A Multifactor Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Positive Identity Measure (LGB-PIM)

Ellen D. B. Riggle
University of Kentucky

Jonathan J. Mohr
University of Maryland

Sharon S. Rostosky
University of Kentucky

Adam W. Fingerhut
Loyola Marymount University

Kimberly F. Balsam
Palo Alto University

This article describes the development of a measure of positive lesbian, gay, and/or bisexual (LGB) identity. Two studies were conducted to, first, establish the factor structure of the Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Positive Identity Measure (LGB-PIM), and second, test the reliability and validity of the resulting 25-item scale. Study 1 provided data for an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with 264 self-identified "male" or "female" individuals who also identified as lesbian, gay, and/or bisexual (MF-LGB). The resulting structure was subjected to a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with the remaining sample of 360 MF-LGB identified individuals and supported a 5-factor solution with subscales representing self-awareness, authenticity, intimate relationships, belonging to the LGBT community, and commitment to social justice. Test-retest correlations and internal consistency provided evidence of reliability for the LGB-PIM. Study 2 (n – 272) provided evidence of validity, with the subscales showing the hypothesized positive correlations with measures of positive well-being and group specific measures corresponding to the subscale concepts. The current studies indicate that positive identity is multifaceted and may be useful to consider in research with LGB populations. The results also suggest to researchers and practitioners the dimensions of positive LGB identity that may need to be assessed and supported to cultivate positive well-being for LGB identified individuals.

Keywords: identity, measurement development, well-being, lesbian, gay, bisexual

At the most basic level, to have a positive identity is to feel good (i.e., have positive emotions and thoughts) about oneself. Feeling good about oneself contributes to psychological good health and enhances social functioning, or flourishing (e.g., Keyes, 1998). By extension, to have a positive lesbian, gay, and/or bisexual (LGB) identity is to feel good about oneself in the context of identifying as LGB.

Positive identity is a part of an ongoing process wherein the individual manifestations of being part of a collective identity are the result of multiple elements, or dimensions, that lead to a sense of positive well-being. Although there are a number of ways to measure LGB identity, identity development, and identity challenges (e.g., Dillon, Worthington, & Moradi, 2011, for a recent review; Mohr & Kendra, 2011), current measures of positive LGB identity are very limited. A measure of positive LGB identity is needed to reflect elements of positive experience and feelings that may provide a foundation for flourishing and other positive well-being outcomes.

The purpose of the current study was to provide preliminary psychometric data for a newly developed multidimensional measure of positive LGB identity. The development of the measure was based on previously reported empirical, inductive thematic analysis of qualitative data on the positive aspects of LGB identities which indicated a multidimensional structure (Riggle & Rostosky, 2012; Riggle, Whitman, Olson, Rostosky, & Strong, 2008; Rostosky, Riggle, Pascale-Hague, & McCants, 2010). The measure we propose provides a new tool to researchers in empirically assessing positive LGB identities.

Conceptualizing Positive Identity for LGB Individuals

Positive LGB identity may be conceptualized as part of an ongoing intrapersonal process (Cass, 1979; cf., Erikson, 1968;

McCarn & Fassinger, 1996; Troiden, 1989). Self-awareness and reflection leads to the identification of different features of the self (e.g., Leary & Tangney, 2003; Tajfel, 1981). Given that most LGB identified people grow up in a context with no or very few LGB identified family members (or other role models), becoming aware of feelings that would signify an LGB identity and labeling those feelings is part of a process of self-awareness, meaning making and personal growth (e.g., King, Burton, & Giese, 2009; Riggle et al., 2008; Riggle & Rostosky, 2012; Rosario, Schrimshaw, Hunter, & Braun, 2006).

LGB identity is an individual identity within a social context, linking individuals to others with similar experiences. This type of collective identity reflects the experiences of group members, including identity-relevant self-categorization, evaluation of identity, group attachment and importance, personal meanings, expressions, and behaviors (see Ashmore, Deaux, & McLaughlin-Volpe, 2004, for an argument for multidimensional measures of collective identities). For example, identities formed within a social context include a cultural valuation that may stigmatize some identities as inferior to other identities (e.g., Adams & Marshall, 1996; Phinney & Ong, 2007; Tajfel, 1981). LGB identified individuals see their identity in relation to others and the broader cultural context of heteronormativity, thus living in a context that culturally devalues their identity (e.g., Cass, 1979; Herek, 2009; Meyer, 2007).

The process of forming an LGB identity in a heteronormative context presents opportunities for personal growth and development of intra- and interpersonal skills (e.g., Kwon, 2013; Riggle & Rostosky, 2012). Positive experiences, including the development of strengths and resources that result from having LGB identities may then contribute to a positive individual identity. Thus, we argue that a positive identity is the result of a process that reflects the multiple dimensions of experience associated with an identity and contributes to positive feelings or a sense of well-being in relation to an LGB identity.

Positive LGB Identity and Well-Being

While researchers have often treated "positive" and "negative" aspects of well-being constructs as though they exist on a single continuum, "positive" is not simply the absence of "negative." Positive indicators of well-being reflect a unique affective vector of experience, different from negative indicators of well-being (e.g., Reich, Zautra, & David, 2003; see also Watson, Clark, & Tellegan, 1988, for a basic psychometric example of differences between positive and negative affect). Given this, positive identity in reference to well-being should be measured separate from negative identity (e.g., Bauer, McAdams, & Pals, 2008) in order to more fully examine the links between identity and well-being. Mayfield (2001) and Mohr and Kendra (2011) have provided preliminary evidence that positive LGB identity is independent of negative LGB identity and not simply opposite ends of the same continuum, reinforcing this need for a separate measure.

Positive LGB identity may provide opportunities to experience and cultivate various types of well-being (see Moradi, Mohr, Worthington, & Fassinger, 2009; see also, Higa et al., 2014; Vaughan & Waehler, 2010, for a discussion of "coming out growth"). For example, being able to "be authentic" was an important part of having a positive LGB identity (Riggle & Rostosky, 2012; Riggle et al., 2008; Rostosky et al., 2010), and authenticity

is important to an overall sense of well-being (e.g., Park, Peterson, & Seligman, 2004; see also, Harter, 2005 for a review). Connection to the LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender) community as part of a positive LGB identity (e.g., Kwon, 2013; Riggle & Rostosky, 2012) may lead to a sense of belonging to a community, an important component of an overall sense of well-being (see Haslam, Jetten, Postmes, & Haslam, 2009, for a recent general review). Being a mentor, role model, or activist is important to positive LGB identity and provides a sense of meaning and purpose in life (Riggle & Rostosky, 2012), which has been found to be important to a sense of well-being (e.g., Keyes, 1998).

To date, only a few empirical studies have examined the contribution of positive identity to well-being in LGB identified individuals. For example, Mohr and Kendra (2011) found a positive association between the Identity Affirmation subscale of the Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Identity Scale (LGBIS) and general satisfaction with life. Kertzner, Meyer, Frost, and Stirratt (2009) found that an individuals' positive valence toward their LGB identity was positively associated with a measure of overall psychological well-being. These limited findings suggest that an empirically validated measure of positive LGB identity will contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of the impact of positive LGB identity on the well-being of LGB individuals.

Measuring Positive LGB Identity

The current body of literature on LGB identity, including models and specific measures to assess these models, are limited in their inclusion of and utility for assessing positive aspects of LGB identity. Early models of lesbian and gay identity were conceptualized as stage models of identity development (many as extensions of Erikson's psychosocial development model, 1968). Achieving each successive "stage" of identity development was assumed to indicate progress toward a more positive lesbian or gay identity. For example, the classic identity model of Cass (1979) proposed six stages with identity acceptance (Stage 4) tipping the balance toward a positive identity, identity pride (Stage 5) being even more positive identity, and identity synthesis (Stage 6) representing of the most positive lesbian or gay identity. There have been attempts to quantify the Cass model (e.g., Gay Identity Questionnaire, Brady & Busse, 1994); however, these conceptualizations and measures focus on individual acceptance of an LGB identity and not on positive feelings or experiences that may occur in relation to that identity and contribute to well-being.

Several measures of LGB identity have assessed identity using questions worded in a negative valence, where the absence of negative feelings about one's own identity is assumed to be the equivalent of having a more positive identity. These models and measures of LGB identities have focused on the stigmatization of these identities and their correlations with indicators of distress. Indicators of internalized negative feelings about identity have included the constructs of internalized homophobia or sexual stigma (e.g., Herek, Gillis, & Cogan, 2009; Lingiardi, Baiocco, & Nardelli, 2012), internalized homonegativity (e.g., Mayfield, 2001), and internalized heterosexism (e.g., Szymanski, Kashubeck-West, & Meyer, 2008a, 2008b).

Even multidimensional models of LGB identity have commonly used negatively worded questions and negative indicators of feel-

ings about identity. For example, the dimensions of Mohr and Fassinger's (2000) Lesbian and Gay Identity Scale (LGIS) reflected negative experiences and feelings about lesbian and gay identities. Other multidimensional measures of LGB identity have primarily focused on stressors associated with identity rather than directly assessing dimensions of identity (e.g., Balsam & Mohr, 2007).

