

“Like a Constantly Flowing River”:

Gender Identity Flexibility among Non-binary Transgender Individuals

M. Paz Galupo, Lexi K. Pulice-Farrow, & Johanna L. Ramirez

Towson University

Accepted for publication in

Sinnott, J. D. (Ed). Identity flexibility during adulthood: Perspectives in adult development. Springer.

Abstract

Gender is one of the first identities we learn and binary distinctions based on gender (e.g. girl/boy, woman/man, cisgender/transgender) are pervasive. The conceptualization of gender identity among transgender individuals is uniquely complicated by dichotomous notions of gender/sex. This is particularly true for individuals in the transgender community who are gender non-conforming or experience their gender outside the binary. The present research investigates the conceptualization of gender identity among non-binary transgender individuals by exploring the gender identity labels they choose and the descriptions they provide for their gender identity and experience. Participants included 197 adults recruited from a larger study on transgender experience who completed an online study. Participants ranged in age between 18-70 and self-identified as gender variant ($n=129$) or agender ($n=68$). Qualitative responses were analyzed via thematic analysis. Six themes were identified as related to the way gender non-conforming individuals describe their gender identity: 1) Gender Identity Using Binary Terms of Gender/Sex; 2) Gender Identity as Blended; 3) Gender Identity as Fluid; 4) Gender Identity as Non-Binary; 5) Transgender as Gender Identity; and 6) Agender Conceptualizations. Discussion focuses on the ways that gender non-conforming individuals' experience of gender identity may contribute to the way we conceptualize identity flexibility.

KEYWORDS: Gender Identity; Gender Flexibility; Gender Nonconformity; Transgender

“Like a Constantly Flowing River”: Gender Identity Flexibility among
Non-Binary Transgender Individuals

Gender is one of the most pervasive psychological constructs and one of first identities we learn (Egan & Perry, 2001). Gender identity is commonly understood to represent an individual’s internal sense of themselves¹ as male, female, both, or neither (Tate, 2014; Tate, Youssef, & Bettergarcia, 2014). As a multidimensional construct it also encompasses an individual’s sex assigned at birth, current gender identity, gender roles and expectations, gender social presentation, and gender evaluations (Tate, et al., 2014). Cisgender and transgender are terms that can be used to describe the relationship between an individual’s sex assigned at birth and current gender identity. Cisgender individuals use a current gender identity label that is the same as their sex assigned at birth; transgender individuals use a label that is different from their sex assigned at birth (Tate, Ledbetter, & Youssef, 2013).

Despite the fact that most individuals experience some flexibility in gender roles and presentation, binary distinctions based on gender (e.g. girl/boy, woman/man, cisgender/transgender) have been conceptually naturalized. However, gender identity, the private understanding of one’s gender, is uniquely complicated for transgender individuals by dichotomous notions of gender/sex². This is particularly true for individuals in the transgender community who experience their gender outside the binary (e.g. genderqueer, gender non-conforming, gender fluid, or agender individuals). The present research investigates the

¹ We intentionally use the singular they and them as gender inclusive pronouns

² Following van Anders (2014; 2015) we use gender/sex to reference a concept that cannot be understood as only biologically or socially constructed.

conceptualization of gender identity among non-binary transgender individuals. As gender identity has been described as an individual's sense of self as male, female, both or either (Tate, 2014; Tate, Youssef, & Bettergarcia, 2014), a focus on non-binary transgender individuals may provide particular insight into way people conceptualize their gender identity as “both” or “neither” and may provide a unique opportunity to explore gender identity flexibility.

Historical and Contemporary Frameworks for Understanding Transgender Experience and Gender Identity

Transgender experience has been narrowly defined and consistently pathologized in the psycho-medical literature. From this perspective, the focus on transgender experience has been on developing a typology of transsexuality (Benjamin, 1966; Blanchard, 1989) and diagnosing gender identity (e.g. as Gender Identity Disorder in DSM-III, APA, 1980; and gender dysphoria in DSM-V, APA, 2013). From a medical perspective, early models of transgenderism have emphasized dichotomous conceptualizations of gender/sex where individuals were considered transsexual based upon their identification with the “opposite” of their “genetic” sex (Benjamin, 1966). Developed in relation to the experiences of transwomen (i.e. narrowly defined as individuals who were assigned male at birth and have a current gender identity of woman), medical models of transgender experience reinforce binary tropes of a “woman trapped in a man's body” and do not always resonate with the diverse experiences of transgender individuals (Serano, 2010; Veale, Clarke, & Lomax, 2012). These models have been criticized for making anatomical determinations central and de-emphasizing the role of self-identification (Bockting & Coleman, 1991; Devor, 1993).

