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**Title: The state of the art and the future of the study of heteronormativity in the workplace**

Existing literature indicates that heteronormativity is present in the workplace and that it has an impact on both employees and people who come into contact with organisations (e.g. clients, customers, users). *Heteronormativity* represents a set of norms regarding gender and sexuality that privileges heterosexuality presenting it as a normality standard (Warner 1993). These norms stem from a binary conception of sex (i.e., male/female), gender (i.e., man/woman), and sexuality (i.e., heterosexual/homosexual) consisting of the idea that there are only two opposite genders, which are aligned with their biological sex and are ‘naturally’ attracted to each other (Kitzinger 2005). Under this assumption, men and women are expected to perform in stereotypically masculine and feminine ways, respectively (West and Zimmerman, 1987). Mentioned expectations likewise shape the limits of normality in relationships between men and women and those that are formed between individuals of the same gender (Rumens 2008; 2011; 2012). When these behaviors are daily reproduced and repeated, they become ritualised and are granted a benchmark status of what is ‘natural’ or normal (Butler 1999). Therefore, heteronormativity establishes what is normal to expect from people who are assumed to be heterosexual males or females, situating those who deviate from the norm as ‘Others’. This belief system existing in our society is mirrored and institutionalised in the organisations that constitute it (Yep, 2003)

Binary views of gender and sexuality are reinforced through institutional structures, daily social interactions, and individual decisions (Ward and Schneider, 2009), and labor organisations are a good illustration of this functioning. Authors researching the field of heteronormativity in the workplace have focused on many different issues related to heteronormativity, including how it is reproduced through individual and organisational discourses (e.g., Bendl et al. 2009; Mungaray and Curtin, 2019), the impact it has on sexual and gender identity disclosure (e.g., Gray 2013; Mattheis et al. 2019), and how it shapes the relationships that are established at work (e.g., Rumens 2008; 2011; 2012). Research has also exposed the impact heteronormativity has on people who do not align with heteronormative ways of being, showing that it has the potential to limit career opportunities (Drydakis 2015; Rumens and Broomfield 2014), reduce engagement and performance (Collins and Rocco 2018; Neary 2016), and harm individuals' well-being (Baker 2014; Priola et al. 2018). These findings may be suggesting that heteronormativity in the workplace has a deleterious potential and that it should be addressed.

Although research so far offers us insights into how heteronormativity operates at work and its implications, little is known about what it is that makes a particular work environment heteronormative. Some studies claim workplaces to be heteronormative because of the occupational sector to which they belong, others consider almost all workplaces to be heteronormative (Rumens, 2016), and some others conclude so based on participants' claims. On the basis of these considerations, we find that there is evidence of inconsistency in the definition of heteronormative environments and consider that analysing the existing information on the manifestation and reinforcement of heteronormativity at work would make for a more global understanding.

Our research intends, thus, to close the mentioned gap through two research objectives. On the one hand, we aim to develop a more comprehensive understanding of the manifestations of heteronormativity and its reinforcement in the workplace. For this purpose, we conducted a review of the literature guided by the following research question: *How does heteronormativity manifest and how is it reinforced in the workplace?* On the other hand, we have the goal of developing a valid scale that is capable of measuring the degree to which heteronormativity is present in organisations.

To meet the *first objective* we conducted a scoping review. Following an a priori research protocol, we analyzed 74 articles that met our inclusion and exclusion criteria. The reviewed evidence revealed that heteronormativity manifests itself at organisational, interpersonal, and individual levels. At an organisational level, space is arranged in a gendered and heterosexualised fashion; policies display binary notions of sex/gender reflecting heteronormative cultures and emphasise what are the standards to be followed in terms of gender and sexuality; and leaders monitor the accomplishment of heteronormative policies. At an interpersonal level, individuals in organisations may address coworkers or users assuming their (heterosexual) sexuality or gender based on gender expression; mark and expose those who do not subscribe to heteronormative logics; and conceive acceptable only those relationships that conform with heteronormative models of human interaction. Individuals in the place of work, in turn, may assimilate heteronormativity by ‘coming out’ endorsing heteronormative understandings of normality and non-normality; putting efforts into burring their sexuality by, for example, overperforming in their jobs; and adopting aesthetics, discourses, and body performances that sustain heterosexual presumption and communicate gender conformity.

To achieve the *second objective* we developed a scale of manifestations of heteronormativity at work to be validated at a later stage. We created the items based on the literature review. The items focus on purely observable aspects related to the place of work and interpersonal relations, which we can group into two categories: one related to the interpersonal level and the other to the organisational level. Both levels are important for the reinforcement of heteronormativity in organisations and, therefore, for the creation of spaces for inclusion and exclusion. In relation to the validation process, the created scale along with other scales will be administered to both LGBTQ and heterosexual workers. First, a pilot study will be carried out to find out how the items created behave. Then, the item responses together with the chosen scales will give us evidence about the validity of the test in terms of its internal structure, content, discriminant validity and reliability of the scores.

Approaching mentioned objectives, this paper seeks to deepen our knowledge about heteronormativity at work, trying to delimit its meaning and providing other researchers with a tool that could facilitate its study. Identifying heteronormativity at work and the degree to which it is present helps to delineate its impact. This could be useful not only to learn about heteronormativity, but also to address it.
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