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Abstract

Participating in queer sports groups, rainbow choirs, trans virtual discussion groups and other Two-Spirit, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and other sexually and gender diverse (2SLGBTQ+) leisure activities can offer participants safety from societal heterosexism and cisgenderism and opportunities for community connection and peer support, as well as foster their overall wellbeing. Yet, transgender/gender nonconforming (TGNC), racialized, and/or disabled individuals, and those with other diverse identities are often marginalized in these spaces. Though researchers have studied exclusion within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, relatively little is known about how the climate of these spaces shapes social and mental health outcomes. Connected to this gap, little is known about risk factors for facing negative climates, resilience-promoting factors, and different resilience and resistance processes. To ensure that all participants benefit from engaging in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, it is important to address these issues to strengthen the empirical basis informing interventions to enhance 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces and promote positive outcomes among their participants.

Guided by a multi-faceted theoretical framework consisting of minority stress theory, resilience, intersectionality, the socioecological framework, and whiteness theory, and using mixed methods (quantitative survey; qualitative interviews), I address these gaps through my dissertation via three manuscripts, each with a different type of analysis. Drawing on survey data in manuscript 1, I examined the relationship between experiencing intersectional discrimination and social and mental wellbeing, finding that social belonging mediated the discrimination-mental health relationship, which was moderated by antidiscrimination policies and inclusive leadership practice. I also found that disability and its interaction with gender were risk factors for discrimination. In manuscript 2, the first of two mixed methods studies, focusing on climate and social
belonging, I quantitatively identified contentious, ambivalent, and welcoming climate profiles across experiential and psychological climate indicators and found lowest belonging in the contentious climate profile, moderate belonging in the ambivalent climate profile, and highest belonging in the welcoming climate profile. Additionally, I qualitatively uncovered processes underlying the climate-belonging relationship, such as dismissive attitudes toward marginalization among members within leisure spaces characterized by negative climates. In manuscript 3, addressing climate and mental health, I found that a more hostile experiential climate was associated with greater psychological distress, while a more inclusive psychological climate was associated with greater positive mental health. Furthermore, 2SLGBTQ+ pride, resilient coping, and social support from friends promotes mental health, but did not moderate the relationship between climate and mental health. Qualitatively, individuals engaged in resistance strategies to process and cope with negative climates through acts such as “passing” behaviours, intervening, and finding new leisure spaces.

The findings have implications for social workers and allied professionals. Micro-practice interventions should include engaging in competent inclusive practices with diverse clients, such as recognizing intersectionality and the associated complexities. Organizational and policy interventions should include identifying and implementing strategies that address systems of oppression and homonormativity in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, such as training to prevent and intervene on discrimination. Moreover, my research offers implications for studying minority stressors, climate, resilience, and intersectionality, such as the value of using mixed methods and examining both experiential and psychological climate. Addressing the of climate of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces and its implications for diverse individuals is pertinent to ensuring that all participants benefit from engaging in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

As I walk along the deck holding my partner’s hand, I feel relaxed and calm, which I rarely feel when holding my partner’s hand in public spaces. We approach the bow of the ship; I turn to kiss him. We do not often kiss in public because I do not often feel comfortable doing so; it frightens me. This is the first time I have felt comfortable with my identity as a gay man. We are on a gay cruise sailing through the Caribbean Sea, having the time of our lives—being who we truly are!

As an Asian, gay cisgender man, I have been in a variety of 2SLGBTQ+ (Two-Spirit, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and other sexually and gender diverse)1 leisure spaces, some where I have felt welcomed, and others where I have been excluded. These embodied experiences as an Asian gay cisgender man bring me to my research, while my epistemology has shaped my approach to research, including using mixed methods (quantitative-qualitative) to understand the climate of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces and its impact on belonging and mental health—the focus of my dissertation research. This dissertation reports on findings across three manuscripts, namely “A Quantitative Examination of Intersectional Discrimination, Wellbeing, and Resilience among Diverse 2SLGBTQ+ People within 2SLGBTQ+ Leisure Spaces” (henceforth referred to as “Examining Intersectional Discrimination and Wellbeing”), “Policing Belongingness within 2SLGBTQ+ Leisure Spaces” (henceforth referred to as “Policing Belongingness”), and “Understanding Resilience and Wellbeing among 2SLGBTQ+ People in 2SLGBTQ+ Leisure Spaces” (henceforth referred to as “Understanding Resilience and Wellbeing”).

This chapter introduces the reader to the dissertation project. I begin by briefly describing the study design, purpose, and structure. Thereafter, consistent with my

---

1 I placed Two-Spirit at the start of the acronym to reflect my commitment to decolonization and Indigenization in centering of Indigenous peoples’ experiences. While the acronym 2SLGBTQ+ is intended to be inclusive of all sexual and gender minorities (hence the +), it is not my intention to minimize the experiences and differences of individual groups.
emphasis on reflexivity, I centre myself within the project and outline my epistemology. Next, I locate the overall study within the literature, which is further detailed in each respective manuscript. I then describe my theoretical framework, specifically outlining the original one that I developed during my comprehensive examination, which guided the study and describe how it changed in the dissertation process. Finally, I identify the contributions my dissertation makes to the field of social work, which I build on in the final chapter which culminates with a discussion of the findings across all three manuscripts and the implications of these findings for social work theory, research, and practice, as well as allied fields, including leisure studies, public health, and psychology.

**Study Design, Purpose, and Structure**

The overall purpose of this dissertation is to examine the climate of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces and its implications for social wellbeing and mental health, as well as to explore factors that shape the climate and promote resilience to a negative climate. To develop a comprehensive understanding of the climate of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, I used a mixed methods design. First, I used an online survey ($N = 548$) to gather quantitative data to provide insight from a large sample recruited of 2SLGBTQ+ people from Canada and the United States to investigate the relationships between climate, social and mental health outcomes, and resilience-promoting factors. Then, I conducted individual interviews ($N = 22$) with participants from the survey sample to gather qualitative data to offer a deeper understanding of the nature of the climate of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces and the factors underpinning both hostile and welcoming climates for diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people. The qualitative component also helped to uncover the strategies that individuals employ or recommend in managing or coping with the negative climate that they directly or indirectly face in some 2SLGBTQ+
leisure spaces. Given the state of the literature, this study is primarily exploratory in nature.

I organized my dissertation into three separate manuscripts, each with their own objectives, background information, methods, results, and discussion. In “Examining Intersectional Discrimination,” which drew only on the survey data, I aimed to: (1) examine the relationship between intersectional discrimination, social wellbeing, and mental health, including social wellbeing as a mediator of the discrimination-mental health pathway; (2) identify identity risk factors (i.e., gender, race, and disability) to experiencing intersectional discrimination; and (3) identify factors that can promote resilience to discrimination (i.e., acts of resistance, social support from friends, organizational antidiscrimination policies, and inclusive leadership practices).

In “Policing Belongingness,” which utilized both quantitative and qualitative data, I sought to quantitatively (1) determine profiles of climate for 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces accounting for experiential and psychological dimensions; (2) ascertain social identities (gender, sexuality, race, and disability), demographics (age and country of residence) and organizational (antidiscrimination policies, inclusive leadership practices) factors that are associated with membership in each profile; and (3) determine the relationship between the climate profiles and social outcomes (sense of belonging in the 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space, satisfaction with the 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space). As well, I aimed to qualitatively (1) describe perceptions of climate and discriminatory experiences within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces and how they relate to participants’ sense of belonging across the different climate profiles; and (2) explore the factors underpinning the different climate profiles and how they explain participants’ belonging in these spaces.
In “Understanding Resilience and Wellbeing,” which also engaged with the quantitative and qualitative data, I set out to: (1) examine the relationship between climate and mental health outcomes (psychological distress, positive mental health); (2) determine the factors (2SLGBTQ+ pride, resilient coping, social support from friends) that moderate the relationship between the climate and mental health outcomes; (3) explain how participants process and cope with a negative climate in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces; and (4) identify what resilience and resistance processes look like in those settings.

**Locating Myself in the Research**

In my daily life, I do not find myself feeling comfortable as a gay Asian man. I find I must maintain composure and not reveal too much of my ‘gay’ self. I feel unease often holding hands with my partner or kissing him publicly, even in downtown Toronto—a place that is supposedly very accepting. This discomfort is largely shaped by my fear of getting derisive gawks from onlookers, rude comments, or even physically attacked. This fear is not unfounded, as we have experienced disparaging comments that have led to tears with neither of us responding publicly, feeling helpless and angry at our helplessness. I often find myself feeling envious of heterosexual couples openly expressing their affection, while I could not feel safe doing so.