A measure that specifically assesses the multidimensional elements of a positive LGB identity is lacking in the literature. Mayfield's (2001) Internalized Homonegativity Inventory included a subscale of general "gay affirmation" items assessing beliefs about being gay or the respondent's "homosexuality." The revision of the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Identity Scale (LGBIS, Mohr & Kendra, 2011) included the 3-item subscale of "identity affirmation" to measure general positive feelings about an individual's LGB identity. Such measures are limited and do not reflect the underlying multidimensional structure of positive LGB identity (see Moradi et al., 2009; Riggle & Rostosky, 2012).

Present Study

In previous work, Riggle and Rostosky (2012) identified eight themes of positive LGBT identities. These themes were: living an authentic life; having increased self-awareness and insight; feeling free to create flexible rules for what gender means and how it is expressed; experiencing strong emotional connections with others and creating supportive families of choice; exploring expressions of sexuality and creating intimate relationships with "new rules"; having a unique perspective on life with empathy and compassion for others; being a positive role model, mentor and activist working for social justice; and, belonging to an LGBTQ community. These themes provide a starting point for creating a factor-based measure of positive LGB identity. The multiple themes incorporate unique concepts, or strengths, that have been found to be important to well-being and resilience in general sample studies. The presence of these themes in prior qualitative study suggests that positive LGB identity may be important as a resource or strength for an individual.

The aim of the current study was to create a measure of positive LGB identity that can be used as an assessment tool in research. Using previously collected qualitative data, we created statements representing eight positive themes of LGB identity (see Riggle & Rostosky, 2012). Positive identity items were constructed to capture affirmative experiences and perceptions and reflect positive strengths and values. The items were tested first using exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. Scores on the refined scale were then tested for reliability and validity.

Study 1: Item Development, Factor Structure, and Reliability

The aim of Study 1 was to develop and test an item pool for reduction to a measure of positive LGB identity. The item pool was developed using qualitative data from LGB identified individuals that had previously indicated a dimensional structure (see Riggle & Rostosky, 2012). A factor analytic approach was used given our focus on assessing multiple dimensions of positive functioning. This approach allowed for item selection criteria that would result in more unique indicators of each dimension.

The first step was an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) on a subsample of data from LGB identified adults who also identified their sex as "male" or "female" (and did not identify as or also identify as transgender). Because of possible differences between participants who are primarily thinking about their sexual identity (LGB) and participants who are primarily thinking about their gender identity (transgender), we made the decision to only include "male" or "female" LGB (MF-LGB) identified participants in the analyses. Results from this EFA were used to identify a factor structure that offered good fit to the data and to reduce the number of items in the measure.

The second step was a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to test the factor structure using data from the remaining MF-LGB identified adults not featured in the EFA. Internal consistency reliabilities were estimated for scores on the resulting subscales. Next, test–retest reliabilities were estimated using data from a subsample of MF-LGB participants who participated in a follow-up retest survey. Finally, preliminary convergent validity data were provided through subscale correlations with an established measure of global positive LGB identity. We hypothesized that this measure would be positively associated with the new subscales assessing more specific facets of positive identity.

Method

Participants. The total sample included 624 participants identified as MF-LGB identified adults. Of the MF-LGB participants, 231 identified as lesbian (all female), 210 identified as gay (all male), 139 identified as bisexual (114 female, 25 male), 34 identified as queer (29 female, 5 male), and 10 identified as pansexual or fluid (8 female, 2 male). Ages ranged from 15 to 75 years old ($M = 32.77$, $SD = 12.50$). The sample represented the following non-mutually exclusive racial/ethnic groups: 44 African American/Black, 38 Asian American/Pacific Islander, 55 Latino/Hispanic, 8 Middle Eastern, 3 Native American/American Indian, and 515 White/Caucasian. Highest level of education completed included some high school (5), high school (30), some college (170), college (195), and an advanced degree (223). Participants were from 41 U.S. states and six non-U.S. countries. As described below, this sample was randomly split into separate groups for the EFA and CFA; a smaller subsample agreed to complete a follow-up survey for the purpose of investigating test–retest reliability.

Procedure. Participants were recruited with an announcement posted to e-mail listservs and websites targeting LGBT communities. The announcement requested that the information be forwarded appropriately (precluding calculation of response rate), and invited participation by individuals who identified as LGBT and who were 18 years of age or older. Participants were directed to a website for more information and provided a link to the survey. The survey contained an informed consent document followed by a brief demographic questionnaire and the measure items. The full pool of 95 item statements were presented in nine sets of 10 questions and a final set of five questions. The questions were balanced for initial themes represented in each set. Participants were given an opportunity to provide feedback in an open-ended text box, volunteer for future studies, and enter a drawing for online gift certificates.

The recruitment procedure yielded data from 840 people who completed the informed consent procedure. We cleaned and managed these data as follows. First, we examined the date, time, and origin of submission for all responses and found no evidence of duplicate surveys. Second, we removed data from 56 people who responded to at least some of the demographic items but did not respond to any of the measure items. Third, we removed 22 people who did not identify their sexual identity as LGB. Fourth, because our focus was on sexual identity and not gender identity, we removed from the final dataset 138 participants who identified as transgender. The sample described above includes all respondents who remained after completing these steps.

Participants in Study 1 who volunteered to participate in future studies were recontacted after 16 months using the e-mail address that they provided. These participants were provided a link to the retest survey which included the 25 retained items from the initial analyses. Participants were given a code number to enter into the survey to link their answers in the retest to their answers in the original Study 1 (test) survey. A total of 307 participants were contacted; 156 completed the survey for Study 2 for a response rate of 50.8%. Forty-four participants in the retest sample identified as transgender or non-LGB and were excluded from the analysis. The final sample for the test–retest was 112 participants.

Measures.

Full item pool. A set of 106 item statements was developed to reflect the eight positive identity themes based on previous qualitative study (see Riggle & Rostosky, 2012). These statements were based on the direct responses provided by participants in surveys of LGBT identified individuals. Eight sets of items were created to reflect each of the central themes and subcategories under the themes. All statements were worded in the positive, affirmative position.

All statements included reference to "LGBT" identity. This was done in order to be inclusive and consistent, and the phrase reflected the actual wording commonly used in the qualitative data. "LGBT" is a widely used and commonly understood phrase indicating a collective identity.

These items were vetted by four coauthors (all except the first author). Minor wording changes were made for clarity and consistency. Eleven statements were deleted to eliminate redundancy, leaving a pool of 95 items. The remaining revised statements were assessed for readability and critiqued by a group of LGBT and non-LGBT identified graduate students and community members. Minor final revisions were made to the item statements to enhance clarity.

Participants were instructed to think about their LGBT identity and "answer the questions by thinking about which response category best represents your feelings about your experiences." Participants rated the extent to which they agreed with each statement on a fully anchored 7-point scale, ranging from 1 (*Disagree Strongly*) to 7 (*Agree Strongly*). See Table 1 for a full list of items.

Identify affirmation. The 3-item Identity Affirmation subscale from the LGBIS (Mohr & Kendra, 2011) was used to assess overall positive evaluation of one's status as an LGBT person. The original items were adapted to be inclusive of LGBT identity and included in the survey after the LGB-PIM items. These three items were: "I am glad to be an LGBT person," "I'm proud to be part of the LGBT community," and "I am proud to be LGBT." Items are rated on a fully anchored scale ranging from 1 (*Disagree Strongly*) to 6 (*Agree Strongly*), and subscale scores are computed by averaging item ratings. Mohr and Kendra found that scores on Identity Affirmation were strongly negatively associated with an internalized homonegativity scale, and strongly positively related to a measure of strength of connection to one's LGB identity. Internal consistency estimates ranged from .89 to .94 in the instrument development studies, and the 6-week test–retest reliability estimate was .91. Alpha in the current sample was .90.

Results

Inspection of missing data patterns suggested that participants were most likely to respond to the items presented early in the survey, and less likely to respond as they progressed through the survey. The lowest missing data rate for measure items was 0.4% and the highest was 15.9%. Approximately 11.3% of all values were missing. Missing data were handled using the full information maximum likelihood approach as implemented in Mplus software version 6.1 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998–2011), which was the package used for the EFA and CFAs. This approach, which is considered a best practice for handling missing data, uses all available information to derive maximum likelihood estimates of relations among variables (Schlomer, Bauman, & Card, 2010).

The MF-LGB participants were randomly split into an EFA subsample ($n = 264$) and a CFA subsample ($n = 360$). We selected a smaller sample size for the EFA than the CFA, given evidence that the higher sample size would most benefit the CFA in terms of minimizing bias and parameter estimate variance (Jackson, 2001; MacCallum, Widaman, Zhang, & Hong, 1999).

Exploratory factor analyses (EFA).

Preliminary analyses. Using the EFA subsample, we inspected frequency distributions of scores for each item. Distributions of scores for several items were clearly leptokurtic and negatively skewed. Both the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin index (.91) and Bartlett's test of sphericity ($p < .001$) suggested that the matrix of item intercorrelations was appropriate for factor analysis.

