

Mumford, Karen A. et al.

Working Paper

Pay Gaps in the National Health Service: Observability and Disclosure

IZA Discussion Papers, No. 14482

Provided in Cooperation with:

IZA – Institute of Labor Economics

Suggested Citation: Mumford, Karen A. et al. (2021) : Pay Gaps in the National Health Service: Observability and Disclosure, IZA Discussion Papers, No. 14482, Institute of Labor Economics (IZA), Bonn

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/236513>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

IZA DP No. 14482

**Pay Gaps in the National Health Service:
Observability and Disclosure**

Karen Mumford
Edith Aguirre
Anna Einarsdóttir
Bridget Lockyer
Melisa Sayli
Benjamin A. Smith

JUNE 2021

DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

IZA DP No. 14482

Pay Gaps in the National Health Service: Observability and Disclosure

Karen Mumford
University of York and IZA

Edith Aguirre
ISER, University of Essex

Anna Einarsdóttir
University of York

Bridget Lockyer
Bradford Institute for Health Research

Melisa Sayli
University of Surrey

Benjamin A. Smith
Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust

JUNE 2021

Any opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and not those of IZA. Research published in this series may include views on policy, but IZA takes no institutional policy positions. The IZA research network is committed to the IZA Guiding Principles of Research Integrity.

The IZA Institute of Labor Economics is an independent economic research institute that conducts research in labor economics and offers evidence-based policy advice on labor market issues. Supported by the Deutsche Post Foundation, IZA runs the world's largest network of economists, whose research aims to provide answers to the global labor market challenges of our time. Our key objective is to build bridges between academic research, policymakers and society.

IZA Discussion Papers often represent preliminary work and are circulated to encourage discussion. Citation of such a paper should account for its provisional character. A revised version may be available directly from the author.

ABSTRACT

Pay Gaps in the National Health Service: Observability and Disclosure

Studies of the relationship between sexual orientation and pay have faced difficulties applying standard models of discrimination if orientation is not observable. Analogously, behavioural explanations of pay based on models of gender linked within-household specialization may not be as relevant in a nonheterosexual context. This article analyses pay gaps using information including earnings, gender, LGB identity, coupling status, and the disclosure of sexual orientation in English National Health Service (NHS) workplaces. The results reveal a robust gender pay gap of 4% in favour of males, but no overall LGB pay gap compared to heterosexuals. The latter is due to similar-sized offsetting effects from disclosure on LGB pay relative to comparable heterosexuals. Amongst LGB employees, disclosure is associated with 13% more pay, with three quarters of this gap related to unexplained differences in returns to observable characteristics. Supportive workplace practices are strongly associated with increased probability of disclosure, especially the availability of a LGB workplace network.

JEL Classification: J16, J31, J71

Keywords: disclosure, gender, LGB, NHS, pay

Corresponding author:

Karen Mumford
York Management School
University of York
Heslington
York YO10 5DD
United Kingdom
E-mail: karen.mumford@york.ac.uk

INTRODUCTION

There are a vast number of studies exploring gender pay gaps in the economics literature (Blau and Kahn, 2017). Studies that also address potential implications of LGBTQ+ status for pay gaps are more recent and considerably rarer (Badgett et al., 2021). Using a rich new survey of National Health Service (NHS) employees in England, this article seeks to provide a more complete explanation of pay gaps by including information of gender, LGB identity, coupling status, disclosure of sexual orientation, and the presence and membership of LGB networks within workplaces. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to include direct measures of both disclosure of LGB sexual orientation and coupling status, allowing for a more insightful interpretation of the mechanisms behind LGB pay gaps.

The most commonly used model explaining wage outcomes, and pay gaps is the Human Capital Model (HCM). In its simplest form, the HCM argues that wages increase with investments made in the productivity of the individual, especially investments in formal education and on-the-job training (Becker, 1975; Mincer, 1974). The HCM rapidly evolved from an intrinsically individual perspective to a broader household context (Becker, 1985). Individuals who expect to eventually become members of a household, may also expect to specialize in different tasks within the household to maximize the combined utility of the household's members. For example, if women are expecting to spend time out of the labour market to raise children, they may invest less in formal labour market skills and/or choose to enter occupations that require less on-the-job training, thereby lowering their predicted earning capacity. Employers may also expect that women will be less attached to the labour market and will have shorter job tenure. The outcome can become self-fulfilling if employers deny women hiring opportunities and/or training paths associated with longer tenure and higher pay.

With such an observable physical characteristic as gender, it may be difficult for women to avoid this lower pay outcome. One way could be for women to engage in expensive formal education as a signal to employers that they intend to stay in the labour market to reap the returns of the investment (Spence, 1973). This will be a higher risk investment for women than men if some employers simply have a taste for discrimination and deny women opportunities regardless of qualifications (Becker, 1957) or if employers do not recognise the individual has different aspirations to their group average (Phelps, 1972; Arrow, 1973).

The LGB (lesbian, gay or bisexual) may be making similar decisions regarding the allocation of market and non-market work within households. They may also be facing employers with a taste for discrimination (Badgett, 1996). However, identifying as LGB is a non-observable characteristic in the workplace unless the employee chooses to share this information.

There is a small but influential literature on LGB versus heterosexual pay gaps based on analysis of survey respondents providing individual level information on their pay, co-habitation and sexual orientation. Unfortunately, such studies are often constrained by low numbers of LGB respondents. It is also very rare for the analyst to have information on disclosure of sexual orientation and the relative pay of employees.

In her seminal study, Badgett (1995) finds that gay men (or lesbians) living in same-sex relationships in the US earn less than do comparable heterosexuals living in different sex partnerships. Klawitter (2015) uses meta-analysis to conclude that most studies find lesbians typically earn more than comparable heterosexual women, and that the negative male gay pay gap is diminishing over time. Jepsen and Jepsen (2020) argue that the male gay pay gap diminished in the US until 2010, flattening thereafter, with the positive lesbian pay gap continuing to decrease but at a very slow rate. More recently, Badgett et al (2021) find the negative pay gap for gay/bisexual men has declined in the US since 2000 but not in a consistent manner and appears to be showing persistence at around 7 log percentage points since 2015; whilst the wage advantage for lesbian/bisexual women is falling since 2000 (when it was around 10 log percentage points) and is now close to zero. These findings are arguably consistent with behavioural models of within-household specialisation, with gay men being less labour market oriented than heterosexual 'primary household-earner' males, and lesbian women being more labour market oriented than heterosexual 'secondary household-earner' women (Aksoy et al., 2018; Aksoy et al., 2019; Jepsen and Jepsen, 2020). It is not possible, however, in these studies to separate out potential discrimination effects as they do not include information on whether sexual orientation is identifiable in the workplace.

Arabsheibani et al. (2005) show that it is important to control for household structure when comparing relative wages. Using UK data, they find gay men earn more than heterosexual men, but that a statistically significant pay differential only occurs between cohabiting gay men and heterosexual men who live with a female partner. They find that this

pay gap would be twice as large (from 2.5 to 5 log percentage points) if the characteristics of gay men were rewarded equivalently to heterosexuals. In contrast, Aksoy et al. (2018) find a small pay penalty for partnered gay men relative to partnered heterosexual men in the UK. They posit that larger pay penalties for older and unpartnered gay men may be related to their long-term lack of a heterosexual marriage making their sexual orientation more observable to their work colleagues, thereby opening the door to discrimination. Bridges and Mann (2019) seek to further address this issue by using information from the UK Labour Force Survey (LFS) on same-sex legal partnership as an indicator of how open gay men or lesbians are in their workplaces, arguing that those who have made a legal commitment to their same-sex relationship are more likely to be open with their colleagues about their orientation. They find that, whilst both gays and lesbians earn more than equivalent gender heterosexuals, this form of disclosure is associated with a lower pay premium and with less promotion for gay men relative to male heterosexuals. They argue these findings are consistent with negative discrimination towards recognisable GB status for males in the workplace.

Measures of tolerance and anti-discrimination practices in the workplace are more readily available to the analyst than are indicators of the disclosure of sexual orientation. Wang et al. (2018) use data from the British Workplace Employment Relations Survey (WERS) 2011 to consider the presence of a diversity and equity management (DEM) policy within the workplace as an indicator of tolerance and lower discrimination. They find a positive relationship between a DEM policy and the pay of gays or lesbians, particularly so if they are single. Also using the WERS 2011 data, Bryson (2017) finds lesbians earn more than heterosexual women if they work in a workplace with an equal opportunity (EO) policy, but no wage premium if there is no EO policy. He finds no pay gap between gay and heterosexual men. Both DEM and EO policies can be interpreted as top-down (vertical) approaches to within-workplace tolerance to the LGB.

It may also be important to consider horizontal support and acceptance structures amongst colleagues to the LGB (OECD, 2020). For example, the presence of LGB networks in the workplace, and evidence of individual membership, provide insights into the additional availability of vertical and horizontal support, respectively. Social scientists have become increasingly aware of the potential role for networks in the labour market especially as a conduit for successful job search and a means to increase productivity (for a recent survey see Hellerstein and Newmark, 2020). More broadly, networks can facilitate a supportive

environment and the transfer of social capital within minority groups in the workplace (Scrivens and Smith, 2013). Meta-analysis has also established a strong relationship between organisational support, disclosure of sexual orientation in the workplace, and positive labour market outcomes for the LGB (Wax et al., 2018). With non-disclosure of sexual orientation due to fear of discrimination impacting negatively on the mental health, absenteeism, and productivity of LGB employees (OECD, 2020).

The next section of the article describes the data source and provides information on the variables to be considered in the modelling. This is followed in section II with discussion of the methodology and explanation of the empirical estimation of the earnings function. Results from this estimation are presented here with a range of comparable pay gaps. Decomposition analysis is presented in section III to provide greater insight into the components of the pay gaps. Disclosure is found to have a substantial association with pay differences between the LGB and with comparable heterosexual employees in sections II and III. The likelihood of disclosure is addressed in the penultimate section of the paper, section IV; with conclusions and policy implications considered in the final section.

I. DATA

Data Collection

There are very few datasets that include information on sexual orientation (Hudson-Sharp and Metcalf, 2016). To the best of our knowledge, there are no data sets that include information of the determinants of pay, partnership, and disclosure of sexual orientation in the workplace. In response to this lack of relevant information, the project team developed an online survey¹; the Employee Engagement Survey (EES-NHS), of those employees working in National Health Service (NHS) Trusts in England who are covered by the NHS Pay Review Board (NHSPRB)². Full information on the surveying procedure and sample characteristics are provided in the survey technical report (Einarsdóttir et al., 2020). The NHS is a particularly relevant workforce to survey as it is large enough to generate a suitable LGB sample for statistically meaningful analysis. Furthermore, the NHS employees included are all working in the health sector where they share a common employer, with well recognised pay and working conditions set by the NHSPRB (which also means that there are no doctors or dentists in the sample). The NHS has a reputation for being an employer mindful of discrimination and with

a varied (in terms of nationality, ethnicity, gender and/or sexual orientation) and highly unionised workforce (Einarsdóttir et al., 2020). These commonalities help to focus the empirical analysis presented below, however; they also limit legitimate extrapolation of the findings outside of the NHS to other workforces in England. This is a caveat that will be returned to in the discussion and interpretation of the results below.

The EES-NHS was launched in January 2019 and closed in May 2019. Human Resources (HR) representatives and Equality Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) leads were approached in all 226 trusts in NHS England and asked to disseminate the survey to employees in their Trust. Eleven Trusts did not respond to the EES-NHS, and a further three Trusts declined to participate due to survey fatigue. During the survey dissemination process, the project team worked in partnership with NHS Employers and NHS Confederation to promote the survey. This included a communications campaign package from NHS Employers, led by the NHS Confederation's communications team. The NHS Digital's headcount data from September 2018³ suggests that the potential sample frame was 1.19 million (staff working in NHS Trusts in England), implying a response rate of less than 0.5% for the EES-NHS. Such a low response rate raises obvious concerns that the sample does not reflect the population of NHS employees.

Compared to the 2018 NHS-Staff Survey (NHS-SS), the EES-NHS sample has a similar gender breakdown (with around 77% female employees) and age distribution (Einarsdottir et al., 2020; Table 8). In terms of sexuality, however, the EES-NHS sample has a larger proportion of respondents declaring as LGB⁴ (12% compared to 3.5%) and fewer respondents opting for 'prefer not to say' (2.3% relative to 6.5%).⁵ This is not surprising given LGB labelling included in the advertising for the EES-NHS survey, it may also indicate potential fear of a backlash for disclosing minority sexual identity in the NHS-SS. Overall comparison of the EES-NHS with the 2018 NHS-SS is encouraging, with many of the survey items displaying similar patterns.

