Generational Impact on Self-Group Distancing Among LGBTQ+ Community

by

Marion Elizabeth Shepard

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Auburn University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Master of Science

Auburn, Alabama
May 2024

Generational Cohort; Self-Group Distancing; LGBTQ+

Copyright 2024 by Marion Elizabeth Shepard

Approved by

Dr. Tierra James, Co-chair, Assistant Professor, Sociology
Dr. Greg Weaver, Co-chair, Associate Professor, Sociology
Dr. Natalia Ruiz-Junco, Associate Professor, Sociology

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to analyze how generational membership impacts the presence and frequency of self-group distancing attitudes, behaviors, and cognitive patterns among members of the LGBTQ+ community. After bivariate testing and multivariate regression analysis of data from the "Generations: A Study of Life and Health of LGB People in a Changing Society United States, 2016-2018" (Meyer, 2023) survey, a couple communities within the LGBTQ+ population showed statistical significance in certain aspects of self-group distancing. Specifically, the White Lesbian and White Bisexual populations returned a statistical impact of generational cohort membership on self-group distancing behaviors and a feeling of community connectedness. Additionally, the White Gay community showed statistical significance in generational membership impact on self-group distancing cognitive patterns in the form of internalized homophobia. Across all communities, however, there was no substantive significance that showed a demonstrable effect of generational membership on overall self-group distancing. Considering this evidence, it appears that generational membership is not as important as a person's social environment and perceived potential for discrimination to occur. Therefore, the best intervention to mitigate self-group distancing from occurring is to facilitate an inclusive environment where the potential for discrimination or prejudice is either low or communally known to be met with a swift response.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Dr. Tierra James for her guidance and assistance throughout the research process. She put in more effort and time into helping me achieve this goal than I ever expected, and it has been truly appreciated. Thank you as well to my committee members, Dr. Greg Weaver and Dr. Natalia Ruiz-Junco, who put up with my “Army-isms” and gave me a great grasp on all the theory sociology has to offer.

Last, and most importantly, thank you to my wife, Erica, who had to listen to rough presentation rehearsals, half-baked ideas, and a dozen “soap box” ramblings through this whole process. Without you, I would still be baking loaves of banana bread to procrastinate instead of writing my first draft.

List of Tables

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics: Independent Variables 60

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Dependent Variables 62

Table 3: Bivariate Statistics 63

Table 4: Multivariate Regression: Identity Centrality by Race 64

Table 5: Multivariate Regression: Identity Centrality by LGBQ+ Identity 65

Table 6: Multivariate Regression: Community Connectedness by Race 66

Table 7: Multivariate Regression: Community Connectedness by LGBQ+ Identity 67

Table 8: Multivariate Regression: Community Connectedness by Race/LGBQ+ Identity (White LGBQ+) 68

Table 9: Multivariate Regression: Community Connectedness by Race/LGBQ+ Identity (Black/LGBQ+) 69

Table 10: Multivariate Regression: Community Connectedness by Race/LGBQ+ Identity (Latino/LGBQ+) 70

Table 11: Multivariate Regression: Internalized Homophobia by Race 71

Table 12: Multivariate Regression: Internalized Homophobia by LGBQ+ Identity 72

Table 13: Multivariate Regression: Internalized Homophobia by Race/LGBQ+ Identity (White/LGBQ+) 73

Table 14: Multivariate Regression: Internalized Homophobia by Race/LGBQ+ Identity (Black/LGBQ+) 74

Table 15: Multivariate Regression: Internalized Homophobia by Race/LGBQ+ Identity (Latino/LGBQ+) 75

Table of Contents

Abstract 2

Acknowledgments 3

List of Tables 4

Table of Contents 5

Chapter 1 Introduction 7

Chapter 2 Literature Review 10

What is the LGBTQ+ Community? 10

Why is the LGBTQ+ Community Stigmatized? 12

How Do Members of the LGBTQ+ Community React to Stigma? 14

Why Do Members of the LGBTQ+ Community React to Stigma in This Manner? 17

Other Considerations—Role Pluralism and Intersectionality 20

Gap in Literature 21

Chapter 3 Methodology 24

Research Question and Hypothesis 24

The Dataset 24

Analytical Approach 26

Chapter 4 Results 28

Demographics 28

Personal Identity Centrality 29

Community Connectedness 31

Internalized Homophobia 36

Chapter 5 Discussion and Conclusion 40

Findings 40

Future Implications 43

Limitations of the Research 45

Suggestions for Future Research 46

Conclusion 47

References 48

Chapter 1: Introduction

"If she has pink accessories, she's going to be a crazy cunt."

-- a female US Army Soldier circa 2016

A female US Army soldier spoke the above quote in reference to another female US Army soldier, and it was her "rule of thumb" on how she judged her peers when first meeting. It was bewildering to hear a female soldier identify an expression of femininity as the hallmark of what would make another female soldier an undesirable coworker and mentally unstable. There was no merit-based assessment; just the fact that another female soldier would be willing to express a culturally defined feminine quality openly was enough to be considered an "other" and disregarded. She was not the only female soldier I have encountered who shared similar sentiments about other female soldiers and their expression of femininity. On the surface, one would anticipate a shared characteristic as a source of unification or camaraderie among a marginalized group and that the shared oppression or discrimination would unite individual members. However, as observed here, the very mechanism of oppression—belittling femininity in a hyper-masculine society—was, in turn, weaponized and employed between members of the marginalized group.

Another example of this phenomenon can be observed in the interactions between members of the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, plus (LGBTQ+) community. While mainstream media would deem the LGBTQ+ community as a homogeneous group, the acronym spans many different facets of personal identities which encompass sexuality, romanticism, gender identity, and gender expression (Princeton Gender and Sexuality Resource Center 2024). These separate groups can experience tension among themselves and within themselves that perpetuates stereotypes and stigmas that have been maintained by the dominant culture

(Parmenter et al. 2021; Weiss 2011). The community as a whole is often assumed to provide a sense of inclusion but has an ability for in-groups/out-groups, gatekeeping, and other types of discrimination to occur (Adams and McCreanor 2014; Parmenter et al. 2021; Weiss 2011).

Across lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals, there are several areas of conflict—such as bi-phobia or transphobia—which speaks to echoing the stereotypes maintained by the heteronormative culture (Robinson 2016; Strayer 2021; Weiss 2011). Although they understand alternative sexualities and how attraction "works", it has been observed in the population that lesbians and gay men can engage in "Bi-erasure," term describing the thought that bisexual individuals do not exist, and that one must prefer one sex over the other (Parmenter et al. 2021). Bi-erasure is perpetuated by purposeful ignorance, willful suppression, or assuming someone to be a definite monosexual after finding a partner (Parmenter et al. 2021). Some within the LGBTQ+ community refuse to date people who identify as bisexual for fear they are promiscuous or going to leave them for the other sex eventually (Cox 2023). Within heteronormative society, bisexuality has been, and still is, contested. People may believe the person is experiencing confusion, an ongoing "phase," seeking attention through promiscuity, or a transitive identity until identifying fully as gay or straight (Cox 2023; Daw 2018).

Another aspect of perpetuated discrimination within the LGBTQ+ exists between members from sexual minorities and those who have differing gender identities (Strayer 2021; Weiss 2011). Some would have the "T" removed from LGBTQ+ as a separate category, or community altogether, from those who experience non-heterosexual attraction (Stryker 2006). In American heteronormative society, a portion of the population has deemed homosexual people as pedophiles who are trying to either "groom" children into joining homosexuality or attempt to gain positions of trust to molest children (Bryant 1977: 114). This narrative has existed for

decades and continues to paint non-heterosexual people as sexual deviants or pedophiles targeting children (Bryant 1977; Burke 2022; Posner 1992).

In recent years, as gender identity has become a part of mainstream cultural awareness, the "grooming/pedophile" narrative has also expanded to encompass transgender individuals (Anti-Defamation League 2022). Instead of supporting these individuals in their push for equal rights, some within the LGBTQ+ community have taken to aiding the "grooming" rhetoric. A national group known as "Gays Against Groomers," a 501(c)4 organization, seeks to stop minors from receiving gender-affirming care, prevent queer theory from appearing in public discourse, and prevent minors from attending drag shows of any kind (GaysAgainstGroomers 2023). This group single-handedly adopts heteronormative fears and rhetoric to target members of their shared marginalized group—the LGBTQ+ community.

Across these groups and some of their conflicts described above, it has observed that members of devalued, marginalized groups may seek to distance themselves from their identity when faced with physical or psychological stressors due to said stigmatized identity. In so doing, they seek to align with the majority, in this case, heteronormative society, and its approval rather than ally with other members of the marginalized group. This mentality manifests itself through a person's negative cognitive patterns, attitudes, and behaviors toward other members of their in-group, known as "Self-Group Distancing" (Van Veelen et al. 2020; Veldman et al. 2021). This set of beliefs and behaviors, intended to help the individual achieve social belonging and mobility and reinforce self-esteem, can instead lead to lasting negative impacts and isolation (Van Veelen et al. 2020).

Chapter 2: Literature Review

What is the LGBTQ+ Community and Why So Many Letters?

American society is predicated on a heteronormative basis which considers heterosexual, cisgendered identities as the "default" or norm for all people (Robinson 2016). The LGBTQ+ community is a large grouping of identities comprising a relatively small percent of the population that faces a uniquely shared social status. The community spans a variety of sexualities, gender identities, romantic leanings, biological makeup and gender expressions and consists of around 7.2 percent of the American adult population (Princeton Gender and Sexuality Research Center 2024; Jones 2023). Despite the broad spectrum of human identities, this community is still considered a group because of each facet's shared non-heteronormative aspect. This non-heteronormative grouping is further solidified by a large heterosexual and cisgendered population (approx. 93%) that, at times, considers the LGBTQ+ a monolithic community with identities that are interchangeable with each other. For example, straight, cis-male comedian Bill Maher discussed the recent Gallup Poll describing LGBTQ+ trends across generations on his HBO show, *Real Time,* in 2023.

During the segment, he first highlighted how the percentages of those self-identifying as LGBT seem to double in each generation, with the youngest generation, Generation Z, showing a 20.8% rate (Maher 2023). Without care for which identity is represented by each letter, he extends that "if we follow this trajectory, we will all be gay by 2054…All I'm saying when things change so fast we have a right to say, 'what's up with that? Are all the babies in the wrong bodies?' (Maher 2023). In this quote he conflates sexuality and gender identity as though they are interchangeable. Further, he continues to make comments in reference to gender identity and expression as though the entirety of the 20.8% of Generation Z LGBT respondents solely

selected a Transgender identity response. The clip, now on YouTube, has had over 7.2 million views since it was posted one year ago. It has a positive reception of over 208,000 "likes" and over 28,000 comments, which appear primarily supportive and receptive of his monologue as of February 2024.

Alternatively, as more time has been spent over the past few decades to acknowledge other sexualities and gender expressions outside of the heteronormative, the community acronym has grown. The community within America has shifted from LGB (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual) of the early 1990s to LGBTQIA+ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer/Questioning, Intersex, Asexual) that is more commonly used today with a "plus" sign at the end to acknowledge the uniqueness of human sexuality and gender expression and its potential to be realized in a multitude of ways (Blakemore 2021). This growth has not happened overnight and is typically met with resistance to the community, both external and internal (Blakemore 2021; Whitehall 2021).

An example of external resistance can be seen in Bill Maher's clip, which references the topic above, while internal strife adopts a different approach. Some within the community disagree with the continual addition of letters to the overall acronym as they believe it will cause confusion or delegitimize the identities of others (Whitehall 2021; Stichler 2018). These tensions arise due to how vastly different these identities and subcommunities are, alongside the fear that acknowledging too many may lead to confusion and potential loss of creditability in the heteronormative society. Perhaps best put by Douglas Stichler in his opinion piece for West Hollywood Community News as he stated, "If we as a community are confused by all this, our straight counterparts can not be expected to understand. Especially when some have a hard enough time already dealing with anything other than heterosexuality." (2018).

Why is the LGBTQ+ Community Stigmatized?

To understand why the LGBTQ+ community faces stigmatization, one must first understand some of the building blocks of society. French Philosopher Emile Durkheim (1895) posited that psychological and sociological concepts are known to an individual through experience but could not be understood without external study. His study led to the identification of "social facts," which he described as the following:

> Any way of acting, whether fixed or not, capable of exerting over the individual an external constraint; or; which is general over the whole of a given society whilst having an existence of its own, independent of its individual manifestation (Durkheim 1895)

In this, he found that these social facts existed which pressured the individual's everyday life. With this concept, Durkheim provides the basic understanding that communities are founded on implied social rules or norms that outline typical, accepted behavior and role performance. By following these social rules, one is a full member of society. However, to exist outside of what is expected causes reactionary pressure to be exerted by other members of said society towards the deviant individual.

Erving Goffman, a sociologist theorizing in the 1960s and 70s, furthered this understanding of society's weighing of an individual's acceptable exhibited behaviors to include a person's physical, mental, and character traits–that it is not merely what a person does but also who they are that is up to public scrutiny. He asserted that members of a society assume an individual to hold certain traits commensurate with the social category to which they are assessed to belong

which is considered a “virtual social identity” (Goffman 1963:2). As the individual demonstrates that they possess certain traits, their “actual social identity” is shown. Should these possessed traits be incongruous with what society’s norms anticipate an individual to have, then that person’s identity, category and social status is reassessed. When the possessed trait is deeply discreditable and, once known to others, leads an individual to be considered tainted or discounted, the trait is consequently considered a stigma (Goffman 1963: 3).

Within American culture, in relation to sexuality and gender norms, there is a social hierarchy and power structure perpetuated with heteronormativity as the ideal (Robinson 2016). Heteronormativity is described as a “hegemonic system of norms, discourses, and practices that constructs heterosexuality as natural and superior to all other expressions of sexuality” (Robinson 2016:2). This system values members’ actions, behaviors, and personal traits that uphold these cultural norms and reward them with societal privilege. Any deviation, even by a heterosexual individual, from these ideals can find the person at a social disadvantage. For example, a voluntarily childless heterosexual, cisgendered couple, or a single heterosexual mother may receive adverse social reactions to their deviation from the American heteronormative ideal, which is based upon a family unit with a husband and wife present to raise a child (Robinson 2016; Ashburn-Nardo 2016). Should either the voluntarily childless couple choose to have a child or the single mother marry a heterosexual, cisgender man, they would return to a more heteronormative status and most likely alleviate the social reactions to their previous deviation from accepted societal behavior and stigma.