The cruise, mentioned above, hosted mostly gay-identified attendees and celebrated gay identity. My ‘gay’ existence and relationship felt natural on the cruise. I could feel safe and comfortable to hold my partner’s hand without any fears of negativity on the cruise. I have never experienced such a level of openness and inclusion, as I did on the cruise, demonstrating to me (and hopefully to the reader) the importance of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces. Also, the cruise was the first place where my intersection of Asian and gay received its first positive validation. I met many would-be
friends who I could identify with, particularly those with similar intersections of Asian and gay. It was wonderful to speak with people who understood the challenges of being marginalized. This included the challenges within our families (e.g., being ‘out’ to our families, pressures), as other researchers have documented (Leung, 2016), as well as the racism that exists within the gay community directed toward Asians (e.g., looked down upon, seen as ‘exotic’, boxed into certain labels), as other researchers have also described (Callander et al., 2015; Han et al., 2013; Jaspal, 2017). In the past, the sense of inferiority from the marginalization has resulted in feelings of not being good enough despite my physical, intellectual, or career accomplishments.

While my experiences demonstrate the value of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings, as my work and that of other scholars’ address, these spaces are also fraught with challenges, including overt and covert discrimination, especially for those who hold marginalized identities related to gender, race, and ability (to name a few). On the cruise, for example, some cruise participants and I witnessed and faced discrimination, including a hierarchy of attraction with Asian men ranked at the bottom and rejection based on racial background, where race contributed to negative experiences (Vo, 2020). Clearly, it is important to consider the complicated experiences that people with intersectional identities have in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings. That is, just because a space has been deemed “safe” does not necessarily mean that everyone will feel welcomed and other systems of oppression beyond heterosexism and transphobia can negatively impact the perceptions and experiences of climate within the leisure setting.

Throughout my adulthood, I have engaged with numerous 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces and activities. In some settings, such as the gay cruise described above, I felt welcomed as my whole self, while in other spaces, I faced discrimination for some parts of myself. Initially, I would perceive the climate of settings where I faced
discrimination to be inclusive of 2SLGBTQ+ people; that is, no matter what our sexual and gender identities are, we are all welcomed. The leaders of these spaces would remind members at the start of meetings that everyone is welcomed therein or include welcoming statements on websites or discussion boards. However, these messages of inclusivity tended to fall apart when it came to identities beyond sexuality, including race and disability. For example, as an Asian man, I experienced racism in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces. These experiences included being excluded from activities or discussions, fetishized, as well as being subjected to offensive comments masked by supposed compliments. I have encountered these blatant and subtle experiences of discrimination in various 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, such as a queer running group, bars and dance clubs, and community pride groups. These experiences caused me to perceive these particular spaces as unwelcoming or hostile for people like me (i.e., certain racialized\(^2\) members). Such experiences caused me to wonder what such spaces would be like for people who hold other marginalized identities, such as transgender and gender nonconforming (TGNC)\(^3\) people and disabled\(^4\) people.

\(^2\) Race is understood as the effect of racialization, which involves social processes that produce racialized bodies that become ‘othered’ (i.e., socially excluded) through colonial and oppressive histories (Ahmed, 2002). People become racialized through various processes including racial stereotypes and economies of attraction and rejection (Ahmed, 2002). Furthermore, racialization involves processes that differentiate between bodies that may belong or do not belong within specific spaces (Ahmed, 2002). This conceptualization of racialization is valuable for its connections to minority stress theory and intersectionality theory, both of which are part of my theoretical framework, particularly because of the relationships with power and oppression that this conceptualization and these theories centre. While there are nuances in terminology and definitions, racialized people and people of colour are used synonymously in this work, and encompass Black and Indigenous People (though the use of racialized people attempts to embody the historical colonialism and oppression that these two groups have experienced).

\(^3\) The use of TGNC is intended to be inclusive of people who identify as transgender, gender non-conforming, non-binary, and other gender diverse identities (beyond the gender binary). Transgender individuals’ gender identities do not align with their sex assigned at birth.

\(^4\) Disability is defined as a “long-term physical, mental, emotional, psychological, or learning disability, which may result in a person experiencing disadvantage or encountering barriers to employment, public appointment, or other opportunities for full participation in society” (Colour of Poverty-Colour of Change, 2019). While disabilities can be visible or invisible, the experience of disabilities is complex and may contribute to individuals’ exclusion from/in certain spaces.
Within these spaces—unwelcoming to my whole self—I have felt indignant and disappointed that I would be made to feel unsafe and an outsider in spaces where I am supposed to belong and be welcomed for who I am. These feelings of indignation and disappointment are related, in part, to the fact that there so few 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces to choose from for me as a racialized man, so I either continued visiting those venues and endured the negative climate, or I found other sites, 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive or not, or created my own to socialize with other 2SLGBTQ+ people. In racist spaces, I have felt a diminished sense of belonging (or felt excluded) that negatively affected my mental health. That is, I would anticipate negative messages directed at me, or I feel I did not have people with whom I could share experiences, and these stressors contributed to my diminished mental health (e.g., increased anxiety) because I had to remain vigilant of the potential incidents of microaggressions (i.e., keep my guard up). Ultimately, such negative experiences and perceptions of exclusion resulted in my search for, and participation in, spaces that celebrated and embraced my full self, such as groups for racialized gay men; specifically, Asian gay men. These unique settings offered opportunities for me to be (and commiserate) with other Asian gay and bisexual men, and thus I was not made to feel as though a part of myself—a particularly salient part of me—my race—was unwelcome. It was in inclusive intersectional settings where I truly felt as though I was benefiting from what 2SLGBTQ+ spaces have to offer me as an Asian, gay, cisgender man.

**Locating my Epistemology**

In addition to my lived experiences, my epistemology has shaped my research. My epistemology embraces a pragmatic lens that encompasses social justice. First, my pragmatic lens seeks to understand problems and the contexts within which they exist to facilitate practical changes in the real world (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). Thus, I
focus on the consequences of the research, as well as placing emphasis on proposing research questions that can inform practice and policy and illuminate issues of social justice. Within this paradigm, I believe in multiple perspectives (or realities) to support understanding of the world and the problem to be addressed. Second, while my pragmatic lens does not lend itself to the use of critical theories, which emphasize addressing injustices and influencing social change (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011; Denzin & Lincoln, 2018), I approach my research as an emancipatory or transformative project. I believe this can be accomplished using mixed methods, including informed by critical quantitative methodologies (Garcia et al., 2018; Strunk & Hoover, 2019) through the use of a quantitative survey to understand the magnitude of social inequities. Through my research, I explored issues of exclusion and marginalization and sought strategies that can be employed by social work and allied fields to advocate for change and shift the outcomes for often-marginalized groups. With few exceptions, my experiences and perceptions of the climate tend to mirror what is reported in the literature in terms of negative experiences. I proceeded to engage in this research with altruistic intentions—to expose the impact of climate on belonging and mental health, as well as find solutions that ensure all people are welcomed in and belong to 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings. I conducted my project hoping that my work will embody the recommendations of leisure scholars (Henderson, 2014; Johnson, 2014; Parry et al., 2013) who call for considerations of social justice within leisure studies. I believe that my project addresses this call, but I leave it to the reader to make their own assessment.

Practicing reflexivity throughout this project, I engaged in journaling as an opportunity to reflect on my experiences in conducting the study and to identify instances where my positionality might be impacting the research, as well as ensure I do not unintentionally cause harm to participants or perpetuate systems of oppression. I
also formed a research advisory committee comprised of nine diverse 2SLGBTQ+ individuals who had a range of lived experiences in different 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings. This group provided insights into my methodology and data collection tools, as well as helped to contextualize the findings through their experiences. Particularly in the early stages of the research, the reflexive practices and engagement with the research advisory committee helped me maintain curiosity and critical thinking in the face of positive and negative experiences reported by participants that I could relate to, given my experiences of both inclusion and exclusion in different 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings. Maintaining a stance of curious learner, I explored both positive and negative experiences and perceptions of climate throughout the study, and reframed interview questions to reflect participants’ different lived experiences, such as delving into both direct and indirect experiences of discrimination—I had initially not considered indirect discrimination in my own experiences and in the conceptual framework guiding my study. Indirect experiences of discrimination refer to ambient or observed discrimination, including interpersonal experiences (i.e., one person to another) or aspects within the environment (e.g., posters perpetuating systems of oppression). Reflexive practices were vital to my pragmatic research paradigm in being able to raise concerns for social justice and identify research strategies to address gaps in the literature.