Differences in reported sexuality are more striking comparing EES-NHS with WERS2011; 97.7% of men and 98.9% of women report as heterosexual in WERS (Wang et al., 2018). There were issues with the confidentiality of the surveys distributed within workplaces in the WERS data collection process, this may be reflected in the fewer respondents willing to identify openly in the WERS survey. The degree of openness about sexuality with all or most co-workers in the EES-NHS sample (60.3%) follows a similar pattern as in the

National LGBT survey (62.5%). Similarly, 78.2% of respondents in the National LGBT Survey subsample were satisfied with their lives⁶, and 70.9% of the EES-NHS respondents are.

The full sample taken from the EES-NHS includes 3,724 of NHS employees. Missing observations for variables used in the analysis limits the usable sample to 3556 observations, (12.37% LGB). One compensation for the over representation of LGB employees in the EES-NHS sample is the inclusion of a reasonable number of observations in the analysis. Nevertheless, the EES-NHS sample size is not big, and the sampling process was not random, both of which limit the extrapolation of the findings across the full NHS workforce.

Variable definitions and summary statistics are presented in Table 1: pair-wise statistical testing for differences in mean values are included for the male and female samples (columns 2 and 3); the LGB and heterosexual (columns 4 and 5); male GB and male heterosexual (columns 6 and 7); and female LB and female heterosexual (columns 8 and 9). Fuller variable definitions and further summary statistics are provided in the Online Appendix Table OA1.

[TABLE 1 AROUND HERE]

The Structure of Pay in the NHS and other explanatory variables

The employees in the NHS sample considered in this article are paid in bands and those bands are set by the government with the advice of the NHS Pay Review Board (NHSPRB)⁷. The average hourly wage measure used below is constructed from the mid-point of the employee's salary band, allowing for their usual working hours and adjusting for paid overtime hours. On average, the employees in the sample receive a salary of £16.62 per hour (column 1 of Table 1); £17.36 for males (column 2) and £16.42 for females (columns 3), suggesting a statistically significant raw gender pay gap of 4.3% or 4.4 log percentage points (lpp) at the 95% confidence level.⁸

Survey respondents are categorised as LGB according to their own choices. The gender of choice from the survey respondents is also used, this is clearly relevant for transgender respondents⁹. On average LGB workers receive £16.83 per hour (column 4), 1.3 lpp more than

heterosexuals at £16.59 per hour (column 5), although this raw pay gap is not statistically significant. We also find no statistically significant ethnic pay gap in column 1, although within the ethnic minority group males earn more than females, and heterosexual males earn more than the GB.

According to the Human Capital model, it is reasonable to expect wages to increase with measures related to investments made in the productivity of the individual, especially their education, job training, and work experience (Becker, 1975; Mincer, 1974). The earnings function estimated below is augmented with the addition of further categories of explanatory variables including: demographic variables which may affect an individual's choice of jobs (gender, LGB identity, having dependent children, marital status, ethnic identification, being foreign born, being disabled, being a carer, and age); occupation controls; job characteristics which are a range of variables loosely reflecting the individuals response to the labour market (working part-time, having a permanent contract, current job tenure, and being a trade union member); workplace characteristics that are associated with the workplace but can vary across employees within that work location (having an effective mentor, having supportive coworkers, a friend in the workplace, being happy with training opportunities, being able to use responsive working hours, often feeling under pressure, ability to maintain work-life balance, having a supportive supervisor, and being in a cooperative work place); and Trust controls that are common to all workers in that Trust (regional location, and Trust type). This augmented model is referred to as the 'full' model below.

The great majority of the sample being considered is female (some 79%). Compared to the males, these women are on average older, have more work experience, are twice as likely to be nurses, half as likely to be in general management, and three times more likely to work part-time (see Table 1). The women are also more likely to have a mentor, belong to a trade union, have at least one close friend in their workplace, and make use of responsive work hour provisions.

Sexual orientation is not evenly distributed across the genders in the sample, 28% of the men identify as GB (column 2 of Table 1) and 8% of the women as LB (column 3); disclosure of this orientation in the workplace is more common amongst men than women (60% relative to 42%, see columns 6 and 8). The LGB respondents to the survey were asked additional questions: is there a LGB network in your workplace; and are you a member of a

LGB network in your workplace. The majority said a LGB network did exist (78% of the GB and 69% of the LB) with around a half being a member (53% of the GB and 47% of the LB).

Columns 6 and 7, and 8 and 9, of Table 1 reveal that the LGB are on average younger than equivalent gender heterosexuals, they are less likely to be from an ethnic minority, married, be living with their partner, or have dependent children. They have less work experience on average, tend to have higher education (especially the males), are more likely to work as Nurses if male, less likely to work part-time if female, are less likely to work in Acute Trusts, and more likely to be located in Ambulance Trusts than heterosexuals. Formal estimations of pay gaps within and between these groups are considered next.

II. ESTIMATING THE EARNINGS FUNCTIONS

Following in the literature examining wage differentials developed by Becker (1975) and Mincer (1974), using semi-logarithmic wage equations, the earnings equation is estimated as:

$$W_{il} = X'_{il}\beta_l + \varepsilon_i, E(\varepsilon_i) = 0, l \in (a, b, p) \quad (1)$$

where W_i is the natural log of the average hourly wage, W , for individual i in group type l ; X_i is a vector of explanatory variables and a constant; ε_i is a residual term; and a represents comparison group a ; b the alternative comparison group b ; or p the pooled group of a and b combined (Neumark, 1988). For example, a might be males, b might be females, and p would be all the males and females combined; or a could be set as male GB, b as male heterosexuals, and p would be all the males. An indicator variable identifying group membership is also included in the pooled model. Estimating the earnings function using ordinary least squares, and allowing for clustering at the Trust level throughout, the first regression specification is a parsimonious model including only indicator variables for gender (male) and being LGB (see column 1, of panel a, of Table 2). With no additional explanatory variables in the model, men earn 4.4 log percentage points (lpp) more than women; and there is neither a sizeable nor a statistically significant pay differential between the LGB and heterosexuals.

[TABLE 2 AROUND HERE]

In column 2 of Table 2, the LGB are divided into those who have disclosed their sexuality identity in the workplace or not, and these two groups are compared separately to the

omitted heterosexual category. Those LGB who disclose their sexual orientation earn 6.1 lpp more than heterosexuals, and those LGB who do not disclose earn 6.1 lpp less than heterosexuals; the two equally sized effects cancel out an overall LGB pay effect (as shown in column 1).

The full set of explanatory variables, as defined in Section 2, are included in the model and selected results (for gender and LGB disclosure) are reported in column 3.¹⁰ The goodness of fit measure (adjusted R-squared) suggests this ‘full’ model is capturing a very reasonable 62% of the variation in earnings. There is now a slightly smaller gender pay gap at 3.9 lpp and offsetting disclosure effects for the LGB at -4.9 lpp without disclosure, and +4.4 lpp for those who do disclose, compared to heterosexuals.¹¹ There is not a sizable, nor a statistically significant, ethnic pay gap found in any of the models considered.¹²

Similar results are provided for the male sample (and the female) in panel b of Table 2 (and panel c). Amongst the males, those GB who disclose have a higher premium relative to the heterosexuals than the penalty associated with those who don’t disclose (column 2), leading to a statistically insignificant pay gap in favor of the GB of 2.6 lpp (column 1). For the females, the positive disclosure effect is slightly outweighed by the negative non-disclosure and the overall LB pay gap is insubstantial and statistically insignificant at – 1.8 lpp.¹³

III. DECOMPOSING THE EARNINGS GAPS

Further insight into these pay gaps can be provided via decomposition analysis (Oaxaca, 1973, Fortin et al., 2011). Following Jann (2008), the approach adopted to apportion the gap in the mean earnings between groups here is discussed in Oaxaca and Ransom (1994) where the reference set of parameters is given by the pooled estimates, $\hat{\beta}$ (reported in Online Appendix Table OA5, column 1). The decomposition of the mean earnings gap is calculated as:

$$\overline{W}_a - \overline{W}_b = \{(\overline{X}_a - \overline{X}_b)\}'\hat{\beta} + \{\overline{X}_a'(\hat{\beta}_a - \hat{\beta}) + \overline{X}_b'(\hat{\beta} - \hat{\beta}_b)\} \quad (2)$$

where overbar denotes the mean value; the first component $\{(\overline{X}_a - \overline{X}_b)\}'\hat{\beta}$ is often referred to as the endowment (or explained component) reflecting differences in the averages of the observed characteristics across the groups; the second component $\{\overline{X}_a'(\hat{\beta}_a - \hat{\beta}) + \overline{X}_b'(\hat{\beta} - \hat{\beta}_b)\}$ is the remaining portion of the gap which is usually referred to as unexplained (or sometimes as the discrimination component), capturing the sum of the differences in the returns to the two groups.¹⁴

[TABLE 3 AROUND HERE]

Aggregate decompositions for the earnings function are presented in Table 3, with each row summarizing a separate decomposition. In row a, the total gender earnings gap is 4.4 lpp in favor of males (column 1). The small, but statistically insignificant, endowment component (column 2) indicates that on average the women have more observable characteristics associated with higher pay than do the men. More than all the total gap is, however, associated with men receiving higher returns to their observed characteristics (as shown by the unexplained component of 5.08 lpp in column 3).

No statistically significant pay gap is found between heterosexual and LGB employees (row b), nor between the female heterosexuals and LB (row c). In both cases the explained and unexplained components of the decomposition are insubstantial and statistically insignificant. Amongst the males (row d), there is some evidence that the heterosexuals are receiving higher returns for their observed characteristics than the GB (the unexplained component in 4.77 lpp); however, the overall pay gap of 2.58 lpp between male heterosexuals and male GB is not statistically significant.

In contrast, the disclosure results in rows (e) to (g) of Table 3 are striking. Those LGB who have disclosed their sexual orientation in the workplace (row e) earn on average 12.99 lpp more than those LGB who have not, with 78% (10.14 lpp) of this gap related to those who disclosed having higher returns (the unexplained component). Amongst the males (row g) this result is even stronger: the male GB who have disclosed their sexual orientation in the workplace have on average 17.59 lpp more pay than the male GB who have not disclosed; with 10.74 lpp being due to those disclosing being treated more favorably (unexplained component) and 6.84 lpp associated with them having characteristics associated with more productivity and higher pay (endowment component). Amongst the women (row f) those LB who have disclosed also receive higher returns (unexplained) but this is partly offset by the non-disclosing LB women having fewer observable characteristics associated with higher pay, this overall pay gap is smaller at 6.87 lpp and is not statistically significant. Nevertheless, in each case (rows e to g) disclosure is found to be significantly associated with sizable pay gains due to preferential rates of return for those who disclose. In summary, LGB employees who have disclosed their

sexual identity in the workplace receive higher pay consistent with them receiving more favorable pay rewards given their endowments (sometimes referred to as positive discrimination).

It is not possible with a single cross-sectional data set to address causality between disclosure and pay. Individuals may have disclosed before, during or after their pay changes. A related concern is that variables influencing pay may also be influencing disclosure in the analyses, unfortunately, it has not been possible to locate suitable identifying variables to address this potential endogeneity in the data set. The results need to be interpreted with these caveats in mind. It is possible, however, to consider more fully the related issue of the probability to disclose.

IV. ON THE PROBABILITY OF DISCLOSING

The probability that a LGB individual discloses their LGB status in the workplace, conditional on a range of observable characteristics expected to predict that probability, is considered next. More formally, a series of probit regressions are estimated, with the latent dependent variable (the propensity to disclose, D_i) set equal to 1 if the individual discloses their sexual orientation and zero otherwise.

$$Pr(D_i = 1) = \theta(\beta X_i) \tag{3}$$

where X_i is a vector of explanatory variables and θ is the standard normal distribution function (Maddala 1992; 327). The models include the full set of explanatory variables grouped for demographic, qualifications, occupation, region, and Trust type as outlined and discussed in the data discussion (section 2) above. Full results are provided in Table OA6 of the Online Appendix, selected results are provided in Table 4.