More contemporary research emphasizes self-identification and often situates transgender experience within the larger lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) community

(Fassinger & Arnseneau, 2007). From this perspective sexual and gender minorities are conceptualized as related groups based on shared community (Fassinger & Arnseneau, 2007), stigma / minority stress (e.g. Breslow, et. al., 2015; Meyer, 2015), and gender non-conformity / atypicality (Alexander & Yescavage, 2003; Clarke, Hayfield, & Huxley, 2012; Drescher, 2010). This approach has focused on transgender experience while privileging those accounts that best fit with a binary conceptualization of transgender experience (e.g. individuals who identify as women / transwomen, and men / transmen) and, with few recent exceptions (Budge, Rossman, & Howard, 2014; Factor & Rothblum, 2008; Farmer & Byrd, 2015; Galupo, Davis, Gryniewicz & Mitchell, 2014; Harrison, Grant, & Herman, 2012; Saltzburg & Davis, 2010; Tate et al., 2013; Tate et al. 2014), fail to acknowledge the experiences of non-binary conceptualizations of transgender experience. Research has begun to acknowledge non-binary transgender identities and have found some differences between the experiences of binary and non-binary transgender individuals (e.g. Factor & Rothblum, 2008). Despite the research that suggests that genderqueer is the most commonly endorsed gender identity among an online and non-clinical sample of transgender individuals (Kuper, Nussbaum, & Mustanski, 2012) gender identity research has not provided clarity in how non-binary transgender individuals conceptualize their gender identity.

The Present Study

The present research investigates gender identity among non-binary transgender individuals by analyzing the gender identity labels they choose and the descriptions they provide for gender identity. By centering on the lived experiences of non-binary individuals, our thematic analysis focuses on identifying the aspects most salient to their gender identity. We include a diverse non-clinical sample including transgender individuals who primarily identify as gender variant or agender.

Method

Participant Demographics and Recruitment Strategy

Participants were 197 adults who self-identified as either gender variant or agender. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 70 ($M = 29.51$, $SD = 11.00$). The majority (73.6%) of participants resided in the U.S. and represented all 50 United States and Washington, DC. Countries that were represented outside of the United States included Canada, Australia, the United Kingdom, New Zealand, Costa Rica, and Norway, among others. Table 1 includes participant demographics with regard to racial/ethnic diversity, highest level of education, socioeconomic status, and sexual orientation. There was limited racial/ethnic diversity within the sample, with 70.1% identifying as White/Caucasian and 19.8% of participants identifying as a racial/ethnic minority and 10.1% providing no answer.

Recruitment announcements, including a link to the online survey, were posted to social media sites, online message boards, and emailed via transgender and gender variant listservs. Some of these resources were geared toward specific sexual minority communities, while others served the transgender community more generally. Participants heard about the study primarily through online means, including Facebook (82.2%) Tumblr (2.43%), research oriented websites/message boards (7.0%), and receiving a forwarded email from an acquaintance or listserv (3.9%).

Measures and Procedure

The present study focused on information obtained from a demographic section of a larger online study investigating gender identity and the experiences of transgender individuals. A structured gender identity question was presented to participants where they chose their

primary gender identity from discrete options: trans-masculine, trans-feminine, gender variant, and agender. The present analysis focuses exclusively on those who chose ‘gender variant’ or ‘agender’ as their primary identity category. We analyze the gender identity labels participants’ use and their answers to an open ended question about how they define their gender identity.

Data Analysis

Thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) was used to characterize the way participants described their gender identity. Our research team includes a professor of psychology who self-identifies as a bi/pansexual cisgender woman (first author), a clinical psychology graduate student who identifies as lesbian/queer genderfluid woman (second author), and a clinical psychology graduate student who identifies as a heterosexual cisgender woman (third author).