**Locating the Study within the Literature**

Engaging in leisure activities, such as reading, making art, socializing with friends, and participating in sports, during one’s free time can enhance a person’s wellbeing and quality of life (Iwasaki, 2006; Kuykendall et al., 2015). Fostering positive wellbeing and quality of life is critical to the mission and values of social work, as is promoting social justice, equity, and inclusion (CASW, 2008). 2SLGBTQ+ people engage in
leisure activities, including ones specifically for 2SLGBTQ+ people, such as community-based rainbow centre programs, queer running groups, gay choirs, for-profit gay bars and dance clubs, as well as virtual groups, such as trans groups on Facebook and Reddit. Many 2SLGBTQ+ people prefer these settings over general leisure spaces because they can spend time with other 2SLGBTQ+ individuals (Formby, 2017; Johnson, 1999; Vo, 2020; Weeden et al., 2016), take refuge from societal heterosexism and transphobia (Browne & Bakshi, 2011; Hartal, 2017; Lewis & Johnson, 2011; Weeden et al., 2016), develop a sense of self and belonging to the 2SLGBTQ+ community (Arnold et al., 2018; Valentine & Skelton, 2003), freely express themselves and their identities (Morrison, 2015; Weeden et al., 2016), and seek social support (Case & Hunter, 2012; Vo, 2020).

Unfortunately, many 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces have been created from a cisgender, white, ableist, and monosexual standpoint (Hartal, 2017; Vo, 2021a), or rather a homonormative ideology (Oswin, 2008), whereby transgender/gender nonconforming (TGNC), racialized, disabled, and other diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people are marginalized. Like their counterparts, these and other “diverse” 2SLGBTQ+ individuals (i.e., hold identities that are marginalized within the 2SLGBTQ+ community) seek refuge from 2SLGBTQ+-related discrimination that occurs in mainstream society, but they often face cisgenderism, racism, and/or ableism and other systems of oppression within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings. As such, these individuals might not experience the benefits these spaces offer. It is, therefore, important to understand the climate of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, both psychological and experiential aspects, including risk factors for experiencing a hostile climate and the impacts on the participants’ social and mental health outcomes. Furthermore, research is imperative to enhance our understanding of how diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people process discrimination within
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2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings. Findings from such research will strengthen the evidence base needed to inform interventions to foster inclusion within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces and to promote the social and psychological wellbeing of diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people. Through a mixed methods study, as reported in this multiple-manuscript dissertation, I explore these issues and make important contributions by providing evidence that can inform and strengthen 2SLGBTQ+ organizations’ efforts to promote inclusion within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings and support the wellbeing of diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people involved in these spaces.

Though other researchers have examined the experiences of 2SLGBTQ+ people in leisure spaces (e.g., Piedra et al., 2017; Pinckney et al., 2018; Symons et al., 2016), including in 2SLGBTQ+-specific spaces (e.g., Carter & Baliko, 2017; Davidson, 2012; Jaspal, 2017), several gaps exist which I aimed to address in my dissertation. In the existing research (both quantitative and qualitative), scholars have tended to focus on the experiences of 2SLGBTQ+ people in general leisure settings (Anderson et al., 2016; Baiocco et al., 2018; Cunningham & Pickett, 2018; Melton & Cunningham, 2013; Symons et al., 2016) with less attention being given to people’s experiences within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces and those studies have often focused on gender and sexuality (e.g., Browne & Bakshi, 2011; Johnson & Samdahl, 2005; Litwiller, 2021) with a shift toward using an intersectionality lens (e.g., Held, 2016; Knee, 2018). As leisure scholars argue, a shift toward intersectionality is vital in achieving social justice goals (Johnson, 2014; Ong et al., 2020; Stewart, 2014). In pursuing research as a social justice project, previous researchers have tended to employ qualitative methods to expose the systemic oppression that diverse individuals face in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings, documenting cisgenderism, racism, and ableism, which contribute to members’ sense of exclusion or diminished sense of belonging (Austin & Goodman, 2017; Carter &
Baliko, 2017; Cheslik & Wright, 2021; Gray et al., 2015; Jaspal, 2017; Knee, 2018). Though producing insightful results, researchers have missed an understanding of how oppression in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings has contributed to participants’ mental health, including quantitatively identifying how oppression (negative climate) is related to one’s mental health. To date, there remain limited quantitative studies that examine the relationship between the climate of leisure spaces and social and mental health outcomes, such as belonging and psychological distress, respectively, as well as the factors that might promote resilience when facing discrimination in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces. Moreover, with their focus on experiences, these researchers neglect the psychological aspect of the climate, which is as equally important as experiential climate for understanding exclusion and inclusion within social environments (Garvey & Rankin, 2015; Woodford et al., 2016; Woodford & Kulick, 2015). Therefore, through this project, I examined both experiential (i.e., experiences of discrimination) and psychological (i.e., perceptions of safety and comfort) dimensions of climate to provide a holistic understanding of the climate, as well as its impact on both belonging and mental health outcomes. To do so, I used mixed methods which proved to be an ideal design. The quantitative component helped to examine the different relationships, including mediation and moderation, between the climate, belonging, mental health, and resilience-promoting factors. The qualitative component provided insights into individuals’ narratives about the climate of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, and how they process their experiences and perceptions of negative climates, as well as the processes related to the climate that impact participants’ sense of belonging in the leisure space.

In addition to these substantive contributions, my work advances scientific knowledge through the methodological aspects of the study of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, as well as research addressing minority stressors and the associated mental
health of diverse 2SLGBGTQ+ people. Briefly, my research demonstrates the effective implementation of quantitative methods and mixed methods to illuminate inequities and marginalization that occur within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces. Moreover, by examining psychological climate and showing its effects on outcomes, my research adds to evolving scholarship that assesses both experiential and psychological climate as minority stressors (Woodford et al., 2016; Woodford & Kulick, 2015). Also strengthening minority stress research, I integrated intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1991) into this study, including its quantitative application via an intercategorical analysis (Bauer & Scheim, 2019; Else-Quest & Hyde, 2016; Rouhani, 2014). Though intersectionality research is growing within leisure studies and beyond, there is a paucity of quantitative studies engaging with this theory (Bowleg & Bauer, 2016; Else-Quest & Hyde, 2016). Finally, while there is a considerable amount of research on the mental health of 2SLGBTQ+ people, it tends to focus on negative aspects of mental health, such as suicide, and overlook positive components, such as quality of life (DeBlaere et al., 2010; Herrick et al., 2014). My study of mental health outcomes is informed by positive psychology (Vaughan & Rodriguez, 2014); thus, I examine both negative and positive mental health outcomes. I describe these contributions in the various manuscripts, and I discuss them broadly in the final chapter.

**Theoretical Framework**

I developed an initial theoretical framework for this study during my comprehensive exam, which I later published (Vo, 2021b). Though that framework informed my dissertation, it also changed during the process of conducting the study. The original guiding framework comprised minority stress theory, resilience theory, intersectionality theory, whiteness theory, and the socioecological framework (**Figure 1**), with an emphasis on experiential discrimination within minority stress theory. While
implementing the study, I revised the model by moving beyond an emphasis on “discrimination” (i.e., experiential climate) to encompass the broader concept of climate, specifically holistic dimensions of climate; that is, both experiential and psychological climate. As seen in the two papers “Policing Belongingness” and “Understanding Resilience and Wellbeing,” this framing is reflected in my engagement with minority stress theory. Additionally, I examine resilience at three levels (individual, interpersonal, and structural), while building on resilience to integrate the notion of resistance, as described in the paper, “Understanding Resilience and Wellbeing.” Finally, in interpreting the findings, I chose not to explicitly engage with whiteness theory in my dissertation and removed it from the framework for the analysis stage, though I envision future work doing so. Below I discuss each component of my original model and the revisions I made in implementing my dissertation.