[TABLE 4 AROUND HERE]

Rather than reporting estimated coefficients, the more intuitive marginal effects at the means for the probit analyses are presented in Table 4. The potential relationship between disclosure and the availability of a LGB network in their Trust is also considered for males (the GB in column 1) and females (LB in column 2); or membership of a LGB network if it is

available for males (GB in column 3) and females (LB in column 4). The majority of the 440 LGB in the complete sample have an existing LGB network in their workplace (324 do, see the penultimate row of Table 4).

Tests reveal that the models are statistically significantly different across the genders (Online Appendix Table OA7) and that each grouping of explanatory variables is typically jointly significantly related to disclosure (Online Appendix Table OA8), however, few of the individual variables are (see Online Appendix Table OA6 for complete results). For example, very little role for specific demographic characteristics is found, with two exceptions. Formally married women are more likely to disclose, consistent with the argument presented in Bridges and Mann (2019), although no relationship between marriage and disclosure is found for men. Interestingly, men with dependent children are much less likely to tell their colleagues about their GB sexual orientation.

The association between occupation and disclosure is similar for both genders, except for ambulance (operational) where males are considerably more likely to disclose, than the omitted allied health, and females are less so. With general managers being more likely to disclose in both genders. There is also some evidence that compared to those in the North of England, women who work in the South West are more likely to disclose, as are those (male and female) working in the South East.

The strongest associations are found between job or workplace characteristics and the propensity to disclose, especially for women. These results are provided in more detail in Table 4. For women, having shorter job tenure, a permanent job contract, a mentor, flexible work hours arrangements, work-life balance, and not recently witnessing bullying at work are all related to an increase in the propensity to disclose. These variables could be broadly interpreted as indicators of job security and a supportive work environment. Although having a supervisor who responds to suggestions lessens this propensity. For men there are fewer statistically significant relationships and those that do exist are perhaps more indicative of concerns for individual job security: working full-time, being a trade union member, or having work life balance are all related to a greater likelihood for men to disclose.

Finally, for females the existence of a LGB network in their workplace is associated with an 18% higher probability of disclosing sexual orientation (column 2 of Table 4). For

males, this relationship is negative and not statistically significant (column 1). If only those workplaces that have a LGB network (columns 3 and 4) are focussed on, a strong positive relationship between network membership and disclosure for both males (20.8%) and females (14.8%) is found. These results suggest that for women, the presence of a network is similarly as inducive for disclosure as is actual network membership. Implying that both vertical (network existence) and horizontal (network membership) support mechanisms are important for female disclosure. In contrast, for males network existence does not encourage disclosure, rather actual LGB network membership does. For both genders, horizontal support as indicated by LGB network membership is substantially related to increased probability of disclosing sexual orientation.

To summarise, supportive workplace practices are found to be positively associated with the probability of disclosure. The role of a workplace LGB network is of particular importance; network existence is positively associated with disclosure for women, and network membership strongly increases disclosure probability for both genders.

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Studies of the relationship between sexual orientation and pay face difficulties applying standard models of discrimination if orientation is not observable. Analogously, behavioural explanations of pay based on models of gender linked within-household specialization may not be as relevant in a non-heterosexual context. Using a rich new survey of employees from the National Health Service in England, information including LGB identity, coupling status, and disclosure of sexual orientation to work colleagues is used to explore pay gaps in this article.

Men are found to earn some 4% more than women, for both heterosexual and non-heterosexual employees. This gender pay gap is robust across a range of specifications. No statistically significant pay gap is found between heterosexual and LGB employees, although decomposition analysis suggests that offsetting effects for those who disclose their sexual orientation are masking pay gaps within this group relative to comparable heterosexuals. Individuals who have disclosed LGB orientation to their work colleagues receive some 6% higher wages than heterosexuals, whereas those who have not disclosed face a similar sized wage penalty. This is true for both genders. Amongst LGB employees, disclosure is associated with 13% more pay, with three quarters of this gap related to unexplained differences in returns

to observable characteristics. The results suggest that the LGB who have disclosed their sexual identity in their workplace receive more favourable pay rewards given their endowments relative to their closeted counterparts (sometimes referred to as positive discrimination).

Supportive workplace practices are strongly associated with the probability of disclosure. The role of a LGB workplace network is of particular importance; the presence of such a workplace network is strongly positively associated with disclosure probability for the LB, and membership is positively related to disclosure for both the GB and LB.

The survey used in this article is focussed towards LGB employees in the NHS. The resulting sample sizes are reasonable; however, they are not large compared to potential response rates. This may limit the ability to legitimately extrapolate the findings to a broader social context and suggests a need for further studies. Nevertheless, this article finds that supportive workplace practices, including LGB networks, are strongly associated with greater levels of disclosure and more favourable pay treatment for the LGB.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank Yvonne Berks, Melanie Jones, Peter Smith, members of the Project Research Advisory Board including representatives from NHS Employers; Stonewall; and Employers Networks for Equality and Inclusion (enei). And funding from the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) [grant number ES/N019334/1].

NOTES

¹ Online surveys are useful for accessing minority groups that may be difficult to reach through other channels. They typically display higher disclosure rates on sensitive information such as sexuality, perhaps due to perceived higher levels of anonymity and confidentiality amongst respondents (Trau et al., 2013). Online surveys also tend to have lower overall response rates (Nulty, 2008).

² <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/nhs-pay-review-body>

³ <https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/nhs-workforce-statistics/september-2018>

⁴ Includes gay men, gay women (lesbian), bisexual and other.

⁵ The 2018 NHS-SS did not ask about transgender identity.

⁶ <https://government-equalities-office.shinyapps.io/lgbt-survey-2017/>

⁷ <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/nhs-pay-review-body>

⁸ Jones and Ezgi (2019; page 40, Table 3) find a similar raw gender pay gap for the NHSPRB employees using pooled Labour Force Survey data between 2016 to 2018 of 5.4%.

⁹ There are 17 self-identifying transsexual individuals in the sample, when further asked which of the following best describes how you think of yourself, their responses were: seven heterosexual, three gay/lesbian, five bisexual, one don't know and one other. Removing the transsexual individuals from the sample does not change the findings in any substantial or statistically significant manner. Results are available from the authors upon request.

¹⁰ Complete results are presented in Table OA2 of the Online Appendix, results for the full model are presented in column 7 of Table OA2, with selected results for pay gaps and disclosure presented in panel a of Table 2. Comparable results for males (GB and heterosexuals) are reported in the Online Appendix Table OA3 column 7, and panel b of Table 2. With comparable results for females in Table OA4 column 7, and panel c of Table 2.

¹¹ A substantial coupling premium also occurs for both men and women; this premium is considerably higher for men (see Online Appendix Table OA4) as is well established in the literature. Comparing results from the full model applied to all employees (column 7 of Online Appendix Table OA2) or the full model applied to the sample of employees who are living with their partner (column 8 of Table OA2), reveals no significant difference in any of the findings. The pay premiums associated with LGB status and disclosure are not as well defined, as would be expected with a smaller sample size, but show little qualitative difference. This is true also for the males (comparing columns 7 and 8 in Online Appendix Table OA3) and the females (Comparing columns 7 and 8 in Online Appendix Table OA4). There is also no significant difference in results for those who are formally married or living together (results available upon request). These results are not strongly supportive of household specialization explaining earnings differences across employees with different sexual orientations.

¹² There is a pay penalty associated with being disabled, of a similar size for males and females but not statistically significant for males. The measurement and interpretation of a disabled pay penalty is a complex issue that will be considered in future work by the authors.

¹³ Limited evidence of pay differences for bisexual employees is found, either in aggregate or gender-specific analyses (results are available upon request).

¹⁴ $\hat{\beta}_b$ and $\hat{\beta}_a$ are reported in the Online Appendix Table OA4, columns 2 and 3 respectively, and \bar{X}_a and \bar{X}_b are reported in Online Appendix Table OA1, columns 2 and 3 respectively.

REFERENCES

- AKSOY, C.G., CARPENTER, C.S. and FRANK, J. (2018) Sexual orientation and earnings: New evidence from the United Kingdom. *International Labor Review* 71(1): 242–272.
- , ----, ----, and HUFFMAN, M.L. (2019) Gay glass ceilings: Sexual orientation and workplace authority in the UK. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* 159: 167-180.
- ARABSHEIBANI, R., MARIN, A. and WADSWORTH, J. (2005) Gay pay in the UK. *Economica* 72(286): 333-347.
- ARROW, K. (1973) The theory of discrimination. In: *Discrimination in the Labor Markets* 3-33. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- BADGETT, M.V.L. (1995) The wage effects of sexual orientation discrimination. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 48(4): 726-739.
- . (1996) Employment and sexual orientation: Disclosure and discrimination in the workplace in A.L. Ellis and E.D.B. Riggle (eds) *Sexual Identity on the Job: Issues and Services*: 29-52. Harrington Park Press/Haworth Press.
- , CARPENTER, C.S. and SASONE, D. (2021). LGBTQ Economics. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 35(2): 141-171.
- BECKER, G. (1957) *The Economics of Discrimination*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . (1975) *Human Capital, Second Edition*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- . (1985) Human capital, effort, and the sexual division of labor. *Journal of Labor Economics* 3(1): S33-S38.
- BLAU, F. and KAHN, L. (2017). The gender wage gap: Extent, trends, and sources, *Journal of Economic Literature*. 55(3): 789-865.
- BRIDGES, S. and MANN, S. (2019) Sexual orientation, legal partnerships and wages in Britain. *Work, Employment and Society* 33(6): 1020–1038.
- BRYSON, A. (2017) Pay equity after the Equality Act 2010: Does sexual orientation still matter? *Work, Employment and Society* 31(3): 484-500.
- EINARSÓTTIR, A., MUMFORD, K., BIRKS, Y., AGUIRRE, E., LOCKYER, B. and SAYLI, M. (2020) *LGBT employee networks within the NHS: Technical report and data addendum*. York: University of York.
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344670897>
- FORTIN, N., LEMIEUX, T. and FIRPO, S. (2011) Decomposition methods in economics. In: O Ashenfelter and D Card (eds) *Handbook of Labor Economics* volume 4(A): 1-102. Elsevier North Holland,
- GOVERNMENT EQUALITIES OFFICE GEO (2018) . *National LGBT Survey Research Report*. GEO-RR001 (ISBN: 978-1-78655-661-5) Manchester.
- HELLERSTEIN, J.K. and NEUMARK, D. (2020) Social capital, networks, and economic wellbeing. *IZA Discussion Paper* 13413.
- HUDSON-SHARP, N. and METCALF, H. (2016) *Inequality Among Lesbian, Gay Bisexual and Transgender Groups in the UK: A Review of Evidence*. Government Equalities Office, Report. July 2016.
- JEPSEN, C. and JEPSEN, L. (2020) Convergence over time or not? U.S. wages by sexual orientation, 2001-2018. *IZA Discussion Paper* 13495.

- JANN, B. (2008) The Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition for linear regression models. *The Stata Journal* 8(4): 453-479.
- JONES, M. and EZGI, K. (2019) *Understanding the Gender Pay Gap within the UK Public Sector*. Research Report for Office of Manpower Economics (OME), Open Call for Research on Public Sector Pay and Workforces 2018.
- KLAWITTER, M. (2015) Meta-analysis of the effects of sexual orientation on earnings. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society* 54(1): 4-32
- MADDALA, G.S. (1992) *Introduction to Econometrics. Second Edition*. Prentice Hall: New Jersey.
- MINCER, J. (1974) *Schooling, Experience and Earnings*. NBER, New York.
- NULTY, D.D. (2008) The adequacy of response rates to online and paper surveys: What can be done? *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*. 33(3): 301-314.
- OAXACA, R. (1973) Male-female wage differentials in urban labor markets. *International Economic Review*. 14(3): 693-709.
- , and Ransom, M.R. (1994) On discrimination and the decomposition of wage differentials. *Journal of Econometrics* 61: 5-21.
- OECD (2020) *Over the rainbow? The road to LGBTI inclusion*. OECD Publishing, Paris. <https://doi.org/10.1787/8d2df1a8-en>
- PHELPS, E.S. (1972) The Statistical Theory of Racism and Sexism. *The American Economic Review* 62: 659-661.
- SCRIVENS, K. and SMITH, C. (2013) *Four interpretations of social capital: An agenda for measurement*. OECD Statistics Working Papers 2013/06. OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/5jzbcx010wmt-en>.
- SPENCE, M. (1973) Job market signalling. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 87(3): 355-374.
- TRAU, R.N., HÄRTEL, C.E. and HÄRTEL, G.F. (2013) Reaching and hearing the invisible: Organizational research on invisible stigmatized groups via web surveys. *British Journal of Management* 24: 532-541.
- WANG, J., GUNDERSON, M. and WICKS, D. (2018) The earnings effect of sexual orientation: British evidence from worker-firm matched data. *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 56: 744-769.
- WAX, A., COLETTI, K.K. and OGAZ, J.W. (2018) The benefit of full disclosure: A meta-analysis of the implications of coming out at work. *Organizational Psychology Review* 8(1): 3-30

TABLE 1. MEANS (AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS) OF VARIABLES BY SEXUAL ORIENTATION.