Determining number of factors. Five criteria were used to determine the number of factors to be extracted and rotated for the final solution: (a) scree plot, (b) parallel analysis, (c) goodness-of-fit statistics, (d) a minimum loading of three items on each factor, and (e) interpretability of the solution, using a minimum factor loading cutoff of .45 and no cross-loadings with less than .20 difference in magnitude from an items' highest factor loading (Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum, & Strahan, 1999; Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). The scree plot supported a 5- or 6-factor solution. We conducted the parallel analysis using code developed by O'Connor (2000), which generated 100 random permutations of the original data set. Results supported extraction of five factors. As a final step, we assessed the fit of the 5-, 6-, and 7-factor solutions using maximum likelihood (ML) factor analysis. Three statistics were examined to assess goodness-of-fit, using the following guidelines for good fit suggested by Hu and Bentler (1999): SRMR ($<.08$) and RMSEA ($<.06$), and CFI ($>.95$). These statistics offered a mixed assessment of fit for the 5-factor solution. The SRMR was consistent with good fit, the RMSEA was slightly higher than the desired cutoff, and the CFI was substantially below the desired cutoff (SRMR = .046; RMSEA = .077; CFI = .67). Results were similar for the 6-factor solution (SRMR = .043;

Table 1

Factor Loadings for the Full LGB-PIM Item Pool

Item (original theme[a])	EFA Structure Coefficients					CFA
	1	2	3	4	5	
I am more aware of how I feel about things because of my LGBT identity. (2)	**.78**	.36	.36	.34	.51	.78
My LGBT identity motivates me to be more self-aware. (2)	**.77**	.38	.44	.41	.51	.79
Because of my LGBT identity, I am more in tune with what is happening around me. (4)	**.75**	.26	.48	.46	.49	.72
My LGBT identity has led me to develop new insights into my strengths. (2)	**.73**	.38	.51	.45	.36	.79
My LGBT identity leads me to important insights about myself. (2)	**.70**	.49	.42	.19	.44	.78
My LGBT identity allows me to be more open to a variety of experiences. (2)	.69	.25	.44	.54	.46	
I form stronger connections with others because of my LGBT identity. (4)	.68	.34	.50	.68	.43	
I am more compassionate with other people because of my LGBT identity. (6)	.68	.17	.35	.49	.42	
I am more open to non-traditional gender/sex roles in my life because of my LGBT identity. (3)	.63	.31	.37	.32	.42	
I am comfortable with my LGBT identity. (1)	.29	**.83**	.31	.20	.22	.93
I have a sense of inner peace about my LGBT identity. (2)	.28	**.77**	.36	.31	.25	.76
I am honest with myself about my LGBT identity. (1)	.34	**.75**	.27	.17	.21	.77
I embrace my LGBT identity. (1)	.35	**.75**	.41	.21	.25	.86
I feel I can be honest and share my LGBT identity with others. (1)	.24	**.75**	.36	.22	.06	.64
I feel free to express my LGBT identity when I interact with others. (1)	.19	.75	.27	.18	.03	
I am living an authentic life as an LGBT person. (1)	.32	.74	.36	.22	.12	
I am a positive role model for other LGBT people. (7)	.40	.73	.57	.31	.38	
It is important to me as an LGBT person to speak up for myself and others. (7)	.38	.67	.36	.23	.49	
I inspire other people to feel safe about expressing their LGBT identity. (7)	.42	.67	.47	.38	.49	
Being open about my LGBT identity will help to improve the world for others. (7)	.39	.65	.39	.22	.51	
I think that other LGBT people see me as a role model. (7)	.37	.64	.60	.37	.33	
My LGBT identity helps me feel whole. (1)	.60	.60	.39	.27	.36	
My LGBT identity is part of being a positive role model for non-LGBT people. (7)	.52	.57	.53	.38	.48	
I feel included in the LGBT community. (8)	.29	.36	**.90**	.27	.26	.91
I feel supported by the LGBT community. (8)	.29	.30	**.86**	.22	.22	.85
I feel a connection to the LGBT community. (8)	.38	.33	**.83**	.21	.31	.80
I find positive networking opportunities in the LGBT community. (8)	.29	.35	**.77**	.37	.36	.75
I feel a connection to other LGBT people. (8)	.48	.22	.76	.20	.31	
I feel empowered as a part of the LGBT community. (8)	.59	.44	.75	.38	.49	
I feel visible in the LGBT community. (8)	.22	.47	**.74**	.22	.20	.72
When I go to a new place I am able to find other LGBT people to connect with if I want to. (8)	.29	.45	.66	.25	.28	
I feel a bond with LGBT people because of shared experiences. (8)	.57	.24	.66	.35	.33	
I feel safe when I am in a crowd of LGBT people. (8)	.35	.15	.59	.19	.24	
My LGBT identity allows me to be closer to my intimate partner. (5)	.52	.29	.40	**.81**	.39	.89
My LGBT identity allows me to understand my sexual partner better. (4)	.55	.36	.46	**.79**	.38	.82
My LGBT identity helps me to communicate better with my intimate partner. (5)	.52	.33	.38	**.79**	.39	.89
I am free to explore different experiences of emotional intimacy with others because of my LGBT identity. (5)	.58	.28	.51	.73	.48	
I have an expanded appreciation for life because of my LGBT identity. (3)	.64	.33	.47	.73	.58	
My LGBT identity frees me to choose who I want as my sexual/intimate partner. (5)	.37	.32	.29	**.72**	.41	.69
I feel my LGBT identity helps me to understand my intimate partner better. (4)	.65	.25	.38	.72	.24	
My LGBT identity helps me develop skills that enhance my life. (2)	.61	.29	.47	.71	.58	
My LGBT identity allows me to have deeper bonds with friends. (4)	.65	.35	.49	.71	.52	
I have a sense of sexual freedom because of my LGBT identity. (5)	.44	.43	.43	**.70**	.41	.64
My LGBT identity allows me to feel free to explore different experiences of physical intimacy with a partner. (5)	.64	.37	.47	.69	.39	
Because of my LGBT identity, I can talk about any subject with my close friends. (4)	.50	.33	.38	.68	.40	
My LGBT identity inspires me to strive towards reaching my full potential in life. (1)	.62	.34	.40	.68	.64	
I am free to express my full range of emotions because of my LGBT identity. (3)	.51	.36	.38	.68	.42	
I am less bound by traditional gender/sex roles because of my LGBT identity. (3)	.48	.32	.31	.66	.42	
I am more sensitive to the experiences of other minority group members because of my experiences as an LGBT person. (6)	.52	.24	.41	.41	.85	
I am more sensitive to prejudice and discrimination against others because of my LGBT identity. (6)	.51	.29	.46	.50	**.81**	.70
My experience with my LGBT identity leads me to fight for the rights of others. (7)	.52	.35	.43	.25	**.79**	.76
I have a greater respect for people who are different from society's expectations because of my LGBT identity. (6)	.50	.22	.30	.46	**.78**	.63
My LGBT identity makes it important to me to actively educate others about LGBT issues. (7)	.40	.35	.36	.25	**.77**	.76
As an LGBT person, it is important to act as an advocate for LGBT rights. (7)	.38	.34	.29	.23	**.74**	.77
Because of my LGBT identity, I value people for who they truly are. (4)	.54	.25	.40	.64	.70	
I think more critically about the suffering in the world because of my LGBT identity. (6)	.60	.21	.44	.40	.69	
I better appreciate the differences between people because of my LGBT identity. (6)	.59	.24	.52	.54	.67	
I am a more inclusive person because of my LGBT identity. (2)	.55	.19	.42	.45	.65	

Table 1 (*continued*)

