




2023

This is Who I Am: Identity Development and Importance Among Diverse Youth from LGBTQ+ Parent Families

Madison T. Diomede

University of Kentucky, maidi.diomede@uky.edu

Author ORCID Identifier:

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5654-6817>

Digital Object Identifier: <https://doi.org/10.13023/etd.2023.022>

[Right click to open a feedback form in a new tab to let us know how this document benefits you.](#)

Recommended Citation

Diomede, Madison T., "This is Who I Am: Identity Development and Importance Among Diverse Youth from LGBTQ+ Parent Families" (2023). *Theses and Dissertations--Psychology*. 227.
https://uknowledge.uky.edu/psychology_etds/227

This Master's Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Psychology at UKnowledge. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations--Psychology by an authorized administrator of UKnowledge. For more information, please contact UKnowledge@lsv.uky.edu.

STUDENT AGREEMENT:

I represent that my thesis or dissertation and abstract are my original work. Proper attribution has been given to all outside sources. I understand that I am solely responsible for obtaining any needed copyright permissions. I have obtained needed written permission statement(s) from the owner(s) of each third-party copyrighted matter to be included in my work, allowing electronic distribution (if such use is not permitted by the fair use doctrine) which will be submitted to UKnowledge as Additional File.

I hereby grant to The University of Kentucky and its agents the irrevocable, non-exclusive, and royalty-free license to archive and make accessible my work in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter known. I agree that the document mentioned above may be made available immediately for worldwide access unless an embargo applies.

I retain all other ownership rights to the copyright of my work. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of my work. I understand that I am free to register the copyright to my work.

REVIEW, APPROVAL AND ACCEPTANCE

The document mentioned above has been reviewed and accepted by the student's advisor, on behalf of the advisory committee, and by the Director of Graduate Studies (DGS), on behalf of the program; we verify that this is the final, approved version of the student's thesis including all changes required by the advisory committee. The undersigned agree to abide by the statements above.

Madison T. Diomedede, Student

Dr. Rachel H. Farr, Major Professor

Dr. Michael Bardo, Director of Graduate Studies

THIS IS WHO I AM: IDENTITY DEVELOPMENT AND IMPORTANCE
AMONG DIVERSE YOUTH FROM LGBTQ+ PARENT FAMILIES

THESIS

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of
Science in the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Kentucky

By

Madison T. Diomedé

Direction: Dr. Rachel H. Farr, Associate Professor of Psychology

Lexington, Kentucky

2022

Copyright © Madison T. Diomedé 2022

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5654-6817>

ABSTRACT OF THESIS

THIS IS WHO I AM: IDENTITY DEVELOPMENT AND IMPORTANCE AMONG DIVERSE YOUTH FROM LGBTQ+ PARENT FAMILIES

Although the literature on identity and related constructs among adolescents, emerging adults, and diverse populations is growing, little research has investigated identity among adolescents and emerging adults specifically in the context of LGBTQ+ parent families. The present study seeks to fill this gap in the literature by qualitatively investigating identity development and importance among diverse youth with LGBTQ+ parents. Participants are 51 youth (ages 12-25 years) with at least one LGBTQ+ parent. Trained personnel conducted remote, audio-recorded, semi-structured interviews from December 2018-February 2020. Interviews included questions about participants' individual identities and conversations they have had with their parents about those identities. Using inductive thematic analysis, a trained team has coded responses from transcribed interviews. Analyses revealed six themes surrounding participants' identities: Identity Type, Appearance, Representation Responsibility, Interaction between Personal Identity and Parent/Family Identity, Community Impact on Identity Development, and Interaction of Personal Identities. Themes indicate that parent identity, family identity, and community all impact the personal identities of youth with LGBTQ+ parents. Findings contribute to current psychological literature on identity and LGBTQ+ families, and help support and highlight this population across health settings, law and policy, as well as broad societal understanding.

KEYWORDS: Adolescence, Emerging Adulthood, Identity, LGBTQ+ parent families, Qualitative Analyses

Madison T. Diomede

12/09/2022

Date

THIS IS WHO I AM: IDENTITY DEVELOPMENT AND IMPORTANCE
AMONG DIVERSE YOUTH FROM LGBTQ+ PARENT FAMILIES

By
Madison T. Diomedé

Dr. Rachel H. Farr
Director of Thesis

Dr. Mike Bardo
Director of Graduate Studies

12/15/2022
Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vi
This is Who I Am: Identity Development and Importance Among Diverse Youth from LGBTQ+ Parent Families	1
<i>Theoretical Framework</i>	3
<i>Identity Development in Youth with LGBTQ+ Parents</i>	6
Sexual and gender identity development.	6
Racial/ethnic identity development.....	8
<i>Identity Importance in Youth with LGBTQ+ Parents</i>	9
Sexual and gender identity importance.	10
Racial/ethnic identity importance	11
<i>Current Study</i>	12
Method	13
<i>Participants</i>	13
<i>Procedure</i>	15
<i>Materials</i>	16
Demographic questions.....	16
Interview guide.	16
<i>Data Analysis</i>	17
Results.....	19
<i>Identity Type</i>	20
<i>Appearance</i>	22
<i>Representation Responsibility</i>	24
<i>Interaction between Personal Identity and Parent/Family Identity</i>	25
<i>Community Impact on Identity Development</i>	28
<i>Interaction of Personal Identities</i>	30
Discussion.....	31
<i>Identities of Youth with LGBTQ+ Parents</i>	32
<i>Factors Related to Youth Identity</i>	35
<i>Strengths and Limitations</i>	37
<i>Implications for Research, Policy, and Clinical Practice</i>	38

<i>Conclusion</i>	40
APPENDICES	45
<i>Appendix A</i>	45
<i>Appendix B</i>	55
References.....	58
VITA.....	69

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1 Participant Demographics.....	42
---	----

This is Who I Am: Identity Development and Importance Among Diverse Youth from LGBTQ+ Parent Families

With the number of LGBTQ+ parent families on the rise in the United States (U.S.; Gates, 2017; Goldberg & Conron, 2018), more children are visibly growing up in LGBTQ+ parent households. Despite this, the experiences of youth with LGBTQ+ parents – from their perspectives – are understudied (Goldberg & Sweeney, 2019). As researchers turn their focus to the strengths and unique experiences of these youth (Farr et al., 2022), identity is one especially important area of research. From a developmental perspective, adolescence and emerging adulthood are marked by rapid change and growth and are thus crucial periods for identity research (Arnett, 2015; Kroger et al., 2010). Identity development is crucially influenced by family (e.g., affirmation for and open communication about marginalized identities in LGBTQ+ parent family homes; Farr et al., 2022; Kivalanka & Munroe, 2020) and cultural contexts (e.g., experiencing major political and social changes relevant to one’s identity, such as same-gender marriage equality; Goldberg, 2014; *Obergefell v. Hodges*, 2015). Identity development in turn influences multiple areas of a person’s life, with strong identification with a marginalized identity being associated with better health outcomes (Love et al., 2009; Mossakowski, 2003; Nelson et al., 2018), academic achievement (Altschul et al., 2006), increased access to community (e.g., LGB community events on college campuses; Hughes & Hurtado, 2018), and less identity uncertainty (Hinton et al., 2021). Thus, to properly support and understand youth with LGBTQ+ parents, it is vital we investigate identity development and its importance with this population. Additionally, such an investigation could provide us with a more comprehensive understanding of identity development and importance as it applies to all young individuals.

At present, there are multiple gaps in the literature regarding identity among youth with LGBTQ+ parents. First, much of the research in this area has been through the retrospective accounts by adults with LGBTQ+ parents (e.g., Kivalanka & Munroe, 2020). An investigation into identity among *youth* with LGBTQ+ parents, specifically, could provide insight into the psychological mechanisms contributing to identity development among this population and youth broadly. Next, LGBTQ+ family research has largely lacked in racial/ethnic, geographic, and socioeconomic diversity (Fish & Russell, 2018). More research with diverse LGBTQ+ families is needed to fully understand the experiences of this population as a whole. Finally, identity research to date has not fully investigated the intersections of multiple marginalized identity statuses and contexts. Not only are these youth being raised by LGBTQ+ parents, but LGBTQ+ parent families are increasingly diverse; one in three LGBTQ+ individuals are people of color (POC; Movement Advancement Project, 2022a), same-gender couples are more likely to adopt (Goldberg & Conron, 2018), and same-gender couples are more open to transracial adoption (i.e., adoption of a child whose race differs from the adoptive parents; Soliz et al., 2009) compared to different-gender couples (Goldberg, 2009). Further investigation into identity among youth with LGBTQ+ parents could contribute to the field's understanding of identity broadly, and the specific marginalized identities held by this population.

In this study, I aim to start filling these various gaps in the literature by investigating identity development and importance within a sample of diverse youth with LGBTQ+ parents using a qualitative approach (Braun & Clarke, 2021b; Fish & Russell, 2018). Ultimately, this research may contribute support and affirmation for this growing

community by providing a platform for their unique experiences. Further, such research could be vital in informing clinical practice with youth and their LGBTQ+ parents (McKnight, 2016).

Theoretical Framework

The present study relies on Ecological Systems Theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1977) to explain the contexts influencing identity development and importance among youth with LGBTQ+ parents. Although identity is commonly thought of as individualistic, when conceptualized within the framework set forth by Bronfenbrenner, it becomes evident that individuals' identities are influenced by multiple factors outside of themselves (Bronfenbrenner, 1977; Ezzy, 1998; Härkönen, 2007; Paat, 2013). As a result, it is important to acknowledge how specific contexts may impact identity development and centrality among this population. The current investigation will focus on the impact of a LGBTQ+ parent family context and cultural context (i.e., 21st century U.S. social norms and political climate; Movement Advancement Project, 2022b).

LGBTQ+ parent family context has the potential to influence youth's individual identities; the current study will focus on sexual identity and racial/ethnic identity among youth with at least one LGBTQ+ parent. Kivalanka and Goldberg (2009)'s qualitative study of LGBTQ+ emerging adults with LGB¹ parents provides insight into sexual identity development in an LGBTQ+ family context. In their sample of 18 LGBTQ+ emerging adults with LGB parents, participants described their LGBTQ+ identity as being impacted in both positive and negative ways by their parents. Six participants felt it was easier to accept and grow in their own LGBTQ+ identity because of their parents'

¹ I use the acronym (e.g., LGB) that reflects the study population of the cited sources throughout this paper.

support. In contrast, 11 participants did not mention their parents as sources of support for their identity growth².

In addition to sexual identity, it is important to consider family context in regards to racial/ethnic identity. Racial/ethnic socialization (i.e., communication of messages regarding ethnic heritage and the construction of race; Nelson et al., 2018) by parents is crucial for positive identity development among racial/ethnic minority youth (Gianino et al., 2009; Samuels, 2009; Simon & Farr, 2022; Soliz et al., 2009). As previously stated, one in three LGBTQ+ individuals are POC (Movement Advancement Project, 2022a), and LGBTQ+ parent families are more likely to not only adopt (Goldberg & Conron, 2018), but also are more open to transracial adoption compared to cisgender heterosexual parent families (Goldberg, 2009). Thus, LGBTQ+ parent families can be an apt context to study racial/ethnic identity as well.

In addition to LGBTQ+ parent family contexts, it is important to consider cultural context when understanding identity in this population. Acceptance for LGBTQ+ identities and LGBTQ+ families is growing, as there continue to be highly publicized advancements for LGBTQ+ rights (*Obergefell v. Hodges*, 2015; Patterson et al., 2021). The persistent legal and social barriers for LGBTQ+ individuals, however, indicate that acceptance and support are not guaranteed; (*Fulton v. City of Philadelphia*, 2021; Movement Advancement Project, 2021). A host of structural inequalities still exist for LGBTQ+ individuals and families in the U.S. (e.g., barriers to adoption, health care, housing, etc.; Movement Advancement Project, 2021), all contributing to institutional stress on LGBTQ+ families, and as a result, youth with LGBTQ+ parents (Brooks, 1981;

² Only 17 of 18 participants' responses were reported for this topic.

