

**Supplement to “When “Who I Am” Is Under Threat: Measures of Threat to Identity
Value, Meanings, And Enactment”**

Table of Contents

Supplement A: Study Materials for Stages 3, 4, 5, and the additional study	3
Stage 3: Threats to Teachers’ Work Identity	3
Stage 4: Threats to Pregnant Women’s Leader Identity.....	6
Stage 5: Threats to Organizational Members’ LGBTQ identities.....	9
Additional Study: Threats to Teachers’ Work Identity	12
Supplement B: Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Inter-item Correlations for Stages 2 and 3	15
Stage 2 – Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Inter-item Correlations	15
Stage 3 – Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Inter-item Correlations	16
Supplement C: Model Comparisons for Confirmatory Factor Analyses with Parallel and Tau-equivalent Models for Stages 3, 4 and 5.....	18
Supplement D: Supplemental Tables for Temporal Consistency Analyses.....	19
Stage 3 – Results of G-studies.....	19
Stage 4 – Results of G-studies.....	20
Supplement E: Results of the CI _{CFA} Analyses.....	21
Supplement F: Path Analyses for Stages 3, 4 and 5	22
Stage 3	22

Stage 4.....	23
Stage 5.....	23
Supplement G: Additional Study Discriminant Validity Analyses.....	28
Participants and Procedures	29
Results	30
Supplement H: Means, Standard Deviations, Cronbach’s alpha, and Correlations of Variables with all Demographics (Stages 3, 4 and 5)	35
References	42

Supplement A: Study Materials for Stages 3, 4, 5, and the additional study

Stage 3: Threats to Teachers' Work Identity

In Stage 3, we measured teachers' perceptions of threat to their identity using the following instructions:

“Please take a moment to think about technological change and the rise in online teaching. The following questions are concerned with how your identity as a teacher is affected by this experience. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.”

We then displayed the 19 identity threat items. Below, we describe the items that correspond to each type of threat.

Threat to Identity Value

1. I feel that there is a negative value attached to my identity as a teacher.
2. Being a teacher is worth less in the eyes of others than before.
3. I feel that others attach a negative value to my identity as a teacher.
4. I feel that my identity as a teacher is devalued by others.
5. I feel that others see little value in my identity as a teacher.

Threat to Identity Meanings

1. I am no longer sure what it means to be a teacher.
2. I am questioning what it means to be a teacher.
3. I find myself questioning what it means to be a teacher.
4. The core of what it means to be a teacher is changing in a way I do not like.
5. What it means to be a teacher is changing in a way I do not like.
6. What it means to be a teacher is being called into question.
7. Being a teacher used to mean something different.

8. I feel that being a teacher does not mean the same thing anymore.

Threat to Identity Enactment

1. I am limited in my ability to express my identity as a teacher.
2. I may no longer be able to engage in activities that express my identity as a teacher.
3. I may no longer be able to show that I am a teacher.
4. I worry about no longer being able to express my identity as a teacher.
5. I worry that I cannot behave in the way a teacher behaves.
6. I worry that I cannot show people that I am a teacher.

To measure the four orbiting constructs described in our literature review, we used the following scales.

Self-esteem

We assessed self-esteem using Rosenberg's 10-item scale (Rosenberg, 1979; Schmitt & Allik, 2005). We asked our participants to rate their degree of agreement with the 10 items. Items included: "I feel that I have a number of good qualities", "On the whole, I am satisfied with myself."

Self-verification striving

To measure people's tendency to self-verify, we used Cable and Kay's (2012) 8-item scale. Participants were asked to rate their degree of agreement with the 8 statements. Sample items were: "I like to be myself rather than trying to act like someone I am not", "It's worth it to be truthful with others about my habits and personality so that they know what to expect from me."

Identity suppression

To gauge the extent to which people suppress who they are, we adapted and shortened Madera et al.'s (2012) identity suppression scale. Because the original scale aims to capture the

extent to which people suppress their ethnic identity at work, some items did not make sense in the teacher context. As above, participants were asked to rate their level of agreement with the items. Our final 5 items were: “I refrain from talking about my identity as a teacher”, “I conceal or camouflage signs of this identity”, “No one knows how important this identity is to me”, “I suppress this identity”, “I try not to use the language, vernacular, or speech style of this identity.”

Identification

To gauge the extent to which our participants identified as a teacher, we used Cameron’s (2004) 3-item scale. Sample items were: “In general, being a teacher is an important part of my self-image”, “I often think about the fact that I am a teacher.”

To capture antecedents or sources of identity threat, we gauged teachers’ perceptions of transformational and frequent change.

Transformational Change

To capture the degree to which our teachers were exposed to technological change, we used Rafferty and Griffin’s (2006) 3-item transformational change scale. Our instructions were the following: “Think about technological changes affecting the work environment of teachers, such as the rise in online teaching. To what extent have you experienced...”. Sample items included: “Large scale changes significantly changing your department’s goals”, “Changes that affect your work department structure.”

Frequent Change

To assess teachers’ perceptions of change frequency, we employed the above instructions and Rafferty and Griffin’s (2006) frequent change 3-item scale, e.g., “It feels like change is always happening.”

For the outcome variables, we measured identity exit intentions, task proficiency, and emotional exhaustion.

Identity Exit Intentions

We used a 3-item measure to capture people's intention to exit their current role-identity (Barthauer et al., 2020). Participants rated their degree of agreement with each of the three items. An example item is: "I frequently think about abandoning my current line of work."

Task Proficiency

We assessed task proficiency using a 3-item scale (Griffin et al., 2007). We asked our participants to rate the extent to which, in the past few weeks, they: e.g., "Carried out [their] tasks well."

Emotional Exhaustion

To gauge emotional exhaustion, we employed Iverson et al.'s (1998) 3 items, e.g., "I feel emotionally drained from my work", "I feel burned out from my work".

For the discriminant validity assessment, we chose employees' green behaviors as it is theoretically unrelated to identity threat. The items are specified below.

Employees' Voluntary Green Behaviors

Teachers were asked to rate the extent to which they "Act in environmentally friendly ways", alongside two additional items (Norton et al., 2017)

Stage 4: Threats to Pregnant Women's Leader Identity

In Stage 4, the following stem prefaced the identity threat items:

"Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. Since becoming pregnant..."

Threat to Identity Value

1. I feel that there is a negative value attached to my identity as a leader.
2. Being a leader is worth less in the eyes of others than before.
3. I feel that others attach a negative value to my identity as a leader.

4. I feel that my identity as a leader is devalued by others.
5. I feel that others see little value in my identity as a leader.

Threat to Identity Meanings

1. I am no longer sure what it means to be a leader.
2. I am questioning what it means to be a leader.
3. I find myself questioning what it means to be a leader.
4. The core of what it means to be a leader is changing in a way I do not like.
5. What it means to be a leader is changing in a way I do not like.
6. What it means to be a leader is being called into question.
7. Being a leader used to mean something different.
8. I feel that being a leader does not mean the same thing anymore.

Threat to Identity Enactment

1. I am limited in my ability to express my identity as a leader.
2. I may no longer be able to engage in activities that express my identity as a leader.
3. I may no longer be able to show that I am a leader.
4. I worry about no longer being able to express my identity as a leader.
5. I worry that I cannot behave in the way a leader behaves.
6. I worry that I cannot show people that I am a leader.

Where needed, we adapted the orbiting constructs' measures, see below.

Self-esteem

Self-esteem was measured with the same items as in Stage 3.

Self-verification Striving

Self-verification striving was measured with the same items as in Stage 3.

Identity Suppression

We used an adapted and shortened version of Madera et al.'s (2012) identity suppression scale. The instructions were: "The below statements are about your identity as a leader. Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements." Item 1 was: "I refrain from talking about my identity as a leader." Items 2 to 5 were the same as above (Stage 3).

Identification

Sample items were: "In general, being a leader is an important part of my self-image", "I often think about the fact that I am a leader."

To capture antecedents to pregnant leaders' identity threat, we measured workplace incivility and workplace norms.

Workplace Incivility

To capture workplace incivility, we used Gloor et al.'s (2018) 7-item scale, prefaced with the following instructions: "Since being pregnant, have you been in a situation where any of your supervisors or coworkers at work..." Sample items included: "Put you down or was condescending to you", "Paid little attention to your statement or showed little interest in your opinion", "Made demeaning or derogatory remarks about you."

Workplace Norms

To measure workplace norms, we used Glick et al.'s (2018) 8-item masculinity contest scale, prefaced with the following instructions: "We are interested in the values and norms you experience in your work environment. Please indicate how well each of the following statements describes the place where you work. Please note that we are NOT asking about your own personal values but rather the norms within your work environment. In my work environment...". Sample items were: "Admitting you don't know the answer looks weak", "Expressing any emotion other than anger or pride is seen as weak", "To succeed, you can't let family interfere with work".

To capture pregnant women's intentions to exit their leader identity, we adapted Barthauer et al.'s (2020) scale. The other two outcome variables were measured with the same items as in Stage 3. See below.

Identity Exit Intentions

The adapted items were: "I frequently think about abandoning my current leadership role", "I am actively searching for an alternative to my current leadership role", and "When I can, I will leave my leadership role."

Task Proficiency

See Stage 3 description.

Emotional Exhaustion

See Stage 3 description.

Stage 5: Threats to Organizational Members' LGBTQ identities

The following instructions prefaced the identity threat items:

"The statements below are about your LGBTQ identity, and how you relate to it, specifically at work. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. At work..."

Threat to Identity Value

1. I feel that there is a negative value attached to my identity as LGBTQ.
2. Being LGBTQ is worth less in the eyes of others than before.
3. I feel that others attach a negative value to my identity as LGBTQ.
4. I feel that my identity as LGBTQ is devalued by others.
5. I feel that others see little value in my identity as LGBTQ.

Threat to Identity Meanings

1. I am no longer sure what it means to be LGBTQ.

2. I am questioning what it means to be LGBTQ.
3. I find myself questioning what it means to be LGBTQ.
4. The core of what it means to be LGBTQ is changing in a way I do not like.
5. What it means to be LGBTQ is changing in a way I do not like.
6. What it means to be LGBTQ is being called into question.
7. Being LGBTQ used to mean something different.
8. I feel that being LGBTQ does not mean the same thing anymore.