Item (original theme[a])	EFA Structure Coefficients					CFA
	1	2	3	4	5	
I make fewer assumptions about other people because of my LGBT identity. (2)	.33	.17	.34	.42	.65	
My LGBT identity leads me to question the status quo more than other people I know. (2)	.45	.19	.29	.49	.64	
My LGBT identity helps me appreciate being able to meet LGBT people from different backgrounds than mine. (8)	.43	.21	.58	.35	.64	
I am wiser because of my LGBT identity. (2)	.58	.29	.41	.54	.64	
Because of my LGBT identity, I am less judgmental of others. (6)	.40	.13	.32	.57	.61	
My LGBT identity prompts me to speak out against prejudice and discrimination. (6)	.60	.32	.34	.27	.61	
I am a stronger person because of my LGBT identity. (2)	.63	.45	.43	.57	.58	
My LGBT identity helps me to understand the experiences of oppression that other, non-LGBT minorities face. (7)	.49	.29	.37	.27	.56	
My LGBT identity has helped me find meaning in my life. (1)	.55	.46	.48	.55	.55	
I have a unique perspective because of my LGBT identity. (2)	.54	.35	.43	.41	.55	
My LGBT identity provides me with many opportunities for personal growth. (2)	.43	.37	.43	.62	.52	
I help people of my sex understand the other sex because of my LGBT identity. (4)	.47	.33	.39	.62	.52	
My LGBT identity helps me have a better understanding of ways I benefit from my privileges in life (based on my race, sex, or class). (6)	.57	.26	.33	.31	.50	
I help people of the other sex understand my sex because of my LGBT identity. (4)	.45	.37	.35	.60	.50	
As an LGBT person, I feel it is important to work towards equality for all people. (7)	.30	.19	.35	.11	.47	
I appreciate the diversity of the LGBT community. (8)	.35	.16	.42	.12	.45	
I have a broader social network because of my LGBT identity. (8)	.30	.26	.57	.44	.45	
My LGBT identity has given me more confidence. (2)	.63	.54	.38	.56	.44	
I wear the clothes I want to express my LGBT identity. (1)	.31	.31	.39	.41	.43	
My LGBT identity allows me to be free from the expectations of others. (2)	.40	.25	.35	.61	.42	
I am freer to have nonsexual relationships (friendships) with members of the other sex because of my LGBT identity. (4)	.47	.30	.26	.62	.42	
My LGBT identity is a gift. (1)	.41	.43	.38	.37	.40	
I have better relationships with others because I can share my LGBT identity with them. (4)	.56	.50	.29	.43	.35	
I express my LGBT identity authentically through my external appearance. (1)	.25	.49	.30	.40	.34	
My LGBT identity frees me from having to act in stereotypical masculine or feminine ways. (3)	.62	.40	.32	.57	.34	
I have freedom to create my own gender/sex roles because of my LGBT identity. (3)	.49	.49	.22	.29	.34	
My LGBT identity makes my decision to have children (or not) a more thoughtful process. (3)	.29	.11	.22	.39	.31	
My LGBT identity frees me from having to act like a "real man" or a "real woman." (3)	.57	.37	.30	.53	.31	
Having an LGBT identity allows me to create my own chosen family. (4)	.63	.35	.46	.55	.31	
My LGBT identity allows me to form a relationship free of social expectations. (3)	.52	.34	.39	.59	.28	
My LGBT identity frees me to negotiate rules/roles in my sexual/intimate relationships. (5)	.60	.34	.43	.52	.28	
Because of my LGBT identity, I have a diverse chosen family (people I choose to be my "family"). (4)	.57	.35	.51	.43	.26	
I have better relationships with my family because I can share my LGBT identity with them. (4)	.37	.47	.37	.20	.25	
I understand the experiences with prejudice that other LGBT people encounter. (7)	.38	.27	.32	.23	.24	
I feel like an equal in my relationship with an intimate partner because of my LGBT identity. (5)	.59	.35	.40	.63	.21	
My LGBT identity allows me to explore new ways of having romantic relationships instead of following typical "heterosexual" patterns. (5)	.52	.35	.28	.40	.19	
Being LGBT is just who I am. (1)	.12	.41	.18	.18	.16	

Note. EFA = exploratory factor analysis; CFA = confirmatory factor analysis. Coefficients for the CFA are standardized factor loadings. Bolded items were retained in the final version of the Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Positive Identity Measure (LGB-PIM).
[a] Original themes based on Riggle and Rostosky (2012) were: (1) Authenticity; (2) Self-Awareness, Personal Insight and Growth; (3) Freedom from Gender Rules/Roles; (4) Emotional Connections and Relationships with Others; (5) Sexuality and Intimate Relationships; (6) Compassion, Empathy, and Understanding; (7) Mentors, Role Models, and Activists; and, (8) LGBTQ Community.

RMSEA = .076; CFI = .69) and the 7-factor solution (SRMR = .040; RMSEA = .076; CFI = .69).

Inspection of the rotated factor loadings for the 5-factor solution indicated that these factors were clearly interpretable and that item loadings could support development of multiple item subscales associated with each of the factors. Compared to this solution, the 6- and 7-factor solutions did not more closely approximate the original eight dimensions that guided item development. Moreover, the 6- and 7-factor solutions featured a greater number of items with substantial loadings on multiple factors, which would have led to an unsatisfactorily small number of retained items. These results, combined with the previous analyses, led us to select the 5-factor solution. The initial 5-factor solution accounted for 55.25% of the shared variance in the 95 items (eigenvalues for unrotated Factors 1 through 5 were 38.52, 5.75, 4.11, 3.53, and 2.55).

Development of subscales. To select items for the new measure, we applied an oblique rotation to the 5-factor solution using the CF-Equamax method (which has been found to perform well relative to other methods when complex factor structures are expected; Sass & Schmitt, 2010). We used structure coefficients (see Table 1) to interpret and label the factors from the 5-factor solution: (a) Self-awareness, a belief that one's LGB identity has increased one's self-awareness; (b) Authenticity, a comfort with one's LGB identity and with expressing one's identity in interactions with others; (c) Community, a sense of involvement with and

support from LGBT communities; (d) Intimacy, a belief that one's LGB identity enhances one's capacity for intimacy and sexual freedom; and, (e) Social Justice, a belief that one's LGB identity has increased one's concern with all forms of oppression and activism for social justice.

We next determined which items to retain in the scale, with a goal of retaining five items per subscale. This process began by retaining items only if their highest structure coefficient was at least .45 in absolute magnitude (to ensure a strong relation of each item to the construct it assessed), and if the difference between the absolute values of the two strongest structure coefficients was at least .20 (to maximize subscale distinctiveness). Applying these criteria led to initial retention of 33 items. We further reduced the item pool to achieve our goal of retaining five items per subscale. We selected items so as to favor statements that (a) had structure coefficients of high magnitude, (b) minimized redundancy in item content, and (c) favored items with clear and succinct phrasing. Selected items are indicated through boldface text in Table 1.

Because dropping items can change the factor structure, we heeded Worthington and Whittaker's (2006) suggestion to conduct a final EFA on the reduced set of items. We expected a 5-factor solution would provide a satisfactory fit to data from the reduced pool of 25 items. The initial 5-factor solution accounted for 69.30% of the shared variance in the 25 items (eigenvalues for unrotated Factors 1 through 5 were 10.48, 2.69, 2.10, 1.87, and 1.45). This solution fit the observed data reasonably well, although two of the fit indices did not quite reach the benchmarks for good fit (SRMR = .028; RMSEA = .072; CFI = .93). After applying a CF-Equamax rotation, the 5 factors closely resembled those retained from the initial 5-factor solution based on the original item pool. Communalities ranged from .43 to .93 (M = .69). Items fulfilled the basic requirements for retention used in the initial factor analysis. Based on these findings, we retained all 25 items for the final version of the measure.

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). We conducted a CFA on the remaining sample of MF-LGB adults to determine the degree to which the EFA factor structure would fit data from a different sample from the same population. This analysis constrained the 25 items to load on five correlated factors such that each item loaded only on the factor on which the item had the highest absolute loading in the EFA. Robust fit statistics indicated that this model provided a reasonably good fit (SRMR = .065; RMSEA = .060; CFI = .91). Factor loadings for the standardized solution ranged from .63–.93 (see Table 1).

Test–retest reliability estimates. For the subsample of MF-LGB participants who completed both surveys, the test–retest

correlations for the subscales were: Intimacy, .54; Self-Awareness, .71; Social Justice, .77; Community, .84; and, Authenticity, .87 (all significant at p < .001). Cronbach's alphas for the subscales in the retest were: Social Justice, .85; Authenticity, .87; Intimacy, .88; Self-Awareness, .91; and, Community, .95.

Preliminary validity evidence. A preliminary check on the convergent validity of subscale scores was performed using the Identity Affirmation subscale. Using the entire sample of MF-LGB identified participants, Identity Affirmation was significantly correlated (p < .001) with each of the subscales: Self-Awareness, r = .54; Authenticity, r = .67; Community, r = .57; Intimacy, r = .45; and, Social Justice, r = .52. These correlations indicate that the multiple dimensions of the measure reflect general positive LGB identity affirmation.

Discussion of Study 1 Results

The final set of 25 items met the criteria for retention and were judged to be lexically distinct from each other. Following Saucier and Goldberg's (2002) reasoning, we chose five item subscales as being reliable and consistent without being overly long. This makes the scale convenient for use by researchers as well as practitioners. Given the 16 month time lapse between test and retest, the moderate to high correlations and high levels of internal consistency reliability indicate that the subscales are suitable for use in research with the LGB population sampled for this study.

The final version of the 25-item LGB-PIM, along with respondent and scoring instructions, are presented in the Appendix. Higher scores on the response scale reflect more positive views of one's identity. Subscales are averaged for interpretability. Subscale means, standard deviations, Cronbach's alpha estimates, skewness coefficients, and intercorrelations for the full sample of MF-LGB participants are presented in Table 2.

Study 2: Preliminary Testing of the Validity of LGB-PIM Scores

Study 2 tested the validity of LGB-PIM scores with a new sample of MF-LGB identified participants. Participants were asked to complete the 25-item LBG-PIM and selected scales hypothesized to be related to the subscales. Specifically, convergent validity of scores was tested by the hypothesized positive correlations between the LGB-PIM subscales and scales that measure the general positive construct indicated: Self-awareness was hypothesized to positively correlate with the Emotional Self-Awareness Scale; Authenticity with the Authentic Living subscale of the

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics for Study 1 and Study 2 Samples

LGB-PIM Subscale	Correlations*					Study 1 (n = 624)				Study 2 (n = 272)			
	1	2	3	4	5	α	M	SD	Skew	α	M	SD	Skew
1. Self-awareness	—	.44	.37	.55	.69	.89	5.67	1.05	−1.00	.89	5.50	1.09	−.99
2. Authenticity	.48	—	.54	.43	.30	.88	5.96	1.08	−2.00	.82	5.91	.87	−.95
3. Community	.44	.53	—	.36	.33	.91	5.14	1.36	−0.89	.89	4.84	1.34	−.55
4. Intimacy	.52	.40	.42	—	.43	.90	5.32	1.26	−0.69	.82	5.11	1.08	−.42
5. Social Justice	.60	.40	.44	.52	—	.87	5.94	1.02	−1.43	.87	5.97	.99	−1.53

Note. Correlations below the diagonal are based on Study 1 data; correlations above the diagonal are based on Study 2 data.
* All correlations are significant at p < .001.