All members of the LGBTQ+ community exist outside of the heteronormative ideal in a mostly irreconcilable capacity through both who they are as people and the actions they take in pursuit of happiness. While total assimilation to said cultural norm is technically possible, the

cognitive dissonance and mental stress placed upon a person in order to do so can have devastating effects (Jones et al. 2022; Meyer 2003; Pachankis et al. 2020). Exhibited behaviors from LGBTQ+ individuals deviate from the accepted social norms or facts of a heteronormative society and are often on the receiving end of adverse social reactions ranging from subtle communication changes, verbal confrontation, outright physical violence, or murder (HRC Foundation 2023; Flores et al. 2020; Soto 2024). Those who do not outwardly exhibit non-heteronormative behaviors still face adverse social reactions from public knowledge–real or perceived– of their stigmatized identity (Goffman 1963; Earnshaw et al. 2016; LGBTQ+ Bar 2024; Earnshaw et al. 2016).

How Do Members of the LGBTQ+ Community React to Stigma?

LGBTQ+ individuals react to social pressure and a stigmatized identity through psychological and physical means. In this section, the basis, process, and onset of psychological stress, as well as physical manifestations and behaviors in reaction to their stigmatized status will be explained. The psychological impact begins with how LGBTQ+ individuals are socialized within a heteronormative society.

While raising children, parents impart personal morals, virtues, lessons, and essential cultural norms (Tam 2015). As nearly all members of American society are assumed heterosexual and cisgender at birth, children are socialized to assume heteronormativity. This process begins before the child is born as their gender is “revealed” to friends and family. It is used to construct a nursery, purchase specific clothing, and select a name. Alongside gender, heterosexuality also begins to be normalized at a young age with children often mirroring or displaying heterosexual acts under the guidance of their parents. A recent viral video showed a five-year-old boy dressed in a suit to giving flowers and a gift to his “valentine,” a young girl

(Good Morning America 2022). Despite Valentine's Day being typically viewed as a celebration of romantic love, the video, both on YouTube and TikTok, has had millions of views (40.5 million on TikTok) and resoundingly positive comments for the without a doubt romantically coded action (Good Morning America 2022; Shelby Small 2024). Many comments praised how the parents were raising the little boy and complimenting the type of future husband the little boy would be (TikTok 2024). This child, as is the case with many others, has achieved interpenetration of heteronormative ideals prior to the typical development age for either gender identity or sexual attraction.

Sociologist Talcott Parsons addressed another aspect of society and communities. He theorized a concept known as "interpenetration," wherein a person internalized "social objects and cultural norms into the personality of the individual" (1971:6). His theory takes what was relayed by Durkheim's external social facts, which are dictated and enforced by external factors and addresses the point in which an individual accepts these facts and enters them into their psyche. This turning point comes after an individual receives continual socialization from parents, family, schools, media, and community members. In terms of gender, a child is thought to be able to distinguish between genders between 18-24 months of age, have a general idea of their gender between the ages of 3-5 years, and complete understanding of their gender between 6-8 years old (Canadian Paediatric Society 2023; Martin and Ruble 2013; West and Zimmerman 1979). Sexual maturity, wherein a person begins to understand the attraction to others, typically occurs concurrently with the onset of puberty between the ages of 9-13 years old (Fortenberry 2013; NCSBY 2024).

The heteronormative socialization for each individual occurs, and achieves interpenetration, prior to knowledge of their own gender identity or sexual orientation. For those in the LGBTQ+

community, their socialization process leads to a significant development upon the realization of their true non-heteronormative trait. As best explained in the words of Goffman:

> *One phase of this socialization process is that through which the stigmatized person learns and incorporates the standpoint of the normal, acquiring thereby the identity beliefs of the wider society and a general idea of what it would be like to possess a particular stigma. Another phase is that through which he learns that he possesses a particular stigma, and, this time in detail, the consequence of possessing it. ... One who… learns late in life that he has always been discreditable…such an individual has thoroughly learned about the normal and the stigmatized long before he must see himself as deficient. Presumably he will have a special problem in reidentifying himself, and a special likelihood of developing disapproval of self. (1963; 32-34)*

For many LGBTQ+ individuals, this realization comes at a point where one already holds heteronormativity as the cultural norm, with deviance seen as a deeply discrediting trait deserving of social pressure to conform. This negativity conflicts with the new self-knowledge and presents itself as internalized fear, a well-known example being internalized homophobia (Russell and Bohan 2006; Szymanski and Chung 2001). Internalized homophobia often manifests as perpetuated oppression between group members, self-negativity, an avoidance of any LGBTQ+ people or coded activities, and an appeal to "homonormativity" as one ages (Robinson 2016; Russell and Bohan 2006; Szymanski and Chung 2001).

In order to still exercise efficacy and attempt to gain agency, homosexual individuals may ascribe to "Homonormativity." This is the act in which non-heterosexual individuals attempt to mirror their heterosexual counterparts in all other ways outside of their same-sex partner and participate in certain institutions to seek advancement and acceptance (Robinson 2016). The persistence of heteronormativity and homonormativity is especially damaging as it divides the LGBTQ+ community. As Robinson described:

> Those sexual minorities who can or do assimilate into heteronormative structures and conform to the congruent gender roles receive more rights and privileges than those who do not or cannot assimilate. For example, many transgender and other gender non-conforming individuals are often pushed to the periphery of LGBTQ+ communities (Robinson, 2016:1).

Robinson's words show that there is both affirmative action to conform and appeal to the heteronormative culture while also distancing from those within the same marginalized group.

Why Do Members of the LGBTQ+ Community React to Stigma in This Manner?

LGBTQ+ individuals can react to their stigmatized identities through the adoption of negative cognitive patterns and attitudes about non-heteronormativity, as well as the adoption of specific actions or behaviors to conform to heteronormativity as closely as possible, apart from their non-heteronormative trait. Due to stigma from one's social identity, potential psychological and physical reactions spawn from social stress and are known as Self-Group Distancing (to be discussed later in this section).

Social Identity Theory, provided by Tajfel and Turner (1979), explains that a person's self-esteem, personal understanding, and self-efficacy align with their position in certain societal groups. Further, their membership in these groups becomes their identity in both how an individual views themselves and how others may view and evaluate the individual. When their identity becomes threatened by actual or potential external devaluing, or internal dissonance, they may be likely to engage in behaviors to reconcile their self-esteem or social standing. LGBTQ+ individuals are in a unique circumstance as their "membership" in this community may not be apparent publicly (Van Veelen et al. 2020). Tajfel and Turner (1979) relay that one is a member of a community upon the perception of membership which occurs, as previously mentioned, when one gains a complete understanding of their sexual orientation or gender

identity and its deviation from heteronormativity. Further, as explained in Minority Stress Theory, people of non-heterosexual identities interpret stress and can react in the face of potential psychological or physical distress (Meyer 1995; 2003). Therefore, regardless of whether one is public about their LGBTQ+ membership, they still face threats to their social identity, self-esteem, and social standing and may resort to self-group distancing.

Self-group distancing manifests itself through a person's cognitive patterns, attitudes, and behaviors toward other members of their in-group (Van Veelen et al. 2020; Veldman et al. 2021). At its foundation, a person's cognitive position and perception of self in relation to their in-group and stereotypes therein determine how they align themselves with said group. For example, a gay cis-gendered man with a group of heterosexual cis-gendered men may highlight his traditionally masculine traits and hobbies while potentially making jokes about more effeminate gay men and/or traditionally feminine traits or hobbies. He may still engage in typical feminine expressions, hobbies, or other aspects of traditional womanhood but choose to minimize certain parts of himself in that moment that could threaten his sense of belonging with the group of heterosexual men.

Regarding attitude, self-group distancing manifests in the beliefs of a person's in-group members and their understanding of the average person within that group (Van Veelen et al. 2020). An example would be a homosexual person believing that same-sex parents are less capable in general than opposite-sex parents due to a lack of a masculine and/or feminine role model and being uneasy about same-sex partners adopting children.

Lastly, a person's self-distancing behaviors are demonstrated in maintaining a physical distance from other members of their in-group (Van Veelen et al. 2020). A person exhibiting self-group distancing behaviors would avoid interacting with in-group coworkers, having friends

within the same in-group, or participating in an activity or group representing said in-group. Specifically, a transgender woman who “passes” (a term wherein an individual physically presents as a gender to the point where the average member of society believes them to be a part of said gender) may not seek to have other transgender friends–especially ones who do not “pass.”

A person may utilize self-group distancing when they feel that their in-group is devalued within the broader community, and membership in said group may hinder them from belonging or having social or professional mobility (Van Veelen et al. 2020; Veldman et al. 2021). While intended to help an individual escape the scrutiny of their stigmatized in-group, self-group distancing is estimated to have more negative than favorable impacts. It may hinder the organization and community as a whole (Van Veelen et al. 2020).

Individually, there is an assumed positive that self-group distancing will reduce immediate physical and psychological stressors and aid in belonging to the out-group and ability for upward mobility in the organization (Major and Schmader 2017; Pasek et al. 2017; Schmader and Sedikides 2017). However, the long-term effects can account for far more negative impacts, such as a lack of cohesion with in-group members, little to no social support, mental/psychological stressors from implication members of in-group, negatively affect feelings of authenticity, distrust, and less resiliency (Barreto et al. 2006; Newheiser et al. 2017; Quinn et al. 2017; Uysal et al. 2010).

Lastly, organizations can suffer from self-group distancing when the pattern continues until there is a loss of diverse thoughts and perspectives (in favor of the out-group’s perspective to assimilate) and little progress or policy change to rectify systemic issues against marginalized groups (Van Veelen et al. 2020).

LGBTQ+ individuals become members of the community upon the perception of membership as determined when one becomes aware of their non-heteronormative trait. With their membership established, LGBTQ+ individuals face an understanding of their stigmatized identity and how they are now deviant from heteronormative cultural ideals. This social difference brings psychological and physical stressors that impact a person's social identity and lower self-esteem and social status. To reconcile, LGBTQ+ members may utilize self-group distancing to attempt to create distance from their stigmatized identity and seek social mobility or belonging. In addition to social pressure from deviation from heteronormativity, there are other cultural norms, stereotypes, and power structures at play within American society.

Other Considerations–Role Pluralism and Intersectionality

The LGBTQ+ community is often seen as a hegemon with representation envisioned as a gay, white cisgender man or homosexual, white cis-gendered woman who belittles and disregards the plethora of other identities (DeLaurentis 1991; Namaste 1994).

Parsons discussed the concept of role plurality, explaining that an individual participates in multiple roles within a society or community structure (Parsons 1971). A person's familial ties, friendships, occupation, and community role(s) come with societal expectations and cultural norms which may coexist separately, alongside each other, or potentially in conflict.

In modern sociological theory, role plurality is further discussed through the lens of power structures in Intersectionality. This theory describes how one's appeal to power or societal position is multifaceted across many different spectra of cultural ideals (Collins 2019; Crenshaw 1991). As one's composition of personal traits, social status, and achievement intersect across these spectrums, so is their sense of privilege weighed in cultural terms. For example, the experience of a straight, white, cis-gendered man from an upper-class economic status has a

vastly different life experience and social position than an asexual, mixed-race, genderfluid person from a middle-class economic status within American culture.

As mentioned above, when discussing the LGBTQ+ community, "colorblind intersectionality" often takes place where the default representation is that of a gay, white, cis-gendered man and –at times–includes a homosexual, white, cis-gendered woman (Cho et al. 2013; Delaurentis 1991). The members of this community maintain many identities and belong to several different facets of humanity simultaneously. Class, race, ethnicity, physical ability, income and education level all coincide in a person and interact to construct our identity (Collins 2019; Parsons 1971; Tajfel and Turner 1979). These layers contribute to a person's social identity and internal/external evaluation, as Tajfel and Turner's Social Identity Theory (1979) explain. Discrimination from members outside of the LGBTQ+ community towards internal members or between internal members can occur for reasons beyond their association with a non-heteronormative identity. Accordingly, individuals of the LGBTQ+ community may not only distance themselves from other members on account of queerness but potentially because of race, class, and sex as well. While studying self-group distancing among the LGBTQ+, it is imperative to understand and account for other reasons for discrimination or distancing that may occur between members outside of one's in-group to ensure the study does not exhibit systemic bias.

Gap in Literature

Current literature shows a gap in our understanding of when someone begins or stops, utilizing self-group distancing as a coping mechanism for anticipated threats toward their identity and sense of belonging (Van Veelen et al. 2020). Across the LGBTQ+ community, there are several reasons why different generational cohorts may be more or less likely to utilize self-

group distancing such as human development, societal attitudes, and historical events. Understanding the specific age of onset and potential age of abeyance could aid in creating targeted interventions to prevent self-group distancing actions from occurring–or lessen their frequency–for the sake of individuals and overall communities/organizations.

Research does show there is evidence of LGBTQ+ youth hiding their non-heteronormative identity to avoid bullying (Earnshaw et al. 2016). This concealment shows a desire to distance oneself and not align with a stigmatized identity. Additionally, young adults exhibit a high consciousness of social cues and show concern for social status and the opinions of others well into their early adult years (Elkind 1967), which could still manifest as a high propensity for self-group distancing from other LGBTQ+ members.

However, social psychology research shows that when individuals are exposed to counter-stereotypical exemplars, they are less prone to racial or gender biases (Finnegan, Oakhill, Garnham 2015; Gonzalez, Steele, Chan, Lim, Baron 2021). Consequently, this leads to the question if "Millennials," the first generation exposed to a litany of different perspectives through social media and a more LGBTQ+ inclusive society, is, in fact, less prone to heteronormative biases than their generational predecessors. Would Millennial LGBTQ+ members, therefore, be less likely to exhibit self-group distancing as a result?