	All (1)	Male (2)	Female (3)	LGB (4)	HetS (5)	Male		Female	
						GB (6)	HetS (7)	LB (8)	HetS (9)
salary	16.62 (6.53)	17.36 (7.27)	16.42 (6.30)	16.83 (6.80)	16.59 (6.49)	17.71 (7.61)	17.23 (7.14)	16.03 (5.86)	16.46 (6.34)
natural log salary	2.742 (0.36)	2.777 (0.39)	2.733 (0.35)	2.754 (0.36)	2.741 (0.36)	2.80 (0.39)	2.77 (0.39)	2.72 (0.33)	2.73 (0.36)
<i>LGB and disclose</i>						0.60		0.42	
<i>LGB and network</i>									
LGB and LGB network exists						0.78		0.69	
LGB and LGB network member						0.53		0.47	
<i>Demographics</i>									
male	0.21			0.48	0.17				
LGB	0.12	0.28	0.08						
age	46.21 (11.43)	45.03 (11.79)	46.53 (11.31)	41.46 (11.32)	46.88 (11.28)	41.89 (11.23)	46.24 (11.78)	41.06 (11.40)	47.01 (11.17)
ethnic minority	0.11	0.14	0.10	0.09	0.12	0.10	0.16	0.08	0.11
married	0.51	0.49	0.51	0.29	0.54	0.27	0.57	0.30	0.53
live in couples	0.69	0.70	0.68	0.57	0.70	0.56	0.75	0.59	0.69
dependent children	0.32	0.30	0.32	0.14	0.34	0.07	0.39	0.21	0.33
disabled	0.36	0.37	0.35	0.45	0.34	0.39	0.36	0.50	0.34
carer responsibilities	0.26	0.19	0.28	0.23	0.27	0.19	0.19	0.27	0.28
foreign born	0.12	0.14	0.12	0.09	0.13	0.11	0.15	0.07	0.12
<i>Qualifications</i>									
min qual	0.01	0.01	0.01		0.01		0.01		0.01
GCSE, D-G	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.02	0.05	0.03	0.04	0.02	0.05
GCSE, A-C	0.08	0.07	0.09	0.05	0.09	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.09
Trade	0.004	0.01	0.002	0.002	0.004		0.01	0.01	0.01
A levels	0.09	0.10	0.09	0.10	0.09	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.09
HE and TQ	0.16	0.17	0.16	0.15	0.16	0.16	0.17	0.14	0.16

TABLE 1. MEANS (AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS) OF VARIABLES BY SEXUAL ORIENTATION.

	All (1)	Male (2)	Female (3)	LGB (4)	HetS (5)	Male		Female	
						GB (6)	HetS (7)	LB (8)	HetS (9)
first degree	0.30	0.31	0.30	0.32	0.30	0.29	0.32	0.34	0.29
higher degree	0.28	0.27	0.28	0.32	0.27	0.34	0.24	0.30	0.28
potential work experience	17.96 (11.66)	16.02 (11.11)	18.48 (11.75)	15.12 (10.57)	18.36 (11.75)	14.92 (10.24)	16.45 (11.42)	15.29 (10.87)	18.76 (11.78)
Occupation									
allied	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.21	0.19	0.17	0.20	0.24	0.19
ambulance	0.009	0.03	0.003	0.04	0.004	0.06	0.01	0.03	0.01
public health	0.01	0.01	0.009	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01
commissioning manager	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.01
nurses	0.24	0.14	0.27	0.21	0.25	0.18	0.12	0.23	0.27
nursing auxiliary	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.07	0.04	0.06	0.05
social care	0.006	0.007	0.006	0.004	0.007	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
wider	0.24	0.21	0.25	0.19	0.25	0.18	0.22	0.20	0.25
general management	0.09	0.14	0.08	0.11	0.09	0.15	0.14	0.07	0.08
other	0.10	0.15	0.09	0.10	0.10	0.11	0.17	0.10	0.09
health professional	0.44	0.35	0.46	0.43	0.44	0.40	0.33	0.45	0.46
Job characteristics									
part-time	0.24	0.09	0.28	0.11	0.26	0.06	0.10	0.15	0.29
job permanent	0.93	0.92	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.94	0.92	0.92	0.93
trade union member	0.57	0.52	0.58	0.56	0.57	0.57	0.50	0.56	0.59
tenure	6.87	6.20	7.05	5.53	7.06	5.48	6.48	5.58	7.18
Workplace characteristics									
mentor	0.47	0.42	0.48	0.45	0.47	0.43	0.42	0.48	0.48
happy training	0.47	0.45	0.47	0.48	0.47	0.50	0.43	0.47	0.47
friend	0.61	0.49	0.64	0.56	0.61	0.54	0.48	0.59	0.64
cooperative	0.39	0.41	0.39	0.43	0.39	0.44	0.40	0.42	0.39
bully witnessed	1.84	1.86	1.84	1.83	1.84	1.91	1.83	1.76	1.85

TABLE 1. MEANS (AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS) OF VARIABLES BY SEXUAL ORIENTATION.

	All (1)	Male (2)	Female (3)	LGB (4)	HetS (5)	Male		Female	
						GB (6)	HetS (7)	LB (8)	HetS (9)
discrimination	1.95	1.95	1.95	1.97	1.95	1.93	1.96	2.01	1.95
responsive hours	0.46	0.39	0.48	0.46	0.46	0.39	0.40	0.52	0.47
pressure	0.55	0.55	0.56	0.55	0.56	0.50	0.56	0.58	0.55
coworker support	0.77	0.75	0.78	0.80	0.77	0.76	0.74	0.83	0.77
work-life balance	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.61	0.59	0.64	0.57	0.58	0.59
supervisor support	0.61	0.59	0.62	0.60	0.61	0.58	0.59	0.62	0.62
<i>NHS England region</i>									
North of England	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.19	0.24	0.27	0.23
Midlands and East of England	0.33	0.28	0.34	0.25	0.34	0.23	0.29	0.26	0.35
London	0.15	0.17	0.14	0.24	0.14	0.27	0.14	0.21	0.14
South West	0.11	0.12	0.11	0.07	0.12	0.07	0.13	0.06	0.12
South East	0.15	0.18	0.15	0.19	0.15	0.22	0.17	0.16	0.15
<i>Trust type</i>									
Acute Specialist Trusts	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.05	0.03	0.04	0.01
Acute Trusts	0.50	0.51	0.50	0.38	0.51	0.41	0.55	0.36	0.51
Ambulance Trusts	0.01	0.03	0.008	0.04	0.008	0.06	0.01	0.03	0.01
Combined Acute and Community Trusts	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.11	0.12	0.11	0.13	0.10	0.12
Combined Mental Health / Learning Disability and Community Trusts	0.08	0.07	0.09	0.11	0.08	0.10	0.05	0.11	0.08
Community Trusts	0.10	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.10	0.07	0.05	0.09	0.11
Mental Health / Learning Disability Trusts	0.14	0.15	0.13	0.20	0.13	0.17	0.15	0.23	0.13
Observations	3,556	753	2,803	440	3,116	210	543	230	2,573

Mean pair differences: Males (2) vs. Females (3); LGB (3) vs. Heterosexual (4); Amongst Males: GB (6) vs. Male Heterosexual (7); or Amongst Females: LB (8) vs. Female Heterosexual (9). bold p<0.10, bold and italic p<0.05

TABLE 2.
DETERMINANTS OF LOG EARNINGS (OLS).

ln(salary)	LGB	Base	Full model
	(1)	(2)	(3)
(a) Full sample			
male	0.044*** (0.014)	0.040*** (0.014)	0.0389*** (0.011)
LGB	-0.0001 (0.0193)		
no disclose & LGB		-0.061** (0.024)	-0.049*** (0.017)
disclose & LGB		0.061** (0.026)	0.044** (0.017)
Adj. R-squared	0.001	0.005	0.618
Number observations	3556		
(b) Male sample			
GB	0.026 (0.028)		
no disclose & GB		-0.081** (0.036)	-0.025 (0.028)
disclose & GB		0.095*** (0.036)	0.072*** (0.027)
Adj. R-squared	-0.0004	0.0122	0.573
Number observations	753		
(c) Female sample			
LB	-0.018 (0.026)		
no disclose & LB		-0.048 (0.029)	-0.050** (0.019)
disclose & LB		0.021 (0.038)	0.039* (0.023)
Adj. R-squared	-0.0001	0.0002	0.637
Number observations	2803		

Standard errors in parentheses (clustered at Trust level). * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01. In addition to the coefficients listed, the full model (column 3) includes additional explanatory and control variables as defined in section 2. Complete results are provided in the Online Appendix Tables: Table OA2 for the total sample; Table OA3 for males; Table OA4 for females; and Table OA5 for the three full models.

TABLE 3.
DECOMPOSITIONS OF THE WAGE GAPS, FULL MODEL.

	Wage gap (1)	Explained (2)	Unexplained (3)
(a) Males versus Females	-0.04402*** (0.0156)	0.0067 (0.0112)	-0.0508*** (0.0123)
(b) Heterosexual vs LGB	-0.0132 (0.0195)	0.0013 (0.0146)	-0.01447 (0.0132)
(c) Females Heterosexual vs LB	0.0187 (0.0250)	0.0110 (0.0191)	0.0077 (0.0155)
(d) Males Heterosexual vs GB	-0.0258 (0.0287)	0.0219 (0.0226)	-0.0477** (0.0235)
(e) Non-Heterosexual (LGB) Disclosed vs Non-Disclosed	-0.1299*** (0.0319)	-0.0285 (0.0242)	-0.1014*** (0.0253)
(f) Female Non-Heterosexual (LB) Disclosed vs Non-Disclosed	-0.0687 (0.0432)	0.0189 (0.0334)	-0.0875** (0.0379)
(g) Male Non-Heterosexual (GB) Disclosed vs Non-Disclosed	-0.1759*** (0.0482)	-0.0684* (0.0398)	-0.1074*** (0.0353)

Standard errors in parentheses (clustered at Trust level). * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

TABLE 4.
PROBABILITY OF DISCLOSURE, MARGINAL EFFECTS, SELECTED RESULTS.

Probability of disclosure	(1) All LGB		(3) LGB where network exists	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Job characteristics				
tenure	0.001 (0.005)	-0.015*** (0.006)	-0.003 (0.005)	-0.017*** (0.005)
part time	-0.217 (0.155)	0.086 (0.082)	-0.199* (0.117)	-0.036 (0.089)
job permanent	-0.011 (0.101)	0.263** (0.125)	-0.232 (0.145)	0.491*** (0.130)
trade union	0.163* (0.087)	0.043 (0.059)	0.225** (0.092)	-0.005 (0.062)
Workplace characteristics				
mentor	0.029 (0.071)	0.084 (0.064)	-0.017 (0.066)	0.167** (0.067)
responsive hours	0.056 (0.078)	0.160** (0.066)	0.079 (0.075)	0.144* (0.076)
pressure	0.006 (0.076)	0.061 (0.064)	0.036 (0.078)	0.129 (0.080)
coworker support	-0.015 (0.067)	-0.051 (0.062)	-0.041 (0.073)	-0.071 (0.074)
work-life balance	0.088 (0.082)	0.167*** (0.058)	0.137* (0.081)	0.279*** (0.058)
supervisor support	0.078 (0.070)	-0.169*** (0.052)	0.106 (0.079)	-0.223*** (0.062)
witnessed bullying	-0.009 (0.037)	-0.089*** (0.030)	-0.005 (0.039)	-0.104*** (0.037)
discrimination	0.091* (0.050)	-0.046 (0.037)	0.054 (0.061)	-0.020 (0.036)
LGB network exists	-0.078 (0.070)	0.180*** (0.062)		
LGB network member			0.208*** (0.069)	0.148** (0.065)
Observations	210	230	164	160
Pseudo R squared	0.171	0.299	0.348	0.468

Standard errors are in parentheses (clustered at Trust level). * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01. In addition to the coefficients listed, the models include additional explanatory and control variables as defined in section 2 (full results are provided in Online Appendix Table OA6).