Authenticity Scale; and, Intimacy with the Emotional Intimacy Scale. Community was hypothesized to positively correlate with a measure of LGBT group identity, and Social Justice to positively correlate with a scale measuring attitudes toward social justice.

Construct validity of scores was also examined through hypothesized negative associations between all of the LGB-PIM subscales and the Internalized Homonegativity/Binegativity subscale of a version of the LGIS (as reworded to use language inclusive of bisexual identified individuals by Balsam & Mohr, 2007). Authenticity was hypothesized to negatively associate with Self-Alienation and Accepting External Influence (subscales of the Authenticity Scale).

An important measure of the utility of the LGB-PIM is whether it accounts for variance in measures of psychosocial functioning, above and beyond existing LGB identity scales. For this reason, incremental validity of scores was tested through models using the LGB-PIM and LGIS subscales to predict separate measures of positive psychological functioning (satisfaction with life) and negative psychological functioning (depression). We reasoned that a valid measure of positive LGB identity should account for additional variance in positive well-being (but not negative psychological functioning) after controlling for negative LGB identity. Similarly, we reasoned that measures of negative LGB identity should account for variance in negative functioning (but not positive well-being) after controlling for the LGB-PIM. In short, to establish the incremental and concurrent validity of LGB-PIM scores, we tested for the extent to which the new measure was specifically related to positive indicators of well-being and not negative indicators of well-being (or psychological distress).

Method

Participants. The 272 participants indicated their sexual and gender identities as, 92 female/lesbian, 91 female/bisexual, 66 female/queer, 90 male/gay, 7 male/bisexual, and 7 male/queer (participants could choose more than one category of identity). Ages ranged from 18 to 72 years old ($M = 28.27$ years; $SD = 11.14$). The sample identified their racial or ethnic identity as African American (39), Asian American (8), Native American (Indigenous Persons, non-White; 8), European American/Caucasian/White (208), Latin/South American or Hispanic (22), and other (11; participants could choose more than one category of identity). Education levels were reported as high school degree (8), some college (103), bachelor's degree (57), and postbaccalaureate or professional degree (104). Participants were from 40 U.S. states and six non-U.S. countries.

Procedure. New participants were recruited for Study 2 using the same procedure as Study 1. The survey contained an informed consent, a brief demographic questionnaire, a series of webpages containing the measure questions, and a survey feedback form. Participants were also given the opportunity to enter a drawing for online gift certificates.

The recruitment procedure yielded a dataset of 343 participants. Following the same procedures as used in Study 1, we removed data for 32 participants who only partially completed the survey, 11 people who did not identify as LGB, and 28 transgender identified participants. The final dataset of 272 participants was used.

Identity measures.

LGB-PIM. The LGB-PIM is a 25-item measure designed to assess five dimensions of positive LGB identity (see Appendix for items, scale, and instructions). Respondents rated each item on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 7 (*Strongly Agree*). Subscale items were averaged to create subscale scores. Subscale coefficient alphas for this sample ranged from .82 to .89 (see Table 2).

LGIS. Five of the six subscales of the Lesbian and Gay Identity Scale (LGIS; Mohr & Fassinger, 2000, as modified by Balsam & Mohr, 2007), a total of 27-items, measured Acceptance Need, Identity Confusion, Difficult Process, Internalized Negativity (Homonegativity/Binegativity), and Privacy Need. The LGIS Identity Superiority subscale was not used due to reliability concerns (see Mohr & Kendra, 2011). The items were modified to refer to "sexual orientation/gender identity" or "LGBT" identity to be inclusive and similar to the wording of the LGB-PIM items. Example items include, "I'm not totally sure what my sexual orientation/gender identity is" (Identity Confusion), and "If you are not careful about whom you come out to, you can get very hurt" (Privacy Need). Participants were asked to indicate how well the statements reflected their experience as an LGB identified person using a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 7 (*Strongly Agree*). The overall valence of the subscales is negative and items worded in the positive direction were reverse coded. Items were averaged to create subscale scores. High internal consistency of the subscales (with alphas ranging from .75 to .81) and validity through correlations with self-esteem and same-group orientation was demonstrated in Mohr and Fassinger (2000). In the current sample, coefficient alpha for the subscales were: Need for Acceptance, .76; Identity Confusion, .89; Difficult Process, .80; Internalized Negativity, .75; and Need for Privacy, .81.

Convergent validity measures.

Authenticity Scale. The Authenticity Scale measured dispositional authenticity (Wood, Linley, Maltby, Baliousis, & Joseph, 2008) using 12 items to measure three factors: Self-Alienation, Authentic Living, and Accepting External Influence. Example items include, "I don't know how I really feel inside" (Self-Alienation), "I am strongly influenced by the opinions of others" (Accepting External Influence), and "I always stand by what I believe in" (Authentic Living). Participants were asked to indicate how well each item described them on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*Not at all*) to 7 (*Describes me very well*). The Self-Alienation and Accepting External Influence subscales have a negative valence such that higher scores indicate less authenticity; the Authentic Living subscale has a positive valence with higher scores indicating more authenticity. Subscale item scores were averaged. The subscales have been shown to have high internal consistency and reliability at 4 weeks in a multigroup CFA study (Self-alienation, $\alpha = .84$, $r = .79$; Accepting External Influence, $\alpha = .77$, $r = .81$; Authentic Living, $\alpha = .70$, $r = .78$) and positive correlations with subjective and psychological well-being (Wood et al., 2008). In the current sample, coefficient alpha for the subscales were: Self-Alienation, .86; Accepting External Influence, .83; and Authentic Living, .75.

Emotional Self-Awareness Scale. The Emotional Self-Awareness Scale (ESAS; Kauer, 2012) was used to assess how

well participants identify and how much they reflect on their feelings. Eleven items were used; six items were worded negatively and were reverse coded (e.g., "I don't often think about my feelings") so that higher scores indicated higher levels of identifying and reflecting on feelings. Participants were asked to indicate "how much of the time do the following statements describe your feelings about yourself" on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*Never*) to 5 (*A Lot*). Example items include, "I frequently take time to reflect on how I feel" and "I know how I feel about most things." Previous studies reporting internal consistency for the 11-item scale were not available. High internal consistency has been found for the original 33-item scale (α = .83; Reid et al., 2011). All 11 items were averaged to create a summary score. In the current sample, coefficient alpha for the 11-item scale was .79.

Emotional Intimacy Scale. Sinclair and Dowdy's (2005) Emotional Intimacy Scale (EIS) is a 5-item measure of perceived closeness to another person. The instructions ask participants to "think of ONE PERSON close to you (your partner, closest friend, or family member)." Participants then answered positively worded questions about their relationship with that person on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 7 (*Strongly Agree*). Example items include, "This person cares deeply for me" and "This person completely accepts me as I am." Sinclair and Dowdy (2005) reported high internal consistency (α = .88) and test–retest reliability for a 6-week period (r = .85) and positive correlations with social support, life satisfaction, and positive affect. The items were averaged to create an emotional intimacy score, with higher scores indicating more perceived closeness in the chosen reference relationship. In the current sample, coefficient alpha was .86.

Group identity. Phinney and Ong's (2007) revised 6-item Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM-R) was used to measure commitment to and exploration of having an LGBT identity. "LGBT" was substituted for "my ethnic group" in statements to apply to LGBT identified individuals' group identity. The 6-item scale includes, "I have spent time trying to find out more about LGBT history and culture" and "I have a strong sense of belonging to my own LGBT community." Using an ethnically diverse student sample, Phinney and Ong (2007) showed high internal consistency for the 6-item scale (α = .81). Using a similar 7-item version of the MEIM-R with an LGB sample, Fingerhut, Peplau, and Gable (2010) found that higher levels of group identity were positively associated with higher levels of psychological well-being. Participants indicated their agreement to the statements on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly Agree*). Items were averaged to create a score, with higher scores indicating higher levels of group identity. In the current sample, coefficient alpha was .84.

Attitudes Toward Social Justice scale. Kizer's (2011) Counselor's Attitudes Toward Social Justice scale (ATSJ) was designed to measure attitudes of counseling psychologists toward social inequality and social justice advocacy. The scale was slightly modified (deleting specific reference to counselors) for use with the current sample. Eight of the original 10 items that were generalizable were used. Example items include, "I am passionate about advocating for marginalized groups" and "I feel upset when I see someone act in a discriminatory manner toward a member of a marginalized group." One item was reworded to refer specifically to the participant's identity ("As an LGBT identified person, it is my duty to actively advocate for other marginalized groups").

Participants indicated their agreement with the statements on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 7 (*Strongly Agree*). Kizer (2011) found high internal consistency (α = .90) with a sample of counseling psychology students. Items were averaged and higher scores indicated higher levels of commitment to social justice advocacy. For the current sample, coefficient alpha was .84.