Conversely, older generations may experience fewer cases of self-group distancing behaviors or actions due to the solidity of identity. As observed, older generations will colloquially state that they no longer care about the opinions of others regarding personal matters and typically experience less shame than younger people (Henry, von Hippel, Nangle, Waters 2016). As a member of an older generation, they may have experienced an abeyance of the need for self-group distancing. On the other hand, given long-time societal expectations, impactful historical

events, and attitudes towards the LGBTQ+ community, older generations may still ascribe to patterns of self-group distancing behaviors.

An example of lingering self-group distancing behaviors can be seen in the 33rd season of the TV series *Survivor*. During this season, the competitors are split between Millennial and Generation X (Gen X) participants. While one competitor from the Millennial tribe, Zeke, is open about his homosexuality from early on in the competition, a Gen X competitor, Bret, reveals his homosexuality much later and only in private to Zeke. The two are alone after sharing a competition reward involving several alcoholic beverages before Bret confides to Zeke that he "is not the only gay man here." Zeke appears taken aback before the two share a moment of camaraderie. Bret tells Zeke that he decided to hide his homosexuality when surrounded by "macho men" within the Gen X tribe. Zeke later tells the camera crew that he owes Bret's generation for how he [Zeke] is able to live his life–a supposed reference to his comfort in being open about his homosexuality.

Given our knowledge of young adults' concern for others' opinions regarding personal presentation and ability to "fit in" to societal norms, one could assume younger cohorts would exhibit an onset of self-group distancing behaviors and a high frequency or persistence of said behaviors. However, given Millennials' exposure to other perspectives through social media and their upbringing in a more LGBTQ+ inclusive society, they may have a low indication of any self-group distancing behaviors. Conversely, members of older generations may be less likely to experience or exhibit self-group distancing behaviors due to their solidity of self-esteem and identity, or, as in Bret's case above, resort to learned self-group distancing behaviors due to their lifetime exposure to such strong negative opinions of LGBTQ+ individuals.

Chapter 3: Methodology

Research Question and Hypothesis

After thoroughly reviewing available literature and considering the current gaps, I had the following research question: “Is there a difference in the presence and/or frequency of self-group distancing between different generations of LGBTQ+ individuals?”.

Given this question, I hypothesize that the stage of human development will impact the utilization of self-group distancing more than generational membership and historical events. Therefore, members of younger generations, specifically the “Millennial” Generation, will exhibit more self-group distancing behaviors, attitudes, and cognitive patterns than older generations.

The Dataset

This study utilizes publicly available, previously recorded data from “Generations: A Study of Life and Health of LGB People in a Changing Society, United States, 2016-2018" (Meyer, 2023). The survey is a longitudinal questionnaire give in three different waves each a year apart from the last in order to determine “whether younger cohorts of lesbian, gay men, and bisexuals (LGB) differed from older cohorts in how they viewed their LGB identity and experienced stress related to prejudice and everyday forms of discrimination” (Meyer 2023). The same respondents were used across all three waves.

The respondents were all 18 years old or older at the time of the first wave of the survey in 2016. They racially consist of Black, White, Latino and/or a mix of one of those three categories and another race category. Lastly, they were geographically representative of all 50 states and the District of Columbia. The respondents were divided into three separate age categories: 18-25

(The “Millennial” Generation[1]), 34-41 (Generation X), and 52-59 (The “Baby Boomer” Generation). These categories were chosen due to the historical significance of each cohort in terms of the Gay Rights Movement within America. The oldest generation (52-59) saw the onset of the movement and Stonewall riots. The middle generation (34-41) came of age during the AIDS epidemic and corresponding societal attitude towards queer people. Lastly, the youngest generation of the survey has grown up in a post-AIDS crisis and in the era of acceptance with the legalization of gay marriage and repeal of “Don’t Ask Don’t Tell.”

The study recruited participants through Gallup Inc., a survey research consulting company, using their dual-sampling procedure, including random digit dialing to reach landline and cell phone users (Meyer 2023). Once the call was answered, potential participants were screened for sexual orientation and gender identity. A total of 366,644 individuals were initially screened as potential participants. Between suitable personal identification, agreement to participate, and actual completion of the survey, the overall number of respondents for the first wave of the survey was 1,345 individuals. In order to have a more representative sample of people of color, the researchers continued to recruit and oversample the Black and Latino/Hispanic populations. The resulting sample size is 1,518 respondents (Meyer, 2023).

I chose this dataset for a couple of reasons. First, because the dataset had the most comprehensive demographics, it is representative of all geographic regions in America, is racially diverse, includes income levels and education levels, and spans several LGBTQ+ identities without getting too overwhelming. It would be difficult to truly analyze all members of the LGBTQ+ or ensure inclusivity of them all. Secondly, this dataset used several scales that are relevant to measuring the different aspects of self-group distancing.

[1] The Millennial Generation is typically considered those born between 1981-1996, according to the Pew Research Center (Dimack, 2019; Parker, 2023). The respondents of this survey ages 18-19 would have been born in 1998 and 1997, respectively, which would put them in Generation Z. I decided to keep this age group intact given the proximity in age with the rest of the Millennial cohort and likely similar sociocultural experiences.

Analytical Approach

For this study, all statistical analysis is conducted using R software. Variables were recoded as needed to facilitate analysis. The independent variables used in this study are generational cohort, race, LGB identity, personal income, household income, education level, and sex. While the overall question is about the difference between generational cohorts, one must account for the other factors that may contribute to an individual's need for self-group distancing.

The three dependent variables were chosen based on their ability to measure the different aspects of self-group distancing. Self-group distancing is comprised of attitudes, behaviors, and cognitive patterns. A person's self-group distancing attitudes relate to how one is willing to be aligned and seen as a part of a particular identity. In this survey, the "Sexual Identity Centrality" scale measured a person's attitude towards their sexuality and whether they felt it was an important part of who they are as a person. While a very high score could be odd—a person's sexuality is not typically the center of their identity—low scores would be out of the norm in an amatonormative society. An individual's behaviors are exhibited through participation in community activities, befriending others in that community, and political action on behalf of that community. The survey's "Community Connectedness" scale measured one's feeling of connectedness to the LGBTQ+ community. Lastly, a person's cognitive patterns reflect the opinions one has of the community and its members. The survey utilized an "Internalized Homophobia" scale which measured a person's perceptions towards being a part of the LGBTQ+. Each dependent variable is a numeric average based on a respondent's answers to items within the scale.

The bivariate analysis was a series of Pearson's correlation coefficient tests and Welch's t-tests. Personal Income, Household Income, Education Level, and Generational Cohort were maintained as continuous, interval variables. Whereas Race and LGBQ+ Identity (Transgender

individuals were not included in this survey), were recoded into their component categories (i.e. White, Black, Latino, or Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, etc.) which were then used as dummy variables for analysis. Each of the dependent variables—Identity Centrality, Community Connectedness, Internalized Homophobia—are continuous ratio variables. Independent variables were then run through a bivariate analysis, with each dependent variable being in accordance with the type of variables.

The multivariate analysis used a linear regression model in R that compared each dependent variable. The regression analysis included a couple of different models that were further subset across race and, separately, across LGBQ+ identity. The first model compared each dependent variable with an "overall" approach and then across each racial category. The linear regression model first contained all independent variables. Then, when focused upon racial groups, separated the dataset by race and then compared the dependent variable with all other independent variables. The same approach was utilized to compare an overall with weighted variables, and then across each LGBQ+ identity category.

Of note, the overall category used a dummy variable, "White," as a control during racial analysis. Where respondents were either white or non-white to determine whether race was a statistically significant variable. Additionally, during LGBQ+ identity regression, the variable "Male" was excluded from the Lesbian model. As "lesbian" is a label for women who are sexually attracted to other women, there were no male respondents in the category. However, the Gay model did include the "Male" dummy variable as the "gay" label—while used predominantly by men who are sexually attracted to other men—is used by some women.

Chapter 4: Results

Demographics

Several independent variables were used during this study, along with three dependent variables. Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics for the variables used during this study. This sample is 53% female and 45.5% male, the remaining percent excluded as those who did not provide a response. There are three generational cohorts (18-25, 34-41,52-59) which hold 44.1%, 24.5%, and 31.4% of the population, respectively. This sample is racially composed of 64.6% white, 15.7% Black/African American, and 19.6% Latino/Hispanic. The dataset was oversampled for people of color, and weighted values were used to perform multivariate regressions when looking for an "overall" relationship. The unweighted values were used when focusing on a specific racial population.

The LGB identity variable came from an individual's response to a specific question in the survey. The question asked, "Which of the following best describes your current sexual orientation?". Possible responses included "Straight/heterosexual," "Lesbian," "Gay," "Bisexual," "Queer," "Same-gender loving," and "Other" with a chance to submit a text option. Those who responded "Straight/heterosexual", "Other", or did not reply were excluded from the analysis. The "Straight/heterosexual" responses were excluded due to potential mismarking and/or survey incongruence. The 11 straight-identifying respondents had mismatched answers throughout the survey. For example, while stating they identify as straight/heterosexual, many answered the age they "came out" to family; women respondents stated they were very sexually attracted to women; and some agreed that to "know me is to know I'm LGB," etc. It is possible, since most of them were women, that some mistakenly checked the "straight/heterosexual" block instead of the "lesbian" block underneath. Due to these inconsistencies, it is difficult to

determine whether these respondents are truly straight/heterosexual or possibly taking the survey to misrepresent data.

The "Other" category was also excluded. The respondents entered a variety of responses across the asexual/aromantic spectrum and the pansexual spectrum. These identities are diametrically opposing, and if separated, were too small to be considered for statistical power. Lastly, those who did not respond were considered "NA" and excluded from analysis.

The last three variables—personal income, household income, and education level—rounded out the last of the independent variables. The average personal income for respondents was between $24,000 to $35,999. The approximate average gross personal income in 2016 was between 47,580 for men and $38,948 for women according to the Bureau of Labor and Statistics (2017). While this sample is slightly below, the Bureau of Labor Statistics report showed a different weekly average for younger age brackets. As this sample is 44% in the youngest bracket, it stands to reason that the sample would trend lower than the average personal income for that year.

Respondents reported an average household income slightly below $48,000 to $59,999. The average household income in 2016 was $57,617 according to the US Census Bureau (2017). Which, again, given the slightly younger sample, appears on track for the averages of the time.

Personal Identity Centrality

The first dependent variable, Identity Centrality, is an average score from how a respondent answered items regarding personal identity and how much their sexuality comprised a central part of that identity. The Sexual Identity Centrality section of this survey pulled five items from the 27-item Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Identity Scale (LGBIS) (Mohr and Kendra 2011). These

five items stated: *My sexual orientation is an insignificant part of who I am; My sexual orientation is a central part of my identity; To understand who I am as a person, you have to know that I'm LGB; Being an LGB person is a very important aspect of my life;* and *I believe being LGB is an important part of me* (Meyer 2023). Respondents then indicated their agreement to the statement using a six-degree Likert scale ranging from "Disagree strongly" to "Agree strongly." At the end of the segment, their five answers were averaged together for a general score between one and six. Higher scores resulted in higher centrality, whereas a lower score means lower centrality and the basis of sexuality as a central part of one's identity. The results from the entire pool of respondents showed an average of 3.95. Across generational cohorts, the averages were 3.943, 3.883, and 3.998, respectively.

Bivariate Analysis (Table 3) showed that among the continuous variables an individual's Education Level ($p<0.01$) was statistically significant with a correlation value of 0.071, which is a weak positive relationship. Among the categorical variables, Lesbian ($p<0.05$), Gay ($p<0.001$), Bisexual ($p<0.001$), and Queer ($p<0.001$) identities were statistically significant. The generational cohort was deemed not statistically significant, showing no significant relationship between cohort and feeling of identity centrality. Regardless of generational membership, it appears respondents feel similarly about how central their sexuality is to their identity.

Multivariate analysis was conducted in two parts. Table 4 and Table 5 reflect the results of each model. The first model conducted a regression across all independent variables and then considered all independent variables by each racial group. The overall result for the first model showed that Lesbian identity ($p<0.001$), Gay identity ($p<0.001$), Queer identity ($p<0.001$), personal income ($p<0.05$), and education level ($p<0.01$) were statistically significant.

When divided across racial categories, all respondents were divided into White, Black, and Latino before conducting the regression model. For white respondents, the Lesbian identity

($p<0.05$), Gay identity ($p<0.01$), Queer identity($p<0.001$), personal income($p<0.01$), and education level ($p<0.01$) were statistically relevant. For Black respondents, only a respondent's sex ($p<0.05$) was statistically relevant. For Latino respondents, no variables were statistically relevant.

The results of the second model are shown in Table 6. As in the first model, an overall regression was conducted, and then the respondents were divided across LGB identities and regression was repeated. Overall, Race ($p<0.05$) and education level ($p<0.001$) were statistically relevant. When broken down further, Lesbian and Gay communities had no statistically significant variables in regard to identity centrality. For Bisexual and Same-gender loving respondents, sex ($p<0.05$) was statistically significant. Lastly, Race ($p<0.05$) was statistically significant for Queer respondents.

Across bivariate and multivariate testing, the generational cohort was not statistically significant for any community. Given these results, I must fail to reject the null hypothesis. There is no statistically significant difference between generations in how they view their sexuality as a central part of their identity. As such, there is no difference between generational cohorts in their willingness to align themselves with an LGB identity and their attitude towards non-heteronormativity. In the first pillar of self-group distancing—attitude—no difference between generational cohorts appears.