ONLINE APPENDIX
Intended for online provision

**Pay Gaps in the National Health Service: The Puzzle of
Observability and Disclosure.**

By Karen Mumford¹, Edith Aguirre², Anna Einarsdóttir³, Bridget Lockyer⁴,
Melisa Sayli⁵, and Benjamin A. Smith⁶

¹University of York and IZA ²ISER, University of Essex ³ University of York
⁴Bradford Institute for Health Research. ⁵University of Surrey ⁶ Rotherham NHS
Foundation Trust

TABLE OA1. DEFINITIONS AND MEANS (STANDARD DEVIATIONS) OF VARIABLES.

	Means (standard deviations)					Definitions
	Pooled	Male	Female	LGB	Heterosexual	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
salary	16.62 (6.53)	17.36 (7.27)	16.42 (6.30)	16.83 (6.80)	16.59 (6.49)	Average hourly pay in GBP (full time equivalent).
natural log salary	2.742 (0.36)	2.777 (0.39)	2.733 (0.35)	2.754 (0.36)	2.741 (0.36)	
Sexuality						
LGB	0.12	0.28	0.08			Respondent LGB
disclose	0.06	0.17	0.03	0.51		Open about sexuality at workplace
Demographics						
male	0.21			0.48	0.17	Respondent is male
age	46.21 (11.43)	45.03 (11.79)	46.53 (11.31)	41.46 (11.32)	46.88 (11.28)	Age of respondent
ethnic minority	0.11	0.14	0.10	0.09	0.12	Ethnic group not white (Mixed; Asian; Black/Black British; Arab or Other)
married	0.51	0.49	0.51	0.29	0.54	Married
live in couples	0.69	0.70	0.68	0.57	0.70	Living together
dependent children	0.32	0.30	0.32	0.14	0.34	Has dependent children
disability	0.36	0.37	0.35	0.45	0.34	Long-standing illness, health problem or disability
carer	0.26	0.19	0.28	0.23	0.27	Look after or give support to family/friend due to health or old age
foreign	0.12	0.14	0.12	0.09	0.13	Born outside UK
Qualifications						
min qual	0.01	0.01	0.01		0.01	Below O level or no recognised qualifications
GCSE D-G	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.02	0.05	O level or GCSE grades D-G
GCSE A-C	0.08	0.07	0.09	0.05	0.09	O level or GCSE grades A-C

TABLE OA1. DEFINITIONS AND MEANS (STANDARD DEVIATIONS) OF VARIABLES.

	Means (standard deviations)					Definitions
	Pooled	Male	Female	LGB	Heterosexual	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
trade	0.004	0.01	0.002	0.002	0.004	Trade apprenticeships
A levels	0.09	0.10	0.09	0.10	0.09	A levels and others
HE and TQ	0.16	0.17	0.16	0.15	0.16	Diploma in higher education, teaching qualifications and others
first degree	0.30	0.31	0.30	0.32	0.30	First degree and PGCE
higher degree	0.28	0.27	0.28	0.32	0.27	Higher degree or postgraduate
potential experience	17.96 (11.66)	16.02 (11.11)	18.48 (11.75)	15.12 (10.57)	18.36 (11.75)	Years of potential experience
Occupation						
allied	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.21	0.19	Allied health professional, healthcare scientist, scientific and technical
ambulance	0.009	0.03	0.003	0.04	0.004	Ambulance (operational)
public health	0.01	0.01	0.009	0.01	0.01	Public health/health improvement
commissioning manager	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	Commissioning manager/support staff
nurses	0.24	0.14	0.27	0.21	0.25	Registered nurse and midwives
nursing auxiliary	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.05	Nursing auxiliary, nursing assistant, health care assistants
social care	0.006	0.007	0.006	0.004	0.007	Social care
wider	0.24	0.21	0.25	0.19	0.25	Wider healthcare team
general management	0.09	0.14	0.08	0.11	0.09	General management
other	0.10	0.15	0.09	0.10	0.10	Other
health professional	0.44	0.35	0.46	0.43	0.44	Respondent is health professional
Job characteristics						

TABLE OA1. DEFINITIONS AND MEANS (STANDARD DEVIATIONS) OF VARIABLES.

	Means (standard deviations)					Definitions
	Pooled	Male	Female	LGB	Heterosexual	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
part time	0.24	0.09	0.28	0.11	0.26	Part-time work
job permanent	0.93	0.92	0.93	0.93	0.93	Has a permanent contract
trade union	0.57	0.52	0.58	0.56	0.57	Member of a trade union
tenure	6.87	6.20	7.05	5.53	7.06	Years in current job
<i>Workplace characteristics</i>						
mentor	0.47	0.42	0.48	0.45	0.47	Has mentor/coach for work advice
happy training	0.47	0.45	0.47	0.48	0.47	Satisfied with opportunities to develop skills
friend	0.61	0.49	0.64	0.56	0.61	At least one close friend in workplace
cooperative	0.39	0.41	0.39	0.43	0.39	Feel workplace is cooperative
bully witnessed	1.84	1.86	1.84	1.83	1.84	Has witnessed bullying at work
discrimination	1.95	1.95	1.95	1.97	1.95	Has been subject to discrimination at work
responsive hours	0.46	0.39	0.48	0.46	0.46	Using at least one of the responsive work hours (flexi-time, reduced hours, same hours fewer days and paid leave to care)
pressure	0.55	0.55	0.56	0.55	0.56	Job makes feel pressure always and often
coworker support	0.77	0.75	0.78	0.80	0.77	Has supportive colleagues
work-life balance	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.61	0.59	Maintains work-life balance
supervisor support	0.61	0.59	0.62	0.60	0.61	Supervisor responds to suggestions
<i>NHS England region</i>						
North of England	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	
Midlands and East of England	0.33	0.28	0.34	0.25	0.34	
London	0.15	0.17	0.14	0.24	0.14	
South West	0.11	0.12	0.11	0.07	0.12	

TABLE OA1. DEFINITIONS AND MEANS (STANDARD DEVIATIONS) OF VARIABLES.

	Means (standard deviations)					Definitions
	Pooled	Male	Female	LGB	Heterosexual	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
South East	0.15	0.18	0.15	0.19	0.15	
<i>Trust type</i>						
Acute Specialist Trusts	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.05	0.01	
Acute Trusts	0.50	0.51	0.50	0.38	0.51	
Ambulance Trusts	0.01	0.03	0.008	0.04	0.008	
Combined Acute and Community Trusts	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.11	0.12	
Combined Mental Health / Learning Disability and Community Trusts	0.08	0.07	0.09	0.11	0.08	
Community Trusts	0.10	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.10	
Mental Health / Learning Disability Trusts	0.14	0.15	0.13	0.20	0.13	
Observations	3,556	753	2,803	440	3,116	

Mean pair differences: Males (2) vs. Females (3); LGB (3) vs. Heterosexual (4), bold p<0.10, bold and italic p<0.05.

TABLE OA2. THE DETERMINANTS OF LOG EARNINGS (OLS ESTIMATES), FULL SAMPLE.

Dependent variable is ln(salary)	(1) Male	(2) LGB	(3) Base	(4) +HC	(5) +Demog	(6) +Occup	(7) +Job/Work	(8) Full	(9) Coupled
male	0.0440*** (0.0139)	0.0440*** (0.0140)	0.0396*** (0.0137)	0.0660*** (0.0121)	0.0624*** (0.0118)	0.0500*** (0.0106)	0.0423*** (0.0111)	0.0388*** (0.0109)	0.0509*** (0.0134)
LGB		-0.0001 (0.0193)							
no disclose & LGB			-0.0612** (0.0238)	-0.0558*** (0.0175)	-0.0323* (0.0171)	-0.0352** (0.0157)	-0.0411** (0.0159)	-0.0493*** (0.0165)	-0.0495** (0.0232)
disclose & LGB			0.0614** (0.0263)	0.0330* (0.0193)	0.0572*** (0.0187)	0.0577*** (0.0178)	0.0557*** (0.0180)	0.0435** (0.0172)	0.0364 (0.0253)
Qualifications (omitted group: min qual)									
O level				0.0738 (0.0488)	0.0865** (0.0437)	0.0087 (0.0506)	0.0030 (0.0507)	0.0001 (0.0517)	0.0501 (0.0612)
GCSE				0.1440*** (0.0537)	0.1505*** (0.0488)	0.0424 (0.0522)	0.0362 (0.0521)	0.0275 (0.0531)	0.0892 (0.0679)
trade				0.2148** (0.0962)	0.2165** (0.0962)	0.1102 (0.0915)	0.0920 (0.0787)	0.0938 (0.0794)	0.1905* (0.1004)
A levels				0.1990*** (0.0451)	0.2104*** (0.0413)	0.0987** (0.0473)	0.0893* (0.0476)	0.0854* (0.0484)	0.1327** (0.0594)
HE and TQ				0.3615*** (0.0483)	0.3675*** (0.0439)	0.2017*** (0.0475)	0.1881*** (0.0468)	0.1847*** (0.0481)	0.2437*** (0.0575)
first degree				0.5134*** (0.0485)	0.5137*** (0.0441)	0.3128*** (0.0499)	0.2859*** (0.0478)	0.2807*** (0.0491)	0.3476*** (0.0604)
higher degree				0.6842*** (0.0496)	0.6862*** (0.0449)	0.4630*** (0.0510)	0.4288*** (0.0488)	0.4176*** (0.0508)	0.4826*** (0.0595)
potential experience				0.0238*** (0.0018)	0.0220*** (0.0018)	0.0174*** (0.0017)	0.0163*** (0.0018)	0.0156*** (0.0017)	0.0166*** (0.0022)
potential experience squared				-0.0003*** (0.0000)	-0.0003*** (0.0000)	-0.0002*** (0.0000)	-0.0002*** (0.0000)	-0.0002*** (0.0000)	-0.0002*** (0.0000)
age					0.0003 (0.0005)	0.0005 (0.0004)	0.0016*** (0.0004)	0.0016*** (0.0004)	0.0015** (0.0006)
ethnic minority						0.0280 (0.0177)	0.0139 (0.0152)	-0.0146 (0.0144)	-0.0230 (0.0192)

TABLE OA2. THE DETERMINANTS OF LOG EARNINGS (OLS ESTIMATES), FULL SAMPLE.

Dependent variable is ln(salary)	(1) Male	(2) LGB	(3) Base	(4) +HC	(5) +Demog	(6) +Occup	(7) +Job/Work	(8) Full	(9) Coupled
live in couples					0.0494*** (0.0094)	0.0424*** (0.0085)	0.0415*** (0.0081)	0.0474*** (0.0083)	
dependent children					0.0468*** (0.0103)	0.0367*** (0.0091)	0.0453*** (0.0092)	0.0470*** (0.0091)	0.0576*** (0.0105)
disability					-0.0464*** (0.0113)	-0.0348*** (0.0091)	-0.0299*** (0.0089)	-0.0311*** (0.0087)	-0.0313*** (0.0108)
carer					0.0016 (0.0091)	0.0061 (0.0090)	0.0027 (0.0085)	0.0031 (0.0081)	0.0045 (0.0112)
foreign					-0.0203 (0.0168)	-0.0165 (0.0150)	-0.0163 (0.0146)	-0.0295** (0.0136)	-0.0353** (0.0166)
Occupational group (omitted group: Registered nurse and midwives)									
allied						0.0238* (0.0127)	0.0300** (0.0127)	0.0324** (0.0125)	0.0435** (0.0178)
ambulance						0.0181 (0.0479)	0.0278 (0.0472)	0.0438 (0.0632)	0.0184 (0.0634)
public health						0.0178 (0.0375)	0.0229 (0.0378)	0.0230 (0.0382)	0.0082 (0.0487)
commissioning manager						0.1526*** (0.0347)	0.1372*** (0.0322)	0.1344*** (0.0318)	0.1692*** (0.0407)
nursing auxiliary						-0.1401*** (0.0226)	-0.1362*** (0.0214)	-0.1343*** (0.0202)	-0.1350*** (0.0288)
social care						0.1690*** (0.0385)	0.1526*** (0.0399)	0.1640*** (0.0414)	0.1739*** (0.0564)
wider						0.0762*** (0.0208)	0.0640*** (0.0196)	0.0674*** (0.0193)	0.0762*** (0.0269)
general management						0.4170*** (0.0245)	0.3747*** (0.0239)	0.3710*** (0.0223)	0.3737*** (0.0315)
other						0.0565*** (0.0201)	0.0439** (0.0203)	0.0461** (0.0197)	0.0611** (0.0269)
health professional						0.2265*** (0.0179)	0.2316*** (0.0174)	0.2288*** (0.0167)	0.2271*** (0.0225)

TABLE OA2. THE DETERMINANTS OF LOG EARNINGS (OLS ESTIMATES), FULL SAMPLE.