Measures of well-being.

CES-D Short Scale (Depression). We used the short 10-item version of The Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D; Radloff, 1977), designed to measure depressive symptom severity during the past week. Participants are asked to indicate for each item how often they have "felt or behaved this way during the past week." The response scale was coded as: 1 for "*Never or Rarely (less than 1 day)*"; 2 for "*Some or Little (1–2 days)*"; 3 for "*Occasionally or a Moderate Amount (3–4 days)*"; and, 4 for "*Most or All (5–7 days)*." Example items include, "I felt fearful" and "I felt hopeful about the future" (reverse scored). Two positively worded items were reverse scored such that all items were coded so that higher numbers indicated more depressive symptoms. The CES-D depression measure has been found to be positively correlated with the LGBIS acceptance concerns and internalized homonegativity subscales, and negatively correlated with the identity affirmation subscale (Mohr & Kendra, 2011). The items were averaged to create a score indicating the severity of depressive symptoms. Alpha for this sample was .87.

Satisfaction with Life Scale. The Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS; Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985) was used as a general measure of well-being. The 5-item measure assesses global life satisfaction through statements such as, "The conditions of my life are excellent." Participants indicated their agreement with the statements on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 7 (*Strongly Agree*). The scale was used with an LGB sample by Balsam and Mohr (2007) and showed high internal consistency (α = .90) and was positively correlated with self-esteem and negatively correlated with distress. Mohr and Kendra (2011) found that that SWLS was negatively correlated with internalized homonegativity and positively correlated with identity affirmation in an LGB sample. Items were averaged to create a score, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with life. In the current sample, coefficient alpha was .91.

Results

Descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations. Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics and subscale intercorrelations for the LGB-PIM for Study 2. The significant intercorrelations support the interrelated nature of the subscales. The intercorrelations are low enough to support the interpretation that the subscales are measuring different dimensions of the concept.

Validity of LGB-PIM subscale scores. Hypothesized associations between the LGB-PIM subscales and the convergent validity measures were confirmed. Table 3 presents all correlations and significance tests for measures in Study 2. As hypothesized, Self-Awareness was positively associated with Emotional Self-Awareness (r = .17), Authenticity was positively associated with Authentic Living (r = .46), Community was positively associated with Group Identity (r = .56), Intimacy was positively associated

Table 3
Study 2 Correlations Between LGB-PIM Subscales and Other Measures (n = 272)

	LGB-PIM Subscales				
	Self-Aware	Authenticity	Community	Intimacy	Social Justice
ESAS	.17**	.28**	.07	.19**	.14*
Authentic Living	.29**	.46***	.21**	.32**	.25**
Group Identity	.60***	.48***	.56***	.51***	.57***
EIS	.11*	.36***	.19**	.19**	.03
ATSJ	.43***	.22***	.22***	.33***	.62***
Self Alienation	−.08	−.38***	−.19**	−.21**	−.07
Accept External Influence	−.01	−.18**	−.08	−.12*	−.01
Internalized Negativity	−.31***	−.57***	−.32***	−.34***	−.30***
Privacy Need	−.10	−.51***	−.35***	−.21**	−.10*
Acceptance Need	−.44***	−.54***	−.33***	−.12*	.02
Identity Confusion	−.09	−.35***	−.14*	−.16**	−.05
Difficult Process	.06	−.37***	−.13*	−.09	−.02
SWLS	.11*	.36***	.31***	.22***	.17**
CES-D	−.07	−.34***	−.24**	−.11**	−.03

Note. Scale abbreviations: ESAS = Emotional Self-Awareness Scale; EIS = Emotional Intimacy Scale; ATSJ = Attitudes Toward Social Justice; CESD = Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale; SWLS = Satisfaction With Life Scale.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

with Emotional Intimacy ($r = .19$), and Social Justice was positively associated with Attitudes Toward Social Justice ($r = .62$).

All of the LGB-PIM subscales were significantly and negatively associated with Internalized Negativity (see Table 3). Authenticity was also negatively associated with Self-Alienation ($r = −.38$) and Accepting External Influence ($r = −.18$).

Incremental validity of LGB-PIM scores. Hierarchical regression models were used to examine the predictive ability of the four Negative Identity subscales of the LGIS and the five subscales of the LGB-PIM on a measure of psychological distress (CESD) and a measure of positive well-being (SWLS). Each model was run with the four negative identity LGIS subscales entered in Step 1 and the five LGB-PIM subscales entered in Step 2, then rerun with the order of entry reversed. We ran these hierarchical regressions with order of entry in both directions to establish the unique relevance of LGB-PIM scores to positive psychological well-being as opposed to distress or negative indicators of well-being.

Results for the CESD suggested that the LGIS subscales significantly predicted levels of depressive symptoms ($R^2 = .18$, $p < .001$), but the LGB-PIM did not significantly add to the model after accounting for the effects of the LGIS subscales ($\Delta R^2 = .02$, $p = .485$). Results for the SWLS suggested that the LGIS subscales significantly predicted levels of satisfaction with life ($R^2 = .16$, $p < .001$), and the addition of the LGB-PIM subscales in Step 2 significantly added to the model after accounting for the effects of the LGIS ($\Delta R^2 = .05$, $p = .005$). Thus, after controlling for negative LGB identity, the LGB-PIM accounted for unique variance in positive but not negative psychological functioning.

We next reversed the models, with the LGB-PIM subscales in Step 1 and the LGIS added in Step 2. Results for the CESD suggested that the LGB-PIM subscales significantly predicted levels of depressive symptoms ($R^2 = .14$, $p < .001$), and the addition of the LGIS subscales significantly increased the predictive ability of the model ($\Delta R^2 = .06$, $p = .002$). Results for the SWLS suggested that the LGB-PIM subscales significantly predicted levels of satisfaction with life ($R^2 = .19$, $p < .001$), but the addition

of the LGIS subscales in Step 2 did not significantly improve the model at the .05 level ($\Delta R^2 = .03$, $p = .067$; see Table 4 for a summary of results.). Thus, after controlling for positive LGB identity as assessed by the LGB-PIM, negative LGB identity accounted for unique variance in negative but not positive psychological functioning.

In short, these analyses indicated that the LGB-PIM provides a unique ability to predict positive well-being beyond indices of negative LGB identity, and renders the negative identity measures superfluous in prediction of positive well-being. Conversely, the LGB-PIM did not contribute to prediction of negative functioning after accounting for negative LGB identity.

Discussion

As scholars have increasingly studied well-being in LGB communities, the need to measure positive LGB identity has become acutely evident. Understanding and being able to assess the dimensions of positive identity may also be important for addressing

Table 4
Summary of Hierarchical Regression Models of Well-Being Outcomes With LGB-PIM and LGIS Subscales as Predictors

Outcome	Step	Variables	R	R^2	ΔR^2	ΔF	df
CESD	1	LGIS	.427	.182		13.484***	4,242
	2	LGB-PIM	.444	.197	.015	.895	5,237
SWLS	1	LGIS	.399	.159		10.907***	4,242
	2	LGB-PIM	.467	.218	.059	3.418**	5,237
SWLS	1	LGB-PIM	.433	.187		10.594***	5,241
	2	LGIS	.467	.218	.031	2.226	4,237

Note. Scale abbreviations: CESD = Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale; SWLS = Satisfaction With Life Scale; LGIS = Lesbian and Gay Identity Scale; LGB-PIM = Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Positive Identity Measure.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

the health and mental health needs of LGB identified individuals. The current studies yielded a 5-factor measure of positive LGB identity. The reduced factor structure from the original set of eight themes to five factors seems to reflect the overlap between the positive identity themes as presented by Riggle and Rostosky (2012). The 5-factor measure provides a more parsimonious representation of the positive dimensions of LGB identity.

The reliability of subscale scores was strongly supported by investigation of internal consistency across multiple samples and test–retest reliability in one subsample of participants. Construct validity was investigated using established measures. The group specific measures (Group Identity and ATSJ) were more highly correlated with the corresponding LGB-PIM subscales (Community and Social Justice, respectively) than the more general conceptual measures. Emotional self-awareness (ESAS) and emotional intimacy (EIS) were significantly although not highly correlated with Self-Awareness and Intimacy, respectively. The ESAS and EIS were more highly correlated with the Authenticity subscale. Thus, the results for construct validity are somewhat mixed. Other established measures that more closely reflect the type of self-awareness (including strengths and insights) and intimacy (with an intimate or sexual partner) assessed by the LGB-PIM subscales would likely make a stronger case for construct validity.

The relationships between the subscales of the LGB-PIM and the LGIS suggest that there are differences in positive and negative dimensions of identity. All of the significant correlations between subscales of the two measures are negative as expected. The strongest (negative) associations are between Internalized Negativity (LGIS) and all of the LGB-PIM subscales, and between Authenticity (LGB-PIM) and all of the LGIS subscales. However, there are several nonsignificant correlations as well, suggesting divergence in the concepts measured by positive versus negative focus on identity.