Threat to Identity Enactment

1. I am limited in my ability to express my identity as LGBTQ.
2. I may no longer be able to engage in activities that express my identity as LGBTQ.
3. I may no longer be able to show that I am LGBTQ.
4. I worry about no longer being able to express my identity as LGBTQ.
5. I worry that I cannot behave in the way LGBTQ individuals behave.
6. I worry that I cannot show people that I am LGBTQ.

We adapted the identity suppression and identification items, see below.

Self-esteem

Self-esteem was measured with the same items as in Stage 3.

Self-verification Striving

Self-verification striving was measured with the same items as in Stage 3.

Identity Suppression

We adapted and shortened Madera et al.'s (2012) identity suppression scale. *Instructions were:* "The below statements are about your identity as LGBTQ and the extent to which you express this identity at work. Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements." Items are reproduced below:

1. I refrain from talking about my identity as LGBTQ at work.
2. At work, no one knows how important this identity is to me.
3. I suppress this identity at work.
4. I try not to talk about this identity at work.

Identification

Sample items were: “Being LGBTQ is an important part of my self-image”, “Being LGBTQ is an important part of who I am.”

The two antecedents we measured were LGBTQ individuals’ workplace microaggression experiences and workplace discrimination.

Workplace Microaggressions

To measure workplace microaggressions, we used 11 of the 12 items from Resnick and Galupo’s (2019) workplace values subscale, prefaced with the following instructions: “The following is a list of experiences that LGBTQ people sometimes have in the workplace. Please read each one carefully, and then respond to the following question. During the past 12 months in your workplace, how often have the following experiences occurred with a colleague, clientele, or your work environment?”. Sample items included: “Not getting paid as much because of your LGBTQ identity” and “Being overlooked for a promotion based on your LGBTQ identity”. We chose not to include the following item: “Hearing a colleague or a customer being called names such as ‘fag,’ ‘dyke,’ or ‘tranny’.”

Workplace Discrimination

To capture workplace discrimination, we used seven of the 15 items in Ragins and Cornwell’s (2001) study and asked our participants to rate their degree of agreement with those. The seven items were:

1. At work, I have sometimes been unfairly singled out because I identify as LGBTQ.

2. Prejudice against LGBTQ individuals exists where I work.
3. Where I work all people are treated the same, regardless of whether they are LGBTQ or not (Reverse coded)
4. At work I feel socially isolated because I am LGBTQ.
5. At work, LGBTQ employees receive fewer opportunities.
6. There is discrimination against LGBTQ individuals where I work.
7. At work I am treated poorly because I identify as LGBTQ.

Outcomes of identity threat included organizational turnover intentions, task proficiency, and emotional exhaustion.

Turnover Intentions

Participants were asked to rate the extent to which they agree with 3 statements. (Mobley et al., 1978). These included: “Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements. I often think about leaving my current employer.”, “I am actively searching for an acceptable alternative to this organization.”

Task Proficiency

See Stage 3 description.

Emotional Exhaustion

See Stage 3 description.

For the discriminant validity assessment, we chose employees’ green behaviors as it is theoretically unrelated to identity threat. The items are specified below.

Employees’ Voluntary Green Behaviors

We used the same measure as in Stage 3.

Additional Study: Threats to Teachers’ Work Identity

We conducted an additional study with a new sample of teachers to compute supplementary discriminant validity analyses (see Supplement G). For this study, we employed the same measures as in Stage 3 (except for employees' voluntary green behaviors). All the Stage 3 scales were included at Time 1 and Time 2. The order of items was not randomized. We also included several attention checks throughout.

Further, we incorporated three additional measures: Two measures of self-efficacy and one measure of identification. We describe these below. Participants responded to all the below items on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

General Self-efficacy

We used Chen et al.'s (2001) 8-item scale. Participants were asked to rate the extent to which they agree with these. Sample items included: "I will be able to achieve most of the goals that I have set for myself", "When facing difficult tasks, I am certain that I will accomplish them."

Work-specific Self-efficacy

To capture work-specific self-efficacy, we used another 8-item measure (Chen et al., 2004). Sample items were: "I can successfully overcome obstacles at work", "I can effectively handle difficult tasks at work."

Occupational Identification (Ashforth et al., 2013; Mael & Ashforth, 1992)

Our second measure of identification (see description in main manuscript) was the one developed by Mael & Ashforth (1992) and later established by Ashforth et al. (2013) as a 3-item measure tapping into occupational identification. We used the following instructions: "The following questions are about your occupation as a teacher and how you relate to it. Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements." Sample items were:

“When someone criticizes my occupation, it feels like a personal insult”, “If a story in the media criticized my occupation, I would feel embarrassed.”

Supplement B: Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Inter-item Correlations for Stages 2 and 3

Stage 2 – Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Inter-item Correlations

Table 1

Item Means. Standard Deviations. and Inter-item Correlations (Stage 2 - Teachers)

Scale	Item	M	SD	V1	V2	V3	V4	V5	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	M7	M8	E1	E2	E3	E3	E5
Threat to Identity Value	V1	2.16	1.13																		
	V2	2.84	1.35	.64																	
	V3	2.25	1.17	.72	.66																
	V4	2.51	1.31	.74	.76	.72															
	V5	2.44	1.22	.66	.70	.68	.73														
Threat to Identity Meanings	M1	2.10	1.09	.52	.50	.48	.53	.55													
	M2	2.47	1.30	.51	.52	.47	.57	.55	.70												
	M3	2.52	1.28	.51	.51	.49	.58	.54	.69	.81											
	M4	2.58	1.28	.51	.58	.52	.59	.54	.61	.60	.59										
	M5	2.63	1.30	.55	.60	.56	.59	.55	.66	.61	.60	.79									
	M6	2.61	1.30	.57	.64	.56	.64	.62	.56	.69	.66	.63	.63								
	M7	3.19	1.28	.51	.62	.50	.57	.54	.50	.50	.51	.58	.58	.63							
	M8	2.84	1.32	.60	.66	.57	.64	.64	.59	.62	.64	.68	.66	.68	.73						
Threat to Identity Enactment	E1	2.06	1.02	.49	.46	.48	.52	.53	.57	.58	.51	.60	.59	.58	.45	.51					
	E2	2.07	1.04	.46	.45	.49	.52	.54	.60	.57	.52	.56	.57	.54	.46	.53	.65				
	E3	1.83	.95	.49	.41	.49	.50	.52	.63	.56	.52	.53	.54	.50	.40	.48	.62	.64			
	E4	1.96	.99	.49	.44	.51	.52	.52	.58	.55	.54	.50	.53	.55	.42	.50	.62	.63	.65		
	E5	2.00	1.06	.43	.42	.43	.50	.45	.55	.51	.48	.48	.51	.50	.43	.46	.58	.56	.58	.53	
	E6	1.81	.96	.45	.37	.43	.45	.48	.50	.48	.44	.41	.41	.46	.36	.38	.61	.56	.67	.59	.58

Note. N = 494. Item text is reproduced in Supplement A.

Stage 3 – Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Inter-item Correlations

Table 2

Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Inter-item Correlations at Time 1 (Stage 3 – Teachers)

Scale	Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	V1	V2	V3	V4	V5	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	M7	M8	E1	E2	E3	E3	E5
Threat to Identity Value	V1	2.25	1.19																		
	V2	2.76	1.30	.61																	
	V3	2.34	1.21	.75	.58																
	V4	2.57	1.26	.69	.69	.69															
	V5	2.49	1.21	.64	.63	.61	.64														
Threat to Identity Meanings	M1	2.06	1.08	.50	.40	.43	.45	.47													
	M2	2.42	1.25	.46	.43	.45	.47	.46	.63												
	M3	2.49	1.25	.44	.42	.44	.41	.46	.58	.76											
	M4	2.65	1.26	.55	.50	.46	.53	.51	.55	.59	.58										
	M5	2.71	1.28	.53	.51	.43	.53	.47	.54	.52	.52	.78									
	M6	2.69	1.25	.58	.60	.52	.58	.56	.48	.60	.54	.55	.54								
	M7	3.08	1.26	.43	.51	.39	.49	.48	.46	.55	.52	.61	.58	.60							
	M8	2.81	1.29	.56	.57	.46	.55	.53	.50	.57	.56	.65	.64	.54	.67						
Threat to Identity Enactment	E1	2.17	1.10	.43	.34	.38	.38	.39	.50	.46	.47	.49	.50	.42	.40	.41					
	E2	2.19	1.09	.43	.36	.37	.38	.38	.51	.43	.45	.50	.52	.41	.39	.45	.61				
	E3	1.85	.95	.41	.32	.41	.39	.40	.56	.43	.44	.41	.39	.38	.32	.35	.50	.54			
	E4	2.04	1.08	.46	.38	.42	.44	.39	.58	.47	.51	.50	.50	.42	.38	.47	.63	.60	.58		
	E5	2.05	1.08	.38	.31	.30	.28	.34	.51	.44	.43	.41	.38	.41	.31	.34	.46	.46	.51	.50	
	E6	1.76	.87	.43	.32	.40	.38	.38	.47	.41	.39	.36	.35	.37	.29	.34	.45	.49	.62	.58	.50

Note. *N* = 500. Item text is reproduced in Supplement A.

Table 3*Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Inter-item Correlations at Time 2 (Stage 3 – Teachers)*

Scale	Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	V1	V2	V3	V4	V5	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	M7	M8	E1	E2	E3	E3	E5
Threat to Identity Value	V1	2.27	1.17																		
	V2	2.81	1.30	.63																	
	V3	2.39	1.21	.76	.63																
	V4	2.61	1.26	.70	.72	.73															
	V5	2.55	1.20	.67	.68	.70	.72														
Threat to Identity Meanings	M1	2.13	1.07	.49	.49	.49	.48	.52													
	M2	2.44	1.24	.52	.53	.48	.52	.54	.68												
	M3	2.50	1.23	.49	.48	.46	.50	.54	.71	.76											
	M4	2.65	1.21	.55	.56	.47	.54	.53	.62	.62	.63										
	M5	2.75	1.23	.57	.59	.52	.57	.52	.61	.62	.62	.77									
	M6	2.65	1.19	.58	.66	.56	.63	.59	.57	.61	.60	.61	.64								
	M7	3.15	1.24	.45	.60	.46	.52	.52	.49	.51	.54	.58	.59	.58							
	M8	2.83	1.26	.56	.62	.53	.55	.57	.61	.67	.64	.67	.67	.66	.71						
Threat to Identity Enactment	E1	2.31	1.12	.48	.45	.44	.46	.49	.55	.51	.51	.56	.53	.48	.43	.55					
	E2	2.23	1.12	.48	.43	.45	.44	.48	.57	.56	.54	.60	.56	.47	.44	.57	.66				
	E3	1.96	0.98	.47	.38	.44	.44	.47	.57	.52	.53	.48	.47	.41	.36	.48	.58	.57			
	E4	2.14	1.07	.53	.47	.47	.50	.54	.65	.60	.60	.57	.53	.51	.45	.59	.67	.72	.61		
	E5	2.18	1.10	.39	.32	.41	.38	.40	.56	.53	.50	.43	.42	.42	.37	.44	.54	.51	.52	.62	
	E6	1.89	0.99	.45	.38	.44	.37	.40	.54	.46	.45	.43	.41	.40	.34	.45	.57	.53	.64	.60	.53

Note. *N* = 426. Item text is reproduced in Supplement A.