Community Connectedness

The second dependent variable, Community Connectedness, measures a person's "desire for and strength of LGBT community affiliation among respondents" (Meyer 2023). The Community Connectedness scale used a 7-item portion from the 8-item scale created by Frost and Meyer (2012). These seven items stated: *You feel you're a part of the LGBT community; Participating in the LGBT community is a positive thing for you; You feel a bond with the LGBT*

community; You are proud of the LGBT community; It is important for you to be politically active in the LGBT community; If we work together, lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people can solve problems in the LGBT community; and *You really feel that any problems faced by the LGBT community are also your own problems* (Meyer 2023). Respondents entered their level of agreement across a four-point, Likert scale ranging from “Agree strongly” to “Disagree strongly.” The final scale was reverse-coded to ease interpretation so that lower answers indicated a lack of connection to the LGBT community. In contrast, a higher score would show a more connected individual. At the end of the segment, their seven answers were averaged together for an average score between one and four. The results from the entire pool of respondents showed an average of 2.966. Across generational cohorts, the averages were 3.03, 2.923, and 2.909, respectively.

Bivariate Analysis (Table 3) showed that among the continuous variables an individual’s generational cohort ($r=-0.09$, $p<0.001$) and personal income ($r=-0.09$, $p<0.001$) were statistically significant. Both variables have very weak negative relationships with community connectedness. Among the categorical variables White ($p<0.01$), Black ($p<0.001$), Latino ($p<0.001$), Bisexual ($p<0.001$), and Queer ($p<0.001$) identities were statistically relevant. The Generational Cohort variable was deemed statistically significant and showed a difference in how generational cohorts respond to community connectedness and belonging to the community. With a negative correlation coefficient, it appears that older generations feel less connected to the LGBTQ+ than younger generations.

Multivariate analysis was conducted in three parts for this variable. The first and second parts were identical to those performed for Identity Centrality. The additional step was to subset the data further into race and LGBQ+ identity before conducting the regression. Tables 6-10 reflect the results of each model. The first model conducted a regression across all independent

variables and considered all independent variables by each racial group. The overall result for the first model showed that Generational Cohort ($p<0.05$), Race ($p<0.001$), Lesbian identity ($p<0.001$), and Queer identity ($p<0.001$) were statistically significant. Addressing the overall sample, it appears that a person's generational cohort does make a numerical difference in how one perceives their connectedness to the LGBTQ+ community.

By race (Table 6), White respondents returned Generational Cohort ($p<0.5$), Household Income($p<0.05$), and Personal Income($p<0.01$) as statistically significant. Black respondents returned that a Gay identity ($p<0.05$) and Sex ($p<0.05$) were statistically significant. No variables were determined to be significant across Latino respondents. As the Generational Cohort variable is only statistically significant for White respondents, it appears that Black and Latino respondents do not have a generational difference in how connected they feel to the LGBTQ+ community.

By LGB Identity (table 7), the overall regression returned that only Race ($p<0.001$) was statistically significant, which aligns with the regression results above. Across specific groups, further variables were considered significant. The Lesbian population returned Generational Cohort ($p<0.01$), Race ($p<0.05$), and Household Income ($p<0.05$) as statistically significant. The Gay population returned Race ($p<0.05$) as statistically significant. The Bisexual respondents returned Race ($p<0.01$) and Personal Income ($p<0.01$) as statistically significant. Lastly, the Queer and Same-gender Loving communities showed no significant variables.

Within the White and Lesbian populations, the generational cohort variable returned that it was statistically significant. The White LGBTQ+ community did not return a statistical significance between any other LGB identity in this survey. There was no significant difference among white LGB identities in how they scored on the Community Connectedness scale. Therefore, the entirety of the White LGBTQ+ community experiences statistical significance

and, further, numerical differences in how generational cohorts perceive Community Connectedness. As the correlation coefficient ($r = -0.06$) is a small negative number, it appears that older generations would feel slightly less connected to the LGBTQ+ community than younger generations.

The Lesbian community also returned a statistical significance ($p<0.01$) for Generational Cohort. Further, Race also returned a statistically significant value ($p<0.05$). As such, the third regression models were performed to determine how LGB identity and racial groups responded (Tables 8, 9, 10). There was a statistical difference in how White Lesbians versus Black Lesbians or Latino Lesbians scored on the Community Connectedness scale. When the model is run across the White Lesbian, Black Lesbian, and Latino Lesbian respondents separately, only the White Lesbian population returns a statistically significant ($p<0.05$) value for the Generational Cohort variable.

Considering the results of the previous model and the presence of Race as a statistically significant variable across the Gay and Bisexual communities, the third regression model was extended beyond Lesbians and racial groups to all separate groups by race and LGBQ+ identity (Tables 8-10)[2]. The White Gay community did not return the generational cohort variable as statistically significant, while the White Bisexual community did ($p<0.05$).

Since the results show statistical significance among the White LGBQ+ population, specifically, the White Lesbian and White Bisexual population, I must reject the null hypothesis for these communities that there is no difference between generational cohorts in how they experience connectedness with the LGBTQ+ community. I fail to reject the null hypothesis for the Black LGBQ+ community, Latino LGBQ+ community, and other LGB identities represented

[2] The White Same-gender Loving group also returned a statistically significant value for Generational Cohort. However, as the group was narrowed down to LGB Identity and Race, the sample size became so small I did not believe it would carry true representation for that group.

in this survey. There appears to be no significant difference in how each generational cohort experiences community connectedness within these categories.

Now that statistical significance has been determined, the next level of analysis is substantive significance. While the White LGBQ+ community, White Lesbian community, and White Bisexual community showed there was a numerically significant difference between generational cohorts, the impact of that difference needs to be addressed. The White LGBQ+ and White Bisexual communities resulted in a very weak, negative regression coefficient (-0.06 White community, -0.08 White Bisexual). In comparison, the White Lesbian community resulted in a slightly weak, negative regression coefficient (-0.19 White Lesbian community). The Generational Cohort variable has three cohorts (youngest, middle, oldest) that are numerically considered one, two, and three, respectively. For the overall White LGBQ+ community, within the regression model, as one increases in the generational cohort their level of community connectedness is estimated to go down by 0.06 with each step. The highest loss is 0.12 more than the youngest generation. As a respondent's possible score on the Community Connectedness scale was between one and four, the difference of 0.12 between the youngest respondent and the oldest respondent is minuscule. To give an example, a respondent with a 3.00 score versus another respondent with a 3.12 score would more than likely not have a demonstrative difference in how connected they feel to the LGBTQ+ community. Likewise, with the White Bisexual community at –0.08, the difference between feeling connected to the community between the youngest white bisexual respondent and the oldest white bisexual respondent is minuscule.

Along the same line, the Lesbian community returned a slightly weak, negative regression coefficient of -0.19. The highest loss is 0.38 more than the youngest generation. Again, as a respondent's possible score on the Community Connectedness scale ranged between one and four, a 0.38 difference is not necessarily significant. For example, a person with a score of 3.00

versus a score of 3.38 may still be considered at about the same level of connection to the LGBTQ+ community—considering the next "step" in the scale is a full number (4) and not a half (3.5). The only other statistically significant variable in the White Lesbian community is household income ($p<0.05$). Generational Cohort and Household Income have a robust and positive relationship ($r=0.50$) which means that as one increases in generation, their household income typically increases. With a regression coefficient of 0.05, as one increases each step of their household income they feel more connected with the LGBTQ+ community. The negativity associated with each generation step would likely be slightly mitigated by adding household income. In essence, at most, the difference between average Community Connectedness scores would be 0.38 between the youngest and oldest generations. Realistically, this would be a more minor difference with the understanding of increasing household income with an increase of generation—perhaps closer to 0.33 or 0.28 on average. This, again, would most likely result in the two respondents perceiving their connection to the community similarly.

While statistically significant, considering the actual impact of generational cohorts in these communities leaves a different understanding. A person's generational cohort may make a numeric impact but does not seem to implicate a demonstrable difference between how younger and older members of the LGBQ+ perceive their connectedness to the community.

Internalized Homophobia

The third dependent variable, Internalized Homophobia, measured how respondents "accept stigma as a part of their own value systems" (Herek et al. 2009). The Internalized Homophobia scale utilized five items, and respondents answered their level of agreeance using a 5-point Likert scale. The five items stated: *I have tried to stop being attracted to people who are the same sex as me; If someone offered me the chance to be completely heterosexual, I would accept the chance; I wish I weren't LGB; I feel that being LGB is a personal shortcoming for me;* and *I*

would like to get professional help in order to change my sexual orientation from LGB to straight (Meyer 2023). Respondents showed their agreeance with the statement by answering on a five-point Likert scale ranging from “Strongly disagree” to “Strongly agree”. At the end of the segment, their five answers were averaged together for a general score between one and five (Meyer 2023). Higher scores demonstrated a higher presence of internalized homophobia, whereas a lower score means a lesser sense of internalized homophobia. The results from the entire pool of respondents showed an average of 1.623. Across generational cohorts, the averages were 1.711, 1.597, and 1.517, respectively.

Bivariate Analysis (table 3) showed that among the continuous variables, an individual’s Generational Cohort ($r=-0.11$, $p<0.001$), Household Income ($r=-0.7$, $p<0.01$), Personal Income ($r=-0.10$, $p<0.001$), and Education Level ($r=-0.11$, $p<0.01$) were statistically significant. Among the categorical variables, Lesbian ($p<0.01$), Gay ($p<0.05$), and Queer ($p<0.05$) identities; a respondent’s Sex ($p< 0.001$); and White ($p<0.01$) or Black ($p<0.05$) were statistically significant. The generational cohort was deemed statistically relevant, which showed there is a statistically significant difference in how different generations experience internalized homophobia.

Multivariate analysis was conducted in three parts for the final time. Tables 11-15 reflect the results of each model. The first model conducted a regression across all independent variables and considered all independent variables by each racial group. The overall result for the first model showed the Generational Cohort ($p<0.05$), Personal Income ($p<0.05$), Sex ($p<0.01$), and Education Level ($p<0.01$) were statistically relevant.

When divided across racial categories, all respondents were divided into White, Black, and Latino before conducting the regression model. For white respondents, their Generational Cohort ($p<0.05$), Lesbian identity ($p<0.01$), Bisexual identity ($p<0.05$), respondent’s Sex ($p<0.05$), and Education Level ($p<0.05$) were statistically significant. For Black respondents, no variables were

statistically significant. For Latino respondents, only a respondent’s Sex ($p<0.01$) was statistically relevant.

The results of the second model are shown in Table 12. As in the first model, an overall regression was conducted then the respondents were divided across LGB identities, and regression was repeated. Overall, Generational Cohort($p<0.05$), Personal Income ($p<0.05$), respondent’s Sex ($p<0.01$), and Education Level ($p<0.05$) were statistically significant. When broken down further, Lesbian, Queer, and Same-gender loving communities had no statistically significant variables in regard to internalized homophobia. For Gay respondents, the Generational Cohort was statistically significant ($p<0.01$). Bisexual respondents returned only a person’s sex ($p<0.001$) was statistically significant.

Considering there was a statistical significance for the Lesbian and Bisexual groups within the White community, further exploration was needed. In the second model, only the Gay community returned a statistical significance for Generational Cohort. By combining subsets (race and LGBQ+ identity) in the third model, I confirmed that the White Gay population returned a statistical significance with Generational Cohort while the remaining identities (particularly Lesbian and Bisexual) do not.

The generational cohort is statistically significant in models one and two’s weighted overall regressions, specifically for the White and Gay identity community. With further analysis, only the White Gay community returns a statistical significance for Generational Cohort. As such, I must reject the null hypothesis that there is no difference between generational cohorts for the White Gay community. For all other racial groups and LGBQ+ identities, I must fail to reject the null hypothesis that there is no difference between generational cohorts. The next aspect to consider is substantive significance.

Although the generational cohort is statistically significant and shows there is a systemic difference between how the different generations of White Gay individuals responded to the internalized homophobia scale items, the most significant impact the variable has is –0.42. Considering the youngest generation would experience –0.14 and the oldest –0.42, there is a difference of –0.28 between generational cohorts. On a one to six scale, a quarter of a point difference does not do much to change the level of internalized homophobia someone is exhibiting. While technically, the null hypothesis has been rejected, there is little demonstrable difference between each generational cohort in the White Gay community.

Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion

Findings

The three dependent variables (Identity Centrality, Community Connectedness, and Internalized Homophobia) were chosen for this study based on their ability to align with the three aspects of self-group distancing (attitude, behaviors, cognitive patterns). As there was no statistical significance for the generational cohort for Identity Centrality, there is no difference between generations and their attitude towards their non-heteronormative identity. Therefore, the first aspect of self-group distancing is not impacted by generational membership for any portion of the LGBQ+ community.

For the following variable, Community Connectedness, the results showed that there was statistical significance for the White LGBQ+ community, White Lesbian community, and White Bisexual community. However, considering the minimal substantive significance of generational cohort for these groups, it is unlikely generational membership provides a perceivable difference in the feeling of community connectedness. Therefore, it is unlikely that generational membership has a demonstrable impact on self-group distancing behaviors among members of the LGBQ+ community.

Lastly, for the final dependent variable, Internalized Homophobia, only the White Gay community returned statistical significance for the generational cohort. As explained above, the substantive significance is unlikely to provide a distinguishable difference between generational cohorts and their level of internalized homophobia. Therefore, it is unlikely that generational membership has a demonstrable impact on self-group distancing cognitive patterns among members of the LGBQ+ community.

A case could be made that any statistical significance is enough to state that the generational cohort impacts an aspect of self-group distancing. However, there are three things to consider

first: a slight numeric difference does not necessarily equate to a perceivable level difference in attitude or affect. Second, no group showed statistical significance for more than one variable. Third, self-group distancing must be considered holistically. For a group to demonstrate a slightly higher amount and/or presence of one aspect of self-group distancing does not mean there is an overall difference between generational cohorts.

With these findings in mind, it appears that generational membership does not meaningfully impact the presence of self-group distancing. In essence, one's current experience of queerness is similar all generational groups. As stated above, each generation balances between their identity development and the sociocultural events they have experienced. For the Gen X and Baby Boomer generations, the implication is that the traumatic historical events experienced by older generations has—and continues to—impact an individual's perception of their non-heteronormative identity. Their aging would assume the completion of identity formation (Elkind 1967) and perhaps less self-group distancing. However, their shared experiences not only formed personal stress and their opinion of the LGBTQ+ community but also that of their heteronormative peers.