Analysis began with the second and third author independently coding data looking for themes related to each category of possible gender identity themes. The research team met and discussed the coding categories and agreed upon an initial set of codes. The second and third author then coded and sorted the data set using the initial set of codes and provided the first author (who served as external auditor) with a list of themes and sorted quotes based on theme. The entire research team agreed upon the coding structure and met several additional times to discuss and solidify which quotes would fit under each theme. Final quotes were chosen to simultaneously exemplify each theme and to ensure that the range of illustrative quotes best represented the diversity of gender non-conforming identities endorsed by the sample.

Two were included in our data analysis process in order to increase the credibility of our results. First, at the end of the survey we provided participants with the opportunity to reflect upon how our questions captured (and failed to capture) their individual experiences. Participants were also asked to provide feedback to improve the present and future studies. Some of those

responses obtained informed our analysis and provided a context for our analysis. Second, throughout the data analysis process we discussed the themes and made decisions via consensus. Because of the range of our collective experiences across sexual orientation, gender identity, gender presentation, and relationship experiences we came to these discussions with different perspectives.

Results and Discussion

Our analysis focuses on participants' answers to two questions. The first question allowed participants to write in the label or labels that they endorsed for their own gender identity. The second was an open-ended question in which participants were asked to describe their gender identity.

Gender Identity Labels

Participants self-identified with a range of gender identity labels. This data was self-generated, and participants were allowed to describe their gender identity in a way that felt authentic to themselves. A percentage of gender variant (20.9%) and agender (25.0%) participants endorsed multiple labels when providing their write in gender identity. For example, one participant responded, *"I use the words genderqueer, gender fluid, trans, transgender, gender non-conforming, and occasionally transmasculine to refer to myself."* (genderqueer)

Table 2 provides the frequency of labels endorsed by participants across gender identity (gender variant and agender). Labels fell into 5 primary categories: 1) gender labels using **binary** terms (e.g. woman, man, masculine, femme); 2) gender labels using **non-binary** terms (e.g. androgynous, non-binary, pangender); 3) gender labels using **fluid** terms (e.g. fluid, gender variant, genderfluid); 4) gender labels using **agender** terms (e.g. genderless, agender, non-gendered); and 5) gender labels using **trans** terms (e.g. trans, transgender, transmasculine). It is

important to note that although both gender variant and agender participants use labels that fall into all five of these categories, there are unique patterns of usage across gender identity. For example, 58.1% of gender variant as opposed to 33.8% of agender individuals used non-binary labels while 3.9% gender variant and 76.5% agender individuals used agender labels. Because there are clear patterns in the way gender variant and agender individuals use gender labels, in the remaining analyses we include direct quotes from the participants accompanied by their self-identified labels as context for understanding their varying perspectives.

Descriptions of Gender Identity

Beyond analyzing the use of gender identity labels, in an open ended question we asked participants to describe their gender. Six major themes emerged in participants' descriptions of their gender identity: 1) Gender identity using binary terms of gender/sex; 2) Gender as blended; 3) Gender identity as fluid; 4) Gender identity as non-binary; 5) Transgender as gender identity; and 6) Agender conceptualizations. These themes are not meant to be mutually exclusive and most participants' responses exemplified more than one of the themes.

“Some days male, some days female”: Gender Identity Using Binary Terms of Gender/Sex

When describing their gender identity, our participants often described their nontraditional gender by employing traditional binary gender terms (e.g. male, female). For example, participants used the terms “male” and “female” to ultimately describe how their gender is not fully contained by either:

“Half male and half female, without being fully one or the other.”

(genderqueer/genderfluid)

“Not comfortably fitting into male or female” (agender)

Sometimes gender was discussed with the binary terms of female and male, other participants used feminine and masculine in similar ways:

“Shifting between masculine, feminine, androgynous” (genderfluid)

“I identify as a somewhat masculine individual whose (ongoing) history of being treated as a woman has become so important to my experiences and identity that I don’t feel comfortable holding an identity as a man.” (nonbinary)

Although participants used binary terms in their descriptions of gender, they were often describing the ways that being confined to one of these terms does not capture their experience of gender:

“I find it easier to identify my gender by what it is not rather than what it is. My gender is not male nor female so the traditional gender binary fails me. As such genderqueer seems like the most accurate label for me.” (genderqueer agender)

“A variable mix of both”: Gender Identity as Blended

Another predominant theme was seen in the way that some participants described their gender identity as a blend or mix of maleness/femaleness or of masculinity/femininity. These descriptions resonate with the conceptualization of gender identity being “both” male/female.