Minority stress theory (Hendricks & Testa, 2012; Meyer, 2003) outlines an identity-discrimination-outcomes pathway, whereby 2SLGBTQ+ people experience internalized, interpersonal, and structural discrimination (i.e., proximal and distal stress processes) that contribute to negative outcomes. Traditionally, researchers who engage with minority stress theory tend to conceptualize discrimination as experiential (i.e., experiencing subtle and blatant discrimination); however, consistent with Woodford and Kulick (2015), I adopt a broader conceptualization that includes both experiences of discrimination and perceptions of safety, comfort, and inclusion as part of the climate. This holistic conceptualization of the climate is necessary to understand the experiences of diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people within their social environments, including 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces. Please see chapter 3 (“Policing Belongingness”) for a discussion of these two aspects of climate.
Resilience (Colpitts & Gahagan, 2016) is defined as the ability to overcome adversity or experiences of stress, including discrimination. Resilience, a part of the minority stress theory (Meyer, 2015), is explicit in my original and final theoretical models, and I expanded on common approaches to resilience to encompass not only individual factors (e.g., coping skills) and interpersonal factors (e.g., social support from friends), but also structural factors (e.g., policies, practices) (e.g., Masten, 2019; Southwick et al., 2014; Ungar, 2018; Ungar et al., 2021). I aimed to identify the factors that promote resilience; these resilience-promoting factors were operationalized as moderators that impact the climate-outcome relationship. The inclusion of resilience theory helps to take the focus away from the victimization of 2SLGBTQ+ people and the common deficits approach to 2SLGBTQ+ scholarship (DeBlaere et al., 2010; Herrick et al., 2014), thereby shifting toward a strengths-based approach that celebrates the positive aspects of 2SLGBTQ+ people’s lives (Vaughan & Rodriguez, 2014).

Since developing my initial conceptual framework, I added to resilience by integrating resistance as a construct related to resilience, but also unique. Resilience and resistance are complementary concepts in fostering positive outcomes in the context of adversity; however, individuals passively develop resilience (e.g., coping skills, social support) when they face adversity (Colpitts & Gahagan, 2016; Meyer, 2015), while individuals actively (or consciously) engage in resistance behaviours (e.g., intervening) to confront adversity and create supportive environments (Case & Hunter, 2012; Guo & Tsui, 2010). Resistance is examined in chapter 4 (“Understanding Resilience and Wellbeing”). Informed by the socioecological framework, my engagement with resilience moves beyond the individual level to examine structural factors, such as inclusive leadership practices and antidiscrimination policies. I do so in recognition of the critique that resilience (and resistance) focuses on the individual, which contributes
to victim-blaming of individuals, particularly racialized people, who do not necessarily show resilience in the face of adversity, or these individuals must handle adversity on their own rather than changes occurring within the system to cause their adversity (i.e., oppression) (Colpitts & Gahagan, 2016; de Lira & de Morais, 2018; Garrett, 2016). To address this concern, I also examine experiences of discrimination and perceptions of climate in my research.

Next, intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1991) is juxtaposed onto this model to, first, identify the various social identities that might contribute to diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people’s experiences in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings, and second, examine the concomitant power relations and systemic issues that these marginalized individuals face in these spaces. Intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1991) refers to the multiplicity of identities and associated power relations and systemic oppression that intermingle to compound and influence individuals’ experiences. According to this theory, examining people’s experiences on a single identity alone (e.g., sexuality) would only provide a limited understanding of their experiences, thereby concealing the richness of their lives as individuals who hold multiple identities, some of which might be marginalized while others are privileged. Vital to intersectionality is the idea that power plays a role in shaping the processes that contribute to different life experiences and outcomes for people at different intersections (Chan & Erby, 2018; Cho et al., 2013; Salem, 2016). Intersectionality is not meant to predict behaviour, mental health processes, or health outcomes (Bowleg, 2012b), but rather to interrogate the underlying issues, namely power relations. In addition, under this theory, conceptualizations of identities cannot be understood in isolation from context, such that identities vary in importance depending on the context (e.g., as people age, entry into different environments) and shape individuals’ experiences across different contexts (Bowleg, 2012a; Bowleg & Bauer,
Such variations are due to the existence of power and the interactions with systems of domination in various settings. In a way, intersectionality seeks to decolonize spaces through its interrogation of power and processes that create systems of domination (Carastathis, 2016).

For this study, I used intersectionality in two ways. First, I employed intersectionality quantitatively to identify identity-related risk factors that contribute to experiences of intersectional discrimination by using identities (e.g., gender, race, disability) as indicators of the associated systemic oppressions (e.g., cisgenderism, racism, ableism). Second, I used intersectionality qualitatively as a lens to understand the ways in which diverse participants experience and perceive the climate, as well as how they negotiate and manage challenging experiences, namely the discrimination they directly or indirectly experience in certain 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces. Intersectionality is not comprehensively discussed in the separate manuscripts; however, the final dissertation discussion chapter includes how intersectionality, used quantitatively and qualitatively, is reflected in the findings.

The socioecological framework (Bronfenbrenner, 1981) applies across all theories, such that each theoretical lens is utilized to focus on all socioecological levels (i.e., individual, interpersonal, and structural). For instance, discrimination within minority stress theory can occur at the individual (e.g., internalized discrimination\(^5\)), interpersonal (e.g., microaggressions), or structural level (e.g., discriminatory policies), while resilience-promoting factors can include factors at the individual (e.g., coping skills), interpersonal (e.g., social support from friends), or structural level (e.g., antidiscrimination policies). The socioecological framework, especially the
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\(^5\) For this study, I measured internalized 2SLGBTQ+ stigma, but did not include it in analyses because I wanted to focus on interpersonal discrimination and perceptions of the climate.
interpersonal and structural domains, helps to shift the attention from the individual and the potential for victim-blaming toward the larger social environment and systems that contribute to their victimization and oppression as well as wellbeing.

Finally, whiteness theory, juxtaposed on the original framework, refers to an interrogation of the dominant (white) identity and the systems that uphold their dominance, such as norms and practices that privilege whiteness and normalizes systems of oppression (Arai & Kivel, 2017; Green et al., 2007; McDonald, 2009). Whiteness is reflected in the concept of homonormativity (Oswin, 2008; Vo, 2021a) in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings, which favours a monosexual, cisgender, white, and ableist standpoint, suggesting that one must have a single same-sex partner, be visibly male or female (i.e., not TGNC), be racially or ethnically white, and be able-bodied to engage in these settings. A white homonormativity underpins the climate of leisure spaces, which, in turn, contributes to participants’ sense of belonging and mental health—with positive outcomes for those who fit the dominant identity and negative outcomes for those who do not. As previously noted, whiteness theory was removed from the theoretical framework for the final dissertation. I made this decision due to the limited data collected around this topic because, even with probing and prompting, participants did not elaborate on the norms and practices that uphold systems of oppression (i.e., whiteness) beyond making general observations about racial diversity or lack thereof within the leisure setting.

Taken together, the theories of whiteness and intersectionality are juxtaposed onto the minority stress theory to illustrate the need to examine intersectionality and whiteness at all stages of the minority stress pathway, not just focusing on the social identities but also the stressors, outcomes, and resilience-promoting factors (Figure 1). The basic minority stress pathway remains central to the theoretical framework,
whereby discrimination is expanded to encompass both experiential and psychological climate to demonstrate the impact on social and mental health outcomes.

Intersectionality contributes to the analysis of minority stress theory via the application of quantitative (e.g., interaction terms) and qualitative analyses (e.g., power, relationality, social inequities, social justice). Concurrently, whiteness theory interposes the importance of examining dominant group norms, values, and practices that support systemic oppression. Resilience theory is enhanced by the socioecological framework to investigate not just intrapersonal and interpersonal factors but also structural factors that might buffer the impact negative climates on 2SLGBTQ+ people’s outcomes. The socioecological framework is depicted to encompass all theories to indicate the application of the multi-level lens (i.e., intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural levels) as the theories are applied. The theoretical framework is intended to be used as an analytic tool to prompt potential aspects to be examined. For a further explanation of the theoretical framework, please see Vo, 2021b (linked here). Given the theoretical framework and the state of the current knowledge base, using a mixed methods design, my dissertation centres on examining the climate of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces and its implications for social wellbeing and mental health, as well as exploring factors that shape the climate and promote resilience to a negative climate.