Things like the cultural emphasis of the "nuclear family" and post-WWII suburban expansion, the enactment of Don't Ask, Don't Tell (DADT), and the response to the AIDS virus were duly traumatic to non-heteronormative people during their formative years. Concurrently, these events and cultural movements affirmed homonegativity for each generation's heteronormative individuals during their formative years as well. Additionally, the LGBTQ+ community is a much smaller portion of the population in older generations (3.3% in Gen X and 2.7% in Baby Boomers) (Jones 2023). This is also in part due to the thousands of losses suffered during the AIDS crisis (Murphy et al. 2021). It stands to reason that although LGBTQ+ members have aged to full identity formation, they remain a part of the same generational cohort whose shared

sociocultural experiences have strongly influenced values and ideals (Odukoya 2017). Their social environment has not changed, even as society has progressed to more inclusive means.

Meanwhile, those of younger generations (Millennials and Gen Z) who have not experienced the same historical events are so early in their identity formation as to contribute to their perception of their non-heteronormative identity similarly. While they have not experienced such drastic events, there remains anti-LGBTQ+ legislation, persistent anti-LGBTQ+ rhetoric, and clear determination to persecute members of the LGBTQ+ community. When the first wave of this survey was conducted (2016 until 2017), America was undergoing a presidential campaign with an eventual election that revolved around "Making America Great Again." This campaign inspired fear within the LGBTQ+ community, who overwhelmingly voted for the Democratic candidate (O'Hara 2016). Many LGBTQ+ members and LGBTQ+ activists discussed their fear of President Trump and Vice President Pence's election win and what it would mean for LGBTQ+ rights (Allegri 2016). Presumably, the fear of America returning to times it was "great" and the anti-LGBTQ+ events that occurred therein could have affected the 18-25-year-olds who took the survey. Although the Millennial and Gen Z participants were experiencing a more inclusive American society than any generation before, the presence of anti-LGBTQ+ sentiments and physical violence at early life cycle development could account for why their perception of their non-heteronormative identities was similar to their older counterparts who have faced harsh persecution.

Currently, Florida's "Don't Say Gay" bill and Tennessee's "Drag Ban" have both been recent attempts to eradicate LGBTQ+ identities from public spaces or educational systems (Senate Bill 0003, 2023; House Bill 1557, 2022; Lavietes 2022). Continual rhetoric denouncing LGBTQ+ people by religious and political members, including former heads of state, has also contributed to adverse events Millennials and Gen Z (who would entirely comprise the 18-25 cohort) have

experienced (Seitz-Wold and Yurcaba 2023; Blackburn and Turner 2024). Additionally, former President Trump has returned to the national election stage, this time with a record of anti-LGBTQ+ rights (Luneau 2022). Given the current climate and the return of former-President Trump, I would assume the survey would return similar results as it appears that age or generation does not impact self-group distancing as much as social environment and potential for discrimination and violence.

Future Implications

Understanding self-group distancing in terms of when people adopt this coping mechanism and how to intervene, particularly within the LGBTQ+ community, could go a long way in validating experiences, celebrating diversity, and building resilience across members as well as better integration in the outside community. With the revelation that one's age or generation cohort does not appear to matter as much as social environment, the best intervention is not in the individual but the organization. Establishing an inclusive organizational culture would be the most important step in reducing self-group distancing across marginalized groups. Especially for organizations that have an adverse history for specific communities and a fear of a return to more discriminatory times remains in the periphery.

Limitations of the Research

This study held some limitations. Overall, they seem to fall across two topics—first, the amount of self-group distancing measurements. Secondly, the study included grouping that excluded certain identities within the LGBTQ+. Ideally, there would be more questions inside each scale for Identity Centrality, Community Connectedness, and Internalized Homophobia. This would enable a better understanding and nuance of each respondent's answer. For example,

having only five questions from the 27-item LGBIS scale certainly limits the numerical significance achievable in this category. Perhaps, with a wider number of responses and additional Likert scale answers, there would be a stronger difference between generational cohorts, particularly in the areas where statistical significance was achieved but not substantially.

Secondly, adding gender would add another level to how self-group distancing is evidenced between generations. This could be achieved by either adding the transgender population to this survey or by assessing the gender expression of each respondent. Considering how gender expression and identity have become a mainstream debate, I would imagine their inclusion would have interesting results.

Suggestions for Future Research

There are a couple of different ways to further research into self-group distancing among the LGBTQ+ community. A suggestion would be to extend a survey with more response options for Identity Centrality, Community Connectedness, and Internalized Homophobia. The additional questions or items would provide more data points and potential for discerning nuance between generations that could have been amiss in this study. Another option would be to include gender expression or identity as well as transgender individuals within the scope of the survey participants.

Another idea would be to conduct an experiment where LGBTQ+ participants of varying ages are randomly exposed to a positive/inclusive environment compared to those exposed to a negative or neutral environment. Given that communal experience, how do LGBTQ+ members of different generations then respond to a survey with Identity Centrality, Community Connectedness, and Internalized Homophobia?

A specific organization to research and study for self-group distancing is the US military. The LGBTQ+ community has faced a variety of challenges in attempting to serve one's country. Initially, all members of the LGBTQ+ community were prohibited from service. In 1993, under President Bill Clinton, a new Department of Defense Instruction (DODI) commonly known as, "Don't Ask Don't Tell" (DADT), allowed Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual (LGB) individuals to serve in the US military so long as their LGB identity was not made public (Thompson 2008). Despite efforts to allow more leniency for LGB individuals to serve, DADT left many psychological scars and legal ramifications.

Research surrounding LGB military service members' experiences within the US Army during DADT exposes how trauma and mental stressors not only derived from treatment by heterosexual peers, but also in how LGB service members had to treat their peers to survive (Raghavan 2021; Ramirez and Sterzing 2017). While DADT has since been repealed, sexual orientation-based discrimination (SOBD) and military sexual trauma (MST) are heightened for LGB service members and serve to continue the social pressure in DADT's stead (Moody et al. 2020). Concurrently, the implementation of transgender servicemember inclusion, surprise reversal over a tweet, and re-allowance over the last few administrations has produced a public discourse where people on both sides have argued the merit of transgender servicemembers, the service ban's kinship to DADT, and the military's role as an inclusive employer (Brading 2021; Stur 2019).

The US Army is currently facing a recruiting crisis and working to strengthen their marketing towards recruits (Ring 2022). According to a Gallop Poll released in 2021, Gen Z (the youngest generation currently reaching adulthood) reports that ~20% identify as a part of the LGBTQ+ community (Jones 2022). Additionally, above-average numbers of young people believe they could be psychologically harmed if they joined the military (Ring 2022). While recent strategies

to cope with retention and recruiting are turning towards internal motivating factors and a "People First" approach (Brading 2021; Ring 2022), attempts to do so with the LGBTQ+ community amongst Gen Z–and further into the future–may be difficult without addressing the tension towards queer service members and the history of their persecution/exclusion.

Determining their internal motivations to serve may be irrelevant considering how past and current LGBTQ+ service members have been treated. When older LGBT veterans express their experiences in the US Army in a negative light due to DADT persecution and current LGBT service members express their experiences of SOBD and MST, it stands to reason Gen Z may not want to join the military or, if they do, be primed to fear a potential return to the standards of a less inclusive past as discussed above. Which will continue to harm military recruitment and retention in coming years (Moody et al. 2020; Ramirez and Sterzing 2017).

The best way to address this history would be to ensure that efforts for equal opportunity (EO) and equal employment opportunity (EEO) are not just "supported" but lived by and enacted. This plan of action would enable members of marginalized communities—specifically the LGBTQ+--to have less trepidation or anticipation of discrimination in their daily lives. In so doing, their community and social support would be much greater and possibly lend to LGBTQ+ members staying in the service. Also, when inclusion is fostered, members of marginalized communities are happier in the military than their civilian peers (Lundquist 2008), and heteronormative counterparts reduce biases (Stur 2019).

Conclusion

In conclusion, self-group distancing is a mix of negative attitudes, behaviors, and cognitive patterns one exhibits when part of a devalued marginalized community. While an individual may seek to distance themselves in hopes of gaining social mobility and a sense of belonging, they

often suffer long term negative impacts instead. There is a gap in our understanding of what age a person may begin to utilize self-group distancing in social settings, or what age they may stop. Within the LGBTQ+, the phase of human development and the historical experiences of each generational cohort could influence their likelihood to self-group distance.

The respondent's generational cohort was found to be statistically relevant for a couple of specific communities within the LGBTQ+ for two out of three aspects of self-group (behavior and cognitive patterns) distancing. However, no portions showed a meaningful, substantive significance in how generational cohort impacted self-group distancing among different generations of the LGBTQ+ community. It appears that generational membership or a person's position within identity development is less important than one's social environment and perceived potential for discrimination. Therefore, the best intervention to offset self-group distancing among the LGBTQ+ population is to exhibit an environment or culture that is inclusive of this group in that members do not feel imminent potential for discrimination or social reaction. That said, the environment's inclusiveness must be shown in daily interactions. An organization's purported inclusion that is not supported through actions will likely play host to self-group distancing.

Future avenues of research include the impact of gender as well as the point in which someone perceives a potential for discrimination. Gender identity and expression was excluded from this study and could be an interesting variable both for the sexualities studied as well as transgender individuals. This study concluded generations experience self-group distancing similarly with the perceived potential for discrimination as the driving factor. That said, future research could be to determine if there a difference between generations in when they perceive potential for discrimination.

References:

Adams, Jeffrey, Virginia Brau McCreanor. 2014. "'Aren't Labels for Pickle Jars, Not People?' Negotiating Identity and Community in Talk About 'Being Gay'". *American Journal of Men's Health* 8(6): 457-69. Doi: 10.1177/1557988313518800.

Allegri, Carlos. 2016. "LGBTQ Community Fears Backlash after Trump Victory." *NBCNews.Com.* Retrieved March 17, 2024. (https://www.nbcnews.com/feature/nbc-out/lgbtq-community-fears-backlash-after-trump-victory-n682561).

Anon. n.d. "Gays against Groomers". *GaysAgainstGroomers.* Retrieved April 10, 2023. (https://www.gaysagainstgroomers.com/).

Anon. n.d. "LGBTQIA+ 101—Princeton Gender + Sexuality Resource Center". *Princeton University*. Retrieved February 28, 2024. (https://www.gsrc.princeton.edu/lgbtqia-101)

Anon. N.d. 2017. "Women' and Men's Earnings by Age in 2016". *U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.* Retrieved March 5, 2024. (https://www.bls.gov/opub/ted/2017/womens-and-mens-earnings-by-age-in-2016.htm).

Anti-Defamation League. 2022. "What is 'Grooming?' The Truth Behind the Dangerous, Bigoted Lie Targeting the LGBTQ+ Community". (https://www.adl.org/resources/blog/what-grooming-truth-behind-dangerous-bigoted-lie-targeting-lgbtq-community).

Ashburn-Nardo, Leslie. 2016. "Parenthood as a Moral Imperative? Moral Outrage and the Stigmatization of Voluntarily Childfree Women and Men". *Journal of Sex Roles* 76(5-6):393-401. DOI: 10.1007/s11199/016-0606-1

Barreto, Manuela, Naomi Ellemers and Serena Banal. 2006. "Working under Cover:

Performance-related Self-confidence Among Members of Contextually Devalued Groups Who Try to Pass". *European Journal of Social Psychology* 36(3):337-352.

Blackburn, Piper Hudspeth and Abby Turner. 2024. "15 Promises Donald Trump has Made So Far in His Campaign for a Second Term". *CNN*. Retrieved March 17, 2024. (15 promises Donald Trump has made so far in his campaign for a second term (msn.com)).

Blakemore, Erin. 2021. "From LGBT to LGBTQIA+: The Evolving Recognition of Identity". *History*. Retrieved February 28, 2024. (https://www.nationalgeographic.com/history/article/from-lgbt-to-lgbtqia-the-evolving-recognition-of-identity).

Burke, Minyvonne. 2022. "Texas Pastor Says Gay People Should be 'Shot in the Back of the Head' in Shocking Sermon". *NBCNews.Com*. Retrieved February 28, 2024. (https://www.nbcnews.com/nbc-out/out-news/texas-pastor-says-gay-people-shot- back-head-shocking-sermon-rcna32748).

Brading, Thomas. 2021. "Serving with Pride: LGBTQ Soldiers Celebrate Diversity, Speak Their Truth." *Army News Service*. Retrieved March 17, 2024. (https://www.army.mil/article/247931/serving_with_pride_lgbtq_soldiers_celebrate_diversity_speak_their_truth).

Canadian Paediatric Society. 2023. "Gender Identity". *Caring for Kids.* Retrieved February 28, 2024. (https://caringforkids.cps.ca/handouts/behavior-and-development/gender-identity)

Cho, Sumi, Kimberle Williams Crenshaw and Leslie McCall. 2013. "Toward a Field of Intersectionality Studies: Theory, Applications, and Praxis". *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 38(4):785-810.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 2019. "Introduction". *Intersectionality as Critical Social Theory.*

Durham: Duke University Press.

Cox, Rebecca. 2023. "I Experience Bi-erasure on a Daily Basis". *PressReader.Com-Digital Newspaper & Magazine Subscriptions.* Retrieved 24 January, 2024. (https://pressreader.com/uk/evening-standard-west-end-final/20230629/281878712814076).

Crenshaw, Kimberle. 1991. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color". *Stanford Law Review* 43(6): 1241.

Daw, Stephen. 2018. "How Mainstream Artists are Fighting Against Bisexual Erasure in 2018". *Billboard.* Retrieved February 28, 2024. (https://www.billboard.com/culture/pride/how-mainstream-artists-are-fighting-bisexual-erasure-halsey-janelle-monae-brendon-urie-8476370/)

DeLauretis, Teresa. 1991. "Queer Theory: Lesbian and Gay Sexualities *An Introduction". Differences*: *A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 3(2):iii-xvii.

Dimock, Michael. 2019. "Defining Generations: Where Millennials End and Generation Z Begins". *Pew Research Center.* Retrieved March 1, 2024. (https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2019/01/17/where-millennials-end-and-generation-z-begins/).