Meyer, 2003; Siegel et al., 2022). Among individuals with LGB parents, previous research has shown that their conceptions of marriage were heavily influenced by their parents and parents' inability to marry before same-gender marriage equality (Goldberg et al., 2014). In *Obergefell v. Hodges* (2015), the Supreme Court ruled in favor of same-sex marriage equality, giving same-sex partners the right to legally marry and access to the same benefits as heterosexual partners. This decision also effectively allowed for same-sex adoption across all 50 states (Patterson et al., 2021). Yet still, only 27 U.S. states prohibit discrimination in adoption and foster care based on sexual orientation and gender identity (Movement Advancement Project, 2021). In fact, 11 states permit state-licensed child welfare agencies to discriminate against LGBTQ+ people based on religious beliefs (Movement Advancement Project, 2021). Youth with LGBTQ+ parents are growing up in a difficult time historically for the LGBTQ+ community; the impact of cultural attitudes toward LGBTQ+ individuals on individual identity in this population must be considered.

Taken together, an Ecological Systems approach (Bronfenbrenner, 1977) emphasizes the importance of considering a wide range of influences when studying individuals and populations. This is specifically true when conducting research with the LGBTQ+ community who are understudied, under supported (Movement Advancement Project, 2021; Pew Research Center, 2016), and in many ways, not fully understood (i.e., gaps in the literature particularly regarding the direct perspectives of children with LGBTQ+ parents; Kivalanka & Monroe, 2020). Acknowledging each level of influence on the children of LGBTQ+ individuals offers researchers the opportunity to understand the population and more fully highlight their strengths (Kivalanka & Goldberg, 2009),

and emphasizes the need for support and resources for LGBTQ+ parents and their children (Movement Advancement Project, 2021; Pew Research Center, 2016).

Identity Development in Youth with LGBTQ+ Parents

Adolescence and emerging adulthood have long been touted as prime stages for identity development and research (Arnett, 2015; Erikson, 1994; Kroger et al., 2010). A small body of previous literature has explored identity development in the context of LGBTQ+ parent families. Many of these investigations have been narrower in focus (i.e., gender identity among children with a transsexual-identified parent; Freedman et al., 2002), and have focused on LGBTQ+ parents' specific impact on gender or sexual identity development (i.e., sexual identity among adults with a LGB parent; Kuvalanka & Goldberg, 2009). Thus, research has not fully investigated identity development broadly or the development of other important marginalized identities like racial/ethnic identities in the context of LGBTQ+ parent families. This research on the topic could not only deepen the field's understanding of identity development overall, but also expand society's understanding of LGBTQ+ families and their strengths, which in turn, could contribute to greater support for this growing population.

Sexual and gender identity development. Sexual identity development, particularly among sexual minorities, is often conceptualized as a series of milestones (i.e., attraction to a member of the same sex, self-identification as a sexual minority, sexual behavior with a member of the same sex, and disclosure of sexual identity; Bishop et al., 2020; Calzo et al., 2011). These milestones mainly occur during adolescence and emerging adulthood (Bishop et al., 2020; Calzo et al., 2011). The specific age one hits these milestones can vary based on gender and racial/ethnic identity. Bishop and

colleagues (2020) found that gay male individuals reported earlier milestones than other groups, Black and Latinx participants reported earlier ages of same-sex attraction and self-realization than white participants, and Black participants reported earlier ages of first same-sex behavior than white and Latinx participants. Bishop and colleagues (2020) theorized that these variations may have been because Black and Latinx individuals already hold a marginalized racial/ethnic identity and thus may be better equipped to integrate another marginalized (sexual) identity. Although researchers have explored individual factors influencing sexual identity development, they have only begun studying the impact of family context on sexual identity development, including when families are headed by LGBTQ+ parents (Kualanka & Goldberg, 2009; Kualanka & Monroe, 2020).

Over the years, some researchers have turned their attention to “second-generation” LGBTQ+ individuals, or LGBTQ+ individuals with LGBTQ+ parents (Kualanka & Goldberg, 2009; Kualanka & Monroe, 2020). As previously described, one noteworthy study in the second-generation literature, conducted by Kualanka and Goldberg (2009), involved LGBTQ+ identified emerging adults. In this study, second-generation LGBTQ+ individuals reported that having an LGB parent eased their sexual identity development in some ways. For example, some participants said that having an LGB parent led to them discovering their identities earlier. Many second-generation LGBTQ+ individuals also reported feeling pressure by societal expectations and heterosexism to not be LGBTQ+ (like their parents), as this could be seen as confirming a stereotype (Kualanka & Goldberg, 2009). Although some research exists about LGBTQ+ identified individuals with LGBTQ+ parents, researchers have yet to fully

investigate the impact of LGBTQ+ parenting on adolescents and emerging adults in the context of ongoing sexual and gender identity development. In the present study, I seek to expand upon the findings by Kivalanka and Goldberg (2009) by examining identity development among younger participants (in range, and on average). This line of research will contribute to the field's understanding of gender and sexual identity development by examining relevant constructs in an understudied population (i.e., in the context of diverse LGBTQ+ parent families).

Racial/ethnic identity development. Racial/ethnic identity is considered a social identity by scholars and is defined as how an individual relates to their racial/ethnic group (Phinney, 1989; Stets & Serpe, 2013; Tajfel, 1982). Thus, racial/ethnic identity development has been documented as the process of realizing one's racial/ethnic identity, exploration of one's identity via participation in one's racial/ethnic community and resulting feelings from this experience, and finally, degree of identification with one's racial/ethnic identity (Phinney, 1989; Stets & Serpe, 2013; Taifel, 1982; Vélez et al., 2019). Similar to sexual identity development, racial/ethnic identity development occurs throughout adolescence (Phinney, 1989). Furthermore, strong attachment to one's racial/ethnic identity has been associated with better health outcomes (Love et al., 2009; Nelson et al., 2018) and academic outcomes (Altschul et al., 2006). Due to the impact of racial/ethnic identity development on individuals, researchers have also investigated factors that impact racial/ethnic identity development, such as family context (Nelson et al., 2018; Samuels, 2009).

One factor related to racial/ethnic identity development within the context of families is parent racial/ethnic socialization (Nelson et al., 2018). A meta-analysis by

Nelson and colleagues (2018) revealed that parent ethnic socialization was associated with higher identity exploration and commitment among racial/ethnic minority youth. When researchers examine this relationship in multiracial and transracial adoptive families, they report that racial/ethnic community and socialization are vital to positive identity formation (Gianino et al., 2009; Samuels, 2009; Soliz et al., 2009). Overall, positive racial/cultural socialization is associated with greater youth social competence in heterosexual, lesbian, and gay parent adoptive families (Simon & Farr, 2022), and greater school competence in adoptive families (Seol et al., 2016).

Although the relationship between parent ethnic socialization and child racial/ethnic identity has been explored among primarily (cisgender) heterosexual parent families (Nelson et al., 2018; Samuels, 2009), it has not been fully explored in LGBTQ+ parent families. According to the reports of some adopted children of LGB parents, including those transracially adopted, they were helped as they fielded inquiries from others about their family when their parents provided them with language and terms to describe their family formation and dynamics (Gianino et al., 2009). The current study represents an opportunity to not only examine racial/ethnic identity development in the context of LGBTQ+ parents, but also in the context of multiethnic LGBTQ+ families. Findings could have important implications for how to best support racial/ethnic minority adolescents and emerging adults broadly, as well as those in LGBTQ+ parent families (Samuels, 2009; Soliz et al., 2009).

Identity Importance in Youth with LGBTQ+ Parents

Identity importance is typically represented in the literature as identity salience (i.e., the likelihood that one's identity will be prompted in any given situation) or

centrality (i.e., how core an identity is to an individual; Stets and Serpe, 2013). For the current study, I will use the term “identity importance” to signify identity salience and centrality. Researchers have examined the relationship between identity importance in the context of different identities, mainly sexual identity (Hinton et al., 2021; Hughes & Hurtado, 2018), gender identity (McGlone & Aronson, 2006; Settles et al., 2016), and racial/ethnic identity (Brittian et al., 2013; Keels et al., 2017; Lee & Ahn, 2013; Steck et al., 2003). Across this research, researchers find a variety of outcomes and unique factors associated with identity importance and specific identities like sexual identity and racial/ethnic identity. Although research has been conducted about the role of identity importance among multiracial/ethnic families (Soliz et al., 2009), research has not investigated the relationship between LGBTQ+ family identity and identity importance. Since LGBTQ+ identities broadly have been linked with significant outcomes, more research into identity importance and related outcomes is necessary. This research may not only provide researchers with more knowledge of identity importance and LGBTQ+ families, but also enlighten society and practitioners on how to better support and highlight this population.

Sexual and gender identity importance. Sexual identity importance, specifically among sexual minorities, is associated with both positive and negative factors (Hinton et al., 2021; Hughes & Hurtado, 2018; Quinn & Chaudoir, 2009). Previous research has found that individuals with a minoritized sexual identity think more about their sexuality more than their heterosexual counterparts (Hughes & Hurtado, 2018); thus, much of previous research on sexual identity importance has been conducted with the LGBTQ+ community. Consistent with identity theory (Stets & Serpe, 2013), higher sexual identity

importance is associated with more active participation in environments that make this identity salient, such as LGBTQ+ community events and LGBTQ+ student organizations, in the case of college students (Hinton et al., 2021; Hughes & Hurtado, 2018).

Unsurprisingly then, LGBTQ+ identity importance is associated with higher LGBTQ+ community belonging (Hinton et al., 2021). Additionally, LGBTQ+ identity importance has been associated with more positive evaluations of LGBTQ+ identity and less concealment, less identity uncertainty, and less internalized stigma (Hinton et al., 2021).

Higher sexual identity importance is also associated with more perceived prejudice (Hinton et al., 2021) and bias and discrimination toward the LGBTQ+ community (Hughes & Hurtado, 2018). This is consistent with previous literature on concealable stigmatized identities, which suggest that as awareness for ones' sexual identity increases, so too do perceptions of threats of discrimination against that identity (Hinton et al., 2021; Hughes & Hurtado, 2018; Quinn & Chaudoir, 2009). Considering higher identity importance is associated with more perceived prejudice (Hinton et al., 2021), and youth with LGBTQ+ parents face prejudice based on their family identity (Farr et al., 2016), it is important that researchers further investigate the ways that LGBTQ+ family context impacts importance among youth with LGBTQ+ parents. Doing so could increase understanding of LGBTQ+ identities, LGBTQ+ family dynamics, and how to best support LGBTQ+ youth as they navigate prejudice.

Racial/ethnic identity importance. Researchers have examined racial/ethnic identity importance both within the context of multiethnic families and in society broadly (Lee & Ahn, 2013; Samuels, 2009; Soliz et al., 2009). Based on previous research, strong racial/ethnic identity salience and centrality are associated with better mental health

outcomes (e.g., strong ethnic identification among Filipino Americans buffers against stress; Mossakowski, 2003). Similar to sexual identity salience and centrality, higher affiliation with a racial/ethnic identity has been related to increased awareness of discrimination (Lee & Ahn, 2013). The current study seeks to examine racial/ethnic identity importance, among other identities, among youth with LGBTQ+ parents. Furthermore, since LGBTQ+ parent families commonly are multiracial and/or are formed through transracial adoption (Goldberg, 2009; Goldberg & Conron, 2018), the current study seeks to investigate how youth with LGBTQ+ parents perceive that their parents impact their individual identities through conversation (i.e., frequent conversations about race in the U.S.) and action (i.e., moving to a district with more diverse schools; Bramlett & Radel, 2010).

Current Study

In the current study, I aim to investigate identity development and identity importance among a sample of youth with LGBTQ+ parents in the U.S. using qualitative analyses. Past literature indicates that adolescence and emerging adulthood are crucial periods for identity development (Arnett, 2015; Kroger et al., 2010), making this age group apt for identity development research. Although some researchers have examined identity development within adults with LGBTQ+ parents (Kovalanka & Goldberg, 2009), literature is scarce on this phenomenon with adolescents *and* emerging adults. Identity importance among this population has been explored even less. Furthermore, the research that has been conducted with this population lacks diversity (e.g., in socioeconomic status, racial/ethnic identity, geography, etc.; Fish & Russell, 2018). I seek to start filling these various gaps by exploring identity development and identity

importance (i.e., salience and centrality) among a diverse sample of adolescents and emerging adults with LGBTQ+ parents. This investigation will provide important insight into the LGBTQ+ parent family context and lived experiences of LGBTQ+ youth that can then be used to increase visibility and support for individuals with LGBTQ+ parents and the LGBTQ+ community broadly in law, policy, and health settings. Due to the complex and exploratory nature of the study, I used qualitative analyses and investigated the following research questions:

1. What factors (including perceptions of stigma) appear related to identity development in this sample?
2. What identities do adolescent and young adults with LGBTQ+ parents describe as important (salient and/or central)?

