chapter	N/A	How can work-family researchers be better about including underrepresented populations in the literature?
Badgett (2008)	Book Chapter	N/A`	What is the business case for understanding LGB inequality and work benefits?
Beauregard, Ozbilgin, & Bell (2009)	Conceptual Paper	N/A	What are the problems with current organizational provisions of work-family policies?
Dang & Frazer (2004)	Report	N/A	How are black same-sex couples in the US legally discriminated against?
Dixon (2018)	Forum Essay	N/A	How are non-traditional family structures discussed in the workplace?
Fassinger (1996)	Conceptual Paper	N/A	How do lesbians experience barriers to vocational choice, implementation, and adjustment?
Goldberg (2013)	Qualitative Review	N/A	How do same-sex couples “do” and “undo” gender in regard to their household labor?
Holman (2018)	Theoretical Framework	N/A	What are the cross-contextual effects of minority stress on couple-level outcomes and family-level outcomes?
King, Huffman, & Peddie (2013)	Book Chapter	N/A	What direction should the LGBT work-family interface take for future research? How do LGBT working parents access family-oriented benefits? What are theoretical models of WFI and outcomes of WFC and WFE?
LeBlanc, Frost, & Wight (2015)	Theoretical Framework	N/A	How are minority stressors experienced by individual partners and jointly by couples due to their stigmatized same-sex relationship?
McNulty (2013)	Book Chapter	N/A	What are the experiences of female breadwinners in non-traditional families?
Roth (2015)	Qualitative Review	N/A	What are the bidirectional influences between LG individuals and context and how do they affect navigating several domains?

Rothblum (2017)	Book Chapter	N/A	What are the challenges and opportunities for including same-sex couples when studying division of labor?
Ryan & Briggs (2019)	Qualitative Review	N/A	Why is there a need for capturing multiple identities in work-life research through an intersectionality lens?
Sawyer, Thoroughgood, & Cleveland (2015)	Theoretical Framework	N/A	Do LGB individuals perceive WFC differently due to prejudicial barriers and how can it be captured in measuring WFC?
Shields, Zappia, Blackwood, Watkins, Wardrop, & Chapman (2012)	Qualitative Review	N/A	What are the experiences of LGBT parents seeking healthcare for their children?
Stavrou & Ierodiakonou (2018)	Theoretical Framework	N/A	Why has work-life research systematically excluded LGBT employees?
Widiss (2016)	Legal Commentary	N/A	How should we research the LGBT population after marriage was legalized?
Wong, Jou, Raub, & Heymann (2019)	Archival	N/A	How do parental leave policies in 34 OECD countries vary for same-sex and different-sex parent families within country?

Figure 1. Traditional Work-Family Relationships Replicated in LGBTQ+ Samples

Figure 2. Unique Work-Family Relationships for LGBTQ+ Employees