Incremental validity of scores as tested by the two-step models also supports an interpretation that positive and negative indicators of well-being may be explained by different positive and negative valenced scales, respectively. The LGB-PIM explained satisfaction with life better than the LGIS alone; however, the LGIS did not improve on the LGB-PIM's performance in explaining a positive indicator of well-being (SWLS). On the other hand, the LGB-PIM did not improve on the LGIS explanation of the variance of a negative indicator of well-being (CESD). This suggests that when attempting to predict positive indicators of well-being, researchers should include positive identity scales.

Identity Affirmation (LGBIS) in Study 1 was positively associated with all of the LGB-PIM subscales. This suggests that Identity Affirmation may reflect different dimensions of positive identity, whereas the LGB-PIM may more fully measure different aspects of positive LGB identity. Future research will be needed to test the LGB-PIM with other types of positive identity experiences (e.g., coming-out growth, Vaughan & Waehler, 2010) and other identity measurement strategies (e.g., identity valence, Kertzner et al., 2009).

The dimensions of positive identity found here suggest associations with different strengths that LGB identified individuals may develop and utilize in all areas of their lives. These strengths are commonly associated with increased positive well-being. Interventions designed to increase positive LGB identity may be beneficial

to general community groups as well as specific populations, such as college students or individual clients.

Limitations

The sample for this study is a purposive sample that self-identified as LGB and self-reported their identity status and responses. The sample was more educated than the general population. Latina/o identified individuals are underrepresented in the samples. Therefore, generalization from this sample to other samples, especially samples of non-White/Caucasian respondents, should be undertaken with caution.

The impact of multiple minority identities or racial and ethnic non-White identities on the performance of this scale has not been specifically assessed. The scales need to be validated on samples of non-White/Caucasian LGB identified individuals. Multiple identities may make some items more or less salient as salience may differ by context. This is also true of non-U.S.-based samples (see Almario, Riggle, Rostosky, & Alcalde, 2013, for an example of positive LGBT identity themes in a sample from Spanish-speaking countries).

The structure of the initial pool of items in this study was not tested using a sample of transgender identified respondents. Specific testing of these items, or a modification of the items, will be necessary to establish the multidimensional structure of positive transgender identity (see Riggle, Rostosky, McCants, & Pascale-Hague, 2011). It is important to recognize that differences in the many identities that LGBT individuals have may cause them to read and apply the statements differently. Individuals who identify as transgender may or may not identify as LGB, leading to a reading of the questions from different combinations of viewpoints of gender and sexual identity.

The measures of different types of positive well-being used in the current study (e.g., the Authenticity Scale) were limited in scope. Different general conceptual measures may perform differently in association with the LGB-PIM subscales. Also, the measure of global satisfaction with life (SWLS) is a measure of hedonic happiness. Measures of eudiamonic well-being (e.g., Ryff, 1989) may be more well-suited to measuring the predictive validity of LGB-PIM scores.

Future Development and Use of LGB-PIM

Future research should continue to validate this measure in a variety of settings with diverse samples. The factors represented in the LGB-PIM suggest possible extensions of research on LGB identity. For example, past studies have used measures of disclosure (outness) as a possible explanatory factor for both well-being and distress (e.g., Feldman & Wright, 2013; Frost & Meyer, 2009). Outness may be more than a simple disclosure decision; outness may involve feelings of authenticity or connections to the LGBT community. This more complex conceptualization of disclosure may account for the inconsistent findings of the effects of outness on well-being. The subscales of the LGB-PIM may more accurately account for well-being outcomes. Future research may also focus on eudiamonic sources of well-being (e.g., Ryff & Keyes, 1995), which include strengths, virtues, and other factors that enhance flourishing as outcomes (e.g., Bauer et al., 2008). The LGB-PIM subscales may provide specific dimensional predictions of these types of outcomes.

The LGB-PIM may have uses in both community and clinical settings. The samples used for the scale development were community samples. More purposive samples for a specific research purpose may require that the researchers revalidate the structure of the items, especially with clinical samples. Also, the present findings suggest satisfactory test–retest reliability with a community (nonclinical) sample. However, future research is needed to identify whether these factors measure stable traits or states and how they respond to interventions aimed at increasing positive LGB identities.

The LGB-PIM provides a parsimonious measure of five positive identity dimensions. This assessment tool will assist basic and applied researchers to move forward in examining the contribution of positive LGB identity to well-being.

References

Adams, G. R., & Marshall, S. (1996). A developmental social psychology of identity: Understanding the person in context. *Journal of Adolescence, 19,* 429–442.

Almario, M., Riggle, E. D. B., Rostosky, S. S., & Alcalde, M. C. (2013). Positive themes in LGBT self-identities in Spanish-speaking countries. *International Perspectives in Psychology: Research, Practice, Consultation, 2,* 1–13. doi:10.1037/a0031055

Ashmore, R. D., Deaux, K., & McLaughlin-Volpe, T. (2004). An organizing framework for collective identity: Articulation and significance of multidimensionality. *Psychological Bulletin, 130,* 80–114. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.130.1.80

Balsam, K. F., & Mohr, J. J. (2007). Adaptation to sexual orientation stigma: A comparison of bisexual and lesbian/gay adults. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54,* 306–319. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.54.3.306

Bauer, J. J., McAdams, D. P., & Pals, J. L. (2008). Narrative identity and eudaimonic well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 9,* 81–104. doi:10.1007/s10902-006-9021-6

Brady, S., & Busse, W. J. (1994). The Gay Identity Questionnaire: A brief measure of homosexual identity formation. *Journal of Homosexuality, 26*(4), 1–22. doi:10.1300/J082v26n04_01

Cass, V. C. (1979). Homosexual identity formation: A theoretical model. *Journal of Homosexuality, 4,* 219–235. doi:10.1300/J082v04n03_01

Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction with Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 49,* 71–75. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13

Dillon, F. R., Worthington, R. L., & Moradi, B. (2011). Sexual identity as a universal process. In S. J. Schwartz, K. Luyckx, & V. L. Vignoles (Eds.), *Handbook of identity theory and research* (Vol. 1, pp. 649–670). New York, NY: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-1-4419-7988-9_27

Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity, youth and crisis.* New York, NY: Norton.

Fabrigar, L. R., Wegener, D. T., MacCallum, R. C., & Strahan, E. J. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods, 4,* 272–299. doi:10.1037/1082-989X.4.3.272

Feldman, S. E., & Wright, A. J. (2013). Dual impact: Outness and LGB identity formation on mental health. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services, 25,* 443–464. doi:10.1080/10538720.2013.833066

Fingerhut, A. W., Peplau, L. A., & Gable, S. L. (2010). Identity, minority stress and psychological well-being among gay men and lesbians. *Psychology & Sexuality, 1,* 101–114. doi:10.1080/19419899.2010.484592

Frost, D. M., & Meyer, I. H. (2009). Internalized homophobia and relationship quality among lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 56,* 97–109. doi:10.1037/a0012844

Harter, S. (2005). Authenticity. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 382–94). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Haslam, S. A., Jetten, J., Postmes, T., & Haslam, C. (2009). Social identity, health and well-being: An emerging agenda for applied psychology. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 58,* 1–23. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.2008.00379.x

Herek, G. M. (2009). Sexual stigma and sexual prejudice in the United States: A conceptual framework. In D. A. Hope (Ed.), *Contemporary perspectives on lesbian, gay, and bisexual identities* (pp. 65–111). New York, NY: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-0-387-09556-1_4

Herek, G. M., Gillis, J. R., & Cogan, J. C. (2009). Internalized stigma among sexual minority adults: Insights from a social psychological perspective. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 56,* 32–43. doi:10.1037/a0014672

Higa, D., Hoppe, M. J., Lindhorst, T., Mincer, S., Beadnell, B., Morrison, D. M., . . . Mountz, S. (2014). Negative and positive factors associated with the well-being of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and questioning (LGBTQ) youth. *Youth & Society, 46,* 663–687. doi:10.1177/0044118X12449630

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling, 6,* 1–55. doi:10.1080/10705519909540118

Jackson, D. L. (2001). Sample size and number of parameter estimates in maximum likelihood confirmatory factor analysis: A Monte Carlo investigation. *Structural Equation Modeling, 8,* 205–223. doi:10.1207/S15328007SEM0802_3

Kauer, S. D. (2012). Emotional Self-Awareness Scale. *Journal of Medical Internet Research, 14*(3), e67. Retrieved from http://www.jmir.org/article/downloadSuppFile/1858/3744

Kertzner, R. M., Meyer, I. H., Frost, D. M., & Stirratt, M. J. (2009). Social and psychological well-being in lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals: The effects of race, gender, age, and sexual identity. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 79,* 500–510. doi:10.1037/a0016848

Keyes, C. L. M. (1998). Social well-being. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 61,* 121–140. doi:10.2307/2787065

King, L. A., Burton, C. M., & Giese, A. C. (2009). The good (gay) life: The search for signs of maturity in the narratives of gay adults. In P. L. Hammack & B. J. Cohler (Eds.), *The story of sexual identity: Narrative perspectives on the gay and lesbian life course* (pp. 375–396). New York, NY: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195326789.003.0016

Kizer, B. (2011). *Construction of the lesbian and gay affirming social justice competency scale* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Missouri-Kansas City, Kansas City, MO.