Method

Participants

Participants ($N = 51$) were 12-25 years old ($M = 19.62$, $SD = 3.48$) and had at least one LGBTQ+ parent. Participants were diverse in terms of geographic region, gender identity, sexual identity, and racial/ethnic identity (see Table 1). In summary, 51% of participants identified as LGBQ, 39% were POC, and 18% identified as transgender or non-binary (TGNB) or with another minoritized gender identity label (e.g., trans masculine, questioning, etc). About one-third ($n = 13$) of participants were under 18 years. All participants except one lived in the U.S. at the time of the study; this participant is originally from the U.S. and lived there for an extensive period. Most participants were from the Southern U.S., specifically Kentucky ($n = 17$) and Ohio ($n = 11$), as well as North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Texas, Indiana, Michigan, and

Minnesota ($n = 1$ from each state). Other participants lived in the Northeastern or Western U.S.: California ($n = 4$) and Pennsylvania ($n = 3$), as well as Connecticut, Massachusetts, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, New Mexico, and Utah ($n = 1$ from each state).

Participants' parents, who are represented in this study but did not directly participate, also varied in gender and sexual identities. Parents' sexual identities, described by participants and including *all* parents (both LGBTQ+ and otherwise), were as follows: lesbian mothers ($n = 46$), heterosexual parents ($n = 24$), gay fathers ($n = 20$), bisexual parents ($n = 10$), queer parents ($n = 2$), pansexual parents ($n = 2$), and parents reporting multiple sexual identities ($n = 7$; e.g., lesbian and queer). Most parents were reported by participants to identify as a cisgender woman ($n = 75$); however, other parents were reported to identify as a cisgender man ($n = 31$), a transgender woman ($n = 4$), nonbinary ($n = 1$), and gender fluid ($n = 1$). Lastly, most parents were described by participants as white ($n = 88$), followed by Black ($n = 14$), Hispanic/Latina or ($n = 3$), Asian ($n = 4$), Middle Eastern ($n = 1$), and multiracial ($n = 5$).

Additionally, participants' families were formed in varied ways. About half of participants were born in the context of a previous different-sex relationship ($n = 26$). They also joined their families via pathways like donor insemination ($n = 13$), private or closed domestic adoption ($n = 2$), foster care adoption ($n = 2$), international adoption ($n = 1$), surrogacy ($n = 1$), or two or more of these methods (e.g., donor insemination and divorce/remarriage; $n = 5$).

Procedure

Targeted and snowball sampling were used to recruit participants for this project, Stories and Experiences of LGBTQ+ Families from Youth (SELFY). Researchers utilized various recruitment techniques such as hanging flyers, posting virtual ads on social media, emailing listservs, and contacting various LGBTQ+ organizations both locally and nationally (e.g., COLAGE, an organization focused on fostering community for children with LGBTQ+ parents). All recruitment materials contained a link to a brief eligibility survey (via Qualtrics survey software). Eligible participants needed to be between the ages of 12 and 25 years old, to have one openly LGBTQ+ identified parent who had been out for five or more years, and to have lived with the parent for at least some period of time while growing up. Participants were not excluded from the study based on family formation. If the participant was eligible and under the age of 18, they completed an assent form and their parent/guardian filled out a parent permission form. If they were eligible and 18 or older, participants were emailed a consent form to fill out. Next, trained research personnel conducted a semi-structured, audio-recorded interview about participants' experiences being part of an LGBTQ+ family, perceptions of identity, family and peer relationships, community support, discrimination, and coping, among other topics. Following recording, interviews were transcribed by trained personnel. Interviews lasted about 90 minutes each and data were collected from December 2018 to February 2020. Participants were compensated \$50 via an e-gift card. The University of Kentucky Institutional Review Board approved the research protocol.

Materials

Demographic questions. Participants reported demographic information in both the eligibility survey and in the interview itself. Researchers asked participants to report their gender, sexual, and racial/ethnic identities, geographic region, age, income (both current and growing up), subjective social status (SSS) ranking, how their family came together, their parents' identities, their current family structure, and anything else they felt relevant to the study. For example, some participants chose to disclose their disability status. Questions included, but were not limited to the following: *“please describe a little bit about how your family was formed (e.g., adoption)”* and *“Where do you currently live, and how would you describe your home and neighborhood (Probe for rural, suburban, urban)? If where you currently live is different from where you grew up, could you describe where you grew up (home, neighborhood, name of the place, etc.)?”*. This method of obtaining demographic information was particularly enhanced by the qualitative nature of the study. Each participant was free to elaborate or provide more detail regarding any demographic question, and many did.

Interview guide. The full interview guide (Appendix A) included questions about participants' identities, disclosure about family identity, family and friend relationships, discrimination experiences and coping strategies, family conversations and dynamics, microaggressions and community climate, and support. This study is specifically focused on questions about identities and disclosure about family identity. In these sections, participants were asked to discuss which identities they considered core to themselves, and how their parents have impacted their identities (if at all). Questions included, but were not limited to, *“If you had to decide which identities are most important or ‘core’ to*

who you are, what are those identities? Is there one identity that is most important to who you are?”.

Data Analysis

In January 2021, a team of trained research personnel began conducting a thematic analysis of the data with an inductive approach (Braun & Clarke, 2006, 2013); the team utilized a codebook approach to the thematic analysis (i.e., use of both reflexive thematic analysis and a structured approach to coding; Braun & Clarke, 2021a). Although personnel focused primarily on questions about the participants’ identity, the entire transcript was read for coding purposes. At the beginning of and throughout the coding process, the team engaged in conversations about positionality, or how the team’s personal identities impacted the coding process and their perspective on the data, and reflexivity, or how personal identities may relate to the data (Braun & Clarke, 2021a; Levitt et al., 2018). This is a process to ensure that coders keep themselves and one another accountable to reduce bias. Overall, the coding team members held an array of gender identities (i.e., cisgender woman, cisgender man, and non-binary individual), sexual identities, (i.e., lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer), racial/ethnic identities (i.e., white, Asian, Hispanic, and Indian), and came from multiple U.S. geographic regions (i.e., South, Midwest, Mid-Atlantic, and Northeast). Additionally, while a majority of coding team members were from non-adoptive families, one team member was a transracially adopted person. In order to be fully in touch with the population of interest, the project received guidance from mentors representing the following identities: LGBTQ+, LGBTQ+ parent, child of LGBTQ+ parent, and BIPOC (Braun & Clarke, 2021a; Levitt et al., 2018).

Overall, data analysis for the present project lasted from January 2021-October 2022 and involved multiple steps including code team meetings, codebook creation (see Appendix B; Braun & Clarke, 2021a), and theme refinement (Braun & Clarke, 2006, 2013). The coding team started by familiarizing themselves with the data. This involved reading through a random selection of 5 transcripts and recording their thoughts and reactions to the transcripts. Following this, the coding team began meeting weekly to discuss patterns and themes emerging from the transcripts (Braun & Clarke, 2006, 2013). The team kept detailed meeting notes throughout the process. As these conversations continued, the coding team began to establish overarching themes related to individual identity, identity development, and identity importance (Braun & Clarke, 2006, 2013). Personnel then coded each transcript for the presence of each established theme. Throughout coding, the coding team frequently engaged in discussions to further define and refine themes; the team made multiple adjustments to themes based on participants' narratives and elaborated on said themes in order to create a detailed codebook (Braun & Clarke, 2006, 2013, 2021a).

To increase rigor to the coding process, the project utilized an auditor (Schwandt, 2007). The auditor first read through my research questions for the project and a selection of transcripts I provided. I chose these transcripts purposefully for variability of theme presence and theme codes and diversity of participants' identities. Following this, I gave the auditor a draft of the codebook and asked them to evaluate whether it accurately reflected the data. To do this, the auditor chose five transcripts that have already been coded and evaluated whether the themes and codes (i.e., subthemes) reflect the data. Next, the auditor familiarized herself with five transcripts that have not been coded by the

team and once again evaluated the accuracy of the themes. At the end of this process, the auditor reported on the strengths and weaknesses of the team's themes; this involved recommendations of themes to be added or altered. The coding team adjusted themes based on the auditor's recommendations and concluded coding in October 2022.

Halfway through and at the conclusion of coding, I conducted reliability checks between team members' codes using Krippendorff's alpha (McHugh, 2012). The team used the initial reliability check to direct and adjust future coding (Braun & Clarke, 2021b); any themes that did not have an alpha of .70 or above were adjusted and recoded. Final reliability checks verified the validity of found themes ($\alpha = .87$; more details in Results). Lastly, I examined the frequency of each theme across specific demographic characteristics of participants (i.e., age, racial/ethnic identity, geographic region, urbanity, family structure, gender, and sexuality). From there, I compiled frequencies of the themes across transcripts and examine the proportion of present themes endorsed by participants across each demographic group (i.e., sexuality, gender, racial/ethnic identity, geographic region (within the U.S.), and family structure). More concisely, I examined how often individuals across demographic groups report each theme.

Results

Coding revealed 6 themes, all with moderate to strong inter-rater reliability (specific values reported below; McHugh, 2012). The themes were: (1) *Identity Type*, (2) *Appearance*, (3) *Representation Responsibility*, (4) *Interaction between Personal Identity and Parent/Family Identity*, (5) *Community Impact on Identity Development*, (6) *Intersection of Personal Identities*.

Identity Type

The first theme was present in all 51 transcripts. Theme 1 centers around the specific identities participants identified as core, or central, to themselves. When asked which identities are core to who they are, participants' answers ranged in identity type. Overall, three different types of identities emerged and were coded dichotomously into three subthemes: Trait ($n = 11$; $\alpha = .94$), Group/Activity ($n = 28$; $\alpha = .92$), and Integrated ($n = 31$; $\alpha = .78$). Most participants were coded in multiple Theme 1 sub-themes; they often listed several "core" identities.

First, a small group of participants described a trait identity as core. Coders defined trait identities as those that were also adjectives or characteristics; some examples include "athletic," "outgoing," and "people-person". For example, one participant, Luke³, said, "*I definitely kind of identify myself as outgoing, embracing and I guess fun-loving. I guess those are the ones that are really kind of important to me*" (18, Hispanic, cisgender man, heterosexual, South, suburban, household 1: two white, lesbian mothers, did not experience divorce). Reports of a trait identity did not seem to vary based on age; most participants in this subtheme were ages 17-22 ($n = 9$). Additionally, many participants were white or multiracial ($n = 6$; $n = 4$) with no Black participants reporting a trait identity. All but one participant with a trait identity were cisgender ($n = 10$). Interestingly, almost all participants in this subtheme came from families without divorce ($n = 10$).

The second identity type participants mentioned was a group/activity identity, or a personal identity with strong connections to a group, community, or other individuals

³ I use pseudonyms throughout the results section to refer to participants.

(e.g., Southern, American, bowler etc..) and/or a personal identity associated specific set of expectations, behaviors, or tasks (e.g., student, nurse, mom, etc.). Many group/activity identities were mentioned in conjunction with a social group. One interviewee, Todd, listed “rower” as one of his core identities. He described that his passion for rowing and relationships with rowing team members were integral to his identity; “...*being an athlete is definitely one. I do crew. I’m a coxswain...I think the teamwork and friendship from crew is a big part of it, because that also is a big part of a lot of my life outside of crew*” (17, multiracial, cisgender man, bisexual/ heteroromantic, West, suburban, household 1: two white, gay fathers, did not experience divorce). More privileged demographic identities also fell in this category (e.g., cisgender man, heterosexual, etc.).

Lastly, integrated identities were defined as those that pervade across the multiple types of identities, social, traits, and beyond. This type of identity was the most frequently referenced and often a marginalized identity, such as participants’ racial/ethnic identity, gender, sexual identity, disability status, or religious identity. Participants noted these identities for a variety of reasons, such as the strong impact of the identity on their life. One participant stated, “*being gay and African American is actually very important to me. I feel like that’s what shapes who I am,*” (Riley: 15, Black, nonbinary, gay, South, suburban, household 1: two Black, bisexual mothers, Experienced divorce), and another said, “*I would say my identity as a woman is important because it’s probably been the one that’s most affected me personally in my life*” (Jessica: 20, white, cisgender woman, heterosexual, South, urban, household 1: two white, bisexual fathers, household 2: one white, heterosexual mother and one white, heterosexual father, experienced divorce). These identities were also frequently promoted across participants’ lives, like in the case

of Preston (20, Black, cisgender man, heterosexual, Midwest, urban, household 1: two Black, gay fathers, experienced divorce) and Jacob (18, Black, trans masculine/ambiguously queer, ambiguously queer (bi/pan/aromantic), Midwest, rural, household 1: two Black, lesbian mothers, household 2: one Indian, heterosexual mother and one black, heterosexual father, experienced divorce). Preston said, “...being a Black male [is] very important cause there’s a lot of situations in this world that doesn’t seem fair” and Jacob said, “I’d say probably race and gender because those are the ones that are not important, but I guess the most relevant in my everyday life because those are the ones that I have to present outwardly.” There were no apparent trends based on participants’ demographic characteristics.