Dependent variable is ln(salary)	(1) Male	(2) LGB	(3) Base	(4) +HC	(5) +Demog	(6) +Occup	(7) +Job/Work	(8) Full	(9) Coupled
part time							-0.0874*** (0.0111)	-0.0838*** (0.0103)	-0.0742*** (0.0122)
job permanent							-0.0091 (0.0173)	-0.0057 (0.0162)	-0.0055 (0.0184)
trade union							-0.0319*** (0.0098)	-0.0286*** (0.0094)	-0.0367*** (0.0130)
mentor							-0.0516*** (0.0074)	-0.0464*** (0.0078)	-0.0488*** (0.0102)
happy training							0.0729*** (0.0100)	0.0689*** (0.0102)	0.0739*** (0.0130)
friend							0.0132 (0.0082)	0.0102 (0.0083)	0.0020 (0.0091)
responsive hours							0.0407*** (0.0096)	0.0433*** (0.0087)	0.0402*** (0.0138)
pressure							0.0310*** (0.0085)	0.0343*** (0.0084)	0.0382*** (0.0108)
coworker support							0.0189* (0.0098)	0.0184* (0.0099)	0.0150 (0.0133)
work-life balance							-0.0294*** (0.0091)	-0.0278*** (0.0088)	-0.0325*** (0.0108)
supervisor support							0.0306*** (0.0097)	0.0287*** (0.0097)	0.0290** (0.0127)
cooperative								0.0088 (0.0081)	0.0102 (0.0101)
NHS England region (omitted group: North of England)									
Midlands and East of England								0.0252* (0.0152)	0.0296 (0.0180)
London								0.1224*** (0.0169)	0.1403*** (0.0216)
South West								0.0065 (0.0193)	0.0058 (0.0244)

TABLE OA2. THE DETERMINANTS OF LOG EARNINGS (OLS ESTIMATES), FULL SAMPLE.

Dependent variable is	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
ln(salary)	Male	LGB	Base	+HC	+Demog	+Occup	+Job/Work	Full	Coupled
South East								0.0378** (0.0161)	0.0478** (0.0201)
Trust type (omitted group: Acute Trusts)									
Acute Specialist Trusts								0.0216 (0.0306)	0.0144 (0.0353)
Ambulance Trusts								-0.0051 (0.0698)	0.0419 (0.0608)
Combined Acute and Community Trusts								0.0000 (0.0165)	0.0092 (0.0205)
Combined Mental Health / Learning Disability and Community Trusts								-0.0437** (0.0209)	-0.0321 (0.0239)
Community Trusts								-0.0415** (0.0179)	-0.0485*** (0.0164)
Mental Health / Learning Disability Trusts								-0.0084 (0.0132)	-0.0002 (0.0165)
constant	2.7334*** (0.0159)	2.7334*** (0.0165)	2.7342*** (0.0166)	2.0094*** (0.0514)	1.9695*** (0.0511)	2.0368*** (0.0569)	1.9993*** (0.0554)	1.9776*** (0.0561)	1.9485*** (0.0784)
Observations	3556	3556	3556	3556	3556	3556	3556	3556	2443
R-squared	0.002	0.002	0.006	0.457	0.470	0.580	0.611	0.6241	0.6205
Adj. R-squared	0.002	0.001	0.005	0.455	0.467	0.577	0.607	0.6186	0.6126

Standard errors are in parentheses (clustered at Trust level). * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

TABLE OA3. THE DETERMINANTS OF LOG EARNINGS (OLS ESTIMATES), MALE SUBSAMPLE.

Dependent variable is ln(salary)	(1) LGB	(2) Base	(3) +HC	(4) +Demog	(5) +Occup	(6) +Job/Work	(7) Full	(8) Coupled
LGB	0.0258 (0.0281)							
no disclose & LGB		-0.0806** (0.0360)	-0.0666** (0.0300)	-0.0173 (0.0300)	-0.0271 (0.0312)	-0.0235 (0.0295)	-0.0254 (0.0280)	-0.0400 (0.0390)
disclose & LGB		0.0953*** (0.0361)	0.0370 (0.0286)	0.0958*** (0.0299)	0.0925*** (0.0290)	0.0830*** (0.0294)	0.0722*** (0.0270)	0.0692 (0.0423)
Qualifications (omitted group: min qual)								
O level			-0.0780 (0.1314)	-0.0607 (0.1323)	-0.1015 (0.1204)	-0.1198 (0.0910)	-0.1500 (0.0972)	-0.2223** (0.1078)
GCSE			-0.0053 (0.1276)	0.0259 (0.1248)	-0.0619 (0.1220)	-0.1089 (0.0937)	-0.1460 (0.1059)	-0.1508 (0.1266)
trade			0.1218 (0.2183)	0.1336 (0.2133)	0.0400 (0.2056)	0.0213 (0.1712)	-0.0023 (0.1751)	-0.0139 (0.1987)
A levels			0.0461 (0.0994)	0.0844 (0.0985)	0.0105 (0.1064)	-0.0014 (0.0773)	-0.0242 (0.0871)	-0.0662 (0.1006)
HE and TQ			0.2514** (0.1202)	0.2780** (0.1194)	0.1460 (0.1214)	0.1059 (0.0856)	0.0726 (0.0962)	0.0809 (0.0996)
first degree			0.3802*** (0.1275)	0.3983*** (0.1225)	0.2402* (0.1261)	0.2036** (0.0914)	0.1726* (0.1008)	0.1561 (0.1087)
higher degree			0.5323*** (0.1144)	0.5543*** (0.1088)	0.3539*** (0.1179)	0.3098*** (0.0823)	0.2745*** (0.0948)	0.2624*** (0.1002)
potential experience			0.0265*** (0.0037)	0.0212*** (0.0039)	0.0202*** (0.0036)	0.0178*** (0.0036)	0.0170*** (0.0034)	0.0190*** (0.0038)
potential experience squared			-0.0004*** (0.0001)	-0.0003*** (0.0001)	-0.0003*** (0.0001)	-0.0003*** (0.0001)	-0.0003*** (0.0001)	-0.0003*** (0.0001)
age				0.0023* (0.0013)	0.0015 (0.0012)	0.0027** (0.0012)	0.0031*** (0.0011)	0.0034** (0.0013)
ethnic minority				0.0387 (0.0353)	0.0193 (0.0322)	0.0214 (0.0308)	-0.0042 (0.0333)	0.0112 (0.0434)
live in couples				0.0889*** (0.0204)	0.0832*** (0.0190)	0.0685*** (0.0198)	0.0681*** (0.0181)	

TABLE OA3. THE DETERMINANTS OF LOG EARNINGS (OLS ESTIMATES), MALE SUBSAMPLE.

Dependent variable is ln(salary)	(1) LGB	(2) Base	(3) +HC	(4) +Demog	(5) +Occup	(6) +Job/Work	(7) Full	(8) Coupled
dependent children				0.0887*** (0.0251)	0.0691*** (0.0227)	0.0591*** (0.0220)	0.0722*** (0.0216)	0.0698** (0.0270)
disability				-0.0397 (0.0253)	-0.0195 (0.0214)	-0.0217 (0.0205)	-0.0228 (0.0210)	-0.0119 (0.0259)
carer				0.0050 (0.0262)	0.0097 (0.0209)	0.0157 (0.0208)	0.0123 (0.0190)	0.0199 (0.0237)
foreign				-0.0635** (0.0319)	-0.0326 (0.0299)	-0.0414 (0.0302)	-0.0517* (0.0311)	-0.0598 (0.0393)
Occupational group (omitted group: Registered nurse and midwives)								
allied					0.0524* (0.0298)	0.0553* (0.0308)	0.0546* (0.0307)	0.0794* (0.0409)
ambulance					0.0569 (0.0537)	0.0667 (0.0505)	0.2914*** (0.0510)	0.3320*** (0.0663)
public health					-0.0063 (0.0783)	0.0059 (0.0792)	-0.0243 (0.0950)	-0.0925 (0.0927)
commissioning manager					0.1168* (0.0611)	0.1100** (0.0535)	0.1210** (0.0532)	0.1495** (0.0704)
nursing auxiliary					-0.1880*** (0.0482)	-0.2005*** (0.0469)	-0.1876*** (0.0470)	-0.1547*** (0.0536)
social care					0.4024*** (0.1471)	0.3301** (0.1544)	0.3991*** (0.1405)	0.4246*** (0.1493)
wider					0.1022** (0.0484)	0.0915* (0.0468)	0.0972** (0.0439)	0.1669** (0.0643)
general management					0.3639*** (0.0615)	0.3268*** (0.0587)	0.3400*** (0.0556)	0.3446*** (0.0691)
other					0.0477 (0.0502)	0.0369 (0.0493)	0.0316 (0.0472)	0.0737 (0.0572)
health professional					0.1842*** (0.0426)	0.1775*** (0.0428)	0.1868*** (0.0411)	0.1795*** (0.0547)
part time						-0.0858** (0.0336)	-0.0792** (0.0318)	-0.0051 (0.0398)

TABLE OA3. THE DETERMINANTS OF LOG EARNINGS (OLS ESTIMATES), MALE SUBSAMPLE.

Dependent variable is	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
ln(salary)	LGB	Base	+HC	+Demog	+Occup	+Job/Work	Full	Coupled
job permanent						0.0426 (0.0302)	0.0503* (0.0288)	0.1327*** (0.0489)
trade union						-0.0183 (0.0237)	-0.0139 (0.0242)	-0.0273 (0.0290)
mentor						-0.0495** (0.0238)	-0.0425* (0.0236)	-0.0375 (0.0304)
happy training						0.0680*** (0.0216)	0.0677*** (0.0211)	0.0707*** (0.0257)
friend						0.0544*** (0.0196)	0.0453** (0.0200)	0.0324 (0.0231)
responsive hours						0.0259 (0.0233)	0.0334 (0.0230)	0.0166 (0.0323)
pressure						0.0644*** (0.0214)	0.0646*** (0.0206)	0.0848*** (0.0282)
coworker support						0.0405 (0.0254)	0.0366 (0.0253)	0.0321 (0.0358)
work-life balance						-0.0319 (0.0239)	-0.0199 (0.0238)	-0.0151 (0.0264)
supervisor support						0.0539** (0.0245)	0.0555** (0.0243)	0.0792*** (0.0296)
cooperative							-0.0009 (0.0221)	-0.0017 (0.0279)
NHS England region (omitted group: North of England)								
Midlands and East of England							0.0470 (0.0304)	0.0400 (0.0374)
London							0.1758*** (0.0325)	0.1847*** (0.0427)
South West							0.0497 (0.0376)	0.0596 (0.0434)
South East							0.0524 (0.0317)	0.0660* (0.0394)

TABLE OA3. THE DETERMINANTS OF LOG EARNINGS (OLS ESTIMATES), MALE SUBSAMPLE.