“A blend of male and female characteristics.” (androgynous, agender)

“I describe myself as somewhere in between male and female, or mixing male and

female” (“androgynous,” I also use the terms “transgender, nonbinary, and genderqueer)

*“I am someone who is neither man nor woman but something else entirely I am a fabulous mix of feminine and masculine. I currently see myself as a femme boi.”
(genderqueer)*

Although participants used binary terms to describe their gender, those illustrating the theme of blended did so by seeing their gender as a mix, blend, or combination.

***“Like a constantly flowing river”*: Gender Identity as Fluid**

Central to some participants’ descriptions of their gender was the notion of change. Many non-binary participants’ responses described their gender in fluid or flexible terms.

“I have a gender that is ‘fluid’, that shifts and changes like a constantly flowing river. I am never ‘just one’ gender as my identity is constantly changing.” (genderfluid under the nonbinary umbrella)

“I see myself as a fluid individual who experiences attributes that are feminine or masculine. These feelings cannot be defined by my sex” (genderqueer)

Analogous to the way sexual fluidity has been described (Diamond, 2003; 2008; Fahs, 2009; Galupo, Mitchell, Gryniewicz & Davis., 2014; Mock & Eibach, 2012; Zinik, 1985) participants typically described gender fluidity by referencing changes in their gender identity and expression across time and context.

“My gender feelings/presentation change consistently” (genderfluid)

“I flow all around the spectrum at any given point” (genderfluid)

“My gender changes on a day to day basis.” (genderfluid)

“I slosh about between male, female, neither, and both.” (genderfluid)

Although traditional definitions of gender identity emphasize that it is an individual’s internal sense of their gender as male, female, both, or neither (Tate, 2014; Tate, Youssef, & Bettergarcia, 2014), many of our participants describe their gender in ways that do not neatly reside within just one of those options.

“My gender changes. Sometimes I am female, sometimes I am a boy, sometimes I am both, and sometimes I am neither.” (genderfluid)

“Sometimes I feel like I am completely a man. Sometimes I feel like I am mostly a man, with some woman/agender mixed in” (demiguy).

“I can switch in between a variety of genders (man, woman, androgyne, agender, third gender, polygender, etc.) day by day.” (genderfluid)

“Gender Flexible, I feel both masculine and femmie to varying degrees. Sometimes multiple days will swing towards masculine or feminine energies. I notice my voice, mannerisms, thoughts and desires shift between the two. Although I have spent the past

two years female full time, I am now rediscovering my male side with a new found respect and love.” (genderqueer)

For those participants who described their gender identity in fluid ways it is clear that change is central to their experience of gender, as noted in their chosen identity labels and descriptions: “*Flexible*” (queer femme), “*Gender fluid*” (gender fluid), “*Fluid*” (genderqueer). This is consistent with the high number of participants who used gender fluid or fluid as their gender identity label (Table 2).

“*Somewhere beyond rather than between*”: Gender Identity as Non-binary

Another theme that was pervasive in participants’ narratives was that their gender identity, in essence, was non-binary. A rejection of binary terms and the traditional binary conceptualization of gender was central to their descriptions.

“I don’t conform to the gender binary” (agender)

“I am beyond the binary genders and do not identify as either female or male.”
(genderqueer/non binary)

The endorsement of non-binary gender identity was often accompanied by a need to find new and alternative descriptors for their identity because binary terms were not enough to capture their conceptualization:

“having a different or alternative gender that does not fit into the binary” (genderqueer)

“I identify as both nonbinary and trans because of the nature of having an identity that cannot easily be described by combining concepts related to “man” and “woman.”

Because I am somewhere beyond rather than between these concepts I am continually having to define myself as both trans and nonbinary in order to come close to having my gender viewed in a way that feels authentic to me. Other terms that are sometimes useful to describe my gender are queer and fluid.” (nonbinary trans person)

This need for adopting multiple gender labels parallels previous research on sexual minority individuals’ sexual identity labels, where those with the most marginalized / non-normative identities used multiple labels and provided more descriptions when referring to their sexuality (Galupo, Mitchell, & Davis, 2015).