Supplement C: Model Comparisons for Confirmatory Factor Analyses with Parallel and Tau-equivalent Models for Stages 3, 4 and 5

Table 4

Model Comparison for Confirmatory Factor Analyses (Stages 3, 4, and 5)

Model	Stage	Time	χ^2	<i>df</i>	$\Delta\chi^2$	CFI	RMSEA	SRMR
Congeneric three-factor model	3	Time 1	732.71	149		.91	.09	.05
	3	Time 2	550.99	149		.94	.08	.04
	4	Time 1	318.32	149		.94	.08	.04
	4	Time 2	378.32	149		.92	.10	.04
	5		888.49	149		.87	.10	.06
Tau equivalent three-factor model	3	Time 1	1536.56	181	803.85***	.79	.12	.09
	3	Time 2	1277.29	181	726.30***	.82	.12	.09
	4	Time 1	436.39	181	118.07***	.90	.09	.06
	4	Time 2	480.83	181	102.51***	.89	.10	.06
	5		1482.3	181	593.81***	.78	.12	.09
Parallel three-factor model	3	Time 1	1655.69	197	922.98***	.77	.12	.08
	3	Time 2	1432.55	197	881.56***	.80	.12	.08
	4	Time 1	464.67	197	146.35***	.90	.09	.06
	4	Time 2	527.47	197	149.15***	.88	.10	.06
	5		1677.37	197	788.88***	.75	.12	.09

Note. Stage 3: Time 1 $N = 500$, Time 2 $N = 426$; Stage 4: Time 1 $N = 186$, Time 2 $N = 157$; Stage 5: $N = 506$. *** $p < .001$

Supplement D: Supplemental Tables for Temporal Consistency Analyses

Stage 3 – Results of G-studies

Table 5

Results of six G-studies of Threat to Identity Value, Meanings, and Enactment: Proportions of Observed Variance Attributed to Each Facet in Stage 3 (Teachers), Before and After Deletion of Temporally Inconsistent Participants

Facet	Variance Component Estimate					
	Threat to Identity Value		Threat to Identity Meanings		Threat to Identity Enactment	
	Before Deletion	After Deletion	Before Deletion	After Deletion	Before Deletion	After Deletion
Person	.82 (52.8%)	.88 (62.9%)	.72 (45.6%)	.83 (55.7%)	.49 (43.1%)	.52 (52.4%)
Item	.04 (2.6%)	.03 (2.2%)	.09 (5.8%)	.07 (4.9%)	.03 (2.4%)	.02 (2.1%)
Time	.00 (0%)	.00 (0%)	.00 (0%)	.00 (0%)	.00 (0.4%)	.00 (0.3%)
Person-by-item	.07 (4.8%)	.08 (5.7%)	.14 (8.6%)	.13 (9%)	.06 (5.5%)	.06 (6.3%)
Person-by-time	.20 (12.8%)	.12 (8.5%)	.18 (11.1%)	.12 (8.1%)	.14 (12.2%)	.09 (9.3%)
Item-by-time	.00 (0%)	.00 (0%)	.00 (0%)	.00 (0.1%)	.00 (0%)	.00 (0.3%)
Person-by-item-by-time (error)	.42 (26.9%)	.30 (20.7%)	.46 (28.9%)	.33 (22.3%)	.41 (36.9%)	.30 (29.6%)

Note. Before deletion of temporally inconsistent respondents $N = 426$. After deletion of temporally inconsistent respondents $N = 319$. Temporally inconsistent respondents were identified using the D^2_{ptc} technique as described in DeSimone (2015). Full D^2_{ptc} results can be found under https://osf.io/b5hrt/?view_only=c1f17b92103c47c8abc9fb795056cbb9.

Stage 4 – Results of G-studies

Table 6

Results of six G-studies of Threat to Identity Value, Meanings, and Enactment: Proportions of Observed Variance Attributed to Each Facet in Stage 4 (Pregnant Leaders), Before and After Deletion of Temporally Inconsistent Participants

Facet	Variance Component Estimate					
	Threat to Identity Value		Threat to Identity Meanings		Threat to Identity Enactment	
	Before Deletion	After Deletion	Before Deletion	After Deletion	Before Deletion	After Deletion
Person	.51 (44.8%)	.56 (61.2%)	.64 (46.0%)	.71 (59.6%)	.60 (44.1%)	.66 (57.2%)
Item	.00 (0.4%)	.00 (0.2%)	.02 (1.2%)	.01 (0.9%)	.00 (0.3%)	.00 (0.2%)
Time	.01 (1.2%)	.01 (0.9%)	.01 (1.0%)	.02 (1.5%)	.01 (0.4%)	.00 (0%)
Person-by-item	.00 (0%)	.01 (1.5%)	.06 (4.6%)	.06 (4.8%)	.09 (6.4%)	.10 (8.7%)
Person-by-time	.24 (20.5%)	.13 (14.3%)	.23 (16.2%)	.13 (11.0%)	.25 (18.1%)	.14 (12.0%)
Item-by-time	.00 (0%)	.00 (0.1%)	.00 (0.3%)	.00 (0.2%)	.00 (0%)	.00 (0%)
Person-by-item-by-time (error)	.38 (33.0%)	.20 (21.8%)	.43 (30.7%)	.26 (21.9%)	.42 (30.6%)	.25 (21.9%)

Note. Before deletion of temporally inconsistent respondents $N = 157$. After deletion of temporally inconsistent respondents $N = 108$. Temporally inconsistent respondents were identified using the D^2_{ptc} technique as described in DeSimone (2015). Full D^2_{ptc} results can be found under https://osf.io/b5hrt/?view_only=c1f17b92103c47c8abc9fb795056cbb9.

Supplement E: Results of the CI_{CFA} Analyses

Table 7

Confidence Intervals for Factor Correlations Between Identity Threat Scales and Orbiting Constructs

Orbiting construct	Dataset	Confidence interval for factor correlation of orbiting construct with threat to identity value		Confidence interval for factor correlation of orbiting construct with threat to identity meanings		Confidence interval for factor correlation of orbiting construct with threat to identity enactment	
		Lower 2.5%	Upper 2.5%	Lower 2.5%	Upper 2.5%	Lower 2.5%	Upper 2.5%
Self-esteem	Stage 3	-.37	-.19	-.39	-.21	-.46	-.29
	Stage 5	-.39	-.21	-.33	-.15	-.43	-.26
Self-verification striving	Stage 3	-.25	-.06	-.26	-.07	-.36	-.17
	Stage 5	-.40	-.21	-.32	-.13	-.46	-.28
Identity suppression ^a	Stage 3	.19	.38	.20	.38	.42	.58
	Stage 5	.32	.49	.21	.38	.51	.64
Identification ^b	Stage 3	-.10	.09	-.11	.08	-.16	.04
	Stage 5	.01	.21	-.25	-.05	-.09	.11

Note. 95% confidence intervals of standardized model results; Stage 3: $N = 500$; Stage 5: $N = 506$. Factor correlations are based on four-factor models (threat to identity value, meanings, enactment, and orbiting construct modelled separately), see Table 5 in the main manuscript; ^aIdentity suppression was measured with five items in Stage 3, and with four items in Stage 5. ^bIdentification was measured with Cameron’s (2004) items.

Supplement F: Path Analyses for Stages 3, 4 and 5

Stage 3

We first estimated an initial model which included paths from the two triggers of threat (frequent change and transformational change) to the three types of identity threat (threat to identity value, meanings, and enactment), and from the three types of identity threat to the three outcomes (identity exit, emotional exhaustion, and task proficiency). This model showed a poor fit with the data (Model 1: $\chi^2 = 669.43$, $df = 9$; $p < .00$; CFI = .40; RMSEA = .38; SRMR = .19). The modification indices suggested the addition of correlated residuals between the three types of threat. As it is theoretically highly plausible that the three types of threat would be correlated for reasons other than the shared antecedents included in our model (for example, due to additional unobserved shared antecedents or due to reciprocally influencing each other), we thus included correlated residuals between the three types of identity threat in Model 2. This model fit the data significantly better (Model 2: $\chi^2 = 35.57$, $df = 6$; $p < .00$; CFI = .97; RMSEA = .10; SRMR = .04; $\Delta\chi^2 = 633.86$, $\Delta df = 3$). The modification indices suggested the inclusion of an additional direct path from frequency of change to emotional exhaustion. As an extensive body of research suggests that experiencing change is associated with lower levels of occupational well-being (e.g., Armenakis & Bedeian, 1999; Rafferty & Jimmieson, 2017), with identity threat likely not acting as the only mechanism, we thus added this path in Model 3. This model showed an excellent fit to the data (Model 3: $\chi^2 = 10.45$, $df = 5$; $p = 0.06$; CFI = 1.00; RMSEA = .05; SRMR = .02; $\Delta\chi^2 = 25.12$, $\Delta df = 1$), and was included as the final model in our paper. Unstandardized coefficients and standard errors for all paths included in this final model are shown in Table 8.

Given that finetuning the model based on modification indices can be considered exploratory and carries the risk of overfitting the model, the additional paths need to be verified in independent samples. To do so, in the next two stages we retained the identified additional

paths that are applicable across contexts (specifically, the correlated residuals among the three types of threat) in the hypothesized models for Stages 4 and 5.