**Study Significance for Social Work**

Social workers are committed to promoting wellbeing, equity, inclusion, and social justice (CASW, 2008). As noted, leisure activities are central to a person’s wellbeing (Kuykendall et al., 2015; Mansfield et al., 2018; Sirgy et al., 2017), including for 2SLGBTQ+ people (Formby, 2017; Litwiller, 2021; Mock et al., 2019; Pharr et al., 2021). In recent years, there has been growing attention to leisure within social work, including a focus on sports as demonstrated by the Alliance of Social Workers in Sports
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(linked here), and schools of social work offering related courses (e.g., Online Sport Social Work Certificate; linked here). There is also a growing collection of social work literature addressing leisure activities (e.g., Anderson-Butcher & Bates, 2021; Ching-Teng, 2019; Kelly & Doherty, 2017; King et al., 2021; Morata et al., 2021). This work has included raising awareness of the benefits of sports and other leisure activities for physical, emotional, and mental health, advocating for expanded opportunities for disadvantaged groups to participate in leisure experiences, fostering inclusive climates in different leisure settings, and supporting the needs of people with disabilities and behavioural/developmental challenges in recreational activities (Anderson-Butcher & Bates, 2021; Mair et al., 2011; Moore & Gummelt, 2018; Newlin et al., 2015; Simard et al., 2014). Aligned with the values of equity, inclusion, and social justice, it is pertinent that social workers and allied practitioners consider the engagement of marginalized groups in leisure spaces and ensure the participants are welcomed and can realize the benefits of participating in leisure experiences. Inclusive 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings are considered spaces of resilience, since participation in these venues contributes to 2SLGBTQ+ people’s ability to overcome the discrimination that they encounter in broader community settings (Case & Hunter, 2012; Theriault, 2014; Vorobjovas-Pinta & Hardy, 2020). As social workers, we must foster safety and inclusion in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings, considering social work’s goals to promote social justice and enable social wellbeing and functioning within spaces where individuals, live, work, learn, and play (CASW, 2008). That way, we can create safe and inclusive spaces for all 2SLGBTQ+ people to enhance their social and mental wellbeing.

As demonstrated in the three manuscripts, my research offers social workers and others, including leisure practitioners and 2SLGBTQ+ advocacy and inclusion groups (e.g., Egale, Canadian Centre for Gender and Sexual Diversity), empirically based
insights that can inform and strengthen their efforts to promote inclusion within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces and support the wellbeing of diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people involved in these spaces. To advance this overall outcome, I offer recommendations in the final chapter for multi-level strategies to foster the inclusion and resilience of TGNC, racialized, and disabled people within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces that, in turn, will support their overall wellbeing.

Conclusion

As my experiences on the gay cruise emphasize, 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings are important for 2SLGBTQ+ people’s wellbeing, but these spaces can also be problematic for some people, particularly those who hold multiple marginalized identities. In the chapters that follow, I highlight the importance of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, the variations in the climate of such spaces and its impact on people’s wellbeing, as well as the different resilience-promoting factors and the resilience and resistance processes that participants employed in negative climates. My research builds on the existing scholarship regarding inclusion within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, addressing several gaps, including understanding the impact of climate in these contexts on participants’ social and mental wellbeing. As will be seen, my work also advances scientific knowledge through the methodological aspects of the study of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, as well as research addressing minority stressors and the associated mental health (both positive and negative aspects) of 2SLGBGTQ+ people. Understanding climate and its impact on diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people’s wellbeing is pertinent to social workers and allied groups, particularly in their efforts to promote social justice, equity, and inclusion. In the final chapter, I discuss the micro (clinical) and macro (policy and organizational) practice implications for social work.
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Chapter 2: A quantitative examination of intersectional discrimination, wellbeing, and resilience among diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces

Abstract

2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces and activities can promote resilience and enable 2SLGBTQ+ individuals to escape heterosexism and cisgenderism in mainstream society. Yet, these spaces can be problematic for people with diverse identities, including transgender/gender nonconforming, racialized, and/or disabled individuals. This study reports findings from a cross-sectional survey that examined experiences of diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people in Canada and the United States within physical and virtual 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces most frequented in the past two years. Relationships between experiencing intersectional discrimination in these spaces, social wellbeing within the leisure space, mental health, and resilience-promoting factors were explored. The results suggested disabled individuals were at increased risk for experiencing intersectional discrimination. Additionally, intersectional discrimination was negatively associated with mental health, and this association was mediated by social wellbeing. These results suggested that more frequent experiences of intersectional discrimination were associated with lower social wellbeing within leisure spaces, which in turn was associated with poorer mental wellbeing. Antidiscrimination policies and inclusive leadership practices were shown to be significant moderators of the discrimination—social wellbeing and the discrimination—mental health relationships, meaning that these moderators could reduce the negative impact of intersectional discrimination on these outcomes, while social support from friends was found to be moderator for mental health. Further research is necessary to examine these relationships in a range of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, including those that are infrequently accessed, as well
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6 I published an earlier version of this chapter as I wrote other dissertation chapters. The earlier version of the article was published Taylor & Francis Group in Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events on March 17, 2022, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/19407963.2022.2042817.
as explore additional moderators with larger samples and describe the ways
diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people engage with 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces.

Keywords: 2SLGBTQ+; intersectionality; discrimination; resilience; wellbeing;
leisure spaces

Introduction

2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces are places/activities for 2SLGBTQ+ people to spend their
free time. They include commercial spaces (e.g., bars, tourist attractions) and
community-based spaces (e.g., community centres, sports and social groups, Reddit,
and Facebook groups). Overall, these spaces can promote positive outcomes among
participants (Formby, 2017; Toft, 2020); however, individuals who face discrimination
within them due to their marginalized identities, such as gender, race, and disability
status, might not realize these benefits (Scandurra et al., 2017; Toft, 2020; Wilkens,
2016).

Leisure studies researchers have qualitatively explored the exclusion of
transgender/gender nonconforming (TGNC), racialized, disabled, and other diverse
2SLGBTQ+ groups within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, especially bars and other
commercial venues, and have documented negative impacts on 2SLGBTQ+ identity
formation, belonging, and mental health (Austin & Goodman, 2017; Gray et al., 2015;
Telander et al., 2017). To date, such experiences have not been quantitatively examined,
thereby limiting understanding of the relationships between discrimination and
outcomes, as well as factors that might promote resilience in the context of adversity.
Additionally, little is known about experiences within community-based 2SLGBTQ+
leisure spaces. Utilizing data collected from diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people involved in

---

7 2SLGBTQ+ is used in this manuscript to be inclusive of all sexual and gender minorities and is not
intended to minimize the experiences of and differences between individual groups.
community-based 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces within Canada and the United States, this study addresses these gaps by quantitively exploring the relationship between intersectional discrimination, social wellbeing, and mental wellbeing. The study also identifies factors that can promote resilience to discrimination.

Specifically, given the discrimination that TGNC, racialized, and disabled people face in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, the role of gender, race, and disability on intersectional discrimination is examined. Further explored is how intersectional discrimination influences social wellbeing in these spaces and overall mental wellbeing, the value of social wellbeing on mental health, and the mediating role of social wellbeing within the leisure space on the relationship between intersectional discrimination and mental wellbeing. Finally, factors that moderate the discrimination-outcome relationships are identified. Potential resilience-promoting factors include acts of resistance (Case & Hunter, 2012), social support from friends (Scandurra et al., 2017), organizational antidiscrimination policies (Woodford et al., 2018), and inclusive leadership practices (Woodford et al., 2018). The specific research questions are provided in the textbox below.

**Research Question 1:** Does gender, race, disability, and their intersections put 2SLGBTQ+ people at risk of intersectional discrimination?

**Research Question 2:** What is the relationship between intersectional discrimination, social wellbeing, and mental health?

**Research Question 3:** Does social wellbeing mediate the relationship between intersectional discrimination and mental health?

**Research Question 4:** What multi-level factors moderate the relationship between intersectional discrimination, social wellbeing, and mental wellbeing?