Appearance

The second theme was present in 24 out of 51 transcripts; interrater reliability was strong ($\alpha = 1.00$). Theme 2 detailed when participants referred to their physical appearance concerning their identity. Three situations emerged overall: the use of appearance to represent identity ($n = 7$), an avoidance of looking like an identity ($n = 1$), and instances of not being perceived as their identity because of their appearance ($n = 16$). In subtheme 2.1, participants purposely used their appearance to represent their identity. Participants often used their appearance to affirm their sexual and/or gender identities. Some examples include: “*I present very masculine so people can generally assume through whatever assumptions they make that I’m not necessarily straight.*” (Brooklyn: 20, mixed/Black, masculine-presenting woman, lesbian/queer, Northeast, suburban, household 1: one white, heterosexual mother and one white, heterosexual father, household 2: single multiracial, lesbian mother, experienced divorce); “*I was so*

happy I had my little like nose ring and my backwards cap and I was like, yeah baby dyke energy and it was like beautiful and it was such a wholesome moment” (River: 21, white, nonbinary woman, queer/bisexual, Northeast, suburban, household 1: single white, lesbian mother, household 2: single white, bisexual mother, did not experience divorce). Many participants who reported this subtheme were ages 18-21 ($n = 6$) and identified as LGBTQ+ ($n = 5$). In contrast, only 1 participant described efforts to *not* look their identity in subtheme 2.2, saying she attempts to pass as straight to avoid bullying (Grace: 17, white, cisgender female, gay/lesbian, South, suburban, household 1: two white lesbian mothers, did not experience divorce).

Subtheme 2.3 represents instances where participants say they do not look like their identity and/or other people do not perceive them as their identity. LGBTQ+ participants ($n = 12$) frequently described themselves as straight-passing (i.e., appearing to be cisgender and heterosexual, but actually identifying as LGBTQ+), and as a result, are not always perceived or treated as their identify. For example, one bisexual participant stated, *“whenever I’m in very heterosexual environments, especially when I’m with like, a male partner, I’m passing as straight a lot, but I feel out of place there”* (Taylor: 21, white, cisgender woman/somewhat questioning, queer/bisexual, West, rural, household 1: two white, lesbian mothers, did not experience divorce). A trans participant echoed this theme and said, *“looking like a butch lesbian and being identical to a lesbian, and then going to a trans man and looking like a cis male... I think it’s hard for people to perceive that I’m a trans man”* (John: 22, white, transgender man, pansexual, South, rural, household 1: two white mothers, did not experience divorce). One participant indicated this theme by discussing how others perceive his biracial identity, *“A lot of*

people think I'm Puerto Rican anyways. So, people think like, they think I'm just really tan, white person, I don't know where that comes from" (Ryan: 22, cisgender man, gay, Midwest, rural, household 1: two white, lesbian mothers, experienced divorce). Another participant described avoiding prejudice as a result of others *not* perceiving her identity, *"And we don't really look, like, stereotypically Arab, so we haven't really had a lot of issue here..."* (Isabelle: 18, white [half-Lebanese], cisgender woman, bisexual/queer, Northeast, Suburban, household 1: one white, gay father and one lebanese, gay father, household 2: two mothers, did not experience divorce).

Representation Responsibility

The third theme was present in 17 out of 51 transcripts; inter-rater reliability was strong ($\alpha = .79$). Theme 3 described the emergence of representation responsibility, or when a participant indicated that they felt obligated to act in a certain way as a result of their personal identity ($n = 17$). To represent his identity as African American, Preston indicated a responsibility to educate others about race. He said, *"The Black history studying, it made me think about the struggle what people went through to put me in the position that I am in now and so it made me feel a certain way about how strong I should be and how I should look at my life and how important I was to my race...it made me carry myself in a certain manner you know?"* (20, Black, cisgender man, heterosexual, Midwest, urban, household 1: two Black, gay fathers, experienced divorce). Another Black participant expressed his responsibility to be a role model to younger Black men, *"in my community, Black males get harassed a lot, so, uh, it's the most important to me to be a strong role model for other young Black males"* (Will: 24, Black, cisgender man,

heterosexual, Midwest, suburban, household 1: single Black, lesbian mother, experienced divorce).

Interaction between Personal Identity and Parent/Family Identity

The fourth theme was present in 45 out of 51 transcripts; interrater reliability was strong ($\alpha = .72$). Theme 4 assessed whether participants felt their family identity had interacted with or affected their personal identity. Overall, participants fell into one of four subthemes. Subtheme 4.1 ($n = 26$) indicates that the participant's parent and/or family identity eased their identity development. For example, many participants noted that having LGBTQ+ parents helped shape them into more empathetic, accepting people. One of these participants said about his moms, *"For me it's been really an integral part in how I interact and greet and engage with other people, you know? I was raised very in an environment that was very non-judgmental"* (Peyton: 21, white, transgender man [gender non-conforming], bisexual/queer, northeast, suburban, household 1: two white, lesbian mothers, household 2: single white, bisexual mother, did not experience divorce). One participant even remarked that her LGBTQ+ family identity and dads impacted her passion for social justice and motivated her to pursue a degree in political science; *"I think it's kind of shaped my whole worldview as a person ... it led down a path where I wanted to be involved with a bunch of other pushes for social justice"* (Jessica: 20, white, cisgender woman, heterosexual, South, urban, household 1: two white, bisexual fathers, household 2: one white, heterosexual mom and one white, heterosexual dad, experienced divorce).

Finally, many participants mentioned that having a parent who identified as LGBTQ+ helped them accept their own LGBTQ+ identity. John said, *"I said I was gay,*

and [my mom] was like, oh, I figured. And I felt like, okay. And she, it was like she was proud. She made me feel like she was proud of me for coming out” (22, white, transgender man, pansexual, South, rural, household 1: two white mothers, did not experience divorce). Ryan said, *“I think for me that adding two moms was definitely helpful for me, because my coming out process, or time, was a piece of cake”* (22, biracial (Black/white), cisgender man, gay, Midwest, rural, household 1: two white, lesbian mothers, experienced divorce). Indeed, a majority of participants in this subtheme were LGBTQ+ ($n = 18$).

In contrast, Subtheme 4.2 ($n = 4$) is for participants who feel that their parent and/or family identity conflicted with the development of their personal identity. For Morgan, this conflict stemmed from their mother’s internalized stigma. They are open about their sexuality while their mom has had trouble embracing her identity. They said, *“Me coming out hasn’t felt so, I don’t know. [My mother] has been so secret and even negative about it when I ask her about it. In a weird way, even though we’re both queer, so, I don’t think there’s a sort of safety”* (21, multiracial (Black/white), nonbinary woman/neutrois, ace/aro, Northeast, urban, household 1: single mother, household 2: single mother, experienced divorce). Another participant shared that coming out to her LGBTQ+ parent was difficult because of her mom’s lack of familiarity with the LGBTQ+ identities. Taylor said, *“I think that the blatant acceptance that people predict is not necessarily what always happens, like, um, I remember I came out to one of my moms as pansexual when I was 12, and she was like, “What is that?”* (21, white, cisgender woman/somewhat questioning, queer/bisexual, West, rural, household 1: two white, lesbian mothers, did not experience divorce).

Subtheme 4.3 ($n = 5$) represents a combination of the first two subthemes— with family identity easing personal development in some ways but conflicting in others. For example, Megan emphasized that having a gay dad helped her understand her LGBTQ+ identity; however, her entire family is white and she is biracial, leading to difficulties navigating her racial/ethnic identity. She said, *“I guess the con with them is sometimes I feel like, you know, since I’m mixed, I don’t really fit in sometimes”* (21, biracial, cisgender woman, heterosexual, Midwest, suburban, household 1: single white, heterosexual mother, household 2: single Black, gay father, experienced divorce). A different participant noted a similar situation, except her experience was the opposite. Her mom was not very helpful in understanding her LGBTQ+ identity, but aided her greatly in accepting her Jewish identity. She shares,

“I don’t remember at what age, but I know that my grandpa being a Holocaust survivor was a big part of my understanding of what it meant to be Jewish, um, and really important for my mom to- like, my mom that is his daughter, that we carry on like, talking about the holocaust or making sure that we never forget what happened and talk about it, because like, for me at a young age, that was a big part of my Jewish identity,, and I think it’s very much like, yeah, be proud of this, it’s a big part of who you are and that’s a good thing” (Taylor, 21, white, cisgender woman/somewhat questioning, queer/bisexual, West, rural, household 1: two white, lesbian mothers, did not experience divorce).

Subtheme 4.4 ($n = 10$) characterized participants who felt their family identity did not affect their personal identity. Many participants emphasized that having gay parents did not make them any different than those who have straight parents, or that their

parents' sexuality did not affect their identities. While many participants were concise when discussing this subtheme, Brooklynn elaborated on their parent's lack of impact on them: *"I don't think it's necessarily important. I think I would be where I am no matter what. I don't think that my parents or family are an influencing factor on my sexuality"* (20, mixed/black, masculine-presenting woman, lesbian/queer, Northeast, suburban, household 1: one white, heterosexual mother and one white, heterosexual father, household 2: single multiracial, lesbian mother, experienced divorce).

Community Impact on Identity Development

The fifth theme was present in 32 out of 51 transcripts; interrater reliability was strong ($\alpha = .84$). Theme 5 was dichotomously coded as present or not present and aimed to capture the impact of community and belongingness on both personal identity and family identity. If a participant indicated that significant engagement with a community impacted their identity, then this theme was coded as present. For example, multiple participants noted that going to LGBTQ+ community centers, or even knowing others who have gay parents, helped them with their own feelings of belongingness and strength in identity. Josh exemplified this theme: *"We have the same feelings we have the same thoughts we can all talk to each other about it we're all comfortable together I think the LGBTQ community to me is just a big family"* (14, Cuban-American, cisgender man, confused about sexuality, South, suburban, household 1: two white, lesbian mothers, household 2: single Cuban, heterosexual father, experienced divorce). Several remarked that attending a pride festival was particularly impactful. Peyton said, *"whenever I get the chance to go to a pride festival or a pride event um usually in June um it especially being around um so many more people that are within the same sphere of um atypical sexual*

and gender identities um just makes – is a very liberating feeling um so that’s an instance that I felt especially proud to be in the community” (21, white, transgender man/gender non-conforming, bisexual/queer, Northeast, suburban, household 1: two white, lesbian mother, household 2: single white, bisexual mother, did not experience divorce).

Community impact was not all LGBTQ+ specific. Chloe, who was passionate about fitness and health and marked it as a significant part of her identity, noted that the CrossFit community at her gym was a huge part of that passion: *“Probably like the CrossFit community. Just cause, at my gym everyone’s a family there and everyone is super kind and supportive and understanding and that makes it more fun to work out”* (17, white, cisgender woman, heterosexual, South, suburban, household 1: one white, bisexual mother and one white, lesbian mother, experienced divorce).

Although many participants described positive impacts, others noted a negative impact of community involvement on their identity. Participants frequently cited religious communities as a source of negativity; Averie mentioned trying to attend a Christian church with her mom and said, *“When I saw with the constant bashing, and then when you get this stares from the congregation when you come through the doors and the whispering. Then you just know that that’s not the place for you”* (Averie, 22, white, cisgender woman, heterosexual, South, suburban, household 1: one Black, bisexual mother and one Black, bisexual father, did not experience divorce). Overall, this theme was especially frequent among two-mother ($n = 21$; represents 72% of two-mother families in sample) and two-father households ($n = 4$; represents 80% of two-father families in sample).