Kwon, P. (2013). Resilience in lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 17,* 371–383. doi:10.1177/1088868313490248

Leary, M. R., & Tangney, J. P. (2003). The self as an organizing construct in the behavioral and social sciences. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (pp. 1–14). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Lingiardi, V., Baiocco, R., & Nardelli, N. (2012). Measure of Internalized Sexual Stigma for Lesbians and Gay Men: A new scale. *Journal of Homosexuality, 59,* 1191–1210. doi:10.1080/00918369.2012.712850

MacCallum, R. C., Widaman, K. F., Zhang, S., & Hong, S. (1999). Sample size in factor analysis. *Psychological Methods, 4,* 84–99. doi:10.1037/1082-989X.4.1.84

Mayfield, W. (2001). The development of an Internalized Homonegativity Inventory for gay men. *Journal of Homosexuality, 41,* 53–76. doi:10.1300/J082v41n02_04

McCarn, S. R., & Fassinger, R. E. (1996). Revisioning sexual minority identity formation: A new model of lesbian identity and its implications. *The Counseling Psychologist, 24,* 508–534. doi:10.1177/0011000096243011

Meyer, I. H. (2007). Prejudice and discrimination as social stressors. In

I. H. Meyer & M. E. Northridge (Eds.), *The health of sexual minorities* (pp. 242–267). New York, NY: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-0-387-31334-4_10

Mohr, J. J., & Fassinger, R. E. (2000). Measuring dimensions of lesbian and gay male experience. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 33,* 66–90.

Mohr, J. J., & Kendra, M. S. (2011). Revision and extension of a multidimensional measure of sexual minority identity: The Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Identity Scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 58,* 234–245. doi:10.1037/a0022858

Moradi, B., Mohr, J. J., Worthington, R. L., & Fassinger, R. E. (2009). Counseling psychology research on sexual (orientation) minority issues: Conceptual and methodological challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 56,* 5–22. doi:10.1037/a0014572

Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (1998–2011). *Mplus user's guide, 6th Edition.* Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén.

O'Connor, B. P. (2000). SPSS and SAS programs for determining the number of components using parallel analysis and Velicer's MAP test. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers, 32,* 396–402. doi:10.3758/BF03200807

Park, N., Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). Strengths of character and well-being. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 23,* 603–619. doi:10.1521/jscp.23.5.603.50748

Phinney, J. S., & Ong, A. D. (2007). Conceptualization and measurement of ethnic identity: Current status and future directions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54,* 271–281. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.54.3.271

Radloff, L. S. (1977). The CES-D Scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. *Applied Psychological Measurement, 1,* 385–401. doi:10.1177/014662167700100306

Reich, J. W., Zautra, A. J., & David, M. (2003). Dimensions of affect relationships: Models and their integrative implications. *Review of General Psychology, 7,* 66–83. doi:10.1037/1089-2680.7.1.66

Reid, S. C., Kauer, S. D., Hearps, S. J. C., Crooke, A. H. C., Khor, A. S., Sanci, L. A., & Patton, G. C. (2011). A mobile phone application for the assessment and management of youth mental health problems in primary care: A randomised controlled trial. *BMC Family Practice, 12,* 131. doi:10.1186/1471-2296-12-131

Riggle, E. D. B., & Rostosky, S. S. (2012). *A positive view of LGBTQ: Embracing identity and cultivating well-being.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Riggle, E. D. B., Rostosky, S. S., McCants, L. E., & Pascale-Hague, D. (2011). The positive aspects of transgender self-identity. *Psychology & Sexuality, 2,* 147–158. doi:10.1080/19419899.2010.534490

Riggle, E. D. B., Whitman, J. S., Olson, A., Rostosky, S. S., & Strong, S. (2008). The positive aspects of being a lesbian or gay man. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 39,* 210–217. doi:10.1037/0735-7028.39.2.210

Rosario, M., Schrimshaw, E. W., Hunter, J., & Braun, L. (2006). Sexual identity development among lesbian, gay, and bisexual youths: Consistency and change over time. *Journal of Sex Research, 43,* 46–58. doi:10.1080/00224490609552298

Rostosky, S. S., Riggle, E. D. B., Pascale-Hague, D., & McCants, L. E. (2010). The positive aspects of a bisexual self-identification. *Psychology & Sexuality, 1,* 131–144. doi:10.1080/19419899.2010.484595

Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57,* 1069–1081. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069

Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69,* 719–727. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.69.4.719

Sass, D. A., & Schmitt, T. A. (2010). A comparative investigation of rotation criteria within exploratory factor analysis. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 45,* 73–103. doi:10.1080/00273170903504810

Saucier, G., & Goldberg, L. R. (2002). Assessing the big five: Applications of 10 psychometric criteria to the development of marker scales. In B. de Raad & M. Perugini (Eds.), *Big Five assessment* (pp. 30–54). Ashland, OH: Hogrefe & Huber.

Schlomer, G. L., Bauman, S., & Card, N. A. (2010). Best practices for missing data management in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 57,* 1–10. doi:10.1037/a0018082

Sinclair, V. G., & Dowdy, S. W. (2005). Development and validation of the Emotional Intimacy Scale. *Journal of Nursing Measurement, 13,* 193–206. doi:10.1891/jnum.13.3.193

Szymanski, D. M., Kashubeck-West, S., & Meyer, J. (2008a). Internalized heterosexism: A historical and theoretical overview. *The Counseling Psychologist, 36,* 510–524. doi:10.1177/0011000007309488

Szymanski, D. M., Kashubeck-West, S., & Meyer, J. (2008b). Internalized heterosexism: Measurement, psychosocial correlates, and research directions. *The Counseling Psychologist, 36,* 525–574. doi:10.1177/0011000007309489

Tajfel, H. (1981). Social stereotypes and social groups. In J. C. Turner & H. Giles (Eds.), *Intergroup behaviour* (pp. 144–167). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Troiden, R. R. (1989). The formation of homosexual identities. *Journal of Homosexuality, 17,* 43–74. doi:10.1300/J082v17n01_02

Vaughan, M. D., & Waehler, C. A. (2010). Coming out growth: Conceptualizing and measuring stress-related growth associated with coming out to others as a sexual minority. *Journal of Adult Development, 17,* 94–109. doi:10.1007/s10804-009-9084-9

Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegan, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54,* 1063–1070. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.54.6.1063

Wood, A. M., Linley, P. A., Maltby, J., Baliousis, M., & Joseph, S. (2008). The authentic personality: A theoretical and empirical conceptualization and the development of the Authenticity Scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 55,* 385–399. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.55.3.385

Worthington, R. L., & Whittaker, T. A. (2006). Scale development research: A content analysis and recommendations for best practices. *The Counseling Psychologist, 34,* 806–838. doi:10.1177/0011000006288127

Appendix

Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Positive Identity Measure (LGB-PIM)

We are going to ask you a series of questions about your identity as a Lesbian, Gay, or Bisexual identified (LGB) person. There are several questions and some of the questions may seem similar, but there are differences in the wording, so please try to answer all of the questions. Please answer the questions by thinking about which response category best represents your feelings about your experiences. Indicate how you really feel now, not how you think you should feel. There is no need to think too much about any one question. Answer each question according to your initial reaction and then move on to the next. Choose the response that best reflects your feelings about your lesbian, gay, or bisexual identity.

1. My LGBT identity leads me to important insights about myself.
2. I am more aware of how I feel about things because of my LGBT identity.
3. My LGBT identity motivates me to be more self-aware.
4. Because of my LGBT identity, I am more in tune with what is happening around me.
5. My LGBT identity has led me to develop new insights into my strengths.
6. I feel I can be honest and share my LGBT identity with others.
7. I am honest with myself about my LGBT identity.
8. I have a sense of inner peace about my LGBT identity.
9. I embrace my LGBT identity.
10. I am comfortable with my LGBT identity.
11. I feel supported by the LGBT community.
12. I feel visible in the LGBT community.
13. I feel included in the LGBT community.
14. I feel a connection to the LGBT community.
15. I find positive networking opportunities in the LGBT community.
16. My LGBT identity allows me to understand my sexual partner better.
17. My LGBT identity allows me to be closer to my intimate partner.
18. My LGBT identity frees me to choose who I want as my sexual/intimate partner.
19. I have a sense of sexual freedom because of my LGBT identity.
20. My LGBT identity helps me to communicate better with my intimate partner.
21. As an LGBT person, it is important to act as an advocate for LGBT rights.
22. My LGBT identity makes it important to me to actively educate others about LGBT issues.
23. My experience with my LGBT identity leads me to fight for the rights of others.
24. I am more sensitive to prejudice and discrimination against others because of my LGBT identity.
25. I have a greater respect for people who are different from society's expectations because of my LGBT identity.

Note. Items should be randomized for presentation in a survey. Recommended response scale: 1, *Strongly Disagree*; 2, *Disagree;* 3, *Somewhat Disagree*; 4, *Neither Agree nor Disagree*; 5, *Somewhat Agree*; 6, *Agree*; 7, *Strongly Agree*. Subscale scores are computed by averaging subscale item ratings: Self-awareness (1, 2, 3, 4, 5), Authenticity (6, 7, 8, 9, 10), Community (11, 12, 13, 14, 15), Intimacy (16, 17, 18, 19, 20), and Social Justice (21, 22, 23, 24, 25).