Durkheim, E. "The Rules of Sociological Method," pp 35-38, 50-59, 119-125, 127-132, 134-135, form Emile Durkheim, *The Rules of Sociological Method,* ed. Steven Lukes, trans. W.D. Halls. New York: Macmillan Publishers, Ltd., The Free Press, 1982.

Earnshaw, Valerie A., Laura M. Bogart, V. Paul Poteat, Sari L. Reisner and Mark A. Schuster. 2016. "Bullying Among Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Youth". *Pediatric Clinics of North America* 63(6): 999-1010.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pcl.2016.07.004

Elkind, David. 1967. "Egocentrism in Adolescence". *Child Development* 38(4):1025-1034. https://doi.org/10.2307/1127100

Ender, Morten G., David E. Rohall and Michael D. Matthews. 2023. "Cadet and Civilian Undergraduate Attitudes Towards Transgender People". *Armed Forces & Society* 42(2):427-435.

Finnegan, Eimear, Jane Oakhill and Alan Garnham. 2015. "Counter-Stereotypical Pictures as a Strategy for Overcoming Spontaneous Gender Stereotypes". *Frontiers in Psychology* 2015(6):1291. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01291

Flores, Andrew R., Lynn Langton, Ilan H. Meyer and Adam P. Romero. 2020. "Victimization Rates and Traits of Sexual and Gender Minorities in the United States: Results from the National Crime Victimization Survey, 2017". *Science Advances* 6(40). DOI: 10.1126/sciadv.aba6910

Fortenberry, J. Dennis. 2013. "Puberty and Adolescent Sexuality". *Hormones and Behavior (64)*2: 280–287. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yhbeh.2013.03.007

Frost, David M. and Ilan H. Meyer. 2012. "Measuring Community Connectedness Among Diverse Sexual Minority Populations". *Journal of Sex Research,* 49(1):36-49. (https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2011.565427).

Goffman, Erving. 1963. *Stigma; Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Gonzalez, Antonya Marie, Jennifer R. Steele, Evelyn F. Chan, Sarah Ashley Lim and Andrew Scott Baron. 2021. "Developmental Differences in the Malleability of Implicit Racial Bias Following Exposure to Counterstereotypical Exemplars". *Developmental Psychology* 57(1): 102-113.

Good Morning America. 2022. "The Story Behind the Viral Video of Boy Asking Girl to Be His Valentine/GMA". *Good Morning America*. Posted February 28, 2022. Retrieved March 17, 2024. Video, 2:39. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lgjp29ZWStc

Guzman, Gloria G. 2017. "Household Income: 2016—U.S. Census Bureau". *U.S Department of Commerce*. Retrieved March 6, 2024. (https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications/2017/acs/acsbr 16-02.pdf)

Henry, Julie D., William von Hippel, Matthew R Nangle and Michele Waters. 2016. "Age and the Experience of Strong Self-Conscious Emotion". *Aging and Mental Health* 22(4): 497-502. DOI: 10.1080/13607863.2016.1268094

Herek, Gregory, J. Roy Gillis and Jeanine C. Cogan. 2009. "Internalized Stigma Among Sexual Minority Adults: Insights From a Social Psychological Perspective". *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 56(1):32-43. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014672.

House Bill 1557, Florida House of Representatives, CS/CS/HB 1557, Engrossed 1. 2022. Retrieved March 14th, 2024 (_h1557er.docx (flsenate.gov).

HRC Foundation. 2023. "2023 LGBTQ+ Youth Report". *HRC Digital Reports.* Retrieved March 2, 2024. (https://reports.hrc.org/2023-lgbtq-youth-report?_ga=2.207521562.886661425.1708638105-187212009.1708638105#school-safety)

Jones, Jeffrey M. 2022. "LGBT Identification in the U.S. Ticks up to 7.1%." *Gallup.com.* Retrieved March 2, 2024. (https://news.gallup.com/poll/389792/lgbt-identification-ticks-up.aspx).

Jones, Timothy W., Jennifer Power and Tiffany M. Jones. 2022. "Religious Trauma and Moral Injury from LGBTQA+ Conversion Practices". *Social Science & Medicine* 305. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2022.115040

Lavietes, Matt. 2022. “Here’s What Florida’s ‘Don’t say Gay’ Bill Would Do, and What it Wouldn’t Do.” *NBCNews.Com.* Retrieved March 17, 2024. (What Florida's 'Don’t Say Gay' bill actually says (nbcnews.com)).

Lundquist, Jennifer Hickes. 2008. “Ethnic and Gender Satisfaction in the Military: The Effect of a Meritocratic Institution”. *American Sociological Review* 73(3): 477-496.

Luneau, Delphine. 2022. “Human Rights Campaign Denounces Trump’s 2024 Bid for President, Vows to Work to ‘Ensure Trump Forever Remains a One-Term President.’” *Human Rights Campaign.* Retrieved March 17, 2024. (https://www.hrc.org/press-releases/human-rights-campaign-denounces-trumps-2024-bid-for-president-vows-to-work-to-ensure-trump-forever-remains-a-one-term-president).

Maher, Bill. 2023. “New Rule: Along for the Pride/Real Time with Bill Maher (HBO)”. *Real Time with Bill Maher*. Posted May 20, 2022. Video, 9:21. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mMBzfUj5zsg&t=1s

Major, Brenda and Toni Schmader. 2017. “Stigma, Social Identity Threat, and Health”. *The Oxford Handbook of Stigma, Discrimination, and Health* (pp. 85-103). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10/1093/oxfordhb/9780190243470.001.0001

Martin, Carol Lynn and Diane N. Ruble. 2010. “Patterns of Gender Development”. *Annual Review of Psychology 61*: 353-381. (https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.093008.100511)

Meyer, Ilan H. 1995. “Minority Stress and Mental Health in Gay Men”. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior,* 36(1), 38-56. doi:10.2307/2137286.

Meyer, Ilan H. 2003. “Prejudice, Social Stress, and Mental Health in Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Populations: Conceptual Issues and Research Evidence”. *Psychological Bulletin,* 129, 674-697. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.129.5.674

Meyer, Ilan H. 2023. "Generations: A Study of the Life and Health of LGB People in a Changing Society, United States, 2016-2019". *Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research*. https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR37166.v2

Moody, Raymond, Elizabeth Savarese, Sitaji Gurung, H. Jonathan Rendina and Jeffrey T. Parsons. 2020. "The Mediating Role of Psychological Distress in the Association between Harassment and Alcohol Use Among Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Military Personnel". *Substance Use Misuse* 55(12):2055-2063. DOI: 10.1080/10826084.2020.1790007

Mohr, Johnathon J. and Matthew S. Kendra. 2011. "Revision and Extension of a Multidimensional Measure of Sexual Minority Identity: The Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Identity Scale". *Journal of Counseling Psychology 58*(2), 234-245. (https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022858).

Murphy, Michaela, Rachel Nall and Ashley Williams. 2021. "The History of HIV and AIDS in the United States". *Healthline*. Retrieved March 17, 2024. (History of HIV and AIDS: 1981-2021, Statistics, and More (healthline.com).

Namaste, Ki. 1994. "The Politics of Inside/Out: Queer Theory, Poststructuralism, and a Sociological Approach to Sexuality". *Sociological Theory* 12(2):220-231.

National Center on the Sexual Behavior of Youth (NCSBY). 2024. "Normative Sexual Behavior". *National Center on the Sexual Behavior of Youth.* Retrieved March 2, 2024.
(https://www.ncsby.org/content/normative-sexual-behavior#:~:text=School%20children%20and%20young%20adolescents,months%20to %20one%20year%20later)

Newheiser, Anna-Kaisa and Manuela Barreto. 2014. "Hidden Costs of Hiding Stigma: Ironic Interpersonal Consequences of Concealing a Stigmatized Identity in Social

Interactions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 52:58-70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2014.01.002

O'Hara, Mary Emily. 2016. "Meet the LGBTQ+ Voters Who Backed Trump". *NBCNews.com.* Retrieved March 17, 2024. (https://www.nbcnews.com/feature/nbc-out/meet-lgbtq-voters-who-backed- trump-n684181).

Odukoya, Angel. 2022. "The Changing Generational Values". *Johns Hopkins University.* Retrieved March 17, 2024. (The Changing Generational Values – Imagine | Johns Hopkins University (jhu.edu)

Pachankis, John E., Skyler D. Jackson, Benjamin K. Fetzner, Conor P. Mahon and Richard Branstrom. 2020. "Sexual Orientation Concealment and Mental Health: A Conceptual and Meta-Analytic Review". *Psychological Bulletin,* 146(*10*)*:* 831-871. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000271

Parker, Kim. 2023. "How Pew Research Center Will Report on Generations Moving Forward". *Pew Research Center*. Retrieved March 1, 2024. (https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2023/05/22/how-pew-research-center-will-report-on-generations-moving-forward/).

Parmenter, Joshua G., R. V. Galliger and A.D.A. Maughan. 2020. "LGBTQ+ Emerging Adults Perceptions of Discrimination and Exclusion within the LGBTQ+ Community". *Psychology & Sexuality*, 12(4): 289-304. doi:10.1080/19419899.2020.1716056

Parsons, Talcott. 1971. "Action Systems and Social Systems". *System of Modern Societies.* Pp 4-28. Alex Inkeles (Ed.). Englewood, New Jersey.

Pasek, M. H., Filip-Crawford, G. and Cook, J. E. (2017). "Identity Concealment and Social Change: Balancing Advocacy Goals Against Individual Needs". *Journal of Social*

Issues 73(2):397-412. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12223

Posner, Richard A. 1992. *Sex and Reason.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pubity. 2024. “This 5-Year-Old Boy Surprises A Girl on Valentine’s Day”. *Tiktok*. Posted February 13, 2024. Originally posted by Shelby Small via ViralHog, 2022. Retrieved March 17, 2024. Video, 1:00. https://www.tiktok.com/@pubity/video/7335063465981267233?lang=en

Quinn, Dianne M., Bradley M. Weisz and Elizabeth K. Lawner. 2017. “Impact of Active Concealment of Stigmatized Identities on Physical and Psychological Quality of Life. *Social Science & Medicine* 192:14-17. (https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.09.024).

Raghavan, Gautam. 2022. “10 Years Later: Looking Back and the Repeal of ‘Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell.’” *The White House*. Retrieved March 17, 2024. (https://www.whitehouse.gov/ppo/briefing-room/2021/09/20/10-years-later-looking-back-at-the-repeal-of-dont-ask-dont-tell/).

Ramirez, M. Heliana and Paul R. Sterzing. 2017. “Coming Out in Camouflage: A Queer Theory Perspective on the Strength, Resilience, and Resistance of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Service Members and Veterans. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*, 29(1):68-86. DOI:10.1080/10538720.2016.1263983

Redden, Crystal Virtanen. 2013. “The Media’s Influence on Female Relational Aggression and its Implications for Schools”. *Canadian Journal of Education.* 36(4): 374-393.

Robinson, Brandon Andrew. 2016. “Heteronormativity and Homonormativity”. *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Gender and Sexuality Studies* 1-3.

Ring, Bol. 2022. “Scientific Approach to Solving Army Retention and Recruiting Problem Self-Determination Theory and Authentic Leadership Theory”. *Small Wars Journal.*

Rosen, Leora N., Kathryn H. Knudson and Peggy Fancher. 2003. "Cohesion and Culture of Hypermasculinity in U.S. Army Units". *Armed Forces & Society* 29(3):325-351.

Russell, Glenda M. and Janis S. Bohan. 2006. "The Case of Internalized Homophobia". *Theory & Psychology 16(3):* 343-366.

Schmader, Toni and Constantine Sedikides. 2017. "State Authenticity as Fit to Environment: The Implications of Social Identity for Fit, Authenticity, and Self-segregation. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 22, 228-259. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868317734080

Senate Bill 0003, Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 7-51-1401. 2023. Capitol.tn.gov. Retrieved April 15, 2023 (https://www.capitol.tn.gov/Bills/113/Bill/SB0003.pdf)

Seitz-Wald, Alex and Jo Yurcaba. 2023. "Trump Vows to 'Stop' Gender-affirming Care for Minors if Re-elected President". *NBCNews.Com.* Retrieved March 17, 2024. (Trump vows to 'stop' gender-affirming care for minors if re-elected president (nbcnews.com)

Soto, Jose. 2024. "Honoring Nex Benedict, a 16-Year-Old Non-Binary High School Student Who Tragically Died After School Beating". *Human Rights Campaign*. Retrieved March 17, 2024. (https://www.hrc.org/news/honoring-nex-benedict-16-year-old-non-binary-high-school-student-who-tragically-died-after-school-beating).

Sue, Derald W. 2010. "Microaggressions and Marginality: Manifestations, Dynamics, and Impact". John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Hoboken, New Jersey.

Stein, T.S. 1993. "Overview of New Developments in Understanding Homosexuality". In J.M. Oldham, M. B. Riba and A. Tasman (Eds.), *Review of Psychiatry* 12:9-40. Washington DC: American Psychiatric Press.

Stichler, Douglas. 2018. "Opinion: Do We Really Need to Add More Letters to the 'LGBT' Acronym?" *WEHOonline.Com.* Retrieved March 17, 2024.

(https://wehoonline.com/2018/02/22/opinion-really-need-add-letters-lgbt-acronym/).

Strayer, Christine E. 2021. "Centering Trans-Gender Experiences of Marginalization, Precarity, and Representation: Developing a Theory of Trans-Precarity". Order No. 29150715 dissertation, Western Michigan University, United States–Michigan (http://spot.lib.auburn.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/centering-trans-gender-experiences/docview/2645855009/se-2).

Stryker, Susan. 2006. "(De)Subjugated Knowledges: An Introduction to Transgender Studies" Pps 1-17 in the Transgender Studies Reader. Susan Stryker and Stephen Whittle (Eds). Routledge. New York.

Stur, Heather Marie. 2019. "Donald Trump's 'Trans Ban' Reverses More than 70 Years of Military Integration". *Washington Post.* Retrieved March 17, 2024. (https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2019/01/29/donald-trumps-trans-ban-reverses-more-than-years-military-integration/).