Interaction of Personal Identities

The sixth and final theme was present in 25 out of 51 of the transcripts; interrater reliability was strong ($\alpha = .94$). This theme was dichotomously coded as present or not present, present if a participants' identities interacted with each other in notable ways. For example, Will discussed his experience as a Black male nurse, noting that not only is nursing a woman-dominated field but his identity as a Black man was more salient in his field; *"People have treated me differently because I'm a Black man in my area. You know? They expect you to be this certain person or think that you're trouble that you're part of the trouble group, but I'm not"* (24, Black, cisgender man, heterosexual, Midwest, suburban, household 1: single Black, lesbian mother, experienced divorce). Many participants noted an intersection in their family LGBTQ+ identity and their racial/ethnic identity, specifically, the difficulty of navigating two a marginalized identities. For example, Lilly, a Hispanic woman with a gay dad said, *"It's just kind of an unspoken thing...when my dad came out it was really difficult to still be as involved in the Hispanic community"* (20, Hispanic American [racially white/ethnically Hispanic], cisgender woman, lesbian, Midwest, urban, household 1: single Hispanic, heterosexual mother, household 2: one Colombian white, gay father and one white, gay father, experienced divorce). Also to this finding, Ryan said, *"And so, there's kind of, there's already I think, a little bit of a stigma within like the African American community and homosexuality"* (22, biracial, cisgender man, gay, Midwest, rural, household 1: two white, lesbian mothers, experienced divorce.). Some participants noted an interaction between their LGBTQ+ identity and their disability. One participant emphasized the importance of this intersection and said, *"radical queer disabled artists is a really big community."*

Surprisingly" (River, 21, white, nonbinary woman, queer/bisexual, Northeast, suburban, household 1: single white, lesbian mother, household 2: single white, bisexual mother, did not experience divorce). Another participant discussed the difficulties of holding both a queer identity and multiple disabilities. He said, *"I also have a disability. I have FAS, fetal alcohol syndrome, and I have bipolar disorder, so that made it even worse, too. To add on to the gay thing. So... it was really, really, and I mean, really, really, it was really, really hard living like that"* (Jack: 24, mixed/black, cisgender man, gay, Midwest, suburban, household 1: single white, gay father, did not experience divorce).

Discussion

The current study explored identity development and identity importance in a sample of diverse youth with LGBTQ+ parents. Participants named an array of vibrant identities as central to themselves, from outgoing, to rowing team member, to queer. Based on participant narratives, development of these identities was influenced by many factors, including family and community, consistent with previous literature (Cashen, 2022; Kivalanka & Goldberg, 2009) and an Ecological Systems theoretical framework (Bronfenbrenner, 1977). Adolescent and emerging adult participants intentionally expressed their identities through their appearance and behaviors; they noted a responsibility to properly represent their identities to others. Findings also indicated that participants' identities do not exist separately from one another, but instead interact in meaningful ways which is consistent with an intersectionality framework (Crenshaw, 1989). Taken together, youth with LGBTQ+ parents demonstrate a passion for and commitment to their identities as well as resilience in the face of stigma against their identities.

The present study contributes to the literature by exploring identity in a minoritized sample. While previous literature has reported on identity among adults with LGBTQ+ parents (Kovalanka & Goldberg, 2009) and LGBTQ+ families with more privileged identities (i.e., LGB, white, from U.S. coastal regions, and high SES; Fish & Russell, 2018), this study focused on identity among adolescents and emerging adults with LGBTQ+ parents and marginalized identities (i.e., LGBTQ+, minoritized racial/ethnic identities, primary from the South and Midwest U.S., varying SES). Ultimately, these findings extend existing empirical work and theory by studying identity at the intersection of multiple marginalized contexts. Finally, the present study provides a platform for these experiences to be disseminated and applied in research, policy, and clinical practice. At present, there are multiple efforts to decrease LGBTQ+ visibility in the U.S. (e.g., “Don’t Say Gay” Bill in Florida; Diaz, 2022) and limit LGBTQ+ individuals’ ability to form families (e.g., through foster care or adoption; *Fulton v. City of Philadelphia*, 2021); this study and others like it assist in empirically demonstrating the unique strengths of and need for support among LGBTQ+ family members, including children.

Identities of Youth with LGBTQ+ Parents

Participants described multiple identities as core to themselves. The types of identities reported are consistent with identity theory, which postulates three different types of identity (i.e., person, group, and role; Stets & Serpe, 2013). Trait identity neatly maps on to the person identity proposed by Stets and Serpe (2013), while group/activity identity reflects group and role identities. However, the present study expanded upon these categories with the “integrated” identity, or an identity that extends across multiple

types of identities to better reflect to experience of marginalized groups. The integrated identity was the most frequently reported identity by participants. This finding is supported by previous research; marginalized identities are often more salient for individuals than privileged identities (e.g., youth with minoritized sexual identities think about their sexuality more often than do heterosexual youth; Hughes & Hurtado, 2018). Furthermore, participants who did not have a marginalized identity often reported trait or role identities.

Regardless of identity type, when asked to report their “core” identities, most participants shared their identities with pride and confidence. This sentiment reflects theory on identity centrality (Stets & Serpe, 2013), which states individuals express confidence and commitment to identities central to themselves. The present study also finds that having a shared LGBTQ+ identity with a parent can help bolster confidence and comfort, or identity centrality, in youth’s LGBTQ+ identity. This is consistent with previous LGBTQ+ parent research with adults (Kovalanka & Goldberg, 2009), and adds to the literature by uncovering the same phenomena in a sample of adolescents and emerging adults.

Participants also demonstrated commitment and awareness of their identities through their appearance and feelings of responsibility to represent their identities. Sexual and gender minority youth described facets of their appearance that onlookers may view as straight or LGBTQ+; often times, this description was accompanied by feelings of discomfort. Sometimes, this stereotyping was based on their personal LGBTQ+ identity, but other times, stigma was based on their parent’s LGBTQ+ identity (i.e., stereotype assuming the children of LGBTQ+ parents must also be LGBTQ+ identified). This

finding supports literature regarding salient LGBTQ+ identities. According to previous research, individuals with more salient LGBTQ+ identities are more likely to perceive stigma toward their LGBTQ+ identity (Hinton et al., 2021; Hughes & Hurtado, 2018; Quinn & Chaudoir, 2009). Adding to the literature, the findings here suggest that cisgender heterosexual youth with LGBTQ+ parents describe the same situation: onlookers assume they are LGBTQ+ identified simply because their parents are LGBTQ+.

The literature also indicates that individuals with a salient marginalized racial/ethnic identity are more likely to perceive stigma associated with their racial/ethnic identity (Lee & Ahn, 2013). This finding is supported and furthered by the present study; multiple participants with marginalized racial/ethnic identities conveyed uneasiness with others' inaccurate assumptions of their identity based on the color of their skin or cultural participation. However, participants went on to express confidence in their identities and cited community and family support as instrumental in coping with stigma against their minoritized racial/ethnic identities.

Many youth with LGBTQ+ parents in the sample felt a responsibility to properly represent their marginalized identities to others, especially in the face of stigma. This responsibility led youth to educate others about minority issues, attempt to be a good role models for others of a similar identity, and even insert themselves into discussions on minority identity issues. In line with Ecological Systems theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1977), youth with LGBTQ+ parents report stigma, and thus, feelings of representation responsibility across context, including peers, school, work, and society broadly. Moreover, since identity salience is associated with more awareness of stigma related to

one's identity and frequent thoughts of one's identity (Hughes & Hurtado, 2018; Hurtado et al., 2015), it may be that identity salience is associated with more feelings of representation responsibility. Future research should investigate the relationship between identity importance and representation responsibility among youth with LGBTQ+ parents and broadly in order to gain insight into the possible relationship. Such findings could also help support youth with LGBTQ+ parents in clinical settings. Representation responsibility appeared to take a toll on participants, adding uncomfortable pressure and expectations to their everyday interactions. Future research should investigate this negative affective state, particularly how it may impact youth with LGBTQ+ parents' mental health.

Factors Related to Youth Identity

Consistent with Ecological Systems theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1977), youth identity development and importance among participants were impacted by factors across multiple contexts, mainly, local community, family context, larger religious institutions, and even at the intersection of contexts (e.g., holding an LGBTQ+ family identity in a Jewish community setting). Involvement with communities that surrounded one's identity were continuously reported as either helpful or hurtful to participants as their identities developed. Religious communities were particularly impactful for participants. Youth with LGBTQ+ parents cited negative attitudes against the LGBTQ+ community from Protestant and Catholic communities as harmful, and as a result, abandoned their religious identity and involvement. Sadly, this finding is consistent with previous research on LGBTQ+ identity and religious involvement (Beagan & Hattie, 2016). This finding was particularly evident amongst youth in same-gender parent families, likely

because of the increased visibility of their LGBTQ+ identity as compared to youth from single parent or different-gender parent families. Indeed, some LGBTQ+ parents note that “passing” as a cis-het parent can lead to less discrimination (Gillig et al., 2022). Encouragingly, participants named the LGBTQ+ community and their community of other youth with LGBTQ+ parents as strong sources of support and influences on positive identity development. This finding is both in line with previous research with young adults with LGBTQ+ parents (Cashen, 2022) and expands the literature’s knowledge on adolescents. Adolescents with LGBTQ+ parents report LGBTQ+ community belonging and involvement as positive just like adults with LGBTQ+ parents (Cashen, 2022; Goldberg et al., 2012).

Participants also reported that their personal identity was impacted by their parents’ identity. On the whole, many participants stated having LGBTQ+ parents made them more empathetic, accepting, and open-minded, which is consistent with some previous research (Goldberg, 2007). Some indicated that sharing an LGBTQ+ identity with their parent, and parent-child conversations about this identity, helped them to feel more confident and informed about their LGBTQ+ identity. Other participants reported that it is more difficult to understand and develop identities that they do not share with their parents. These reports reflect findings throughout the literature on adults with LGBTQ+ parents (Goldberg et al., 2012; Kivalanka & Goldberg, 2009), yet add to the literature by sampling adolescents. For participants of color with white parents, not sharing a racial/ethnic identity sometimes led to feelings of isolation and difference. This finding demonstrates a need for more racial and cultural socialization in families with white parents; such socialization can be vital for youth of color in navigating their

racial/ethnic identity (Samuels, 2009), including in families with LGBTQ+ parents (Simon & Farr, 2022). Finally, a group of participants stressed the lack of influence that their parents' LGBTQ+ identity has had on their personal identities. They were insistent that their parents' LGBTQ+ identity did not impact them, which is consistent with one common theme in previous literature on LGBTQ+ parent families. Specifically, youth with LGBTQ+ parents have commonly assuaged stigma against LGBTQ+ parent families by highlighting their similarities with cis-het parent families (Clark & Demetriuo, 2016).

Finally, the current study underscores that the intersections of participants' identities are impactful not only for their identity but everyday life experiences, consistent with Intersectionality Theory (Crenshaw, 1989). It was evident throughout participant accounts that each of their identities did not exist in a vacuum and instead intersected with one another in important ways, such as through encouraging and/or discouraging community involvement with one important identity over another and interacting with stereotypes associated with multiple identities. Overall, this finding, as well as findings about the impact of parents and community on individual identity, support Ecological Systems theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1977), and as such, lay the groundwork for a more detailed future investigation into the ways in which LGBTQ+ parents encourage resilience and strength in their youth's individual identities.

Strengths and Limitations

Despite its many strengths, the current study is not without limitations. Firstly, the present sample size, while large for a qualitative study, is small overall, and thus not generalizable to all youth with LGBTQ+ parents or broader populations of youth. However, the present qualitative study was not intended to be generalizable, and rather, I

sought to elevate the voices of the present population. In order to fully understand the population's experiences, the psychological and scholarly community must first familiarize itself with the lived experiences of youth with LGBTQ+ parents. The results of this study represent a step in that direction. Next, the present sample is diverse in several key ways, especially as compared to previous LGBTQ+ studies. A large amount of LGBTQ+ research to date has been conducted with white, high-income, LG families from the Northeast and West coasts of the U.S. (Fish & Russell, 2018). In contrast, the current sample is mostly from the South and Midwest and represents an array of sexual, gender, and racial/ethnic identities and income backgrounds. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said for participants' parents. Overall, a majority of participants' parents were white and while several parents held minoritized gender identities, a majority of parents were cisgender and LGB. Finally, we collected data for the current project before the COVID-19 pandemic. Although this study provides a snapshot into these youth's lives pre-pandemic, the COVID-19 pandemic likely has had a long-lasting, critical impact on the lives of youth (and their parents) in LGBTQ+ parent families that is not accounted for in this study (Drabble & Eliason, 2021).