### 2SLGBTQ+ Leisure Spaces and Exclusion

2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, both commercial and community-based, offer 2SLGBTQ+ people many benefits, ranging from affirming sexual and/or gender identities to creating
a sense of community and belonging (Telander et al., 2017; Wilkens, 2016). A sense of belonging to the 2SLGBTQ+ communities is important for one’s overall positive mental health (Austin & Goodman, 2017; Gray et al., 2015; Meyer, 2010), including explaining the effects of discrimination on mental health (Wong et al., 2014). TGNC, racialized, and disabled 2SLGBTQ+ people often face discrimination in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, which can undermine one’s sense of safety and belonging (Barbosa, 2015; Held, 2015; Toft, 2020; Wilkens, 2016). For example, Held (2016) ethnographic study conducted within Manchester’s Gay Village concluded that particular spaces are gendered, sexualized, racialized, and classed, creating an “othering” experience, compromising racialized cisgender women’s sense of comfort and safety, and reducing their desire to return to such spaces. Similarly, Toft (2020) reported how 2SLGBTQ+ communities can be unwelcoming for many people with disabilities, who often feel they do not fit the normative image of the 2SLGBTQ+ person. For example, deaf gay men experience the 2SLGBTQ+ community in complicated ways, such as experiencing rejection on mobile dating apps, having difficulties finding friends, and being fetishized for their disability (Cheslik & Wright, 2021). The exclusion that marginalized people face in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces can minimize the benefits they receive from these spaces.

Anti-2SLGBTQ+ discrimination is a well-established risk factor to negative mental health outcomes among 2SLGBTQ+ people (Berg et al., 2016; Cyrus, 2017). Beyond leisure spaces, researchers investigating diverse 2SLGBTQ+ communities have found associations between experiencing lateral discrimination (e.g., racism, transphobia, ableism) and poor mental wellbeing, including greater psychological distress and lower self-esteem (Arayasirikul & Wilson, 2019; English et al., 2018; McConnell et al., 2018; Moreno et al., 2017). Existing qualitative studies that examined
these topics in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces have raised awareness of the experiences of marginalized groups within these so-called safe spaces (Held, 2016; Scandurra et al., 2017; Toft, 2020; Wilkens et al., 2016). By quantitatively examining these issues among a large group of diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people, this study adds to the knowledge base by examining the prevalence of intersectional discrimination within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces in Canada and the United States, and its relationships with belonging and mental health outcomes.

*Intersectionality*

Intersectionality is a theory that suggests a multiplicity of identities and concomitant systems of power and oppression interact in ways that impact individuals’ experiences (Collins & Bilge, 2016; Crenshaw, 1991). As such, examining a single identity alone would only provide a one-dimensional understanding of people’s experiences and potentially mask the diverse, full experiences brought on by having multiple marginalized identities (Collins & Bilge, 2016; Crenshaw, 1991). By interrogating power differentials, systems of oppression, and social inequities, intersectionality is helpful in examining the experiences of TGNC, racialized, and disabled 2SLGBTQ+ people in leisure spaces. To date, applications of intersectionality have mainly used qualitative methods (e.g., Bowleg, 2012; Irazábal & Huerta, 2015; Toft, 2020). Quantitatively, the intercategorical complexity model of intersectionality examines how inequities exist across social identities (e.g., gender, race, disability) and analyses focus on relationships and processes that produce those inequities (Else-Quest & Hyde, 2016; Parent et al., 2013). This type of analysis involves investigating the interaction between identities and how they impact various outcomes, such as discrimination between subgroups (Else-Quest & Hyde, 2016). Within this model, social identities are used as indicators of underlying systems of oppression (McCall, 2005).
Scheim and Bauer (2019) argue that the intercategorical complexity model is pertinent to measuring and understanding discrimination and its effects across various intersections of identity (e.g., gender X race). Consistent with this model, they describe intersectional discrimination as the experience of oppression due to multiple social identities, such as sexuality, gender, race, and disability (Scheim & Bauer, 2019). Furthermore, they argue it is important to measure intersectional discrimination rather than specific forms of discrimination, such as racism and transphobia, because doing so allows researchers to examine the impact of discrimination across a range of intersections without burdening the respondent in having to answer multiple measures to determine the likely source of the discrimination, such as race or gender (Scheim & Bauer, 2019). Using their measure of intersectional discrimination, Scheim and Bauer (2019) found that individuals with more marginalized identities (i.e., racialized sexual/gender minorities) reported higher intersectional discrimination scores compared to white heterosexual/cisgender individuals and white sexual/gender minority individuals. They also found that experiencing greater intersectional discrimination was associated with greater psychological distress (Scheim & Bauer, 2019). The present study applies the intercategorical complexity model by examining gender, race, and disability, as well as their interactions, as risk factors for experiencing intersectional discrimination in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces.

**Resilience**

There has been a growing attention to resilience and the strengths of 2SLGBTQ+ people, including TGNC, racialized, and disabled subgroups (Colpitts & Gahagan, 2016; McConnell et al., 2018; Toft, 2020). Resilience is commonly defined as the ability to bounce back from experiences of stress and/or adverse events, and is often investigated by exploring factors that might promote resilience (Colpitts & Gahagan,
Intrapersonal and interpersonal resilience-promoting factors, such as coping behaviours and social support, respectively are commonly examined (Colpitts & Gahagan, 2016), and have been shown to mitigate the impact of discrimination on wellbeing (McConnell et al., 2018; Meyer, 2010; Scandurra et al., 2017; Wilson et al., 2016). Little research, however, has investigated acts of resistance that challenge exclusion (Case & Hunter, 2012), such as speaking up against discrimination, as well as structural/institutional factors, such as organizational antidiscrimination policies and inclusive leadership practices (Colpitts & Gahagan, 2016; de Lira & de Morais, 2018). Often described in the context of counterspaces where participants with marginalized identities negotiate and resist dominant stereotypes about their identities, acts of resistance can promote mental wellbeing (Case & Hunter, 2012). Recent research with postsecondary school 2SLGBTQ+ students highlights the value of policies in that those attending schools with gender-inclusive (as opposed to those only inclusive of sexual orientation) antidiscrimination policies reported lower discrimination, which in turn was associated with lower distress and higher self-acceptance (Woodford et al., 2018).

Understanding the role of acts of resistance, social support, and inclusion-related policies and practices of organizational leaders within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces will help to advance insights about the benefits of these factors on the wellbeing of diverse participants.

**Conceptual Framework**

This study uses a framework that draws on minority stress theory, intersectionality, resilience theory, and the socioecological framework. An intersectional understanding of minority stress theory (McConnell et al., 2018; Meyer, 2010) forms the basic aspect of the model: individuals with multiple marginalized identities (identity status) experience greater intersectional discrimination (stressor) that negatively impacts their
social and mental wellbeing (outcomes). Resilience theory (Colpitts & Gahagan, 2016) and the socioecological framework (Bronfenbrenner, 1981) are reflected in the types of resilience-promoting factors at the individual, interpersonal, and structural levels that might moderate the discrimination—outcome relationship. Please see Vo (2021b) for a detailed discussion of the model. Reflected in the model hypothesized for this study, the framework is used as an analytic tool to examine intersectional experiences within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces and its consequences, as well as potential multi-level moderating factors.

**Materials and Methods**

The study was conducted between January and May 2021, amidst the COVID-19 pandemic. Given the implications of the pandemic on physical isolation, this study intentionally inquired about leisure activities within the past two years and included virtual spaces as a leisure activity. The study was informed by a community research advisory committee consisting of nine diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people involved in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces. Data were collected from both Canada and the United States. The study was approved by the Wilfrid Laurier University Research Ethics Board.

**Participants**

The sample consists of 548 respondents, evenly split between Canada and the United States. The average age of participants was 30 years old with the majority identifying as TGNC, white, and bisexual/pansexual or queer. Among TGNC participants, the largest group was comprised of diverse gender followed by trans men and then trans women. The largest racial minority group was Asian followed by mixed race. About half of participants identified as having some type of disability with the largest group having a mental/emotional disability followed by chronic illness and intellectual disability. For
additional information about the diversity of the sample, see Table 1.

**Measures**

Unless stated, average scores were calculated for all multi-item measures that used continuously oriented response-sets. Scales comprised of dichotomous items were summed. When completing measures specific to 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, respondents did so regarding their experiences in the space in which they spent most of their leisure time during the past two years. Early in the survey, respondents provided the name/pseudonym of that specific space, and the survey was programmed to display the name for relevant questions. Descriptive statistics for study variables are presented in Table 1, which include the theoretical range and, when applicable, internal consistency statistics (all of which were satisfactory). Factor analysis was conducted for all adapted and newly developed multi-item scales. All scales produced single-factor solutions with items loadings greater than 0.4.