Dependent variable is ln(salary)	(1) LGB	(2) Base	(3) +HC	(4) +Demog	(5) +Occup	(6) +Job/Work	(7) Full	(8) Coupled
Trust type (omitted group: Acute Trusts)								
Acute Specialist Trusts							-0.0441 (0.0511)	-0.0496 (0.0730)
Ambulance Trusts							-0.2429*** (0.0471)	-0.2298*** (0.0715)
Combined Acute and Community Trusts							0.0079 (0.0334)	0.0317 (0.0411)
Combined Mental Health / Learning Disability and Community Trusts							-0.1338*** (0.0341)	-0.1436*** (0.0446)
Community Trusts							0.0043 (0.0293)	-0.0010 (0.0374)
Mental Health / Learning Disability Trusts							-0.0267 (0.0258)	0.0071 (0.0345)
constant	2.7702*** (0.0205)	2.7702*** (0.0205)	2.1999*** (0.1175)	2.0399*** (0.1140)	2.0798*** (0.1178)	1.9633*** (0.0939)	1.9228*** (0.0992)	1.8400*** (0.1144)
Observations	753	753	753	753	753	753	753	524
R-squared	0.0009	0.0148	0.4031	0.4364	0.5386	0.5732	0.6018	0.5786
Adj. R-squared	-0.0004	0.0122	0.3943	0.4226	0.5208	0.5499	0.5734	0.5350

Standard errors are in parentheses (clustered at Trust level). * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

TABLE OA4. THE DETERMINANTS OF LOG EARNINGS (OLS ESTIMATES), FEMALE SUBSAMPLE.

	(1) LGB	(2) Base	(3) +HC	(4) +Demog	(5) +Occup	(6) +Job/Work	(7) Full	(8) Coupled
LGB	-0.0187 (0.0255)							
no disclose & LGB		-0.0477 (0.0291)	-0.0473** (0.0234)	-0.0291 (0.0221)	-0.0282 (0.0184)	-0.0395** (0.0178)	-0.0500** (0.0194)	-0.0439 (0.0273)
disclose & LGB		0.0210 (0.0377)	0.0274 (0.0261)	0.0406 (0.0250)	0.0561** (0.0238)	0.0489** (0.0241)	0.0394* (0.0232)	0.0323 (0.0312)
Qualifications (omitted group: min quals)								
O level			0.1116*** (0.0313)	0.1167*** (0.0309)	0.0347 (0.0404)	0.0358 (0.0390)	0.0335 (0.0399)	0.1201*** (0.0353)
GCSE			0.1812*** (0.0350)	0.1767*** (0.0341)	0.0657 (0.0414)	0.0677 (0.0414)	0.0619 (0.0415)	0.1504*** (0.0388)
trade			0.2039*** (0.0701)	0.1837*** (0.0599)	0.1020* (0.0578)	0.0786 (0.0543)	0.0747 (0.0501)	0.1784*** (0.0523)
A levels			0.2382*** (0.0329)	0.2361*** (0.0338)	0.1192*** (0.0403)	0.1136*** (0.0400)	0.1105*** (0.0398)	0.1890*** (0.0334)
HE and TQ			0.3879*** (0.0337)	0.3808*** (0.0349)	0.2102*** (0.0416)	0.2041*** (0.0414)	0.2014*** (0.0422)	0.2810*** (0.0361)
first degree			0.5465*** (0.0300)	0.5340*** (0.0308)	0.3249*** (0.0412)	0.3032*** (0.0396)	0.2975*** (0.0400)	0.3911*** (0.0344)
higher degree			0.7224*** (0.0322)	0.7110*** (0.0322)	0.4863*** (0.0422)	0.4557*** (0.0411)	0.4451*** (0.0424)	0.5386*** (0.0359)
potential experience			0.0232*** (0.0018)	0.0225*** (0.0018)	0.0169*** (0.0016)	0.0162*** (0.0018)	0.0158*** (0.0017)	0.0165*** (0.0022)
potential experience squared			-0.0003*** (0.0000)	-0.0003*** (0.0000)	-0.0002*** (0.0000)	-0.0002*** (0.0000)	-0.0002*** (0.0000)	-0.0002*** (0.0000)
age				-0.0006 (0.0007)	0.0001 (0.0005)	0.0012** (0.0005)	0.0012** (0.0005)	0.0012* (0.0007)
ethnic minority				0.0236 (0.0226)	0.0145 (0.0181)	0.0077 (0.0175)	-0.0238 (0.0165)	-0.0324 (0.0230)
live in couples				0.0383*** (0.0105)	0.0322*** (0.0096)	0.0341*** (0.0090)	0.0389*** (0.0092)	

TABLE OA4. THE DETERMINANTS OF LOG EARNINGS (OLS ESTIMATES), FEMALE SUBSAMPLE.

	(1) LGB	(2) Base	(3) +HC	(4) +Demog	(5) +Occup	(6) +Job/Work	(7) Full	(8) Coupled
dependent children				0.0368*** (0.0114)	0.0306*** (0.0100)	0.0430*** (0.0100)	0.0435*** (0.0097)	0.0611*** (0.0108)
disability				-0.0485*** (0.0118)	-0.0372*** (0.0099)	-0.0306*** (0.0097)	-0.0323*** (0.0094)	-0.0338*** (0.0115)
carer				0.0032 (0.0104)	0.0066 (0.0095)	0.0010 (0.0086)	0.0010 (0.0083)	0.0035 (0.0118)
foreign				-0.0063 (0.0182)	-0.0101 (0.0160)	-0.0097 (0.0156)	-0.0218 (0.0151)	-0.0267 (0.0185)
Occupational group (omitted group: Registered nurse and midwives)								
allied					0.0227 (0.0144)	0.0275** (0.0136)	0.0291** (0.0136)	0.0377** (0.0189)
ambulance					-0.0575 (0.0607)	-0.0665 (0.0584)	-0.1601*** (0.0594)	-0.1768*** (0.0670)
public health					0.0280 (0.0488)	0.0326 (0.0459)	0.0426 (0.0430)	0.0400 (0.0523)
commissioning manager					0.1823*** (0.0364)	0.1617*** (0.0355)	0.1553*** (0.0352)	0.1994*** (0.0466)
nursing auxiliary					-0.1145*** (0.0263)	-0.1087*** (0.0249)	-0.1090*** (0.0241)	-0.1073*** (0.0355)
social care					0.1026** (0.0440)	0.0997** (0.0432)	0.0972** (0.0478)	0.0794** (0.0402)
wider					0.0881*** (0.0224)	0.0733*** (0.0206)	0.0742*** (0.0207)	0.0762*** (0.0287)
general management					0.4538*** (0.0252)	0.4082*** (0.0239)	0.3972*** (0.0227)	0.4097*** (0.0326)
other					0.0729*** (0.0232)	0.0577** (0.0224)	0.0584** (0.0225)	0.0695** (0.0323)
health professional					0.2506*** (0.0204)	0.2602*** (0.0198)	0.2556*** (0.0197)	0.2615*** (0.0268)
part time						-0.0856*** (0.0110)	-0.0815*** (0.0106)	-0.0776*** (0.0122)

TABLE OA4. THE DETERMINANTS OF LOG EARNINGS (OLS ESTIMATES), FEMALE SUBSAMPLE.

	(1) LGB	(2) Base	(3) +HC	(4) +Demog	(5) +Occup	(6) +Job/Work	(7) Full	(8) Coupled
job permanent						-0.0227 (0.0201)	-0.0204 (0.0191)	-0.0183 (0.0204)
trade union						-0.0379*** (0.0104)	-0.0350*** (0.0099)	-0.0430*** (0.0136)
mentor						-0.0531*** (0.0079)	-0.0485*** (0.0078)	-0.0515*** (0.0123)
happy training						0.0728*** (0.0105)	0.0677*** (0.0108)	0.0718*** (0.0126)
friend						0.0036 (0.0091)	0.0014 (0.0092)	-0.0032 (0.0110)
responsive hours						0.0440*** (0.0093)	0.0452*** (0.0087)	0.0425*** (0.0111)
pressure						0.0222** (0.0094)	0.0255*** (0.0095)	0.0268** (0.0112)
coworker support						0.0122 (0.0128)	0.0116 (0.0130)	0.0047 (0.0167)
work-life balance						-0.0288*** (0.0092)	-0.0274*** (0.0089)	-0.0321** (0.0125)
supervisor support						0.0259** (0.0107)	0.0242** (0.0100)	0.0197 (0.0130)
cooperative							0.0110 (0.0088)	0.0144 (0.0107)
NHS England region (omitted group: North of England)								
Midlands and East of England							0.0210 (0.0165)	0.0248 (0.0194)
London							0.1067*** (0.0174)	0.1219*** (0.0206)
South West							-0.0031 (0.0197)	-0.0110 (0.0231)
South East							0.0362** (0.0164)	0.0421** (0.0206)

TABLE OA4. THE DETERMINANTS OF LOG EARNINGS (OLS ESTIMATES), FEMALE SUBSAMPLE.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	LGB	Base	+HC	+Demog	+Occup	+Job/Work	Full	Coupled
Trust type (omitted group: Acute Trusts)								
Acute Specialist Trusts							0.0498 (0.0341)	0.0423 (0.0361)
Ambulance Trusts							0.1120* (0.0655)	0.1331* (0.0705)
Combined Acute and Community Trusts							0.0034 (0.0168)	0.0102 (0.0207)
Combined Mental Health / Learning Disability and Community Trusts							-0.0198 (0.0238)	0.0011 (0.0257)
Community Trusts							-0.0468** (0.0180)	-0.0523*** (0.0187)
Mental Health / Learning Disability Trusts							-0.0021 (0.0157)	0.0048 (0.0190)
constant	2.7349*** (0.0169)	2.7349*** (0.0169)	1.9777*** (0.0335)	1.9855*** (0.0476)	2.0290*** (0.0532)	2.0128*** (0.0564)	1.9988*** (0.0579)	1.9336*** (0.0658)
Observations	2803	2803	2803	2803	2803	2803	2803	1919
R-squared	0.0002	0.0010	0.4739	0.4851	0.6005	0.6319	0.6431	0.6508
Adj. R-squared	-0.0001	0.0002	0.4718	0.4818	0.5965	0.6267	0.6367	0.6416

Standard errors are in parentheses (clustered at Trust level). * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

TABLE OA5. THE DETERMINANTS OF LOG EARNINGS (OLS ESTIMATES).

Dependent variable is ln(salary)	(1) FULL	(2) MALE	(3) FEMALE
male	0.038*** (0.010)		
LGB			
no disclose & LGB	-0.049*** (0.016)	-0.025 (0.028)	-0.050** (0.019)
disclose & LGB	0.043** (0.017)	0.072*** (0.027)	0.039* (0.023)
Qualifications (omitted group: min qual)			
O level	0.000 (0.051)	-0.150 (0.097)	0.033 (0.039)
GCSE	0.027 (0.053)	-0.146 (0.105)	0.061 (0.041)
trade	0.093 (0.079)	-0.002 (0.175)	0.074 (0.050)
A levels	0.085* (0.048)	-0.024 (0.087)	0.110*** (0.039)
HE and TQ	0.184*** (0.048)	0.072 (0.096)	0.201*** (0.042)
first degree	0.280*** (0.049)	0.172* (0.100)	0.297*** (0.040)
higher degree	0.417*** (0.050)	0.274*** (0.094)	0.445*** (0.042)
potential experience	0.015*** (0.001)	0.017*** (0.003)	0.015*** (0.001)
potential experience squared	-0.000*** (0.000)	-0.000*** (0.000)	-0.000*** (0.000)
age	0.001*** (0.001)	0.003*** (0.001)	0.001** (0.000)
ethnic minority	-0.014 (0.014)	-0.004 (0.033)	-0.023 (0.016)
live in couples	0.047*** (0.008)	0.068*** (0.018)	0.038*** (0.009)
dependent children	0.047*** (0.009)	0.072*** (0.021)	0.043*** (0.009)
disability	-0.031*** (0.008)	-0.022 (0.021)	-0.032*** (0.009)
carer	0.003 (0.008)	0.012 (0.019)	0.001 (0.008)
foreign	-0.029** (0.013)	-0.051* (0.031)	-0.021 (0.015)
Occupational group (omitted group: Registered nurse and midwives)			
allied	0.032** (0.012)	0.054* (0.030)	0.029** (0.013)
ambulance	0.043 (0.063)	0.291*** (0.051)	-0.160*** (0.059)
public health	0.023 (0.038)	-0.024 (0.095)	0.042 (0.043)
commissioning manager	0.134*** (0.031)	0.121** (0.053)	0.155*** (0.035)

TABLE OA5. THE DETERMINANTS OF LOG EARNINGS (OLS ESTIMATES).