Implications for Research, Policy, and Clinical Practice

This study could have important implications for the psychological field and society's general understanding of youth with LGBTQ+ parents. Firstly, findings could both expand the literature's understanding of youth with LGBTQ+ parents and their identities and start filling gaps in the literature regarding LGBTQ+ family context (i.e., current participants represent more racial/ethnic, gender, and geographic diversity than previous LGBTQ+ research; Fish & Russell, 2018). With more understanding could

come more support and acceptance for the second-generation LGBTQ+ community (Fitzgerald, 2010). The present study also highlights a need for more research to be conducted on family contexts broadly as they relate to youth identity. For example, this study primarily focuses on the LGBTQ+ family context, yet future studies could investigate other types of family contexts more narrowly (e.g., multi-racial family, immigrant family). Additionally, the present study utilizes qualitative methods to gain a deeper and more robust understanding of participants' lived experiences (Braun & Clarke, 2021b; Fish & Russell, 2018). The same techniques applied to other populations could provide a better understanding of other communities' strengths and experiences (Braun & Clarke, 2021b; Fish & Russell, 2018). Regarding strengths of youth with LGBTQ+ parents, results show great resiliency and thoughtfulness among this sample. These adolescents and emerging adults must navigate stigma related to their identities, yet through interactions with the community and their parents, many find strength and express happiness in their identities (Breshears & Braithwaite, 2014).

This research also has the potential to impact LGBTQ+ relevant policy and clinical practice. As previously stated, the LGBTQ+ community is continuously fighting for the right to form families. In *Fulton v. City of Philadelphia* (2021), the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the City of Philadelphia's decision to withdraw public funding from a religious foster care agency that discriminated against LGBTQ+ couples was unconstitutional. That is, under the ruling, publicly funded religious organizations can continue to discriminate against LGBTQ+ parents on the basis of religious freedom. Given this decision and similar actions across the U.S., there is an increased need for research that informs the public and lawmakers alike about the strengths and unique

dynamics of LGBTQ+ parent families, including advantages LGBTQ+ individuals bring to family formation, such as with adoption and foster care settings (Patterson & Farr, 2022).

By providing insight into the lived experiences and identity processes of youth with LGBTQ+ parents, this research could be used in clinical settings to better understand and support individuals with LGBTQ+ parents as well as identity development across youth. In their article on therapy and individuals with LGBTQ+ parents, Fitzgerald (2010) urges clinicians to attend more to this population, especially as they grow in visibility. Youth with LGBTQ+ parents carry with them a unique set of pressures and expectations to represent LGBTQ+ parent families and navigate stigma associated with their parents' identities (Farr et al., 2016). As a result, increased awareness, understanding, and compassion can be vital in understanding how to best support this population in clinical settings (Fitzgerald, 2010).

Conclusion

The present study investigates identity among youth with LGBTQ+ parents, and ultimately demonstrates that youth exhibit pride, strength, and resilience across their various identities. Findings have both been consistent with and expanded upon previous findings in the literature and foundational theories. Mainly, marginalized identities continue to be important to youth and impact their lives in significant ways (Bishop et al., 2020; Brittian et al., 2016), and LGBTQ+ parents continue to help bolster positive identity development among their children (Kovalanka & Goldberg, 2009). The current study adds to literature by observing this same finding in a sample of diverse adolescents and emerging adults. Consistent with Ecological Systems Theory (Bronfenbrenner,

1977), participants' identities were related to multiple factors outside themselves, such as parent identity, community, and social narratives. Most importantly, the present study indicates that identities among youth with LGBTQ+ parents are impactful and effervescent. The implications are numerous both to current psychological literature (e.g., providing insight into identity development and importance in a diverse, unique sample) and to societal support and affirmation for LGBTQ+ families (e.g., informing clinicians and other professionals on which areas youth with LGBTQ+ may need more support).

Table 1.1 Participant Demographics

Table 1
Participant Demographics

Baseline Characteristic	Sample Total (N=51)	Percentage of Sample
Gender		
Cisgender Woman	28	55%
Cisgender Man	14	27%
Transgender Man	2	4%
Transmasculine	4	8%
Nonbinary	2	4%
Questioning	1	2%
Race/Ethnicity		
White	31	61%
Black	5	10%
Latinx	5	10%
Asian	1	2%
Multiracial	9	18%
Sexual Orientation		
Gay/Lesbian	6	12%
Bisexual	7	14%
Queer	5	10%
Confused/Questioning	5	10%
Asexual	1	2%
Pansexual	2	4%
Heterosexual	25	49%

Table 1.1, continued

Age

Adolescent (>18)	13	25%
Emerging Adult (18+)	38	76%

Geography

South	22	43%
Midwest	14	27%
Northwest	9	18%
West	6	12%

SSS Ranking (1-10)

<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	5.71(1.27)
------------------------	------------

Note. Subjective Social Status (SSS) rankings were collected using the MacArthur Ladder of Subjective Social Status (Adler et al., 2000).

APPENDICES

Appendix A

WTG Foundation Scholars Program Grant – Project 1

“Stories and Experiences of LGBTQ Families from Youth” (SELFY)

PI: Rachel H. Farr, PhD

INTERVIEW GUIDE

Version current as of 12/21/18

INTRODUCTION

Objective: We are interested in learning more about the experiences of young people (ages 12-25) who have lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) parents. Along with these criteria, we are seeking individuals diverse in race, class, and background.

Interviews will be audio-recorded and are expected to last 1-2 hours. These will generally take place by phone but may also occur via Skype or online messaging (e.g., Google chat), depending on participants’ preferences. Participants will be compensated a \$50 Amazon gift card for their time and participation distributed via e-mail.

Interview Themes:

- Discrimination & microaggressions related to identities (e.g., race, SES, LGBTQ parents)
- Intersectional aspects of distinct identities
- Coping strategies
- Family communication about marginalized identities / family relationships
- Peer relationships / disclosure about family
- Perceptions of helpful resources in the community / community support & climate

Aside from demographic questions, specific questions were developed for the purposes of this study, as well as adapted from measures and interviews used by the following researchers: David Frost, Phil Hammack, Ilan Meyer, & Stephen Russell; Abbie Goldberg; Brian Mustanski & Gregory Swann; Sherry Rostosky.

INTERVIEW SCRIPT

BEFORE BEGINNING: These questions represent a general framework for a semi-structured interview and were generally developed for this specific study. Trained research personnel will conduct the interviews and will probe with further questions as needed. The target participant’s name should be inserted where appropriate. Before

beginning the interview (e.g., placing the call), please ensure all audio recording equipment is set up and ready by doing a test recording.

Probes:

- Probes and follow-up questions are not optional. If information is not provided in response to questions, ask all the appropriate probes.
- Ask probes in a way that maintains the participant's narratives whenever possible: probes do not have to be asked in the order shown.
- Alternate ways of phrasing questions are provided in some cases. Use alternate questions if the original question is confusing to the participant or if the alternate is more appropriate given the circumstances.
- Give participants time to reflect and answer. Do not assume questions are N/A or confusing.
- Use these probes liberally when participants give brief or incomplete answers: Can you say more about that? How? Why / why not? Could you give me an example? Tell me about a time when... Anything else?

THE INTERVIEW:

Interviewer: Hello! My name is [insert interviewer name], and I am a [insert role e.g., graduate student] on this research project. We really want to thank you for agreeing to take this time to tell us more about your experiences. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions; we want to hear your experiences and thoughts. Please feel free to not answer a question if you would prefer not to share this information.

Lastly, as another reminder, I want to let you know that your responses will not be shared with anyone outside of our research team and your name will not be included with any transcripts of your responses. Again, thank you for spending this time letting us know about your experiences. Do you have any questions before we start?

Demographic Interview Questions: We'll start with a few introductory questions.

1. To begin, families come together in many different ways. For instance, some families might experience divorce, remarriage and stepparenting. Other families might experience adoption. Others might work with reproductive technologies to have children (*if needed: e.g., surrogacy, donor insemination, IVF*). Tell me about your family and how your family came to be. (*Probe for details, e.g., siblings? How many? Ages?*)
2. How do your parent(s) describe or label their sexual and gender identity (e.g., LGBTQ), and what is your parent(s)' current relationship status (*e.g., single, married, divorced*)?

3. If you know it, when did your parent(s) come out as LGBTQ (if known)? Could you describe when you understood what it meant to have an LGBTQ parent?
4. Where do you currently live, and how would you describe your home and neighborhood (*Probe for rural, suburban, urban*)? If where you currently live is different from where you grew up, could you describe where you grew up (home, neighborhood, name of place, etc.)?
5. To ask you about your socioeconomic status or class, consider a ladder with 10 rungs or steps. Think of this ladder as representing where people stand in the United States. At the **top** of the ladder are the people who are best off – those who have the most money, the most education and the most respected jobs. At the **bottom** are the people who are the worst off – who have the least money, least education, and the least respected jobs or no job. The higher you are on this ladder, the closer you are to the very top (or 10); the lower you are, the closer you are to the people at the very bottom (or 1). Considering where you and your family stand at this time in your life, relative to other people in the United States, where would you place yourself on this ladder from bottom (1) to top (10)? [MacArthur Research Network on Socioeconomic Status and Health, 2008]
6. Last question before the next section: How old are you (in years)?

Open-ended Interview Questions:

In this next section, we'll discuss what identities are most important to you as well as how you talk to family and friends about a variety of topics.

Identity:

7. I'll start by asking you about 3 of your possible identities – race-ethnicity, gender, and sexuality. First, how do you describe or label your racial-ethnic identity? Your gender identity (*probe for pronouns*)? Your sexual identity (e.g., gay, straight, bisexual, asexual, etc.)?
8. If you had to decide which identities are most important or “core” to who you are, what are those identities? Is there one identity that is most important to who you are?
9. Would you say that being the child of an LGBTQ parent* is one of your core identities? (**Note: participant may have used their own wording, such as “having gay fathers” – feel free to substitute as needed whatever language the participant uses throughout the interview.*)

7. I'd like to understand how you see some of these different identities relating to each other. [*Note: can substitute wording for identities that participants self-describe.*] Tell me what it's like to have LGBTQ parents and also identify as [*substitute an identity that participant self-describes*], or tell me about some advantages and disadvantages you see to having several distinct identities (e.g., having LGBTQ parents, identifying as [RACIAL-ETHNIC IDENTITY]).
8. In general, how do you feel that being raised by LGBTQ parents affects you, on a day-to-day basis, if at all?
9. Do you consider yourself to be a member of the LGBTQ community, or an ally, or something else? Is this different from how others perceive you? And, do you feel that being part of an LGBTQ family is a special or unique identity? Why / why not?
 - a. [IF PARTICIPANT IS LGBTQ]: Do you think you're perceived differently because you and your parent are both LGBTQ? Tell me more about that experience.
10. Tell me about a time you felt proud to be part of the LGBTQ community, as well as a time it felt difficult or that you did not belong. You can start with either experience.
11. Before we turn to the next portion of the interview, are there any other parts of your identity that we have not yet talked about that are important to understand you as a person?

Disclosure about Family:

11. Next, we're interested in how you talk to others about your family and having an LGBTQ parent. In other words, how do you "come out" about your family? How do you decide when and how to tell? (*e.g., Probe for possible groups, e.g., someone you're dating friends, classmates, teachers, strangers, coworkers, religious or faith community members*)
12. How do people react when you tell them about your family, and do reactions differ depending on who you tell? (*Probe for possible groups named in previous question*)

Family and Friend Relationships:

13. Have you ever felt different from others or that you had to act a certain way because your parent(s) are LGBTQ? Tell me about such a time.
14. Do you think your parents have raised you in a different way than your friends with heterosexual parents? In what ways?

15. Has having an LGBTQ parent changed how you think about what it means to have or be a family? How so? Has it changed how you think about becoming or being a parent? How so?
16. Would you say your friends, classmates, and peers are supportive of you having an LGBTQ parent? Could you give an example of a time you felt supported in having an LGBTQ parent?

Discrimination Experiences and Coping Behavior: Next, we'll turn toward experiences where you might have been treated differently or felt you have experienced discrimination.

17. Earlier, you told me about your "core identities" [NAME THEM]. Have you experienced discrimination or been treated differently based on any of these identities? [REFERENCE THE "CORE" IDENTITIES NAMED BY PARTICIPANT.] (*Probe for details: frequency, where, who, when, examples.*) Specifically, has this happened based on your race or ethnic identity? Your socioeconomic status (SES) or social class? For any other reason?
 - a. [IF PARTICIPANT DESCRIBES "explicit" discrimination that they can name]: Do you think you could tell me a little bit more about these experiences? Do you feel like some experiences are "bigger" or "smaller"? Which do you think has influenced you more? How so?
18. Could you tell me about a time that you felt like you were treated differently because you had an LGBTQ parent? This could be something you experienced as an individual or as a family (*Probe for who / what / when / where, etc.*). How did you feel, and what did you do to deal with this experience? (Who or what helped you to cope? *e.g., possible probes: talking to friends, family, teachers, online groups, etc.; engaging in behaviors like distraction, withdrawing, problem-solving, confrontation, attitude change, reflection, journaling, meditation, prayer, etc.*) Specifically, does it ever help to share your experiences with other kids who have LGBTQ parents?
19. Overall, how frequently do you feel you have been treated differently because you have an LGBTQ parent? Does this happen to you as an individual, your parent, or your whole family? (*Probe for details: Where happened? How old were you?*) In the future, do you think you might be treated differently because of having an LGBTQ parent? (*Probe: What kinds of situations in the future do you think being treated differently might occur?*)
20. How would you describe the impact that feeling different, being treated as different, or facing discrimination has had on you? Have these experiences changed you? Is there a particular experience that you feel has affected you the most?