Stage 4

We estimated an initial model in which the three types of identity threat (assessed at Time 2) were regressed onto the two identity threat triggers (workplace incivility and workplace norms, assessed at Time 1), and the three outcomes (emotional exhaustion, identity exit intentions, and task proficiency, assessed at Time 2) were in turn regressed onto the three types of identity threat. As noted above, we also let the residuals of the three types of threat correlate with each other. The resulting model showed a good fit (Model 1: $\chi^2 = 13.11$, $df = 6$; $p = .023$; CFI = .99; RMSEA = .09; SRMR = .04). There were no significant modification indices to suggest the inclusion of additional paths in the model. We thus retained this model. Unstandardized coefficients and standard errors for all paths included in this model are shown in Table 9.

Stage 5

In Model 1 the three types of threat were regressed on the two identity threat triggers (workplace discrimination and workplace micro-aggressions), and the three outcomes (turnover intention, exhaustion, and task proficiency) were regressed onto the three types of threat. As in stage 4, we also let the residuals of the three types of threat correlate with each other. This model did not fit the data very well (Model 1: $\chi^2 = 52.04$, $df = 6$; $p < .00$; CFI = .96; RMSEA = .12; SRMR = .05). The modification indices suggested the inclusion of an additional direct path between discrimination and turnover intention. This direct relationship is in line with meta-analytic evidence that feeling mistreated is positively associated with turnover intentions (Bowling & Beehr, 2006; Hershcovis & Barling, 2010; Nielsen & Einarsen, 2012). We thus included a path between discrimination and turnover intentions in Model 2. The model fit was

improved (Model 2: $\chi^2 = 24.11$, $df = 5$; $p < .00$; CFI = .99; RMSEA = .09; SRMR = .04; $\Delta\chi^2 = 27.93$, $\Delta df = 1$). Unstandardized coefficients and standard errors for all paths in this final model are shown in Table 10. We note that this final model including the additional may be overestimating the model fit and future research is needed to cross-validate the updated model.

Table 8*Unstandardized Coefficients and Standard Errors for Path Model 3 (Stage 3 – Teachers)*

	Unstandardized coefficient	Standard error
Frequent change → Threat to identity value	0.07	0.05
Transformational change → Threat to identity value	0.33 ^{***}	0.06
Frequent change → Threat to identity meanings	0.15 ^{**}	0.05
Transformational change → Threat to identity meanings	0.27 ^{***}	0.05
Frequent change → Threat to identity enactment	0.10 [*]	0.04
Transformational change → Threat to identity enactment	0.16 ^{***}	0.04
Threat to identity value → Identity exit	0.12	0.07
Threat to identity meanings → Identity exit	0.38 ^{***}	0.09
Threat to identity enactment → Identity exit	0.22 [*]	0.09
Threat to identity value → Emotional exhaustion	0.23 ^{**}	0.07
Threat to identity meanings → Emotional exhaustion	0.24 ^{**}	0.08
Threat to identity enactment → Emotional exhaustion	0.12	0.08
Frequency of change → Emotional exhaustion	0.28 ^{***}	0.06
Threat to identity value → Task proficiency	0.04	0.04
Threat to identity meanings → Task proficiency	-0.02	0.05
Threat to identity enactment → Task proficiency	-0.26 ^{***}	0.05
Threat to identity meanings ↔ Threat to identity value	0.64 ^{***}	0.05
Threat to identity meanings ↔ Threat to identity enactment	0.49 ^{***}	0.04
Threat to identity value ↔ Threat to identity enactment	0.42 ^{***}	0.04
Emotional exhaustion ↔ Identity exit	0.35 ^{***}	0.06
Task proficiency ↔ Identity exit	-0.01	0.03
Task proficiency ↔ Emotional exhaustion	0.02	0.03

Note. ^{*} $p < .05$, ^{**} $p < .01$, ^{***} $p < .001$.

Table 9*Unstandardized Coefficients and Standard Errors for Path Model 1 (Stage 4 – Pregnant**Leaders)*

	Unstandardized coefficient	Standard error
Workplace incivility → Threat to identity value	0.37 ^{***}	0.10
Workplace norms → Threat to identity value	0.44 ^{***}	0.08
Workplace incivility → Threat to identity meanings	0.40 ^{***}	0.11
Workplace norms → Threat to identity meanings	0.37 ^{***}	0.09
Workplace incivility → Threat to identity enactment	0.29 ^{**}	0.11
Workplace norms → Threat to identity enactment	0.40 ^{***}	0.09
Threat to identity value → Identity exit	0.21	0.16
Threat to identity meanings → Identity exit	0.36 [*]	0.15
Threat to identity enactment → Identity exit	0.10	0.16
Threat to identity value → Emotional exhaustion	0.48 ^{**}	0.19
Threat to identity meanings → Emotional exhaustion	-0.13	0.17
Threat to identity enactment → Emotional exhaustion	0.40 [*]	0.18
Threat to identity value → Task proficiency	-0.13	0.11
Threat to identity meanings → Task proficiency	0.03	0.10
Threat to identity enactment → Task proficiency	-0.11	0.11
Threat to identity meanings ↔ Threat to identity value	0.47 ^{***}	0.07
Threat to identity meanings ↔ Threat to identity enactment	0.52 ^{***}	0.07
Threat to identity value ↔ Threat to identity enactment	0.49 ^{***}	0.07
Emotional exhaustion ↔ Identity exit	0.43 ^{***}	0.10
Task proficiency ↔ Identity exit	0.04	0.05
Task proficiency ↔ Emotional exhaustion	-0.00	0.06

Note. ^{*} $p < .05$, ^{**} $p < .01$, ^{***} $p < .001$.

Table 10*Unstandardized Coefficients and Standard Errors for Path Model 2 (Stage 5 – LGBTQ**Organizational Members)*

	Unstandardized coefficient	Standard error
Workplace discrimination → Threat to identity value	0.60 ^{***}	0.05
Workplace microaggressions → Threat to identity value	0.22 ^{**}	0.08
Workplace discrimination → Threat to identity meanings	0.29 ^{***}	0.06
Workplace microaggressions → Threat to identity meanings	0.18	0.10
Workplace discrimination → Threat to identity enactment	0.68 ^{***}	0.06
Workplace microaggressions → Threat to identity enactment	-0.15	0.10
Threat to identity value → Turnover intentions	0.11	0.10
Threat to identity meanings → Turnover intentions	-0.06	0.08
Threat to identity enactment → Turnover intentions	0.20 [*]	0.09
Workplace discrimination → Turnover intentions	0.40 ^{***}	0.08
Threat to identity value → Emotional exhaustion	0.43 ^{***}	0.09
Threat to identity meanings → Emotional exhaustion	-0.09	0.08
Threat to identity enactment → Emotional exhaustion	0.16	0.08
Threat to identity value → Task proficiency	0.03	0.05
Threat to identity meanings → Task proficiency	-0.02	0.05
Threat to identity enactment → Task proficiency	-0.09	0.05
Threat to identity meanings ↔ Threat to identity value	0.40 ^{***}	0.04
Threat to identity meanings ↔ Threat to identity enactment	0.43 ^{***}	0.04
Threat to identity value ↔ Threat to identity enactment	0.43 ^{***}	0.04
Emotional exhaustion ↔ Turnover intentions	0.90 ^{***}	0.08
Task proficiency ↔ Turnover intentions	-0.07	0.04
Task proficiency ↔ Emotional exhaustion	-0.10	0.04

Note. ^{*} $p < .05$, ^{**} $p < .01$, ^{***} $p < .001$.

Supplement G: Additional Study Discriminant Validity Analyses

To account for various sources of measurement error (random error, specific factor error, and transient error; see Shaffer et al., 2016), we conducted an additional study. Data collection was approved by the ESSEC Research Ethics Committee (Study Title: Individual Identity Threat: The Development and Validation of a Scale). Like in Stages 2 and 3, we decided to survey teachers, in line with studies showing that the introduction of technology in their daily work can potentially trigger all three types of identity threat (Craig et al., 2019). Details about study materials can be found in Supplement A.

As described in the literature review (see main manuscript), we identified four constructs that share the most overlap with threat to identity value, meanings, and enactment: Self-esteem, self-verification striving, identity suppression, and identification. Further, as an anonymous reviewer suggested, self-efficacy is also an orbiting construct. We therefore included two measures of self-efficacy to this new study.

We conducted three discriminant validity analyses. First, for every factor pair (e.g., threat to identity meanings and self-verification striving), we conducted CFAs and compared the Chi-square of an unconstrained model (where the two factors freely covary) to those of a model with a fixed covariance of $|\cdot.85|$, in line with Shaffer et al. (2016). Second, using the results of these CFAs, we compared the CFIs of the unconstrained model and the model with a fixed covariance. Third, we computed disattenuated correlations for all factor pairs (i.e., estimates corrected for the three sources of measurement error; see Shaffer et al., 2016).

We applied Shaffer and colleagues' (2015) recommendations and used the split-half approach (Schmidt et al., 2003). We constructed half-scales for each of the 10 measures (three measures of identity threat, four measures for the orbiting constructs, two measures of self-

efficacy, and an additional measure of identification; see Supplement A). We ensured that the halves were similar in content. We also split reverse-scored items evenly between half-scales.

Participants and Procedures

At Time 1, 500 teachers completed our survey via Prolific. Respondents received £2 for completing the first 10-minute survey and were invited to participate in the same survey two weeks later. Time 2 participants also received £2 for their participation.

At Time 1, we excluded 12 respondents who did not pass our three attention checks, resulting in a final sample of 488. On average, participants were 33.01 years old ($SD = 10.35$) and had worked in their current organization for 6.73 years ($SD = 6.08$). Out of 488 teachers, 108 respondents identified as male (22.1%), 376 identified as female (77%), and four identified as “other” (e.g., non-binary). Our participants held a diverse array of teaching jobs: 25.4% were elementary school teachers, 9.4% were middle school teachers, 22.1% were high school teachers, 20.9% were college/university professors or lecturers, and 22.1% people held other teaching-related jobs.

Out of the initial 488 participants, 346 teachers completed our second survey (response rate: 70.9%). We excluded 10 participants who did not pass our three attention checks. Following Shaffer et al. (2016) we excluded participants for whom substantive changes in the focal constructs had occurred between administrations. Twenty-two teachers indicated that since the Time 1 survey there had been a significant change in how they think about their identity as a teacher, and/or a significant change in the degree to which technological changes were affecting their identity as a teacher. These were excluded from further analyses, resulting in a final sample of 314 respondents.