“*Being a trans* guy is still a significant part of my identity*”: Transgender as Gender Identity

Some non-binary transgender individuals described the ways they used transgender as a gender identity label that was meaningful to their experience. For example, two participants endorsed trans along with a traditional binary labels: “*I am trans and male*” and “*Female with a trans history.*” Other participants expanded on their use of transgender or trans as an identity.

“I identify as both nonbinary and trans because of the nature of having an identity that cannot easily be described by combining concepts related to “man” and “woman.”

Because I am somewhere beyond rather than between these concepts I am continually having to define myself as both trans and nonbinary in order to come close to having my gender viewed in a way that feels authentic to me. Other terms that are sometimes useful to describe my gender are queer and fluid.” (nonbinary trans person)

“I don't identify within the gender binary. I mostly identify as genderqueer, which to me means I'm not a boy or a girl but some mix of the two, with other stuff thrown in.

However, I identified as a trans man for a few years and took T during that time, so I feel being a trans guy is still a significant part of my identity for now.” (genderqueer trans* guy)*

***“My identity is not modified by gender”:* Agender Conceptualizations**

Many participants described their gender identity using agender terms, where they were genderless, gender neutral, non-gendered, for example. Their descriptors spoke to the way that their identity was not bound by gender.

“In the end I feel that categorization by gender is absurd and my identity is not modified by gender. Hence non-gendered or agender.” (genderqueer/non-gendered/gender non-conforming)

“I feel mostly genderless but occasionally I feel closer to female, and I feel like I fit in between female and agender.” (bigender)

“neutral dress. neutral pronouns. neutral appearance. no makeup.” (agender)

“I'm neutrois and gender-fluid. My gender identity itself doesn't "flow" but my gender presentation does. I flow between femme and androgynous but even when I present as more femme I don't identify as female/a woman. When I'm at work I use he/his pronouns and present as a guy; outside of work that varies wildly day to day. My gender identity is

basically that of a shapeshifting being.”

“I do not have an internal gender. It is not androgynous; it is not fluid; it is non-existent.” (agender)

“I don't feel connected to femininity or masculinity respectively. I don't attach gender to things I do or understand why people do. I think of myself as a person not a "woman" or "man." (agender).

“If there are two axes on a graph, one for how female a person feels, and another for how male they feel, I am very close to the coordinate (0, 0). (agender)

Conclusions

The present research focuses on understanding the conceptualization of gender identity among non-binary transgender individuals by exploring the gender identity labels they choose and the descriptions they provide for their identity. By centering on non-binary transgender experience, the present research allows a conceptualization of gender identity outside of the traditional research frameworks that constrain transgender experience, and inherently define transgender experience (and gender identity more generally) in binary terms.

Our participants represented a convenience sample collected online. Although online sampling is useful for transgender research where privacy and access issues are unique from the general population (Riggle, Rostosky, & Reedy, 2005), online samples have been shown to disproportionately represent educated, middle class, White individuals (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2008). Because our sample demographics reflect this trend, interpretation of our

findings should be done within the noted demographics. In addition, we recruited participants who identify as transgender, transsexual, gender variant, or having a transgender history, which we used as a broad terms intended to encompass many different gender identities. Because our recruitment strategy emphasized recruitment through transgender community resources, individuals who see their transgender experience as more of a history or status may be under represented within our sample. In particular, because many non-binary transgender individuals encounter microaggressions from within the transgender community regarding whether they are *really* transgender (Galupo, Henise & Davis, 2014), non-binary individuals may feel distanced from the community and our recruitment efforts may not have reached these potential participants.

Despite the limitations of recruitment, we received a geographically diverse sample with representation across gender identities. The present research extends the current transgender literature by centering on individuals who identify as gender variant and agender. However, we did not specifically address comparisons or the potential overlap with individuals across the entire range of transgender identities. For example, many transwomen or transmen may also endorse non-binary or agender labels. Future research is needed, then, to consider patterns of responses across gender identity.