Dependent variable is ln(salary)	(1) FULL	(2) MALE	(3) FEMALE
nursing auxiliary	-0.134*** (0.020)	-0.187*** (0.047)	-0.109*** (0.024)
social care	0.164*** (0.041)	0.399*** (0.140)	0.097** (0.047)
wider	0.067*** (0.019)	0.097** (0.043)	0.074*** (0.020)
general management	0.371*** (0.022)	0.340*** (0.055)	0.397*** (0.022)
other	0.046** (0.019)	0.031 (0.047)	0.058** (0.022)
health professional	0.228*** (0.016)	0.186*** (0.041)	0.255*** (0.019)
part time	-0.083*** (0.010)	-0.079** (0.031)	-0.081*** (0.010)
job permanent	-0.005 (0.016)	0.050* (0.028)	-0.020 (0.019)
trade union	-0.028*** (0.009)	-0.013 (0.024)	-0.035*** (0.009)
mentor	-0.046*** (0.007)	-0.042* (0.023)	-0.048*** (0.007)
happy training	0.068*** (0.010)	0.067*** (0.021)	0.067*** (0.010)
friend	0.010 (0.008)	0.045** (0.020)	0.001 (0.009)
responsive hours	0.043*** (0.008)	0.033 (0.023)	0.045*** (0.008)
pressure	0.034*** (0.008)	0.064*** (0.020)	0.025*** (0.009)
coworker support	0.018* (0.009)	0.036 (0.025)	0.011 (0.013)
work-life balance	-0.027*** (0.008)	-0.019 (0.023)	-0.027*** (0.008)
supervisor support	0.028*** (0.009)	0.055** (0.024)	0.024** (0.010)
NHS England region (omitted group: North of England)			
Midlands and East of England	0.025* (0.015)	0.047 (0.030)	0.021 (0.016)
London	0.122*** (0.016)	0.175*** (0.032)	0.106*** (0.017)
South West	0.006 (0.019)	0.049 (0.037)	-0.003 (0.019)
South East	0.037** (0.016)	0.052 (0.031)	0.036** (0.016)
Trust type (omitted group: Acute Trusts)			
Acute Specialist Trusts	0.021 (0.030)	-0.044 (0.051)	0.049 (0.034)
Ambulance Trusts	-0.005 (0.069)	-0.242*** (0.047)	0.112* (0.065)

TABLE OA5. THE DETERMINANTS OF LOG EARNINGS (OLS ESTIMATES).

Dependent variable is ln(salary)	(1)	(2)	(3)
	FULL	MALE	FEMALE
Combined Acute and Community Trusts	0.000 (0.016)	0.007 (0.033)	0.003 (0.016)
Combined Mental Health / Learning Disability and Community Trusts	-0.043** (0.020)	<i>-0.133***</i> (0.034)	<i>-0.019</i> (0.023)
Community Trusts	-0.041** (0.017)	0.004 (0.029)	<i>-0.046**</i> (0.018)
Mental Health / Learning Disability Trusts	-0.008 (0.013)	-0.026 (0.025)	-0.002 (0.015)
cooperative	0.008 (0.008)	-0.000 (0.022)	0.011 (0.008)
constant	1.977*** (0.056)	1.922*** (0.099)	1.998*** (0.057)
Observations	3556	753	2803
R-squared	0.624	0.601	0.643
Adj. R-squared	0.618	0.573	0.636

Standard errors are in parentheses (clustered at Trust level). * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Coefficient pairs difference (Male Vs. Female): bold p<0.10, bold and italic p<0.05.

TABLE OA6. PROBABILITY OF DISCLOSURE, MARGINAL EFFECTS.

Probability of disclosure	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)	
	All LGB		LGB where network exists		LGB where network exists		LGB where network exists	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
LGB network exists	-0.078 (0.070)	0.180*** (0.062)						
LGB network member					0.208*** (0.069)	0.148** (0.065)		
Qualifications (omitted group: O level or GCSE grades D-G)								
GCSE grades A-C	-0.172 (0.267)	-0.329 (0.254)	-0.610*** (0.204)	-0.010 (0.249)				
A levels	0.052 (0.236)	0.035 (0.217)	-0.098 (0.216)	0.296* (0.165)				
HE and TQ	0.101 (0.229)	-0.181 (0.223)	-0.107 (0.193)	0.110 (0.194)				
first degree	0.049 (0.229)	-0.211 (0.214)	-0.109 (0.200)	0.121 (0.188)				
higher degree	0.171 (0.221)	-0.041 (0.219)	-0.047 (0.202)	0.384** (0.183)				
Occupational group (omitted group: allied)								
ambulance	0.560*** (0.078)	-0.316*** (0.057)	0.568*** (0.114)	-0.307*** (0.052)				
commissioning manager	0.059 (0.196)	-0.014 (0.170)	-0.048 (0.199)	0.060 (0.174)				
registered nurse	0.187* (0.110)	0.111 (0.094)	0.157 (0.136)	0.124 (0.083)				
nursing auxiliary	0.133 (0.190)	0.164 (0.142)	0.157 (0.198)	0.280* (0.153)				
wider	0.141 (0.110)	0.275*** (0.095)	0.287** (0.131)	0.405*** (0.081)				
general management	0.249** (0.124)	0.212* (0.128)	0.246 (0.156)	0.395*** (0.117)				
other	0.162 (0.123)	0.013 (0.125)	0.001 (0.168)	-0.025 (0.122)				
health professional	-0.081 (0.098)	0.001 (0.097)	0.013 (0.121)	0.097 (0.097)				
Demographic								
male								
age	0.004 (0.003)	0.001 (0.002)	0.006* (0.003)	0.001 (0.002)				
ethnic minority	0.089 (0.106)	-0.202 (0.132)	0.071 (0.120)	0.001 (0.138)				
foreign	-0.081 (0.094)	0.036 (0.134)	-0.085 (0.103)	-0.252* (0.139)				
married	-0.085 (0.081)	0.159*** (0.058)	-0.033 (0.080)	0.251*** (0.065)				
dependent children	-0.305** (0.146)	-0.002 (0.069)	-0.552*** (0.168)	0.077 (0.080)				

TABLE OA6. PROBABILITY OF DISCLOSURE, MARGINAL EFFECTS.

Probability of disclosure	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	All LGB		LGB where network exists	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
disability	0.049 (0.061)	-0.041 (0.069)	0.059 (0.056)	-0.102 (0.074)
carer	-0.064 (0.071)	0.115 (0.079)	-0.069 (0.078)	0.147* (0.076)
Job characteristics				
tenure	0.001 (0.005)	-0.015*** (0.006)	-0.003 (0.005)	-0.017*** (0.005)
part time	-0.217 (0.155)	0.086 (0.082)	-0.199* (0.117)	-0.036 (0.089)
job permanent	-0.011 (0.101)	0.263** (0.125)	-0.232 (0.145)	0.491*** (0.130)
trade union	0.163* (0.087)	0.043 (0.059)	0.225** (0.092)	-0.005 (0.062)
Workplace characteristics				
mentor	0.029 (0.071)	0.084 (0.064)	-0.017 (0.066)	0.167** (0.067)
responsive hours	0.056 (0.078)	0.160** (0.066)	0.079 (0.075)	0.144* (0.076)
pressure	0.006 (0.076)	0.061 (0.064)	0.036 (0.078)	0.129 (0.080)
coworker support	-0.015 (0.067)	-0.051 (0.062)	-0.041 (0.073)	-0.071 (0.074)
work-life balance	0.088 (0.082)	0.167*** (0.058)	0.137* (0.081)	0.279*** (0.058)
supervisor support	0.078 (0.070)	-0.169*** (0.052)	0.106 (0.079)	-0.223*** (0.062)
witnessed bullying	-0.009 (0.037)	-0.089*** (0.030)	-0.005 (0.039)	-0.104*** (0.037)
discrimination	0.091* (0.050)	-0.046 (0.037)	0.054 (0.061)	-0.020 (0.036)
NHS England region (omitted group: North of England)				
Midlands and East of England	-0.023 (0.103)	0.070 (0.084)	0.082 (0.118)	-0.135 (0.086)
London	0.074 (0.099)	0.018 (0.097)	0.118 (0.093)	-0.166* (0.091)
South West	0.038 (0.172)	0.307*** (0.111)	-0.109 (0.186)	0.237** (0.106)
South East	0.178** (0.089)	0.231*** (0.087)	0.191** (0.094)	0.118 (0.092)
Trust type (omitted group: Acute Trusts)				
Acute Specialist Trusts	0.084 (0.147)	0.228* (0.135)	0.219*** (0.068)	0.427*** (0.071)
Ambulance Trusts	-0.568***	0.610***	-0.576***	0.567***

TABLE OA6. PROBABILITY OF DISCLOSURE, MARGINAL EFFECTS.

Probability of disclosure	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	All LGB		LGB where network exists	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Combined Acute and Community Trusts	0.027 (0.043)	0.289*** (0.052)	0.070 (0.045)	0.189 (0.048)
Combined Mental Health / Learning Dis	0.016 (0.129)	0.048 (0.087)	-0.087 (0.096)	-0.111 (0.121)
Community Trusts	-0.139 (0.113)	-0.095 (0.082)	-0.138 (0.108)	-0.107* (0.075)
Mental Health / Learning Disability Trust	0.091 (0.112)	-0.004 (0.079)	0.034 (0.101)	0.082 (0.061)
Observations	210	230	164	160
Pseudo R squared	0.171	0.299	0.348	0.468

Standard errors are in parentheses (clustered at Trust level). * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

TABLE OA7.

TEST - GENDER PROBIT MODELS SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT

Male Network Vs. Female Network	χ^2	<i>561.47</i>
	Prob > χ^2	(0.0000)
Male Member any Vs. Female Member any	χ^2	<i>588.63</i>
	Prob > χ^2	(0.0000)

χ^2 sig tests: bold and italic p<0.05.

H0: No significant difference between models.

TABLE OA8.
JOINT TESTING OF EXPLANATORY VARIABLE GROUPINGS

Groups		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
		Network		Member any	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
Qualifications					
	χ^2	4.25	<i>17.20</i>	<i>14.15</i>	<i>21.72</i>
	Prob > χ^2	(0.5136)	<i>(0.0041)</i>	<i>(0.0147)</i>	<i>(0.0006)</i>
Occupation					
	χ^2	<i>80.66</i>	<i>72.80</i>	<i>66.92</i>	<i>81.55</i>
	Prob > χ^2	<i>(0.0000)</i>	<i>(0.0000)</i>	<i>(0.0000)</i>	<i>(0.0000)</i>
Demographics					
	χ^2	10.28	10.45	<i>15.80</i>	<i>14.70</i>
	Prob > χ^2	(0.1733)	(0.1645)	<i>(0.0270)</i>	<i>(0.0401)</i>
NHS England region					
	χ^2	5.68	<i>12.05</i>	6.22	<i>16.92</i>
	Prob > χ^2	(0.2247)	<i>(0.0170)</i>	(0.1831)	<i>(0.0020)</i>
Trust type					
	χ^2	<i>103.10</i>	<i>57.42</i>	<i>53.31</i>	<i>39.07</i>
	Prob > χ^2	<i>(0.0000)</i>	<i>(0.0000)</i>	<i>(0.0000)</i>	<i>(0.0000)</i>
Job characteristics					
	χ^2	5.08	<i>8.98</i>	<i>13.39</i>	<i>19.62</i>
	Prob > χ^2	(0.2793)	<i>(0.0617)</i>	<i>(0.0095)</i>	<i>(0.0006)</i>
Workplace characteristics					
	χ^2	10.02	<i>34.25</i>	12.87	<i>59.83</i>
	Prob > χ^2	(0.2640)	<i>(0.0000)</i>	(0.1163)	<i>(0.0000)</i>
Observations		210	230	164	160

χ^2 group sig tests: bold p<0.10, bold and italic p<0.05.

H₀: No significant relationship as a group with the probability to disclose.

Note: Qualifications include: O level, GCSE A-C, trade, A levels, HE and TQ, first degree, and higher degree. Occupation includes: ambulance, public health, commissioning manager, nurses, nursing auxiliary, social care, wider, general management, and other. Demographics include: age, ethnic minority, foreign, married, dependent children, disability, and carer. NHS England region includes: Midlands and East of England, London, South West, and South East. Trust type includes: Acute Specialist, Ambulance, Combine Acute and Community, Combined Mental Health/Learning Disability and Community, Community, and Mental Health/Learning Disability. Job characteristics include: tenure, part time, job permanent and trade union. Workplace characteristics include: mentor, responsive hours, pressure, coworker support, work-life balance, supervisor support, witnessed bullying and discrimination.