On average, these 314 participants were 33.78 years old ($SD = 10.74$) and had worked in their current organization for 6.97 years ($SD = 6.39$). Sixty-nine respondents identified as male

(22%), 244 identified as female (77.7%), and one identified as non-binary. Of these 314 teachers, 26.8% were elementary school teachers, 9.2% were middle school teachers, 19.7% were high school teachers, 22% were college/university professors or lecturers, and 22.3% people held other teaching-related jobs.

Results

Table 11 presents the means, standard deviations, correlations, and alpha coefficients for all variables. At Time 1, omega total was .94, .95, and .94 for threat to identity value, meanings, and enactment, respectively. At Time 2, omega total was .94 for all three threat variables. These results indicate excellent internal consistency.

Table 12 presents CFA results that account for all three sources of measurement error and disattenuated correlations. We compared the unconstrained model with a model in which factor covariances were set to $|\lambda|$. In line with Shaffer et al. (2015), we also provide a summary of the number of discriminant validity indices (out of our three analyses) that meet or exceed the cutoff value for each construct pair. As can be seen in the table, the results suggest that all factor pairs were distinct, supporting discriminant validity.

Results of our CFAs suggest that the two-factor models can be improved, based on the relatively poor model fit indices. The modification indices suggest the addition of item correlations between time points which is unsurprising given that identity threat is not a state, but a transient appraisal. We therefore decided to allow items to correlate at time points and re-ran the Chi-square and CFI comparisons with these better-fitting models. Table 13 presents the results of the CFAs and details about the items that were allowed to correlate. As can be seen in the table, the results support discriminant validity.

Table 11*Means, Standard Deviations, Cronbach's alpha, and Correlations of Variables (Additional Sample – Teachers)*

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Age	33.78	1.74														
2. T1 Threat to identity value	2.67	1.13	-.05	(.94)												
3. T1 Threat to identity meanings	2.59	1.10	.07	.65	(.95)											
4. T1 Threat to identity enactment	2.02	.91	.05	.52	.66	(.94)										
5. T1 Identification (Cameron)	3.97	.76	.10	-.09	-.09	-.13	(.80)									
6. T1 Self-esteem	3.80	.81	.25	-.28	-.27	-.32	.15	(.92)								
7. T1 Self-verification striving	3.97	.54	.09	-.17	-.12	-.16	.28	.31	(.76)							
8. T1 Identity suppression	2.03	.75	.03	.31	.32	.43	-.32	-.29	-.25	(.84)						
9. T1 Identification (Ashforth)	3.32	.95	-.05	.09	.08	.10	.43	-.15	.13	.01	(.73)					
10. T1 Generalized self-efficacy	4.00	.69	.07	-.19	-.26	-.30	.21	.72	.36	-.23	-.08	(.92)				
11. T1 Work-related self-efficacy	4.06	.65	.16	-.16	-.14	-.27	.24	.55	.36	-.26	-.02	.67	(.90)			
12. T1 Frequent change	3.48	.92	.01	.19	.27	.19	.04	-.04	-.03	.13	.10	-.03	.04	(.78)		
13. T1 Transformational change	2.84	.98	-.05	.22	.33	.23	.01	-.14	-.05	.16	.09	-.10	-.08	.42	(.85)	
14. T1 Career turnover intentions	2.52	1.33	-.10	.36	.44	.40	-.29	-.32	-.22	.33	-.04	-.27	-.23	.19	.21	(.92)
15. T1 Task proficiency	3.99	.79	.04	-.14	-.18	-.20	.16	.44	.18	-.16	-.03	.53	.57	-.02	-.04	-.27
16. T1 Exhaustion	3.61	1.19	-.13	.37	.38	.33	-.06	-.36	-.18	.17	.15	-.25	-.23	.26	.22	.48
17. T2 Threat to identity value	2.74	1.11	-.08	.61	.52	.44	-.10	-.30	-.21	.29	.17	-.25	-.22	.22	.23	.37
18. T2 Threat to identity meanings	2.72	1.05	.03	.52	.68	.57	-.08	-.26	-.16	.35	.14	-.22	-.18	.29	.29	.43
19. T2 Threat to identity enactment	2.11	.93	.05	.48	.53	.62	-.11	-.29	-.14	.45	.19	-.26	-.20	.25	.29	.42
20. T2 Identification (Cameron)	3.90	.78	.08	-.10	-.14	-.11	.77	.15	.28	-.32	.39	.24	.27	.11 ⁿ	-.02	-.32
21. T2 Self-esteem	3.77	.81	.23	-.26	-.27	-.33	.18	.91	.31	-.30	-.11	.73	.55	-.05	-.13	-.34
22. T2 Self-verification striving	3.99	.55	.10	-.18	-.15	-.15	.19	.24	.60	-.22	.09	.28	.25	-.10	-.11 ⁿ	-.22
23. T2 Identity suppression	2.20	.79	.00	.29	.27	.33	-.26	-.29	-.24	.64	-.00	-.24	-.23	.17	.18	.30
24. T2 Identification (Ashforth)	3.23	.90	-.06	.20	.13	.15	.33	-.21	.09	.06	.70	-.10	-.12	.05	.10	.02
25. T2 Generalized self-efficacy	4.01	.64	.11 ⁿ	-.23	-.23	-.29	.23	.67	.32	-.24	-.08	.81	.66	-.04	-.11 ⁿ	-.22
26. T2 Work-related self-efficacy	4.06	.62	.15	-.21	-.20	-.28	.26	.55	.32	-.24	-.04	.63	.77	-.01	-.11	-.19
27. T2 Frequent change	3.31	.97	.02	.15	.18	.09	-.01	-.02	.00	.09	.09	-.04	-.01	.61	.31	.13
28. T2 Transformational change	2.58	.97	-.02	.28	.28	.26	-.01	-.13	-.04	.21	.17	-.07	-.12	.45	.57	.24
29. T2 Career turnover intentions	2.62	1.29	-.12	.34	.41	.37	-.31	-.33	-.18	.34	-.05	-.25	-.22	.18	.18	.83
30. T2 Task proficiency	3.97	.76	.11 ⁿ	-.18	-.18	-.23	.19	.46	.17	-.15	-.03	.46	.62	-.05	-.05	-.22
31. T2 Exhaustion	3.61	1.18	-.19	.38	.36	.31	-.08	-.39	-.12	.15	.16	-.28	-.29	.23	.18	.46

Note. *N* = 314. Cronbach's alphas are in parentheses. For all pairs, correlations $\geq |.11|$ are $p < .05$ (except for the correlations marked with an "n") and correlations $\geq |.15|$ are $p < .01$.

Table 11 (Continued)*Means, Standard Deviations, Cronbach's alpha, and Correlations of Variables (Additional Sample – Teachers)*

Variable	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31
15. T1 Task proficiency	(.94)																
16. T1 Exhaustion	-.26	(.94)															
17. T2 Threat to identity value	-.21	.35	(.94)														
18. T2 Threat to identity meanings	-.18	.36	.66	(.94)													
19. T2 Threat to identity enactment	-.20	.31	.57	.64	(.94)												
20. T2 Identification (Cameron)	.18	-.08	-.11 ⁿ	-.13	-.08	(.82)											
21. T2 Self-esteem	.45	-.37	-.33	-.31	-.33	.20	(.93)										
22. T2 Self-verification striving	.11 ⁿ	-.22	-.15	-.14	-.16	.22	.29	(.80)									
23. T2 Identity suppression	-.15	.19	.32	.33	.42	-.29	-.33	-.21	(.86)								
24. T2 Identification (Ashforth)	-.07	.21	.24	.17	.25	.41	-.19	.14	.01	(.76)							
25. T2 Generalized self-efficacy	.50	-.28	-.27	-.22	-.25	.25	.74	.33	-.23	-.16	(.92)						
26. T2 Work-related self-efficacy	.55	-.22	-.28	-.22	-.21	.28	.57	.31	-.26	-.10	.76	(.89)					
27. T2 Frequent change	-.10	.24	.18	.27	.17	.11 ⁿ	-.02	-.04	.06	.06	-.01	-.02	(.84)				
28. T2 Transformational change	-.11	.24	.36	.35	.38	.01	-.12	-.01	.21	.22	-.09	-.09	.46	(.89)			
29. T2 Career turnover intentions	-.22	.46	.44	.47	.47	-.34	-.37	-.15	.33	.04	-.25	-.23	.16	.27	(.92)		
30. T2 Task proficiency	.66	-.23	-.22	-.17	-.21	.19	.48	.16	-.15	-.08	.53	.64	-.05	-.11	-.22	(.94)	
31. T2 Exhaustion	-.29	.83	.40	.40	.34	-.10	-.43	-.18	.18	.27	-.33	-.31	.23	.25	.535	-.28	(.94)

Note. $N = 314$. Cronbach's alphas are in parentheses. For all pairs, correlations $\geq |.11|$ are $p < .05$ (except for the correlations marked with an "n") and correlations $\geq |.15|$ are $p < .01$.

