

Limitations and future research

Due to the sensitive nature of this research topic, there are several limitations to our study.

From a conceptual and practical standpoint, one might say that coming out is the goal, workplace disclosure benefits the individual, if so, positive behaviour may be equated with workplace disclosure, and negative behaviour is equal to lack of behaviour that corresponds with workplace disclosure and vice versa can be considered positive or negative respectively. workplace disclosure. However, people vary in the extent to which they want to be open about their personal lives and in their individual needs to keep some things aspects of it private. For people those with a higher/greater need for privacy, workplace disclosure may actually increase stress. Therefore, depending on the person's individual privacy or boundary preferences, workplace disclosure may not always be what is best for the target in that person's best interest.

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

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

Commented [AM1]: לא מובן לי כיצד הבעיות שאתם מפרטים נובעות דווקא מאופיו הרגיש של הנושא (בכל מקרה, לא כל 5-6 החסרונות שאתם מציינים). כלומר לא האופי הרגיש של הנושא גורם לבעיה. עדיף פשוט לציין שניתן להעלות מספר בקורות, שלחלקן אתם מסבירים כיצד נתתם מענה. אפשר לוותר עליו כאן לגמרי, מה עוד שהוא חוזר מספר פעמים בפיסקה.

Commented [AM2]: Or "It may be true from a conceptual and practical standpoint, that an individual wishes to achieve workplace disclosure."

Commented [AM3]: צריך להיות ההפך, "להסתיר"?

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

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

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

Commented [AM5]: המשפט תקין מבחינת השפה אבל אינני מבינה מהו אומר.

Commented [AM6]: או שאולי צ"ל "control against"? אינני חושבת שתקין או ברור לכתוב בלבד.

Commented [AM7]: אני חושבת שמה שכתבתי ברור יותר, אבל אם אינו מדויק, ניתן לחזור לניסוח המקורי.

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

Commented [AM8]: LGBTQ?

Commented [AM9]: האם מדוע סוגריים? האם האות הושמטה במקור או שפשוט הופיעה כאות קטנה? בהנחה שהאפשרות השנייה, אין צורך לסמן (ואז, בסוגריים מרובעות, כפי שעושים אם יש צורך להשלים מילות הסבר או מסיבות אחרות).