**Leisure Spaces**

Five questions were asked about leisure spaces and activities. Selecting from a list of seven options, respondents reported the type of leisure spaces (e.g., recreational activities, social clubs, online discussion forums) they spent time in over the past two years and then identified one leisure space in which they spent the most time. Afterwards, they were asked the frequency of attendance and whether they played a leadership role within that space/activity. Respondents were also asked to rate their perceived comfort within that space (1 = very uncomfortable, 7 = very comfortable).

**Study Variables**

**Intersectional Discrimination.** The Intersectional Discrimination Scale (Scheim & Bauer, 2019) was adapted by making it specific to 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, changing
the temporal period from one year to two years, and adding two items (i.e., discrimination by a group leader/captain; an open-ended item to capture other discrimination incidents not reflected in the presented items). Other scale items addressed various forms of discrimination, including jokes, being made fun of, or being treated rudely (0 = never, 3 = almost every time). The stem sentence for the scale stated “Please tell us how often you have experienced any of the following types of discrimination because of who you are. “Because of who you are,” includes both how you describe yourself and how others might describe you, including race, ethnicity, ancestry, nationality, religion, gender, sexuality, age, weight/body shape or size, disability, or income”. Including “because of who you are” expands the scope beyond a single aspect of identity and helps to make the measure intersectional.

**Sense of Belonging in 2SLGBTQ+ Leisure Space.** This 7-item scale was created using items from the sense of belonging scale (Dugan et al., 2012) for postsecondary campuses and the Community Connectedness Scale (Testa et al., 2015). All items were adapted for the 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree; sample item: “I feel valued as a person in this 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space”).

**Satisfaction with 2SLGBTQ+ Leisure Space.** Participants were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with the 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space using three items with one adapted from the Campus Climate subscale (Reid & Radhakrishnan, 2003) 1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree; sample item: “If I had just moved to my city/town, I would still join this space/activity”).
Positive Mental Health. Participants were asked how they felt over the past 30 days on 13 items related to positive mental health using the Mental Health Continuum Short Form (MHC-SF; (Lamers et al., 2011). Scores for each item (0 = never, 5 = every day) were summed to produce an overall score. The stem sentence for the scale was “During the past month, how often did you feel…” and scale items asked about emotional, social, and psychological wellbeing in general.

Psychological Distress. Participants reported their psychological distress on six items for the past 30 days using the Kessler-6 Psychological Distress Scale (Kessler et al., 2002). Items asked about feeling depressed, hopeless, restless, worthless, nervous, or that everything was an effort (0 = none of the time, 4 = all of the time).

Acts of Resistance. Using four items, participants rated how frequently they engaged in acts of resistance within their specified leisure space using a measure created for the present study based on the resistance framework within counterspaces (Case & Hunter, 2012; 0 = never, 3 = almost every time; sample item: “I have spoken up for others when treated unfairly or discriminated against”).

Social Support from Friends. Participants were asked four questions to consider their perceived support from their friends using the Friends Subscale of the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (Dahlem et al., 1991) 1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree; sample item: “I can talk about my problems with my friends”).

Antidiscrimination Policies. Participants were asked three questions about antidiscrimination policies within the 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space, which were adapted from the Diversity Policies subscale of the 2SLGBTQ+ Perceptions of Campus Climate
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8 The original measure was comprised of 14 items. One item (satisfied with life) was unintentionally excluded from the survey.
Scale from the Thriving on Campus Survey, a large-scale campus climate study conducted with 2SLGBTQ+ postsecondary students throughout Ontario, Canada (Woodford, personal communication, 2019). Responses included no, yes, and don’t know; sample item: “Discrimination of people like me is prohibited through anti-discrimination or harassment policies.” For this analysis, “don’t know” responses were grouped with “no” responses. Exploratory analysis for each scale item and intersectional discrimination, sense of belonging, and satisfaction did not find significant differences between “no” and “don’t know” responses.

**Inclusive Leadership Practices.** Participants were asked five questions about inclusive leadership practices within the specified 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space. The scale was adapted from the Institutional Leadership subscale from the 2SLGBTQ+ Perceptions of Campus Climate Scale (Woodford, personal communication, 2019). Responses included no, yes, and don’t know; sample item: “The leaders openly support issues and concerns of equity and inclusion.” As with the policy scale, “don’t know” responses were grouped with “no” responses; exploratory analysis for each item and discrimination, sense of belonging, and satisfaction did not find significant differences between “no” and “don’t know” responses.

**Demographics.** Demographics included age, sexual identity, gender, race, disability, highest level of education, and income. Participants could select multiple gender and sexual identities, but later were asked to select the identity that best describes them with a write-in option. Participants were asked whether they had a disability and, if yes, were then asked to select the specific type of disability (multiple

---

9 See study website for more details: https://lgbtq2sthivingoncampus.ca/en_ca/
options possible). Please see Table 1 for information about the options provided for sexual identity, gender, race, and disability.

Procedure

Purposive convenience sampling was used to recruit participants, for an online confidential survey using XM Qualtrics. Recruitment occurred through Facebook and Instagram ads, Facebook groups, and 2SLGBTQ+ non-profit organizations and community groups in Canada and the United States (groups were contacted and asked to share study information with members). Interested individuals completed an interest/screening survey which collected contact information, details about engagement in leisure spaces, and select demographic information, including age, gender, sexual, and racial identities to determine eligibility. Those determined eligible (e.g., 16 years and older, identified as a sexual or gender minority, lived in Canada or the United States, participated in a 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space in the past two years) were emailed a participant code with a link to the study survey and consent form. Quota sampling was used to ensure adequate representation of racialized and TGNC participants (minimum of 100 participants for each group). At the end of the survey, participants could choose to receive or donate $10 to a 2SLGBTQ+ organization. Quality control strategies (e.g., fraudulent scores, IP address monitoring) and questions (e.g., asking age and year of birth) were included to ensure the validity of responses.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were conducted for all variables, including examination of missing data (no concerns were identified except for acts of resistance; 38.32% missing), and correlations for study variables were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics version 26. In addition, exploratory descriptive analysis using analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to compare intersectional groups by gender, race, and disability (e.g.,
cisgender/white, cisgender/racialized, TGNC/white, TGNC/racialized) in relation to intersectional discrimination, and post-hoc tests were conducted to determine differences across subgroups. Then, structural equation models (SEM) were used to test the proposed model (Figure 1) using Mplus version 8.6. Intersectional discrimination, acts of resistance, support from friends, antidiscrimination policies, inclusive leadership practices, gender, race, and disability were included in the model as observed variables. Social wellbeing in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces was conceptualized as a latent variable and indicated by sense of belonging and satisfaction as observed variables. Mental wellbeing was also a latent variable comprised of positive mental health and psychological distress as observed variables. In terms of demographics, gender, race, and disability were included in the model.

Specifically, to address the first research question, the model tested gender, race, and disability, and their interactions (gender X race, gender X disability, race X disability) as predictors of intersectional discrimination. The three-way interaction was not run due to the small counts in the subgroups (e.g., 25 cisgender racialized and disabled, 36 TGNC racialized no disability), limiting the power of the analysis. Significant demographic predictors ($p < .05$) were further tested to determine the extent of the moderation (i.e., interaction) effect on intersectional discrimination via simple slope analysis.

To address research questions two and three, the model also examined the relationship between intersectional discrimination and social wellbeing and mental wellbeing, as well as social wellbeing as a mediator of the discrimination—mental wellbeing pathway, respectively. Pathways were used to examine the direct (intersectional discrimination—mental wellbeing) and indirect/mediation effects (intersectional discrimination—social wellbeing—mental wellbeing); SEM allows for a
whole theoretical process to be tested together instead of testing parts of the process separately. While SEM might suggest causal relationships, the cross-sectional nature of the data precludes the determination of causation. The following criteria were used to assess goodness of fit for the models: $\chi^2$ to degrees of freedom ratio less than 2.0; the root mean squared error of approximation (RMSEA) of 0.08 or less (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2019); the comparative fit index (CFI) and Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) with 0.90; and standardized root mean squared residual (SRMR) with 0.06 set as the cut-off for adequate fit (Bentler, 1990; Byrne, 1994; Hu & Bentler, 2009).