Table 12*Confirmatory Factor Analyses and Discriminant Validity Indices for Every Factor Pair (Additional Sample – Teachers)*

Construct Pairs	$\Delta\chi^2$	ΔCFI	Disattenuated Correlation	Indices suggesting lack of discriminant validity	Model fit indices Unconstrained model					Model fit indices Model with factor covariances set to $ \leq .85 $				
					χ^2	df	CFI	RMSEA	SRMR	χ^2	df	CFI	RMSEA	SRMR
TI-Value & Identification (C)	233.28	.18	-.03	0	284.11	19	.79	.21	.07	517.39	20	.61	.28	.46
TI-Value & Identification (A)	139.35	.12	.06	0	28.12	19	.78	.21	.08	419.47	20	.66	.25	.13
TI-Value & Self-esteem	183.28	.06	-.10	0	512.60	89	.86	.12	.06	695.88	90	.79	.15	.40
TI-Value & Self-verification	46.52	.31	-.07	0	341.76	64	.81	.12	.06	802.28	65	.50	.19	.68
TI-Value & Identity suppression	142.53	.09	.13	0	345.80	34	.80	.17	.07	488.33	35	.70	.20	.27
TI-Value & Generalized SE	199.38	.08	-.08	0	454.45	64	.84	.14	.06	653.83	65	.77	.17	.49
TI-Value & Work-based SE	206.08	.10	-.08	0	423.11	64	.84	.13	.06	629.20	65	.74	.17	.47
TI-Meanings & Identification (C)	229.99	.11	-.04	0	513.10	43	.78	.19	.07	743.09	44	.67	.23	.42
TI-Meanings & Identification (A)	147.84	.08	.04	0	5.49	43	.77	.18	.07	648.33	44	.69	.21	.11
TI-Meanings & Self-esteem	193.68	.05	-.09	0	771.53	134	.83	.12	.07	965.20	135	.78	.14	.42
TI-Meanings & Self-verification	463.36	.20	-.05	0	621.19	103	.78	.13	.07	1084.56	104	.58	.17	.67
TI-Meanings & Identity suppression	132.40	.06	.13	0	604.60	64	.77	.16	.07	737.00	65	.72	.18	.26
TI-Meanings & Generalized SE	211.05	.06	-.08	0	707.72	103	.82	.14	.06	918.77	104	.76	.16	.50
TI-Meanings & Work-based SE	217.71	.07	-.06	0	683.43	103	.81	.13	.07	901.14	104	.74	.16	.48
TI-Enactment & Identification (C)	381.16	.29	-.04	0	237.31	26	.84	.16	.07	618.47	27	.56	.26	.62
TI-Enactment & Identification (A)	138.93	.11	.06	0	236.33	26	.83	.16	.08	375.26	27	.72	.20	.13
TI-Enactment & Self-esteem	161.21	.05	-.11	0	469.85	103	.88	.11	.06	631.06	104	.82	.13	.36
TI-Enactment & Self-verification	483.87	.31	-.07	0	316.62	76	.85	.10	.07	8.49	77	.53	.17	.68
TI-Enactment & Identity suppression	68.64	.04	.18	0	331.67	43	.83	.15	.07	4.31	44	.79	.16	.16
TI-Enactment & Generalized SE	182.81	.07	-.10	0	468.88	76	.85	.13	.07	651.69	77	.78	.15	.45
TI-Enactment & Work-based SE	181.66	.08	-.09	0	402.67	76	.86	.12	.07	584.33	77	.78	.15	.41

Note. TI denotes threat to identity. Identification (C) denotes Cameron's (2004) measure of identification. Identification (A) denotes Ashforth et al.'s (2013) measure of identification. Self-verification is short for self-verification striving. SE is an acronym denoting self-efficacy.

Table 13

Confirmatory Factor Analyses and Discriminant Validity Indices for Every Factor Pair (Additional Sample – Teachers) – Improved Models

Construct Pairs	$\Delta\chi^2$	ΔCFI	Indices suggesting lack of discriminant validity	Model fit indices Unconstrained Model ^a					Model fit indices Model with factor covariances set to $ \leq .85 $				
				χ^2	df	CFI	RMSEA	SRMR	χ^2	df	CFI	RMSEA	SRMR
TI-Value & Identification (C)	365.66	0.29	0	39.51	18	.98	.06	.04	405.17	19	.70	.25	.57
TI-Value & Identification (A)	144.97	0.12	0	36.89	18	.98	.06	.06	181.86	19	.86	.17	.11
TI-Value & Self-esteem	197.73	0.07	0	272.15	88	.94	.08	.05	469.89	89	.87	.12	.41
TI-Value & Self-verification	450.37	0.31	0	98.99	63	.98	.04	.04	549.36	64	.67	.16	.66
TI-Value & Identity suppression	146.13	0.10	0	101.99	33	.96	.08	.05	248.11	34	.86	.14	.26
TI-Value & Generalized SE	210.45	0.08	0	212.72	63	.94	.09	.05	423.17	64	.86	.13	.50
TI-Value & Work-based SE	216.84	0.10	0	18.75	63	.95	.08	.05	397.60	64	.85	.13	.48
TI-Meanings & Identification (C)	222.69	0.11	0	196.08	40	.93	.11	.06	418.76	41	.82	.17	.39
TI-Meanings & Identification (A)	150.73	0.08	0	184.72	40	.93	.11	.06	335.46	41	.85	.15	.10
TI-Meanings & Self-esteem	195.00	0.05	0	458.61	131	.91	.09	.06	653.61	132	.86	.11	.40
TI-Meanings & Self-verification	445.63	0.19	0	306.99	100	.91	.08	.06	752.61	101	.72	.14	.63
TI-Meanings & Identity suppression	133.73	0.06	0	291.74	61	.90	.11	.07	425.46	62	.85	.14	.24
TI-Meanings & Generalized SE	203.01	0.06	0	39.47	100	.91	.10	.06	593.48	101	.85	.13	.46
TI-Meanings & Work-based SE	216.34	0.07	0	368.32	1001	.91	.09	.06	584.67	101	.84	.12	.45
TI-Enactment & Identification (C)	369.68	0.28	0	106.27	23	.94	.11	.06	475.95	24	.66	.25	.57
TI-Enactment & Identification (A)	136.27	0.11	0	104.61	23	.93	.11	.07	24.88	24	.82	.17	.12
TI-Enactment & Self-esteem	152.30	0.05	0	341.20	100	.92	.09	.06	493.50	101	.87	.11	.32
TI-Enactment & Self-verification	470.49	0.30	0	186.64	73	.93	.07	.06	657.13	74	.62	.16	.65
TI-Enactment & Identity suppression	62.67	0.04	0	204.38	40	.90	.11	.06	267.05	41	.86	.13	.14
TI-Enactment & Generalized SE	172.38	0.07	0	339.36	73	.90	.11	.06	511.74	74	.83	.14	.39
TI-Enactment & Work-based SE	171.95	0.08	0	274.00	73	.91	.09	.07	445.95	74	.84	.13	.36

Note. TI denotes threat to identity. Identification (C) denotes Cameron's (2004) measure of identification. Identification (A) denotes Ashforth et al.'s (2013) measure of identification. Self-verification is short for self-verification striving. SE is an acronym denoting self-efficacy. ^aIn both the unconstrained model and the model where factor covariances were set to $|\leq .85|$, we allowed several items to covary based on modification indices. These suggested adding: (1) a covariance between two threat to identity value items at Time 2 (items 3 and 4); (2) covariances between threat to identity meanings items 1 and 3 at Time 2, items 6 and 7 at Time 1, and items 5 and 8 at Time 2; (3) covariances between threat to identity enactment items 1 and 3 at Time 1, items 1 and 5 at Time 1, and Items 4 and 6 at Time 2.

Supplement H: Means, Standard Deviations, Cronbach's alpha, and Correlations of Variables with all Demographics (Stages 3, 4 and 5)

Table 14

Means, Standard Deviations, Cronbach's alpha, and Correlations of Variables (Stage 3, Teachers)

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Tenure	7.51	6.99														
2. Gender – male	0.39	0.49	-.01													
3. Gender – female	0.60	0.49	.02	-.97												
4. Elementary school teacher	0.21	0.41	.02	-.13	.13											
5. Middle school teacher	0.10	0.30	.01	-.01	.02	-.17										
6. High school teacher	0.21	0.41	.04	.06	-.06	-.27	-.17									
7. University/college lecturer or professor	0.27	0.45	-.02	.11	-.10	-.31	-.20	-.32								
8. Age	38.19	11.07	.59	-.07	.06	.00	-.02	.00	.00							
9. T1 Threat to identity value	2.48	1.05	.04	-.05	.05	.07	.01	.17	-.19	.02	(.92)					
10. T1 Threat to identity meanings	2.61	0.99	.04	-.03	.03	.05	.03	.09	-.09	.05	.72	(.93)				
11. T1 Threat to identity enactment	2.01	0.80	.03	-.04	.05	.10*	.01	.01	-.10	.02	.57	.69	(.90)			
12. T2 Threat to identity value	2.55	1.06	.06	-.01	-.01	.03	.09	.14	-.18	.07	.75	.58	.46	(.92)		
13. T2 Threat to identity meanings	2.66	0.99	.10*	-.06	.04	.00	.05	.10	-.10	.13	.64	.76	.57	.75	(.93)	
14. T2 Threat to identity enactment	2.15	0.88	.09	-.05	.05	.06	.07	.03	-.13	.13	.55	.62	.71	.63	.74	(.90)
15. Self-esteem	3.78	0.74	.20	-.01	.01	.04	.02	.01	.07	.20	-.26	-.27	-.35	-.25	-.25	-.32
16. Self-verification striving	4.00	0.57	.15	.04	-.06	.05	-.05	.01	-.01	.09	-.13	-.14	-.21	-.09	-.12	-.20
17. Identity suppression	2.04	0.72	-.09	.07	-.06	.02	-.05	-.06	-.05	-.05	.23	.25	.42	.23	.28	.36
18. Identification	3.89	0.94	.13	-.02	.06	.11*	.10*	.16	-.06	.11	.03	.01	-.04	.04	-.02	.01
19. Frequent change	3.50	0.88	.13	-.09	.07	.04	.02	.10	-.05	.08	.31	.30	.22	.25	.29	.26
20. Transformational change	2.98	0.94	.12	.05	-.06	.00	-.02	.14	.02	.06	.19	.25	.19	.15	.21	.20
21. Emotional exhaustion	3.48	1.20	.05	-.14	.11	.03	.04	.13	-.07	.04	.39	.40	.33	.37	.43	.34
22. Task proficiency	3.98	0.69	.13	.03	-.01	-.02	.06	.08	-.06	.09	-.13	-.20	-.29	-.11	-.18	-.27
23. Identity exit intentions	2.44	1.31	-.08	-.04	.04	-.05	.00	-.02	-.06	.01	.38	.45	.39	.29	.40	.32
24. Green behaviors	3.49	1.00	.03	.01	-.02	-.06	.09	-.01	.00	.02	-.03	.00	-.05	-.09	-.09	-.11

Note. $N = 500$ for all variables apart from the T2 threat measures. $N = 426$ for all the three T2 threat measures (variables 5 – 7). Profession variables are dummy coded, with “Other teaching profession” as the reference category; Gender was dummy coded, with “other” as the reference category. Cronbach's alphas are in parentheses. For all pairs not involving T2 threat measures, correlations $\geq |.09|$ are $p < .05$ and correlations $\geq |.12|$ are $p < .01$. For all pairs involving T2 threat measures, correlations $\geq |.10|$ are $p < .05$ and correlations $\geq |.13|$ are $p < .01$.