Szymanski, Dawn M. and Y. Barry Chung. 2001. "The Lesbian Internalized Homophobia Scale". *Journal of Homosexuality*, 41(2):37-52. DOI:10.1300/J082v41n02_03

Tajfel, H. and J. C. Turner. 1979. "An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict" In W.G. Austin and S. Worchel (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Tam, Kim-Pong. 2015. "Understanding Intergenerational Cultural Transmission Through the Role of Perceived Norms". *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 46(10):1260-1266.

Thompson, Mark. 2008. "'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' Turns 15." *Time.* Retrieved March 17, 2024. (https://content.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,1707545,00.html).

Uysal, Ahmet, Helen Lee Lin and C. Raymond Knee. 2009. "The Role of Need Satisfaction in

Self-Concealment and Well-Being". *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 36(2):187-199. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167209354518

Van Veelen, Ruth, Jenny Veldman, Colette Van Laar and Belle Derks. 2020. "Distancing from a Stigmatized Social Identity: State of the Art and Future Research Agenda on Self-group Distancing". *European Journal of Social Psychology*. DOI:10.1002/ejsp.2714

Veldman, Jenny, Colette Van Laar, Loes Meeussen and Salvatore Lo Bue. 2021. "Daily Coping with Social Identity Threat in Outgroup-Dominated Contexts: Self-Group Distancing Among Female Soldiers". *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 47(1):118-130.

Weiss, Jillian. 2011. "Reflective Paper: GL Versus BT: The Archaeology of Biphobia and Transphobia Within the U.S. Gay and Lesbian Community". *Journal of Bisexuality* 11(4):498-502

West, Candace and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender". *Gender & Society* 1(2);125-151.

Whitehall, Jess. 2021. "Can We Stop Adding Letters to the LGBTQIA+ Acronym?". *Medium*. Retrieved March 17, 2024. (https://medium.com/@jesswhitehall/can-we-stop-adding-letters-to-the-lgbtqia-acronym-b584aa44f490).

Table 1, Descriptive Statistics: Independent Variables

Category	Respondents	Percentage	Mean	Total (n)
Generation				1518
(1) Younger	670	44.1		
(2) Middle	372	24.5		
(3) Older	476	31.4		
Sex				1518
(1) Female	812	53.50		
(2) Male	706	46.5		
Race				1518
(1) White	981	64.6		
(2) Black/African	239	15.7		
American	298	19.6		
(3) Latino/Hispanic				
LGB Identity				1518
(1) Straight/heterosexual	11	0.7		
(2) Lesbian	288	19.0		
(3) Gay	533	35.1		
(4) Bisexual	490	32.3		
(5) Queer	88	5.8		
(6) Same-Gender Loving	25	1.7		
(7) Other	70	4.6		
(8) NA	13	0.9		
Education				1518
(1) Less Than Highschool	309	20.40		
(2) Some College	492	32.40		
(3) College Graduate	429	28.30		
(4) Post-Graduate work	288	19.0		
Individual Income			5.017	1518
(1) Under $720	41	2.70		
(2) $720 to $5,999	54	3.56		
(3) $6,000 to $11,999	65	4.28		
(4) $12,000 to $23,999	162	10.70		
(5) $24,000 to $35,999	189	12.50		
(6) $36,000 to $47,999	126	8.30		
(7) $48,000 to $59,999	140	9.22		
(8) $60,000 to $89,999	220	14.50		
(9) $90,000 to $119,999	174	11.50		
(10) $120,000 to	17	11.40		
$179,999	69	4.50		
(11) $180,000 to	66	4.35		
$239,999				

(12) $240,000 and over				
Household Income			6.951	1518
(1) Under $720	160	10.50		
(2) $720 to $5,999	173	11.40		
(3) $6,000 to $11,999	161	10.60		
(4) $12,000 to $23,999	225	14.80		
(5) $24,000 to $35,999	175	11.50		
(6) $36,000 to $47,999	116	7.64		
(7) $48,000 to $59,999	120	7.91		
(8) $60,000 to $89,999	161	10.60		
(9) $90,000 to $119,999	86	5.67		
(10) $120,000 to	65	4.28		
$179,999	22	1.45		
(11) $180,000 to	13	0.86		
$239,999				
(12) $240,000 and over				
Household Members (besides respondent)				1518
(1) Lives alone	2	0.13		
(2) 1 other person	449	29.60		
(3) 2 other people	484	31.90		
(4) 3 other people	221	14.60		
(5) 4 other people	205	13.50		
(6) 5 other people	81	5.34		
(7) 6 other people	34	2.24		
(8) 7 other people	6	0.395		
(9) 8 other people	3	0.198		
(10) 10 other people	1	0.066		

Table 2, Descriptive Statistics for Dependent Variables

Category	Range	Mean	Total (n)
Identity Centrality	1-6		
Overall		3.946	1495
Youngest Generation		3.943	1509
Middle Generation		3.883	1514
Oldest Generation		3.998	1508
White		3.933	1504
Black		3.932	1513
Latino		3.998	1514
Community Connectedness	1-4		
Overall		2.966	1467
Youngest Generation		3.030	1500
Middle Generation		2.923	1510
Oldest Generation		2.909	1493
White		2.914	1486
Black		3.050	1510
Latino		3.069	1507
Internalized Homophobia	1-5		
Overall		1.623	1489
Youngest Generation		1.711	1511
Middle Generation		1.597	1510
Oldest Generation		1.517	1504
White		1.57	1502
Black		1.748	1508
Latino		1.70	1515

Table 3, Bivariate Statistics

Category	Test Type	Degrees Freedom	Confidence Interval	R Value	P Value
Identity Centrality					
Generation Cohort	Pearson's	1493	-0.03 to 0.07		0.49
Household Income	Pearson's	1462	-0.06 to 0.04		0.64
Personal Income	Pearson's	1460	-0.08 to 0.03		0.32
Education Level	Pearson's	1493	0.02 to 0.12	0.071	0.006**
White	Welch's T test	1161	-0.08 to 0.15		0.55
Black	Welch's T test	332.04	-0.14 to 0.17		0.83
Latino	Welch's T test	481.06	-0.20 to 0.07		0.35
Sex	Welch's T test	1449.6	-0.15 to 0.08		0.58
Lesbian	Welch's T test	424.55	-0.33 to -0.04		0.01*
Gay	Welch's T test	1112	-0.35 to -0.11		0.0001***
Bisexual	Welch's T test	979.12	0.36 to 0.60		0.000***
Queer	Welch's T test	105.8	-0.86 to -0.47		0.000***
Same-gender Loving	Welch's T test	22.43	-0.73 to 0.50		0.70
Community Connectedness					
Generation Cohort	Pearson's	1465	-0.14 to -0.04	-0.09	0.0003***
Household Income	Pearson's	1434	-0.06 to 0.04		0.77
Personal Income	Pearson's	1432	-0.14 to -0.04	-0.09	0.0005***
Education Level	Pearson's	1465	-0.08 to 0.02		0.29
White	Welch's T test	1056.2	0.09 to 0.21		0.000***
Black	Welch's T test	317.59	-0.18 to –0.02		0.02*
Latino	Welch's T test	441.42	-0.20 to –0.06		0.001***
Sex	Welch's T test	1434.6	-0.04 to 0.08		0.44
Lesbian	Welch's T test	398.91	-0.13 to -0.02		0.14
Gay	Welch's T test	1065.9	-0.08 to 0.04		0.45
Bisexual	Welch's T test	1019.5	0.05 to 0.17		0.000***
Queer	Welch's T test	102.23	-0.31 to -0.09		0.000***
Same-gender Loving	Welch's T test	20.63	-0.21 to 0.28		0.77
Internalized Homophobia					
Generation Cohort	Pearson's	1487	-0.16 to -0.06	-0.11	0.000***
Household Income	Pearson's	1455	-0.12 to -0.02	-0.07	0.01*
Personal Income	Pearson's	1453	-0.15 to -0.04	-0.10	0.000***
Education Level	Pearson's	1487	-0.16 to –0.06	-0.11	0.000**
White	Welch's T test	963.41	0.07 to 0.23		0.000***
Black	Welch's T test	298.15	-0.26 to –0.03		0.011*
Latino	Welch's T test	425.79	-0.20 to 0.006		0.06
Sex	Welch's T test	1359.9	-0.26 to -0.11		0.000***
Lesbian	Welch's T test	466.54	0.04 to 0.22		0.005**
Gay	Welch's T test	1028.9	-0.16 to -0.01		0.04*
Bisexual	Welch's T test	901.53	-0.15 to 0.02		0.12
Queer	Welch's T test	106.93	0.04 to 0.30		0.01*
Same-gender Loving	Welch's T test	22.59	-0.36 to 0.35		0.98

P<0.05*
P<0.01**
P<0.001***

Table 4, Multivariate Regression: Identity Centrality by Race

Measure				
	Overall *Weighted*	White Unweighted	Black Unweighted	Latino Unweighted
Generational Cohort	-0.03(0.04)	0.003(0.05)	-0.07(0.12)	-0.12(0.09)
White	-0.09 (0.06)			
Lesbian	0.50(0.13)***	0.43(0.19)*	0.42(0.37)	0.18(0.35)
Gay	0.54 (0.14)***	0.66(0.20)**	0.81(0.42)	0.17(0.38)
Bisexual	0.01 (0.12)	-0.04(0.17)	-0.04(0.35)	-0.33(0.33)
Queer	0.84(0.16)***	1.00(0.22)***	0.37(0.44)	0.39(0.39)
Same Gender Loving	0.27(0.29)	0.73(0.39)	0.69(0.49)	-1.16(0.67)
Household Income	-0.01(0.01)	0.001(0.02)	-0.01(0.03)	-0.01(0.03)
Personal Income	-0.03(0.01)*	-0.05(0.02)**	-0.03(0.04)	-0.02(0.03)
Male	-0.15(0.09)	-0.21(0.12)	-0.58(0.27)*	0.10(0.20)
Education	0.09(0.03)**	0.13(0.04)**	0.02(0.09)	0.04(0.08)
# of Observations	**1,453**	**952**	**223**	**277**
R2	**0.07**	**0.09**	**0.07**	**0.08**
Adjusted R2	**0.06**	**0.08**	**0.03**	**0.05**
Residual Std. Error	**1.06(df=1441)**	**1.11(df=941)**	**1.08(df=212)**	**1.02(df=267)**

Estimate(Standard Error)
P<0.05* p<0.01**
p<0.001***

Table 5, Multivariate Regression: Identity Centrality by LGBQ+ Identity

Measure						
	Overall *Weighted*	Lesbian Unweighted	Gay Unweighted	Bisexual Unweighted	Queer Unweighted	Same gender-loving Unweighted
Generational Cohort	0.03(0.04)	-0.17(0.10)	0.01(0.07)	0.06(0.08)	-0.18(0.19)	-0.36(0.40)
White	-0.15(0.06)*	0.05(0.16)	-0.01(0.11)	-0.07(0.11)	0.42(0.20)*	0.52(0.58)
Household Income	-0.01(0.01)	0.01(0.03)	0.02(0.02)	-0.03(0.02)	-0.03(0.04)	0.11(0.17)
Personal Income	-0.02(0.01)	-0.05(0.04)	-0.06(0.03)*	-0.05(0.03)	0.07(0.05)	-0.19(0.14)
Male	0.01(0.06)	NA	-0.10(0.29)	-0.23(0.11)*	-0.06(0.23)	1.68(0.61)*
Education	0.11(0.03)***	0.10(0.08)	0.14(0.05)	0.03(0.06)	-0.04(0.13)	0.58(0.35)
# of Obs.	**1,460**	**283**	**521**	**476**	**90**	**26**
R2	**0.01**	**0.03**	**0.02**	**0.04**	**0.08**	**0.45**
Adjusted R2	**0.01**	**0.01**	**0.01**	**0.02**	**0.01**	**0.25**
Residual Std. Error	**1.09(df=1450)**	**1.12(df=273)**	**1.11(df=511)**	**1.07 (df=466)**	**0.87(df=80)**	**2.22(df=16)**
Estimate(SE) **P<0.05*** **p<0.01**** **p<0.001*****						

Table 6, Multivariate Regression: Community Connectedness by Race

Measure				
	Overall	White	Black	Latino
Generational Cohort	-0.06(0.02)*	-0.06(0.03)*	0.05(0.06)	0.005(0.05)
White	-0.17(0.03)***			
Lesbian	0.24(0.07)***	0.02(0.1)	0.31(0.19)	0.15(0.18)
Gay	0.14(0.08)	0.04(0.10)	0.50(0.22)*	0.03(0.20)
Bisexual	0.03(0.06)	-0.15(0.09)	0.21(0.18)	-0.03(0.17)
Queer	0.23(0.08)**	0.11(0.11)	0.32(0.23)	0.17(0.2)
Same Gender Loving	-0.06(0.16)	0.25(0.20)	0.16(0.26)	-0.55(0.36)
Household Income	0.01(0.01)	0.02(0.01)*	0.01(0.02)	0.01(0.02)
Personal Income	-0.01(0.01)	-0.03(0.01)**	-0.01(0.02)	-0.01(0.02)
Male	-0.03(0.05)	-0.01(0.06)	-0.30(0.15)*	-0.03(0.11)
Education	0.01(0.02)	0.03(0.02)	-0.07(0.05)	0.002(0.04)
# of Observations	**1,425**	**934**	**220**	**271**
R2	**0.06**	**0.04**	**0.06**	**0.03**
Adjusted R2	**0.05**	**0.03**	**0.01**	**-0.005**
Residual Std. Error	**0.56(df=1413)**	**0.55(df=923)**	**0.56(df=209)**	**0.54 (df=260)**