Family Conversations: Next, we'll discuss how you and your parents talk about your identities, and some other topics such as sexual health and discrimination experiences.

21. Do you talk with your parents about any of your “core” identities? [NAME THEM]
(Probe for identities including race and social class, as well as details: who, when, where, who initiates, frequency, and how the participant and parents feel during these conversations)
22. Specifically, do you talk with your parents about being an LGBTQ parent family?
(Probes: who initiates, frequency, other details, e.g., how do you/ your parents feel during these talks)
23. It's not uncommon for parents to talk to their teenage or young adult kids about sex. Do you talk with your parents about sex, and if so, how helpful do you find these talks? *(Probe for details, e.g., how do you/your parents feel during these talks, frequency, who initiates)*
24. Do you and your parents talk about discrimination? Could you tell me about a time where you talked with your parents about discrimination? *(Probe for details such as frequency, who initiates, topics, how do you / your parents feel during these talks).*
25. Do you think it is easier to talk with your parents about discrimination related to one identity more so than another (e.g., gender discrimination vs. racial discrimination)? Do you discuss discrimination that you have faced in the past or might face in the future (or might face)? Do you talk about discrimination that your parent has faced or discrimination in general?
26. Has your parent talked with you about discrimination specifically because they are LGBTQ? (If has not already been discussed): Could you tell me about such a time?
27. Do you think these conversations about sex and/or discrimination with your parents are similar or different to those that your peers might have with their parents? How so?

Community Climate and Support Questions: These next questions explore feelings and thoughts about community, particularly the LGBTQ community.

28. We throw around this big word, “LGBTQ community,” but what does that really mean? What do you think of when you hear someone refer to the LGBTQ community?

29. Tell me about some activities you have participated in related to the LGBTQ community. (*Probes: Do you do this as a family or as an individual? Do your parents get you involved? Is this a positive experience for you and/or is this involvement important to you?*)

30. Do you have friends who have LGBTQ parents, and would you say you know a lot of other people from LGBTQ parent families? (*Probe for details: How many people from LGBTQ parent families do you know?*). Tell me more about how you connect with others who have LGBTQ parents (e.g., online communities, community organizations. Is it important to you to have these connections? (*Probes: Do you belong to any organizations or online groups specifically for children of LGBTQ parents, such as COLAGE? Would you like to?*)

31. Are there local organizations or resources for LGBTQ families where you live? (*Probe: Do these organizations make a difference for LGBTQ families, or would they if they existed?*)

32. Do you feel LGBTQ people and families are supported in your community? (*Probe specifically for schools, religious institutions, political climate. Are there ways that LGBTQ families could be better supported in your community? Can LGBTQ families can be out and open safely in your community? How does your community's support (or lack of support) compare to support for LGBTQ people and families in your state? In our country?*)

33. Are there other communities based on your “core” identities [NAME THEM] that you feel strongly a part of? (*Probe: Do you feel this community is supported where you live?*)

General: I just have a few more open-ended questions before the last section of the interview.

31. Looking back over your life, what do you think has been the biggest challenge, as well as the *most positive aspect*, so far about *having an LGBTQ parent*? As you get older, do you imagine any additional challenges or positive aspects of having an LGBTQ parent?

32. What advice would you give to other youth that have an LGBTQ parent?

LGBTQ FAMILY MICROAGGRESSIONS (modified from Swann et al., 2016):

In this last section of the interview, we are interested in getting your feedback about a survey related to the microaggression experiences of young people with LGBTQ parents.

Microaggressions are defined as comments or actions that subtly, and often unconsciously or unintentionally, express a prejudiced attitude toward a member of a marginalized group (such as people of color, immigrants, women, LGBTQ people, etc.).

I'll read 28 items about experiences you may have had because you have an LGBTQ parent.

Once we complete these items, we will be interested in hearing your feedback about the survey overall, so we will have several broad follow-up questions. Please answer honestly because there is no "right" answer. As a note, sometimes we use the word "gay" as a general term because we are quoting the way it is used in popular culture.

[FOR INTERVIEWER]: Adjust language so the measure makes sense (don't say parents if only one parent is LGBTQ)

To get started, in thinking about just the LAST SIX MONTHS, we'd like to know how often you have had the following experiences. You can answer using the following 1-5 scale: 1 = not at all, 2 = a few times, 3 = about every month, 4 = about every week, and 5 = about every day.

1. You heard someone say 'that's so gay' in a negative way
2. You were told that being gay [LGBTQ] is just a phase
3. A heterosexual person didn't believe that LGBTQ people face discrimination
4. Someone said LGBTQ people are trying to get 'special rights' that they don't deserve
5. You heard about people trying to deny rights for same-sex couples or LGBTQ people
6. Someone implied that only heterosexuality & families with a mother and father are normal
7. Someone said, "you know how gay [LGBTQ] people are"
8. Someone expressed a stereotype (example: "gay men are so good at fashion")
9. You heard someone talk about "the gay lifestyle"
10. You saw a group either in person, or in the media, show negative signs (example: A religious group with a sign that said "God hates fags")

11. Someone said, "I don't mind gay [LGBTQ] people, they just shouldn't be so public"
12. Someone said a hateful slur about LGBTQ people (e.g., "fag", "dyke" said in a mean way)
13. Someone said "homosexuality" is a sin or immoral
14. A heterosexual person denied they have any heterosexism (example: "I'm offended that you would imply I could be homophobic")

OK we are halfway through items! Just as a reminder, please think of whether the following have happened to you in the last six months and answer using the following 1-5 scale: 1 = not at all, 2 = a few times, 3 = about every month, 4 = about every week, and 5 = about every day.

15. You were told you were overreacting when you talked about a negative experience you or your family had because of your parents' sexual orientation or gender identity
16. A heterosexual person said you are being "paranoid" when you suspect someone treated you or your family in a homophobic way
17. A friend or family member expressed disappointment about you having LGBTQ parents
18. Someone assumed your parent(s) has HIV because of their sexual orientation or gender identity
19. You heard that people of certain ethnicities are not LGBTQ
20. Someone assumed your parent(s) must be depressed because of their sexual orientation or gender identity
21. A heterosexual person seemed uncomfortable because they thought your parent(s) were attracted to them
22. Someone assumed that you might be LGBTQ because your parent is / parents are
23. You were made to feel that your family was inferior because your parent(s) are LGBTQ
24. You were told not to disclose or discuss that your parent(s) are LGBTQ

25. You were told you must have missed out on having a same-gender or appropriate gender role model as a parent
26. Someone said, “your parents are not like those gay [LGBTQ] people”
27. Someone asked, “Where’s your mom/dad?”, assuming you have parents of both genders rather than same-sex parents
28. We’ve talked about a number of different examples of microaggressions, do you think there are any other experiences that we didn’t mention in the survey that you think might be important to ask? Other, please describe: _____ (*Is there any other experience you would add?*)

Feedback Questions on Microaggressions Survey:

1. What are your general reactions to this survey about microaggressions? Do you have feedback on any of the items? (*Probe for adding / changing / removing items to improve it.*)
2. Would you say this survey (i.e., the 28 items) does a good job overall in assessing microaggression experiences of young people with LGBTQ parents?

Our final question: Is there anything else we have not covered that you would like to share?

That is the end of the interview. Thank you so much for your time and participating!

Appendix B

Identity Codebook

11.08.2022

The purpose of this codebook is to explore themes of identity development and saliency, family identity, and disclosure of family identity across a sample of youth with LGBTQ+ parents. The following steps

1. Read the entire SELFY transcript(s) assigned, pay special attention to questions regarding core identity, family identity (LGBTQ+ parent family), and disclosure of their family identity.
2. In the google sheet, select the sheet with your name on it. Each sheet will feature a column of Participant IDs which correspond to the transcript we are coding, a column for each theme discussed in this code book (EX: Theme1), and a column for explanation (EX: Theme_EX).
3. Each theme and/or subtheme will be coded with the appropriate code laid out in the theme details.
4. In the explanation column (the column directly to the right of the code column; titled the same as the code column but with EX on the end), enter a quote representative of your theme code.
5. In the notes column, enter elaboration on said quote, your code, or a combination of the two to explain why you coded the interviewee that way.

Theme Details:

Theme 1: Type of Identity:

- This includes all salient IDs, either IDs referenced when asked about core IDs or IDs that they discuss throughout the transcript
- Subtheme 1.1: Trait Identity (0/1)
 - Trait identities resemble personality traits or adjectives that a person would use to describe themselves
 - Trait identities such as “intelligent”, “athletic”, “outgoing”, “people person”, “gluten-free”
- Subtheme 1.2: Group/Activity Identity (0/1)
 - Group ID is one that is not limited to one individual, but instead there are many people who share this identity, whether through community, social networks, or broader systems
 - I.e. hobbies, teams, artists, parent, career, etc.
 - Role identities are IDs in which there is a specific set of expectations, behaviors, or tasks revolving around their ID
 - Cishet white men
 - Male
 - Man
 - Straight
 - Being a role model
- Subtheme 1.4: Integrated/Underserved/Marginalized identity (0/1)
 - IDs that encompass more than one or all of the above categories as they are both personal and unique, come with their own set of experiences, and have some sort community or group behind the ID (Ex: LGBTQ+ ID, Racial-Ethnic ID, Religious ID) (Does not include cismen or white people)
 - Child of LGBTQ+ parent

When asked, “what identities do you consider core to who you are?”

Theme 2: Appearance

- Code 0: Not mentioned/Not impacted
 - Connection between Appearance and ID is either not intentional/meaningful or it is not mentioned
- Code 1: Appearance represents ID
 - They talk about/use their appearance to affirm or represent their own identity
- Code 2: Avoidance of looking like ID
 - They try not to look like their ID
- Code 3: Conflicting Appearance (Perception is a big piece here)/ Doesn't look like ID
 - Makes a point to say they do not look like their ID, may be defensive
 - Regretful
 - May look like some IDs, but not look like others

- Trying to look like the ID, but not being perceived as the ID they try to look like
- People perceive them differently than how they identify themselves

Theme 3: Representation Responsibility

- Code 0: Doesn't Mention This
- Code 1: Indicates Responsibility to Represent personal ID

Theme 4: Interaction between Personal ID and Family ID or Parent ID

- Code 0: Doesn't mention this
- Code 1: Parent ID/Family ID eased development of Personal ID
- Code 2: Parent ID/Family ID conflicted with development of ID
- Code 3: Parent ID/Family ID both eased and conflicted with development of IDs
- Code 4: Parent ID/Family ID did not impact development of ID

Theme 5: Community impact on Identity Development (Community outside of the home)

Code 0: Theme not mentioned

Code 1: Community impacts personal ID development

- May break down
- 1.1 Positive
- 1.2 Negative

Theme 6: Intersection of Identities

- Code 0: Not mentioned
- Code 1: Intersection impacts identity development and/or saliency

Non-continuous multiple category codes; Krippendorff alpha

References

- Altschul, I., Oyserman, D., & Bybee, D. (2006). Racial-ethnic identity in mid-adolescence: Content and change as predictors of academic achievement. *Child Development, 77*(5), 1155-1169. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2006.00926.x>
- Arnett, J.J., (2015). Identity development from adolescence to emerging adulthood: What we know and (especially) don't know. In K.C. McLean & M. Syed Editor (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of identity development* (pp. 53-64). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199936564.013.009>
- Bishop, M. D., Fish, J. N., Hammack, P. L. & Russell, S. T. (2020). Sexual identity development milestones in three generations of sexual minority people. *Developmental Psychology, 56*(11), 2177-2193. doi: 10.1037/dev0001105.
- Bramlett, M. D., & Radcliff, L. F. (2010). The National Survey of Adoptive Parents: An introduction to the special issue of adoption quarterly. *Adoption Quarterly, 13*(3-4), 147-156. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926755.2010.524870>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology, 3*(2), 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013). *Successful qualitative research*. Sage.