Table 14 (continued)

	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
1. Self-esteem	(.90)									
2. Self-verification striving	.36	(.80)								
3. Identity suppression	-.34	-.27	(.82)							
4. Identification	.13	.27	-.28	(.86)						
5. Frequent change	-.04	.02	.02	.18	(.77)					
6. Transformational change	.02	.15	.06	.21	.43	(.79)				
7. Emotional exhaustion	-.29	-.06	.13	.01	.32	.16	(.92)			
8. Task proficiency	.41	.29	-.32	.20	-.05	.04	-.06	(.90)		
9. Identity exit intentions	-.31	-.16	.29	-.21	.15	.04	.42	-.12	(.93)	
10. Green behaviors	.21	.19	-.12	.12	.06	.19	-.07	.21	-.05	(.95)

Table 15*Descriptive Statistics, Cronbach's Alpha, and Correlations of Variables (Stage 4, Pregnant Leaders)*

Variables	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1. Tenure	5.47	3.31																	
2. Number of direct reports	9.93	16.04	.12																
3. Weeks of pregnancy at T1	22.28	9.82	.12	-.03															
4. Maternity leave at T1	0.09	0.29	.10	-.03	.33														
5. Age	32.06	4.82	.19	-.15	.12	-.02													
6. T1 Threat to identity value	1.92	0.84	-.09	.11	-.01	.06	-.17	(.90)											
7. T1 Threat to identity meanings	2.10	0.92	-.03	.08	.03	.07	-.16	.80	(.92)										
8. T1 Threat to identity enactment	2.11	0.94	-.09	.06	.02	.03	-.14	.80	.77	(.91)									
9. T1 Self-esteem	3.90	0.74	.10	-.04	-.05	-.13	.11	-.36	-.40	-.42	(.88)								
10. T1 Self-verification striving	3.98	0.64	-.04	.01	-.07	-.08	-.02	-.12	-.13	-.21	.38	(.83)							
11. T1 Identity suppression	2.72	0.86	-.08	-.02	-.01	.02	.00	.13	.16	.14	-.40	-.19	(.83)						
12. T1 Identification	3.80	0.92	.09	.18	-.30	-.20	.07	.02	.01	-.01	.18	.24	-.25	(.88)					
13. T1 Incivility	1.59	0.73	-.02	.12	-.05	.11	-.20	.56	.48	.43	-.27	-.15	.13	.06	(.91)				
14. T1 Workplace norms	2.15	0.88	-.08	.21	-.14	-.03	-.10	.49	.46	.43	-.22	-.16	.09	.32	.55	(.86)			
15. T1 Emotional exhaustion	3.25	1.29	-.03	.08	.03	.10	-.04	.38	.38	.44	-.42	-.31	.19	-.09	.38	.40	(.94)		
16. T1 Task proficiency	4.33	0.71	-.07	-.11	.02	-.16	-.01	-.16	-.21	-.20	.28	.28	-.31	.10	-.02	-.08	-.15	(.90)	
17. T1 Identity exit intentions	2.05	1.15	.03	.11	.09	.10	.00	.44	.47	.46	-.29	-.21	.03	-.10	.29	.34	.46	-.09	(.89)
18. T2 Threat to identity value	2.10	0.97	-.09	.03	.01	.00	-.09	.63	.59	.54	-.48	-.33	.27	-.01	.50	.55	.48	-.24	.43
19. T2 Threat to identity meanings	2.27	1.02	-.09	.00	.06	.05	-.16	.57	.70	.59	-.49	-.30	.14	-.07	.47	.49	.38	-.19	.46
20. T2 Threat to identity enactment	2.24	1.00	-.07	.02	.04	.00	-.03	.56	.57	.66	-.50	-.35	.26	-.02	.42	.48	.49	-.25	.44
21. T2 Self-esteem	3.87	0.76	.14	.03	-.08	-.10	.06	-.35	-.39	-.37	.85	.33	-.38	.16	-.28	-.28	-.38	.27	-.24
22. T2 Self-verification striving	4.00	0.67	.05	.02	.04	-.07	-.01	-.20	-.13	-.19	.31	.68	-.20	.11	-.17	-.09	-.17	.28	-.15
23. T2 Identity suppression	2.80	0.81	-.06	-.10	.09	.05	.08	.14	.20	.15	-.42	-.21	.59	-.26	.12	.09	.22	-.16	.20
24. T2 Identification	3.68	0.96	.06	.14	-.32	-.25	-.07	.06	.03	-.01	.20	.28	-.14	.73	.14	.28	-.10	.12	-.15
25. T2 Incivility	1.63	0.72	.04	.08	.00	.06	-.09	.49	.48	.42	-.38	-.31	.21	.07	.67	.46	.41	-.13	.37
26. T2 Workplace norms	2.23	0.91	-.08	.14	-.15	-.02	-.06	.42	.40	.39	-.27	-.21	.13	.20	.49	.75	.42	-.11	.45
27. T2 Emotional exhaustion	3.13	1.36	-.05	.20	.01	-.06	-.06	.30	.31	.37	-.33	-.30	.21	-.08	.38	.44	.73	-.21	.47
28. T2 Task proficiency	4.27	0.73	.12	-.08	-.05	-.08	.01	-.19	-.17	-.19	.44	.32	-.40	.07	-.10	-.09	-.19	.48	-.05
29. T2 Identity exit intentions	2.19	1.16	-.04	.11	.11	.07	-.12	.35	.42	.33	-.24	-.16	.09	-.12	.40	.38	.39	-.11	.76

Note. For all T1 variables, $N = 186$. For all T2 variables, $N = 157$. Maternity leave was coded as 0 = not on maternity leave, 1 = on maternity leave. For all pairs not involving T2 measures, correlations $\geq |.15|$ are $p < .05$ and correlations $\geq |.20|$ are $p < .01$. For all pairs involving T2 threat measures, correlations $\geq |.16|$ are $p < .05$ and correlations $\geq |.21|$ are $p < .01$. Cronbach's Alpha are in parentheses.

Table 15 (continued)*Descriptive Statistics, Cronbach's Alpha, and Correlations of Variables (Stage 4, Pregnant Leaders)*

Variables	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
18. T2 Threat to identity value	(.92)											
19. T2 Threat to identity meanings	.81	(.94)										
20. T2 Threat to identity enactment	.82	.81	(.91)									
21. T2 Self-esteem	-.46	-.50	-.53	(.90)								
22. T2 Self-verification striving	-.26	-.20	-.31	.35	(.84)							
23. T2 Identity suppression	.21	.13	.21	-.42	-.17	(.90)						
24. T2 Identification	.04	-.01	.00	.20	.23	-.24	(.88)					
25. T2 Incivility	.58	.52	.58	-.41	-.30	.20	.09	(.92)				
26. T2 Workplace norms	.60	.52	.54	-.32	-.20	.19	.14	.60	(.87)			
27. T2 Emotional exhaustion	.51	.42	.50	-.36	-.19	.20	-.09	.45	.54	(.94)		
28. T2 Task proficiency	-.26	-.21	-.25	.42	.34	-.23	.07	-.22	-.10	-.15	(.90)	
29. T2 Identity exit intentions	.49	.52	.48	-.27	-.09	.14	-.13	.43	.47	.53	-.08	(.90)

Table 16*Descriptive Statistics, Cronbach's Alpha, and Correlations of Variables (Stage 5, LGBTQ Organizational Members)*

Variables	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1.Tenure	3.78	4.46															
2.Gender – Female	0.70	0.46	-.19														
3.Gender – Male	0.23	0.42	.21	-.84													
4.Gender – Transgender female	0.01	0.10	-.02	-.15	-.06												
5.Gender – Transgender male	0.03	0.18	-.03	-.28	-.10	-.02											
6.Gender – Non-conforming	0.02	0.12	.07	-.19	-.07	-.01	-.02										
7.LGBTQ – Lesbian	0.15	0.36	.03	.22	-.23	-.04	.01	.03									
8.LGBTQ – Gay	0.11	0.32	.11	-.51	.61	-.04	-.07	-.05	-.15								
9.LGBTQ – Bisexual	0.59	0.49	-.05	.23	-.13	-.12	-.11	-.09	-.51	-.43							
10.LGBTQ – Transgender	0.02	0.14	-.01	-.22	-.08	.70	-.03	.10	-.06	-.05	-.17						
11.LGBTQ – Questioning	0.03	0.16	-.03	.00	.03	-.02	-.03	-.02	-.07	-.06	-.19	-.02					
12. Industry – Arts & education	0.17	0.37	.02	.06	-.07	-.04	.09	-.06	.02	.02	-.02	-.06	.03				
13. Industry – Business-related	0.16	0.37	-.02	-.04	.04	-.04	.01	-.01	-.05	.05	.00	-.02	.00	-.19			
14. Industry – Health care	0.14	0.35	-.02	.06	-.12	.02	.05	.08	.05	-.09	.04	.02	-.03	-.18	-.18		
15. Industry – IT	0.06	0.24	.02	-.05	.04	-.03	-.05	.10	.03	-.01	-.03	.02	.01	-.11	-.11	-.10	
16. Industry – Hospitality	0.06	0.23	.00	-.01	.00	-.02	.05	-.03	-.03	-.01	.03	-.04	-.04	-.11	-.11	-.10	-.06
17. Age	30.63	8.44	.60	-.20	.22	-.07	-.01	.02	.06	.09	-.09	-.02	-.02	-.01	.01	.02	.00
18. Threat to identity value	2.15	0.95	.07	.02	-.04	.01	.02	.07	.05	-.10	.04	.00	-.07	.02	-.02	.09	-.08
19. Threat to identity meanings	2.10	0.94	.09	.04	-.01	.01	-.05	.02	-.06	-.07	.12	-.02	.00	.04	-.05	.09	-.07
20. Threat to identity enactment	2.17	1.01	.02	.03	-.04	-.03	.01	.07	-.05	-.14	.12	-.02	-.04	.06	-.01	.10	-.05
21. Self-esteem	3.44	0.85	.03	-.04	.13	-.06	-.10	-.06	.01	.18	-.06	-.09	-.01	-.02	.09	-.07	.01
22. Self-verification striving	3.75	0.67	-.05	-.04	.00	.04	.11	-.05	.01	.07	-.08	.06	-.04	.05	.02	.04	.02
23. Identity suppression	3.13	1.18	-.01	.10	-.09	-.04	.01	-.01	-.23	-.19	.28	-.09	.04	.03	.02	.00	.00
24. Identification	3.57	1.01	.02	-.01	-.09	.06	.12	.06	.18	.05	-.14	.10	-.19	.05	.03	-.01	-.03
25. Workplace discrimination	1.84	0.80	.11	-.06	.00	.05	.03	.13	.10	-.03	-.08	.06	-.02	.06	.01	.03	-.08
26. Workplace microaggressions	1.24	0.50	.10	-.07	.03	.11	-.02	.10	.09	.03	-.10	.10	-.06	.04	-.05	-.02	-.03
27. Turnover intentions	2.61	1.40	.02	.03	-.06	.03	.00	.05	-.09	-.11	.04	.05	.07	-.07	-.01	.07	-.10
28. Emotional exhaustion	3.31	1.36	.06	.09	-.13	.02	.04	.06	-.05	-.16	.10	.03	.01	.01	-.09	.10	-.07
29. Task proficiency	4.38	0.73	.05	-.04	.06	.00	.01	-.09	.05	.07	-.05	.03	-.11	.00	-.01	-.03	.00
30. Green behaviors	3.44	1.07	-.03	-.07	.03	.02	.07	.10	-.04	.02	-.03	-.02	.05	.04	.01	-.02	.01

Note. *N* = 506. Gender variables are dummy coded, with “Other” as the reference category; LGBTQ membership variables are dummy coded, with “Other” as the reference category. Industry variables are dummy coded, with “Other” as the reference category. Correlations $\geq |.09|$ are $p < .05$ with the exception of ^a the correlation between variables 13 and 25 ($r = .085, p = .055$). All correlations $\geq |.13|$ are $p < .01$. Cronbach's Alpha are in parentheses.