The present findings do offer some suggestions for reconsidering the way we conceptualize gender identity. Participants described their gender identity in ways that both reflected and challenged research frameworks for understanding transgender experience. Recent definitions of gender identity that are transgender inclusive emphasize that it is an individual's internal sense of their gender as male, female, both, or neither (Tate, 2014; Tate, Youssef, & Bettergarcia, 2014). Although it appears that non-binary transgender individuals would fall in the

“both” or “neither” categories, our participants’ responses suggest that their conceptualization of gender identity is more complicated than these two simple categories. In particular, the terms “both” and “neither” still convey binary gender options and fail to capture all the ways that non-binary individuals conceptualize their identity.

Our participants’ descriptions of gender were captured across six distinct themes (binary, blended, fluid, non-binary, transgender, agender). Participants describing their gender identity in *blended terms* were the most aligned with the conceptualization of gender identity as being “both” male and female, while those describing their gender identity in *agender terms* were the most aligned with “neither” male nor female. Participant responses that fell into the remaining categories are not quite captured in conceptualizations of gender identity in the existing literature and may provide insight into additional conceptualizations of gender identity that cannot be neatly described as “male,” “female,” “both,” or “neither.” Although sometimes participants did use *binary terms* (male/female or masculine/feminine) to describe their gender identity, they did so to convey the ways that these terms, even combined, did not quite capture their identity. Similarly some participants explicitly used *non-binary terminology* to convey that their identity did not reside anywhere on a continuum between male and female. Participants also described their gender in *fluid terms* where the central characterization of their gender identity rested in flexibility and change (across time and context). Additionally, because their gender identity could not be captured in binary terms, participants often used *transgender terms* as a way to describe their identity.

The findings from the present research overall suggest that our participants’ gender identity could not be discretely conceptualized as “male” “female” “neither” or “both.” This was demonstrated in the way many of their descriptions failed to map onto one of these four

traditional options when describing gender identity and in the way that many participants endorsed multiple labels when naming their gender identity. This need for adopting multiple gender labels and multiple descriptors parallels previous research on sexual minority individuals' sexual identity labels, where those with the most marginalized / non-normative identities used multiple labels and provided more descriptions when referring to their sexuality (Galupo, Mitchell, & Davis, 2015). Non-binary participants demonstrated flexibility both in the way that they used gender terminology and in the way that they described their own gender identity in fluid / flexible terms. These findings have important implications for transgender researchers, as they suggests a need to expand the understanding of gender identity in ways that better reflects the range of experience of transgender individuals. Ultimately, this research suggests a need for broader and more flexible definitions of gender identity.

References

- Alexander, J., & Yescavage, K. (2003). Bisexuality and transgenderism. *Journal of Bisexuality*, 3(3-4), 1-23. doi: 10.1300/J159v03n03_01
- American Psychiatric Association. (1980). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.
- Benjamin, H. (1966). *The transsexual phenomenon*. New York: Julian Press.
- Blanchard, R. (1989a). The concept of autogynephilia and the typology of male gender dysphoria. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 177, 616-623. Retrieved from: http://journals.lww.com/jonmd/Abstract/1989/10000/The_Concept_of_Autogynephilia_and_the_Typology_of.4.aspx
- Blanchard, R. (1989b). The classification and labeling of nonhomosexual gender dysphorias. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 18, 315-324. doi: 10.1007/BF01541951
- Bockting, W. O. & Coleman, E. (1991). A comment on the concept of transhomosexuality, or the dissociation of the meaning. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 20(4), 419-421.
- Breslow, A. S., Brewster, M. E., Velez, B. L., Wong, S., Geiger, E. & Soderstrom, B. (2015). Resilience and collective action: Exploring buffers against minority stress for transgender individuals *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, 2(3), 253-265. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000117>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77-101. doi: 10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