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021a). Can I use TA? Should I use TA? Should I not use TA? Comparing reflexive thematic analysis and other pattern-based qualitative analytic approaches. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research, 21*(1), 37-47.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/capr.12360>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021b). Conceptual and design thinking for thematic analysis. *Qualitative Psychology*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1037/qup0000196>
- Breshears, D., & Braithwaite, D. O. (2014). Discursive struggles animating individuals' talk about their parents' coming out as lesbian or gay. *Journal of Family Communication, 14*(3), 189-207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15267431.2014.908197>
- Brittian, A. S., Umaña-Taylor, A. J., Lee, R. M., Zamboanga, B. L., Kim, S. Y., Weisskirch, R. S., ... & Caraway, S. J. (2013). The moderating role of centrality on associations between ethnic identity affirmation and ethnic minority college students' mental health. *Journal of American College Health, 61*(3), 133-140.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2013.773904>
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *American Psychologist, 32*(7), 513-531. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.32.7.513>
- Brooks, V. R. (1981). *Minority stress and lesbian women*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

- Cashen, K. K. (2022). Community Connections Among Emerging Adults with Sexual Minority Parents. *LGBTQ+ Family: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 18(2), 151–172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/27703371.2022.2058670>
- Clarke, V., & Demetriou, E. (2016). ‘Not a big deal’? exploring the accounts of adult children of lesbian, gay and trans parents. *Psychology & Sexuality*, 7(2), 131-148. doi:10.1080/19419899.2015.1110195
- Crenshaw, K.W. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 139–167. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429500480-5>
- Drabble, L. A., & Eliason, M. J. (2021). Introduction to special issue: Impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on LGBTQ+ health and well-being. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 68(4), 545-559.
- Diaz, J. (2022). Florida’s governor signs controversial law opponents dubbed “Don’t Say Gay.” *National Public Radio*. <https://www.npr.org/2022/03/28/1089221657/dont-say-gay-florida-desantis>
- Erikson, E. H. (1994). *Identity and the life cycle*. WW Norton.
- Ezzy, D. (1998). Theorizing narrative identity: Symbolic interactionism and hermeneutics. *Sociological Quarterly*, 39(2), 239-252. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.1998.tb00502.x>
- Farr, R. H., Crain, E. E., Oakley, M. K., Cashen, K. K., & Garber, K. J. (2016). Microaggressions, feelings of difference, and resilience among adopted children

with sexual minority parents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 45(1), 85–104.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-015-0353-6>

Farr, R. H., Tornello, S. L., & Rostosky, S. R. (2022). How do LGBTQ+ parents raise well-adjusted, resilient, and thriving children? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*. Advance online publication.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/09637214221121295>

Fish, J. N., & Russell, S. T. (2018). Queering methodologies to understand queer families. *Family Relations*, 67(1), 12-25. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12297>

Fitzgerald, T. J. (2010). Queerspawn and their families: Psychotherapy with LGBTQ families. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Mental Health*, 14(2), 155-162.
doi:10.1080/19359700903433276

Freedman, D., Tasker, F., & Di Ceglie, D. (2002). Children and adolescents with transsexual parents referred to a specialist gender identity development service: A brief report of key developmental features. *Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 7(3), 423-432. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1359104502007003009>

Fulton v. City of Philadelphia (2021). U.S. Supreme Court, decided June 17, 2021.

Gates, G. J. (2017). LGBT data collection amid social and demographic shifts of the US LGBT community. *American Journal of Public Health*, 107(8), 1220–1222.
<https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2017.303927>

- Gianino, M., Goldberg, A., & Lewis, T. (2009). Family outings: Disclosure practices among adopted youth with gay and lesbian parents. *Adoption Quarterly, 12*(3-4), 205-228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926750903313344>
- Gillig, T. K., Macary, J. T., & Gross, L. P. (2022). Explain, label, or ignore? Exploring LGBTQ-parent families' communication about family identity. *Communication Studies, 1*-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10510974.2022.2064532>
- Goldberg, A. E. (2007). (How) does it make a difference? Perspectives of adults with lesbian, gay, and bisexual parents. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 77*(4), 550-562. doi:10.1037/0002-9432.77.4.550
- Goldberg, A. E. (2009). Lesbian and heterosexual pre-adoptive couples' openness to transracial adoption. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 79*(1), 103–117. doi:10.1037/ a0015354
- Goldberg, A. E. (2014). Will I marry if my parents can't? Young adults with LGB parents consider marriage for themselves. *Journal of Family Issues, 35*, 151–180. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X12473746>
- Goldberg, A. E., & Sweeney, K. K. (2019). LGBTQ parent families. In B. H. Fiese, M. Celano, K. Deater-Deckard, E. N. Jouriles, & M. A. Whisman (Eds.), *APA handbook of contemporary family psychology: Foundations, methods, and contemporary issues across the lifespan* (pp. 743–760). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0000099-041>

- Goldberg, A. E., Kinkler, L. A., Richardson, H. B., & Downing, J. B. (2012). On the border: Young adults with LGBQ parents navigate LGBTQ communities. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 59*(1), 71-85. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024576>
- Goldberg, S. K., & Conron, K. J. (2018). *How many same-sex couples in the U.S. are raising children?* The Williams Institute. Retrieved from <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/research/parenting/how-many-same-sex-parents-in-us/>
- Härkönen, U. (2007) The Bronfenbrenner ecological systems theory of human development. In: Aleksandra Slahova et al. (Eds.), *Scientific Articles of V International Conference Person. Color. Nature. Music* (pp. 9–22). Saule, Latvia: Daugavpils University.
- Hinton, J. D., de la Piedad Garcia, X., Kaufmann, L. M., Koc, Y., & Anderson, J. R. (2021). A systematic and meta-analytic review of identity centrality among LGBTQ groups: An assessment of psychosocial correlates. *The Journal of Sex Research, 1*-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2021.1967849>
- Hughes, B. E., & Hurtado, S. (2018). Thinking about sexual orientation: College experiences that predict identity salience. *Journal of College Student Development, 59*(3), 309-326. doi:10.1353/csd.2018.0029.
- Keels, M., Durkee, M., & Hope, E. (2017). The psychological and academic costs of school-based racial and ethnic microaggressions. *American Educational Research Journal, 54*(6), 1316-1344. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831217722120>

- Kroger, J., Martinussen, M., & Marcia, J. E. (2010). Identity status change during adolescence and young adulthood: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Adolescence*, 33(5), 683-698. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2009.11.002>
- Kuvalanka, K. A., & Goldberg, A. E. (2009). “Second generation” voices: Queer youth with lesbian/bisexual mothers. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 38(7), 904-919. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10964-008-9327-2>
- Kuvalanka, K. A., & Munroe C. (2020). The “second generation:” LGBTQ youth with LGBTQ parents. In: Goldberg A., Allen K. (eds) *LGBTQ-Parent Families*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-35610-1_15
- Lee, D. L., & Ahn, S. (2013). The relation of racial identity, ethnic identity, and racial socialization to discrimination–distress: A meta-analysis of Black Americans. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 60(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031275>
- Levitt, H. M., Bamberg, M., Creswell, J. W., Frost, D. M., Josselson, R., & Suárez-Orozco, C. (2018). Journal article reporting standards for qualitative primary, qualitative meta-analytic, and mixed methods research in psychology: The APA Publications and Communications Board task force report. *American Psychologist*, 73(1), 26–46. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000151>
- Love, A. S., Yin, Z., Codina, E., & Zapata, J. T. (2006). Ethnic identity and risky health behaviors in school-age Mexican-American children. *Psychological reports*, 98(3), 735-744. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.98.3.735-744>

- McGlone, M. S., & Aronson, J. (2006). Stereotype threat, identity salience, and spatial reasoning. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 27*(5), 486-493.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2006.06.003>
- Meyer, I. H. (2003). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychological bulletin, 129*(5), 674. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.129.5.674>
- Mossakowski, K. N. (2003). Coping with perceived discrimination: Does ethnic identity protect mental health?. *Journal of health and social behavior, 44*(3), 318-331.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/1519782>
- Movement Advancement Project. (2021). Foster and Adoption Laws. Retrieved from https://www.lgbtmap.org/equality-maps/foster_and_adoption_laws
- Movement Advancement Project. (2022a). *LGBTQ+ people of color*. Retrieved from <https://www.lgbtmap.org/policy-and-issue-analysis/LGBTQ-people-of-color>
- Movement Advancement Project. (2022b). Snapshot: LGBTQ+ equality by state. Retrieved from <https://www.mapresearch.org/equality-maps/equality-maps>
- Nelson, S. C., Syed, M., Tran, A. G., Hu, A. W., & Lee, R. M. (2018). Pathways to ethnic-racial identity development and psychological adjustment: The differential associations of cultural socialization by parents and peers. *Developmental Psychology, 54*(11), 2166. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000597>
- Obergefell v. Hodges. (2015). U.S. Supreme Court, decided June 26, 2015.

- Paat, Y. F. (2013). Working with immigrant children and their families: An application of Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 23(8), 954-966. 10.1080/10911359.2013.800007
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2013.800007>
- Patterson, C. J., & Farr, R. H. (2022). Sexual orientation, gender identity, and foster care: What can social science offer in a case like *Fulton v. City of Philadelphia*? *Family Court Review*, 60(1), 10-22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fcre.12623>
- Patterson, C. J., Farr, R. H., & Goldberg, A. E. (2021). LGBTQ+ parents and their children. *National Council on Family Relations*, 6(3). Retrieved from:
https://www.ncfr.org/sites/default/files/2017-01/ncfr_policy_brief_november_final.pdf
- Pew Research Center. (2016). *Where the public stands on religious liberty vs. non-discrimination*. Retrieved from <https://www.pewforum.org/fact-sheet/changing-attitudes-on-gay-marriage/>
- Phinney, J. S. (1989). Stages of ethnic identity development in minority group adolescents. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 9(1-2), 34-49.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431689091004>
- Quinn, D. M., & Chaudoir, S. R. (2009). Living with a concealable stigmatized identity: the impact of anticipated stigma, centrality, salience, and cultural stigma on psychological distress and health. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 97(4), 634-651. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015815>

- Samuels, G. M. (2009). "Being raised by White people": Navigating racial difference among adopted multiracial adults. *Journal of marriage and family*, 71(1), 80-94.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2008.00581.x>
- Schwandt, T. A. (2007). Auditing. *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405165518.wbeosa075.pub2>
- Settles, I. H., O'Connor, R. C., & Yap, S. C. (2016). Climate perceptions and identity interference among undergraduate women in STEM: The protective role of gender identity. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 40(4), 488-503.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684316655806>
- Siegel, M., Legler, M., Neziraj, F., Goldberg, A. E., & Zemp, M. (2022). Minority stress and positive identity aspects in members of LGBTQ+ parent families: Literature review and a study protocol for a mixed-methods evidence synthesis. *Children*, 9(9), 1364. <https://doi.org/10.3390/children9091364>
- Simon, K. A., & Farr, R. H. (2022). Identity-based socialization and adopted children's outcomes in lesbian, gay, and heterosexual parent families, *Applied Developmental Science*, 26(1), 155-175.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2020.1748030>
- Seol, K. O., Yoo, H. C., Lee, R. M., Park, J. E., & Kyeong, Y. (2016). Racial and ethnic socialization as moderators of racial discrimination and school adjustment of adopted and nonadopted Korean American adolescents. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 63(3), 294–306. doi:10.1037/cou0000120

- Soliz, J., Thorson, A. R., & Rittenour, C. E. (2009). Communicative correlates of satisfaction, family identity, and group salience in multiracial/ethnic families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 71(4), 819-832. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2009.00637.x>
- Steck, L. W., Heckert, D. M., & Heckert, D. A. (2003). The salience of racial identity among African-American and white students. *Race and Society*, 6(1), 57-73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.racsoc.2004.09.005>
- Stets J.E., & Serpe R.T. (2013) Identity Theory. In: DeLamater J., Ward A. (eds) *Handbook of Social Psychology*. Handbooks of Sociology and Social Research. Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-6772-0_2
- Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual review of psychology*, 33(1), 1-39. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.uky.edu/10.1146/annurev.ps.33.020182.000245>

VITA

1. University of Texas at Tyler, B.S. in Psychology, May 2020
2. Graduate student, Teaching and Research Assistant
3. University of Texas at Tyler Undergraduate Research Grant
4. Madison T. Diomedede