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Introduction

- The Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer (LGBTQ) community reports a higher prevalence of mental health problems than the heterosexual population (Meyer, 2003).
- The minority stress model states that this higher frequency of mental disorders exists due to alienation and isolation from social structures and institutions. It predicts that isolation is instigated by the individual's identification as a minority.
- Members of the LGBTQ community have historically been ostracized from various social groups, and this victimization has been associated with multiple functional impairments (Lick, Durso & Johnson, 2013).
- Social support and social connectedness have been identified as tools to reduce stress, and can encourage social and psychological well-being.
- People with low connectedness have been found to report higher levels of loneliness, anxiety, and depression, and lower self-esteem (Baumeister & Leary, 1995).

Research shows insufficient institutional policies, structural opportunities, and interpersonal relationships can be tied to negative outcomes. However, there has been no research to assess how these factors might directly influence social connectedness. Differences in social connectedness might then alter the experience of minority stress.

Our research hypothesis is that sociocultural factors such as institutional policies, structural opportunities, and interpersonal relationships influence the development of social connectedness, which may mitigate the negative outcomes that originate from minority stress (Fig. 1).

Methods

Participants

A sample of 213 individuals who identify as LGBTQ between the ages of 18 and 24 were recruited via a Qualtrics participant panel; 28% gay/lesbian, 60% bisexual, 12% queer/questioning/other. The sample included 54% women, 37% men, 9% unspecified, and 1% other sex assignments.

Survey

Participants were asked to complete a survey that assessed:
- Sociocultural factors: Institutional policies, Structural opportunities, Interpersonal relationships
- Social connectedness
- Minority stress: Social stigma, Marginalization
- Demographic Information: Age, gender, sexual orientation, state or territory of residence, ethnicity, religious affiliation, current year in college, and socioeconomic status
- GSA Participation and Teacher/Staff Support: Participation in a GSA at the high school or college campus attended, and experiences of support from teachers or staff
- Social Connectedness Scale (Revised) (Lee, Draper, & Sujin, 2001): Social connectedness

Results

Dependent variable: Identity affirmation (IA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GSA involvement (high school) &gt; IA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA involvement (high school) &gt; IA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA involvement (high school) &gt; IA</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.0173</td>
<td>5.806</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA involvement (high school) &gt; IA</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.0173</td>
<td>1.694</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA involvement (college) &gt; IA</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.0173</td>
<td>6.746</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA involvement (college) &gt; IA</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.0173</td>
<td>1.884</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social connectedness &gt; IA</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.0163</td>
<td>9.029</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions

Significant direct effects were found for the following:
- GSA involvement in high school on identity affirmation
- GSA involvement in college on identity affirmation
- Social connectedness on identity affirmation
- GSA involvement in college on social connectedness
- GSA supportive staff in college on identity affirmation

Social connectedness was found to be a mediating factor between GSA involvement and identity affirmation in college.
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