Table 16 (continued)

Variables	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
16. Industry – Hospitality															
17. Age	.01														
18. Threat to identity value	-.01	.04	(.84)												
19. Threat to identity meanings	.00	.09	.63	(.91)											
20. Threat to identity enactment	-.08	.02	.73	.60	(.89)										
21. Self-esteem	-.03	.11	-.26	-.21	-.31	(.92)									
22. Self-verification striving	.01	-.04	-.23	-.17	-.28	.25	(.81)								
23. Identity suppression	-.08	.00	.35	.26	.53	-.23	-.32	(.91)							
24. Identification	.02	-.05	.11	-.13	.04	-.03	.18	-.16	(.83)						
25. Workplace discrimination	-.03	.09	.58	.30	.50	-.22	-.14	.22	.20	(.88)					
26. Workplace microaggressions	.00	.01	.41	.24	.24	-.06	.00	-.01	.18	.58	(.91)				
27. Turnover intentions	.08	-.01	.28	.16	.29	-.21	-.14	.22	-.02	.41	.25	(.93)			
28. Emotional exhaustion	.08	-.04	.35	.20	.30	-.36	-.16	.26	.05	.36	.23	.62	(.93)		
29. Task proficiency	.04	.01	-.07	-.07	-.11	.22	.15	-.07	.02	-.03	.05	-.09	-.12	(.92)	
30. Green behaviors	-.01	-.05	-.09 ^a	-.08	-.06	.15	.22	-.02	.06	-.01	.06	-.07	-.14	.13	(.96)

Table 17*Descriptive Statistics, Cronbach's Alpha, and Correlations of Variables (Stage 6, Moderation)*

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Tenure	8.34	7.07															
2. Gender	0.30	0.46	-.04														
3. Elementary school teacher	0.23	0.42	.00	-.17													
4. Middle school teacher	0.07	0.25	.17	-.06	-.15												
5. High school teacher	0.20	0.40	.13	.03	-.27	-.13											
6. University/college lecturer or professor	0.25	0.43	-.10	.25	-.32	-.16	-.29										
7. Age	39.59	11.08	.58	-.04	-.02	.12	.05	-.04									
8. Frequency of online teaching during COVID-19	3.23	1.15	-.05	.15	-.15	.04	.03	.30	-.08	(.79)							
9. Frequency of online teaching before COVID-19	2.04	0.90	.05	.22	-.31	-.07	.00	.42	.05	.49	(.77)						
10. Threat to identity value T1	2.41	1.06	.10	-.12	-.04	.12	.11	-.08	.07	-.01	-.01	(.92)					
11. Threat to identity meaning T1	2.61	1.04	.06	-.08	-.05	.13	.00	.00	.08	.01	.00	.77	(.93)				
12. Threat to identity enactment T1	1.90	0.80	-.02	-.10	-.05	.05	-.09	.06	.02	.01	.04	.63	.75	(.91)			
13. Identity exit intentions T2	2.32	1.20	-.03	-.02	.01	.05	-.07	.00	.06	-.11	-.02	.29	.34	.35	(.92)		
14. Emotional exhaustion T2	3.30	1.28	.05	-.18	.13	.03	.03	.02	-.06	.03	.01	.33	.32	.30	.42	(.95)	
15. Task proficiency T2	3.61	0.86	.05	-.01	.02	.02	-.03	.01	-.05	.19	.10	-.11	-.14	-.17	-.08	-.08	(.93)

Note. $N = 350$. Profession variables are dummy coded, with “Other teaching profession” as the reference category; Gender was coded as 0 = male, 1 = female (no participant chose the “other” option); Correlations $\geq |.11|$ are $p < .05$ and correlations $\geq |.16|$ are $p < .01$. Cronbach's Alpha are in parentheses.

References

- Armenakis, A. A., & Bedeian, A. G. (1999). Organizational change: A review of theory and research in the 1990's. *Journal of Management*, 25(3), 293-315.
- Ashforth, B. E., Joshi, M., Anand, V., & O'Leary-Kelly, A. M. (2013). Extending the expanded model of organizational identification to occupations. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 43(12), 2426-2448. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12190>
- Barthauer, L., Kaucher, P., Spurk, D., & Kauffeld, S. (2020). Burnout and career (un)sustainability: Looking into the blackbox of burnout triggered career turnover intentions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, Advance online publication*. 117. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2019.103334>
- Bowling, N. A., & Beehr, T. A. (2006). Workplace harassment from the victim's perspective: A theoretical model and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 998-1012. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.5.998>
- Cable, D. M., & Kay, V. S. (2012). Striving for self-verification during organizational entry. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(2), 360-380. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.0397>
- Cameron, J. (2004). A three-factor model of social identity. *Self and Identity*, 3, 239-262. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13576500444000047>
- Chen, G., Goddard, T. G., & Casper, W. J. (2004). Examination of the Relationships among General and Work-Specific Self-Evaluations, Work-Related Control Beliefs, and Job Attitudes. *Applied Psychology*, 53(3), 349-370. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2004.00175.x>
- Chen, G., Gully, S. M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a new general self-efficacy scale. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4(1), 62-83. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109442810141004>
- Craig, K., Thatcher, J. B., & Grover, V. (2019). The IT identity threat: A conceptual definition and operational measure. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 36(1), 259-288. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2018.1550561>
- DeSimone, J. A. (2015). New techniques for evaluating temporal consistency. *Organizational Research Methods*, 18(1), 133-152. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428114553061>
- Glick, P., Berdahl, J. L., & Alonso, N. M. (2018). Development and validation of the masculinity contest culture scale. *Journal of Social Issues*, 74(3), 449-476. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12280>
- Gloor, J. L., Li, X., Lim, S., & Feierabend, A. (2018). An inconvenient truth? Interpersonal and career consequences of “maybe baby” expectations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 104, 44-58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2017.10.001>
- Griffin, M. A., Neal, A., & Parker, S. K. (2007). A new model of work role performance: Positive behavior in uncertain and interdependent contexts. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(2), 327-347. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2007.24634438>
- Herscovis, M. S., & Barling, J. (2010). Towards a multi-foci approach to workplace aggression: A meta-analytic review of outcomes from different perpetrators. *Journal Of Organizational Behavior*, 31(1), 24-44. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.621>
- Iverson, R. D., Olekalns, M., & Erwin, P. J. (1998). Affectivity, organizational stressors, and absenteeism: A causal model of burnout and its consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 52(1), 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1996.1556>

- Madera, J. M., King, E. B., & Hebl, M. R. (2012). Bringing social identity to work: the influence of manifestation and suppression on perceived discrimination, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 18*(2), 165-170. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027724>
- Mael, F., & Ashforth, B. (1992). Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13*(2), 103-123. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030130202>
- Mobley, W. H., Horner, S. O., & Hollingsworth, A. T. (1978). An evaluation of precursors of hospital employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 63*(4), 408-414. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.63.4.408>
- Nielsen, M. B., & Einarsen, S. (2012). Outcomes of exposure to workplace bullying: A meta-analytic review. *Work & Stress, 26*(4), 309-332. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2012.734709>
- Norton, T. A., Zacher, H., Parker, S. L., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2017). Bridging the gap between green behavioral intentions and employee green behavior: The role of green psychological climate. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 38*(7), 996-1015. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2178>
- Rafferty, A. E., & Griffin, M. A. (2006). Perceptions of organizational change: a stress and coping perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(5), 1154-1162. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.5.1154>
- Rafferty, A. E., & Jimmieson, N. L. (2017). Subjective perceptions of organizational change and employee resistance to change: Direct and mediated relationships with employee well-being. *British Journal of Management, 28*(2), 248-264. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12200>
- Ragins, B. R., & Cornwell, J. M. (2001). Pink triangles: Antecedents and consequences of perceived workplace discrimination against gay and lesbian employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(6), 1244-1261. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.6.1244>
- Resnick, C. A., & Galupo, M. P. (2019). Assessing experiences with LGBT microaggressions in the workplace: Development and validation of the microaggression experiences at work scale. *Journal of Homosexuality, 66*(10), 1380-1403. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2018.1542207>
- Rosenberg, M. (1979). *Conceiving the Self*. Basic Books.
- Schmidt, F. L., Le, H., & Ilies, R. (2003). Beyond alpha: An empirical examination of the effects of different sources of measurement error on reliability estimates for measures of individual-differences constructs. *Psychological Methods, 8*(2), 206-224. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.8.2.206>
- Schmitt, D. P., & Allik, J. (2005). Simultaneous administration of the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale in 53 nations: exploring the universal and culture-specific features of global self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 89*(4), 623-642. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.89.4.623>
- Shaffer, J. A., DeGeest, D., & Li, A. (2016). Tackling the problem of construct proliferation: A guide to assessing the discriminant validity of conceptually related constructs. *Organizational Research Methods, 19*(1), 80-110. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428115598239>