- Budge, S. L., Rossman, H. K., & Howard, K. A. S. (2014). Coping and psychological distress among genderqueer individuals: The moderating effect of social support. *Journal of LGBT Issues in Counseling*, 8(1), 95-117, doi: 10.1080/15538605.2014.853641
- Clarke, V., Hayfield, N., & Huxley, C. (2012). Lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans appearance and embodiment: A critical review of the psychological literature. *Psychology of Sexualities Review*, 3(1), 51-70. ISSN 2047-1467 Available from: <http://eprints.uwe.ac.uk/17812>
- Devor, H. (1993). Sexual orientation identities, attractions, and practices of female-to-male transsexuals. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 30(4), 303-315.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3813004>
- Diamond, L. M. (2003). Was it a phase? Young women's relinquishment of lesbian/bisexual identities over a 5-year period. *Developmental Psychology*, 36, 241-250.
- Diamond, L. M. (2008). *Sexual fluidity: Understanding women's love and desire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Dillman, D., Smyth, J., & Christian, L. M. (2008). *Internet, Mail, and Mixed-Mode Surveys: The tailored design method*. New York: Wiley
- Drescher, J. (2010). Queer diagnoses: Parallels and contrasts in the history of homosexuality, gender variance, and the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual*. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 39, 427-460. doi: 10.1007/s10508-009-9531-5
- Egan, S. K., & Perry, D. G. (2001). Gender identity: A multidimensional analysis with implications for psychosocial adjustment. *Developmental Psychology*, 37(4), 451-463. doi: 10.1037//0012-1649.37.4.451
- Factor, R. J. & Rothblum, E. D. (2008). Exploring gender identity and community among three groups of transgender individuals in the United States: MTFs, FTMs, and genderqueers.

Health Sociology Review, 17, 241-159.

Fahs, B. (2009). Compulsory Bisexuality?: The challenges of modern sexual fluidity. *Journal of Bisexuality*, 9, 431-449. doi: 10.1080/15299710903316661

Farmer, L. B. & Byrd, R. (2015). Genderism in the LGBTQQIA Community: An interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Journal of LGBT Issues in Counseling*, doi: 10.1080/15538605.2015.1103679

Fassinger, R. E. & Arseneau, J. R.(2007). 'I'd rather get wet than be under the umbrella': Differentiating the experiences and identities of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people. In K. J. Biesche, R. M. Perez, & K. A. DeBord (Eds.), *Handbook of Counseling and Psychotherapy with Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Clients* (pp.19-49). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Galupo, M. P., Davis, K. S., Grynkiewicz, A. L., & Mitchell, R. C. (2014). Conceptualization of sexual orientation identity among sexual minorities: Patterns across sexual and gender identity. *Journal of Bisexuality*, 14, 433-456. doi. 10.1080/15299716.2014.933466

Galupo, M. P., Henise, S. B., & Davis, K. D. (2014). Transgender microaggressions in the context of friendship: Patterns of experience across friends' sexual orientation and gender identity. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, 1(4), 461-470.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000075>

Galupo, M. P., Mitchell, R. C., & Davis, K. S. (2015). Sexual minority self-identification: Multiple identities and complexity. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, 2(4), 355-364. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000131>

Galupo, M. P., Mitchell, R. C., Grynkiewicz, A. L., & Davis, K. S. (2014). Sexual minority reflections on the Kinsey Scale and the Klein Sexual Orientation Grid: Conceptualization

- and Measurement. *Journal of Bisexuality*, 14, 404-432. doi:
10.1080/15299716.2014.929553
- Harrison, J., Grant, J., & Herman, J. L. (2012). A gender not listed here: genderqueers, gender
revels, and otherwise in the National Transgender Discrimination Survey. *LGBTQ Policy
Journal at the Harvard Kennedy School*, 2, 13-24. UCLA: The Williams Institute.
Retrieved from: <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/2zj46213>
- Kuper, L. E., Nussbaum, R., & Mustanski, B. (2012). Exploring the diversity of gender and
sexual orientation identities in an online sample of transgender individuals. *Journal of
Sex Research*, 49, 244-254. doi: 10.1080/00224499.2011.596954
- Mock, S. E., & Eibach, R. P. (2012). Stability and change in sexual orientation identity over a
10-year period in adulthood. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 41(3), 641-648. doi:
10.1007/s10508-011-9761-1
- Meyer, I. H. (2015). Resilience in the study of minority stress and health of sexual and gender
minorities. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, 2(3), 209-213.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000132>
- Riggle, E. D. B., Rostosky, S. S., & Reedy, C. S. (2005). Online surveys for BGLT research.
Journal of Homosexuality, 49, 1-21. doi: 10.1300/J082v49n01-01
- Saltzburg, S. & Davis, T. S. (2010). Co-authoring gender-queer youth identities: Discursive
tellings and retellings. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Diversity in Social Work*, 19(2),
87-108. doi: 10.1080/15313200903124028
- Serano, J. M. (2010). The case against autogynephilia, *International Journal of Transgenderism*,
12(3): 176-187. doi: 10.1080/15532739.2010.514223
- Tate, C. C. (2014). Gender identity as a personality process. In B. L. Miller (Ed.), *Gender*