Estimate(Standard Error)
P<0.05* p<0.01 p<0.001*****

Table 7, Multivariate Regression: Community Connectedness by LGBQ+ Identity

Measure						
	Overall *Weighted*	Lesbian Unweighted	Gay Unweighted	Bisexual Unweighted	Queer Unweighted	Same gender-loving Unweighted
Generational Cohort	-0.03(0.0)	-0.13(0.05)**	0.03(0.03)	-0.06(0.04)	-0.02(0.11)	-0.32(0.19)
White	-0.19(0.03)***	-0.16(0.08)*	-0.13(0.06)*	-0.18(0.05)***	-0.03(0.12)	0.38(0.27)
Household Income	0.01(0.01)	0.04(0.02)*	0.01(0.01)	0.003(0.01)	-0.002(0.02)	0.03(0.10)
Personal Income	-0.01(0.01)	-0.03(0.02)	-0.02(0.01)	-0.03(0.01)**	0.04(0.03)	-0.02(0.10)
Male	-0.03(0.03)	NA	0.08(0.15)	-0.02(0.05)	-0.14(0.13)	0.29(0.25)
Education	0.01(0.02)	-0.02(0.04)	0.003(0.03)	0.03(0.03)	-0.11(0.08)	0.23(0.17)
# of Obs.	**1,432**	**278**	**515**	**465**	**90**	**24**
R2	**0.03**	**0.11**	**0.02**	**0.07**	**0.05**	**0.41**
Adjusted R2	**0.03**	**0.09**	**0.003**	**0.06**	**-0.02**	**0.15**
Residual Std. Error	**0.57(df=1422)**	**0.57(df=268)**	**1.28(df=505)**	**0.51 (df=455)**	**0.50(df=80)**	**0.50(df=14)**
Estimate(SE)						
P<0.05*						
p<0.01**						
p<0.001***						

Table 8, Multivariate Regression: Community Connectedness by Race/LGBQ+ Identity (White LGBQ+)

Measure	White LGB Overall *Unweighted*	Lesbian Unweighted	Gay Unweighted	Bisexual Unweighted	Queer Unweighted	Same gender-loving Unweighted
Generational Cohort	-0.04(0.2)	-0.19(0.07)**	0.01(0.04)	-0.08(0.04)*	-0.06(0.14)	-0.91(0.12)**
Household Income	0.02(0.01)*	0.05(0.02)*	0.02(0.02)	0.009(0.01)	0.01(0.03)	0.33(0.07)*
Personal Income	-0.03(0.01)**	-0.03(0.02)	-0.03(0.02)	-0.04(0.02)*	0.04(0.04)	-0.14(0.05)
Male	0.03(0.04)	NA	0.29(0.18)	0.01(0.06)	-0.16(0.16)	0.40(0.14)
Education	0.04(0.02)	0.01(0.05)	0.03(0.03)	0.04(0.03)	-0.09(0.10)	0.66(0.12)*
# of Obs.	**941**	**191**	**336**	**311**	**58**	**11**
R^2	**0.02**	**0.10**	**0.02**	**0.04**	**0.06**	**0.96**
Adjusted R^2	**0.01**	**0.08**	**0.004**	**0.02**	**-0.03**	**0.90**
Residual Std. Error	**0.55(df=931)**	**0.60(df=181)**	**0.57(df=326)**	**0.51 (df=301)**	**0.48(df=48)**	**0.50(df=3)**

P<0.05*
p<0.01**
p<0.001***

Table 9, Multivariate Regression: Community Connectedness by Race/LGBQ+ Identity (Black LGBQ+)

Measure	Black Overall *Unweighted*	Lesbian Unweighted	Gay Unweighted	Bisexual Unweighted	Queer Unweighted	Same gender-loving Unweighted
Generational Cohort	0.06(0.06)	0.01(0.01)	0.12(0.10)	0.02(0.14)	0.78(0.50)	-0.005(0.26)
Household Income	-0.0002(0.02)	0.001(0.04)	0.02(0.03)	-0.004(0.03)	-0.02(0.06)	-0.03(0.13)
Personal Income	-0.002(0.02)	0.02(0.05)	-0.002(0.04)	-0.07(0.04)	0.01(0.11)	0.005(0.14)
Male	-0.13(0.08)	NA	-0.69(0.35)	-0.22(0.21)	-0.73(0.61)	0.22(0.33)
Education	-0.05(0.05)	-0.07(0.09)	-0.10(0.08)	-0.09(0.10)	-0.55(0.20)	0.08(0.19)
# of Obs.	**225**	**54**	**74**	**71**	**18**	**11**
R^2	**0.02**	**0.02**	**0.10**	**0.14**	**0.51**	**0.27**
Adjusted R^2	**-0.001**	**-0.07**	**0.03**	**0.07**	**0.02**	**-0.96**
Residual Std. Error	**0.57(df=215)**	**0.52(df=44)**	**0.56(df=64)**	**0.57 (df=61)**	**0.51(df=8)**	**0.41(df=3)**
P<0.05* p<0.01 p<0.001*****						

Table 10, Multivariate Regression: Community Connectedness by Race/LGBQ+ Identity (Latino LGBQ+)

Measure						
	Latino Overall *Unweighted*	Lesbian Unweighted	Gay Unweighted	Bisexual Unweighted	Queer Unweighted	Same gender-loving Unweighted
Generational Cohort	0.004(0.05)	-0.01(0.11)	0.04(0.09)	-0.01(0.10)	-0.07(0.27)	Sample too small
Household Income	0.005(0.02)	0.03(0.04)	0.004(0.03)	-0.005(0.02)	-0.01(0.10)	NA
Personal Income	-0.01(0.02)	-0.04(0.05)	0.02(0.03)	-0.03(0.03)	0.004(0.15)	NA
Male	-0.05(0.07)	NA	0.32(0.42)	-0.03(0.11)	-0.10(0.36)	NA
Education	-0.01(0.04)	-0.18(0.12)	-0.04(0.07)	0.08(0.07)	0.08(0.23)	NA
# of Obs.	**275**	**44**	**114**	**92**	**23**	**3**
R2	**0.004**	**0.15**	**0.02**	**0.03**	**0.02**	
Adjusted R2	**-0.01**	**0.05**	**-0.03**	**-0.03**	**-0.36**	
Residual Std. Error	**0.54(df=265)**	**0.49(df=34)**	**0.58(df=104)**	**0.47 (df=82)**	**0.66(df=13)**	
P<0.05* p<0.01 p<0.001*****						

Table 11, Multivariate Regression: Internalized Homophobia by Race

Measure				
	Overall *Weighted*	White Unweighted	Black Unweighted	Latino Unweighted
Generational Cohort	-0.070.03)*	-0.07(0.03)*	-0.13(0.09)	-0.08(0.07)
White	-0.04(0.04)			
Lesbian	0.11(0.09)	0.32(0.12)**	-0.12(0.27)	-0.10(0.26)
Gay	0.15(0.10)	0.24(0.13)	0.11(0.31)	-0.38(0.28)
Bisexual	0.13(0.08)	0.25(0.11)*	0.05(0.26)	-0.01(0.24)
Queer	0.05(0.11)	-0.01(0.14)	0.13(0.32)	-0.05(0.29)
Same Gender Loving	0.38(0.20)	0.26(0.25)	0.09(0.36)	-0.03(0.51)
Household Income	0.01(0.01)	-0.01(0.01)	-0.04(0.02)	0.03(0.02)
Personal Income	-0.02(0.01)*	-0.01(0.01)	-0.01(0.03)	-0.01(0.03)
Male	0.17(0.06)**	0.17(0.07)*	0.22(0.20)	0.49(0.15)**
Education	-0.05(0.02)*	-0.06(0.03)*	0.08(0.06)	-0.06(0.06)
# of Observations	**1,445**	**948**	**218**	**279**
R2	**0.04**	**0.05**	**0.07**	**0.07**
Adjusted R2	**0.03**	**0.04**	**0.02**	**0.04**
Residual Std. Error	**0.73(df=1433)**	**0.70(df=938)**	**0.79 (df=207)**	**0.78 (df=268)**
Estimate(Standard Error)				
P<0.05* p<0.01 p<0.001*** **				

Table 12, Multivariate Regression: Internalized Homophobia by LGBQ+ Identity

Measure	Overall *Weighted*	Lesbian Unweighted	Gay Unweighted	Bisexual Unweighted	Queer Unweighted	Same gender-loving Unweighted
Generational Cohort	-0.07(0.03)**	-0.08(0.06)	-0.13(0.05)**	-0.04(0.05)	-0.15(0.12)	-0.18(0.28)
White	-0.04(0.04)	0.10(0.10)	-0.04(0.08)	-0.10(0.08)	-0.38(0.13)**	0.03(0.41)
Household Income	0.01(0.01)	0.004(0.02)	-0.01(0.02)	-0.001(0.02)	0.01(0.02)	-0.03(0.12)
Personal Income	-0.03(0.01)**	-0.005(0.02)	-0.01(0.02)	-0.02(0.02)	-0.01(0.03)	-0.03(0.01)
Male	0.17(0.06)**	NA	-0.06(0.20)	0.32(0.08)***	0.20(0.14)	0.20(0.43)
Education	-0.05(0.02)*	-0.007(0.05)	-0.02(0.04)	-0.04(0.04)	-0.05(0.08)	-0.15(0.25)
# of Obs.	**1,443**	**281**	**516**	**475**	**90**	**26**
R2	**0.04**	**0.01**	**0.04**	**0.05**	**0.19**	**0.19**
Adjusted R2	**0.03**	**-0.005**	**0.03**	**0.04**	**0.13**	**-0.12**
Residual Std. Error	**0.73(df=1433)**	**0.67(df=271)**	**0.77(df=506)**	**0.77 (df=465)**	**0.54(df=80)**	**0.87(df=16)**
Estimate(SE) P<0.05* p<0.01 p<0.001*** **						

Table 13, Multivariate Regression: Internalized Homophobia by Race/LGBQ+ Identity (White LGBQ+)

Measure	White Overall *Unweighted*	Lesbian Unweighted	Gay Unweighted	Bisexual Unweighted	Queer Unweighted	Same gender-loving Unweighted
Generational Cohort	-0.05(0.3)	-0.05(0.07)	-0.14(0.05)**	-0.03(0.06)	-0.14(0.13)	0.44(0.52)
Household Income	-0.01(0.01)	-0.02(0.03)	-0.01(0.02)	-0.001(0.02)	0.001(0.02)	-0.17(0.18)
Personal Income	-0.001(0.01)	0.01(0.03)	-0.001(0.02)	-0.04(0.02)	-0.02(0.03)	0.09(0.10)
Male	0.16(0.05)***	NA	0.08(0.23)	0.24(0.09)*	0.19(0.14)	-0.25(0.59)
Education	-0.07(0.03)**	-0.04(0.06)	-0.06(0.04)	-0.04(0.05)	-0.03(0.10)	-0.92(0.47)
# of Obs.	**956**	**193**	**338**	**316**	**58**	**11**
R2	**0.03**	**0.01**	**0.04**	**0.05**	**0.12**	**0.55**
Adjusted R2	**0.03**	**-0.01**	**0.03**	**0.04**	**0.03**	**-0.01**
Residual Std. Error	**0.70(df=946)**	**0.67(df=183)**	**0.72(df=328)**	**0.75 (df=306)**	**0.44(df=48)**	**0.73(df=4)**

P<0.05*
p<0.01**
p<0.001***

Table 14, Multivariate Regression: Internalized Homophobia by Race/LGBQ+ Identity (Black LGBQ+)

Measure						
	Black Overall *Unweighted*	Lesbian Unweighted	Gay Unweighted	Bisexual Unweighted	Queer Unweighted	Same gender-loving Unweighted
Generational Cohort	-0.14(0.09)	-0.23(0.16)	-0.12(0.16)	-0.20(0.19)	0.28(1.03)	0.12(0.53)
Household Income	-0.03(0.02)	0.04(0.05)	-0.01(0.04)	-0.004(0.03)	0.002(0.12)	-0.20(0.26)
Personal Income	-0.03(0.03)	-0.001(0.06)	-0.004(0.06)	-0.07(0.04)	-0.003(0.22)	-0.28(0.25)
Male	0.36(0.12)	NA	0.21(0.29)	-0.22(0.21)	0.01(1.25)	-0.37(0.64)
Education	0.08(0.06)	0.11(0.11)	0.05(0.13)	-0.09(0.10)	0.10(0.41)	0.22(0.37)
# of Obs.	**223**	**51**	**73**	**71**	**18**	**11**
R^2	**0.06**	**0.08**	**0.03**	**0.14**	**0.07**	**0.66**
Adjusted R^2	**0.04**	**-0.01**	**-0.04**	**0.07**	**-0.51**	**0.24**
Residual Std. Error	**0.80(df=213)**	**0.67(df=41)**	**0.77(df=63)**	**0.57 (df=61)**	**0.88(df=8)**	**0.83(df=4)**
P<0.05* p<0.01 p<0.001***						

Table 15, Multivariate Regression: Internalized Homophobia by Race/LGBQ+ Identity (Latino LGBQ)

Measure						
	Latino Overall *Unweighted*	Lesbian Unweighted	Gay Unweighted	Bisexual Unweighted	Queer Unweighted	Same gender-loving Unweighted
Generational Cohort	-0.11(0.07)	-0.18(0.12)	-0.11(0.12)	0.09(0.17)	-0.23(0.22)	Sample too small
Household Income	0.03(0.02)	0.08(0.05)	0.02(0.04)	0.01(0.04)	0.17(0.08)	NA
Personal Income	-0.02(0.03)	-0.10(0.05)	-0.02(0.05)	0.06(0.05)	-0.11(0.12)	NA
Male	0.25(0.10)**	NA	-0.20(0.59)	0.65(0.19)**	0.51(0.30)	NA
Education	-0.06(0.06)	-0.02(0.12)	-0.004(0.09)	-0.10(0.12)	-0.45(0.18)	NA
# of Obs.	**283**	**48**	**115**	**95**	**23**	**3**
R2	**0.05**	**0.20**	**0.02**	**0.15**	**0.52**	
Adjusted R2	**0.03**	**0.11**	**-0.03**	**0.10**	**0.34**	
Residual Std. Error	**0.78(df=273)**	**0.63(df=38)**	**0.80(df=105)**	**0.83 (df=85)**	**0.54(df=13)**	
P<0.05* p<0.01 p<0.001*** **						