- identity: Disorders, developmental perspectives, and social implications.* (pp. 1-22).
Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers.
- Tate, C. C., Ledbetter, J. N. & Youssef, C. P. (2013). The two-question method for assessing gender categories in the social and medical sciences. *Journal of Sex Research, 50*(8), 767-776. doi: 10.1080/00224499.2012.690110
- Tate, C. C., Youssef, C. P., & Bettergarcia, J. N. (2014). Integrating the study of transgender spectrum and cisgender experiences of self-categorization from a personality perspective. *Review of General Psychology, 18*(4), 302-312. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/gpr0000019>
- van Anders, S. M. (2014). Newborn bio/logics and US legal requirements for changing gender/sex designations on state identity documents. *Feminism & Psychology, 24*(2), 172-192. doi: 10.1177/0959353514526222
- van Anders, S. M. (2015). Beyond sexual orientation: Integrating gender/sex and diverse sexualities in Sexual Configurations Theory. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. Advanced online publication. doi: 10.1007/s10508-015-0490-8
- Veale, J. F., Clarke, D. E., & Lomax, T. C. (2012). Male-to-female transsexuals' impressions of Blanchard's autogynephilia theory. *International Journal of Transgenderism, 13*, 113-139. doi: 10.1080/15532739.2011.669659
- Zinik, G. (1985). Identity conflict of adaptive flexibility? Bisexuality reconsidered. *Journal of Homosexuality, 11*, 7-20. doi: 10.1300/J082v11n01_02

Table 1: Participant Demographics

	%
Gender Identity	
Gender Variant	65.5
Agender	34.5
Sex Assigned at Birth	
Female	71.6
Male	24.9
Intersex	3.0
No Answer	0.5
Sexual Orientation	
Queer	26.6
Pansexual	15.9
Heterosexual	17.9
Bisexual	14.0
Lesbian	8.7
Gay	3.9
Asexual	3.9
Fluid	1.9
Other	7.2
Race/Ethnic Identity	
White/Caucasian	70.1
Bi/Multiracial	7.6
Hispanic/Latino	6.1
Asian/Asian American	2.5
American Indian / Alaska Native	0.5
Black/African American	0.5
Other	1.9
No Answer	10.1
Education	
Did not complete High School or GED	2.5
High School	41.2
College	29.4
Graduate School	16.8
Socioeconomic Status	
Working Class	28.9
Lower Middle Class	22.3
Middle Class	25.4
Upper Middle Class	8.6
Upper Class	2.0

Table 2: Frequency of Gender Identity Labels by Group

Self-Identification	Gender Variant % (n)	Agender % (n)
Binary	16.3 (21)	4.4 (3)
Butch	(1)	-
Female/Woman	(10)	(1)
Femme	(2)	(1)
Feminine Male	(2)	-
Male/Man	(6)	(1)
Non-Binary	58.1 (75)	33.8 (23)
Androgynous	(2)	-
Androgyne	(4)	(1)
Ambigender	(1)	-
Bigender	(6)	-
Demigirl	(1)	(1)
Genderqueer	(37)	(13)
Non-Binary	(19)	(8)
Non-conforming	(3)	-
Pangender	(1)	-
Third gender	(1)	-
Fluid	27.9 (36)	4.4 (3)
Fluid	(2)	-
Genderfluid	(32)	(2)
Gender variant	(2)	(1)
Agender	3.9 (5)	76.5 (52)
Agender	(2)	(38)
Genderless	-	(4)
Neutral	(1)	(6)
Neutrois	(2)	(4)
Non-gendered	-	-
Trans Identities	10.8 (14)	11.8 (8)
FTM	(1)	(1)
Trans	(4)	(2)
Trans boi	(1)	-
Transfemale	(1)	-
Transgender	(3)	-
Trans guy	(1)	-
Transmale/Transman	(2)	(1)
Transmasculine	-	(4)
Transsexual	(1)	-
TOTAL (N)³	(129)	(68)

*Column data includes the *Percentage* of participants endorsing an identity based on *n*; column totals exceed 100% as many participants (20.9% of gender variant; 25.0% agender) endorsed multiple identity labels.