To address the fourth research question, four additional models were tested using Mplus to illustrate moderation effects within the previously described mediation pathway. The moderators tested included acts of resistance, support from friends, antidiscrimination policies, and inclusive leadership practices. Each moderator was tested separately to facilitate parsimonious analysis (i.e., minimum participants per free parameter) given the sample size (Bentler & Chou, 1987), resulting in four moderation models. Significant moderators ($p < .05$) were further tested to determine the extent of the moderation effect via simple slope analysis.

**Results**

Participants spent most of their time in the following 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces: online/virtual discussion forums/chat groups (45.8%), recreational activities and social clubs (17.5%), online/virtual events happening in real-time (17.3%), social events (7.3%), sports clubs and leagues (4.7%), and another venue (7.3%). Most respondents visited their leisure space daily (27.4%), weekly (28.9%), or a few times a month (18.2%). About one-fifth had a leadership role in the 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space (19.5%). On average, participants rated their perceived comfort to be 5.83 ($SD = 1.38$), which falls between “somewhat comfortable” and “comfortable.”
Concerning intersectional discrimination, the average score was 0.36 on the 0–3 scale. A little more than one-third (38.9%) of participants reported no discrimination, while 12.6% reported a score of 1 but less than 2, and 1.3% reported a score of 2 or greater on the scale. Significant correlations (0.13 to 0.48) were found between the proposed moderators and the social and mental wellbeing outcomes, except for acts of resistance which was not significantly associated with any of the outcomes (results not shown).

**Intersectional Group Comparisons**

Based on the ANOVA, differences were observed for intersectional discrimination based on the intersections of gender, race, and disability, mainly for the intersections by race X disability, as well as gender X disability (Table 2). The post-hoc results (not shown) illustrated that white individuals with disabilities experienced greater intersectional discrimination compared to both white individuals without disabilities \((\text{Mean difference [MD]} = 0.256, p < .001)\) and racialized individuals without disabilities \((\text{MD} = 0.190, p < .001)\). Cisgender individuals with disabilities reported higher levels of intersectional discrimination compared to both cisgender individuals without disabilities \((\text{MD} = .311, p < .001)\) and TGNC individuals without disabilities \((\text{MD} = 0.221, p < .05)\). Finally, TGNC individuals with disabilities had greater levels of intersectional discrimination than cisgender individuals without disabilities \((\text{MD} = 0.204, p < .001)\).

**Multivariable Models**

Figure 1 displays the structural equation models with mediation and moderation relationships, as well as the three different two-way interactions of gender, race, and disability (gender X race, gender X disability, and race X disability). The overall fit of the main model fell slightly above the thresholds for adequate fit across the different model fit indices. All observed variables were found to be good indicators of their latent
factors. Figure 1 also includes the resilience-promoting factors that were tested to moderate the various discrimination—outcome relationships, but, as noted above, separate models were run and the results for each model are reported in the same figure.

**Research Question One.** The SEM results indicated that only disability ($\beta = 0.373, p < .001$) and the two-way interaction gender X disability ($\beta = -0.194, p < .05$) showed a significant effect on intersectional discrimination. These findings indicate that disability and its interaction with gender can put individuals at greater risk of experiencing intersectional discrimination. In terms of the two-way interaction, the simple slope analysis suggested that disability significantly predicted intersectional discrimination for both cisgender and TGNC participants, with a larger effect among cisgender individuals compared to TGNC individuals (Table 3). Of note, the two-way interaction race X disability was approaching significance ($p = 0.06$, data not shown), although no further analysis was completed for this interaction.

**Research Questions Two and Three:** The total effect of intersectional discrimination was significant ($\beta = -0.180, 95\% CI = -0.312, -0.030$). As such, there is an overall inverse relationship between intersectional discrimination and mental wellbeing, meaning that greater experience of intersectional discrimination is associated with a decrease in mental wellbeing. A closer look found intersectional discrimination demonstrated a main effect with social wellbeing within the leisure space ($\beta = -0.435, 95\% CI = -0.556, -0.307$). That is, participants who reported experiencing intersectional discrimination more often also reported lower social wellbeing within their leisure spaces. Further, intersectional discrimination had an indirect effect on mental wellbeing through social wellbeing within the leisure space ($\beta = -0.111, 95\% CI = -0.208, -0.047$), but no remaining direct effect between intersectional discrimination and mental wellbeing ($\beta = -0.067, 95\% CI = -0.250, 0.074$). That is, individuals experiencing higher
levels of intersectional discrimination reported lower mental wellbeing, which is accounted for by the inverse relationship between intersectional discrimination and social wellbeing in the 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space.

**Moderation Results**

**Research Question Four:** Based on the models conducted for each moderator, significant moderation effects were observed in antidiscrimination policies ($\beta = 0.200, p < .05$) and inclusive leadership practices ($\beta = 0.238, p < .05$) on the relationship between intersectional discrimination and social wellbeing. Specifically, for both antidiscrimination policies and inclusive leadership practices, higher levels of each of these resilience-promoting factors were associated with smaller, but still significant, negative effects of intersectional discrimination on social wellbeing within the leisure space ($p < .001$, **Table 4**). Finally, antidiscrimination policies ($\beta = -0.174, p < .05$), inclusive leadership practices ($\beta = -0.241, p < .05$), and social support from friends ($\beta = -0.289, p < .05$) had a significant moderation effect on the discrimination—mental wellbeing pathway. Among all three moderators, higher levels of each moderator were associated with reducing the effect of intersectional discrimination on mental wellbeing ($p < .05$, **Table 4**). There was a poor fit for the moderation models (i.e., goodness of fit indicators fell beyond the thresholds, see **Appendix A, Table 1**), thus these results should be interpreted with caution.

**Discussion**

The findings advance understanding of discrimination within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces and its relationship with social belonging in those spaces and mental health. This is the first quantitative study to examine lateral discrimination within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, and it uniquely does so by focusing on community-based spaces and engaging participants from Canada and the United States. The main findings shed light
on the potential impact of intersectional discrimination on participants’ social wellbeing in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, and how social wellbeing, in turn, can influence their mental health. Additional findings identify potential moderators that may help buffer the negative effects of intersectional discrimination on wellbeing outcomes, and other results identify the role of gender, disability, and their interactions in increasing ones’ risk for experiencing intersectional discrimination.

**Intersectional Discrimination, Outcomes, and Moderators**

Consistent with qualitative studies documenting the negative impacts of racism, cisgenderism, ableism, and other forms of exclusion in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces (Barbosa, 2015; Held, 2016; Toft, 2020), intersectional discrimination was found to be negatively associated with participants’ social wellbeing within leisure spaces. Quantitative research with postsecondary school sexual minority students corroborates this. Specifically, Woodford and Kulick (2015) found that experiencing campus-based heterosexism was associated with lower perceptions of social acceptance on campus and institutional satisfaction.

The current study invaluably demonstrates that the inverse relationship between intersectional discrimination and social wellbeing can threaten participants’ mental wellbeing. The total effect that was observed indicates that there is an association between intersectional discrimination and mental wellbeing, and the relationship is mediated by social wellbeing. This suggests that social belonging helps to explain why individuals who experience greater levels of intersectional discrimination are more likely to have poorer mental wellbeing. The general findings of the relationship between discrimination and mental health align with previous research with diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people and various types of discrimination, such as sexual orientation-, gender-, and race-based discrimination (Balsam et al., 2011; Bostwick et al., 2014). The mediation
findings are corroborated by previous research not specific to leisure spaces that found a mediating relationship between the 2SLGBTQ+ stigma, connection to 2SLGBTQ+ community, and perceived stress pathway among 2SLGBTQ+ adults (McConnell et al., 2018). Furthermore, other quantitative and qualitative research has demonstrated the positive role of social wellbeing on mental health among various diverse groups, including gay men (McLaren et al., 2008), TGNC individuals (Austin & Goodman, 2017; Barr et al., 2016), racially-diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people (Frost & Meyer, 2012), and 2SLGBTQ+ individuals with intellectual disabilities (Tallentire et al., 2020).

The findings also highlight the differential effects of specific resilience-promoting factors within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces. The SEM findings indicate that the presence of more antidiscrimination policies and greater inclusive leadership practices moderated the negative effect of intersectional discrimination on social wellbeing within the leisure space as well as the negative effect of intersectional discrimination on mental health. Other research supports this finding. In particular, 2SLGBTQ+ policies and resources were negatively associated with heterosexism among sexual minority postsecondary students, which was related to reduced psychological distress and increased self-acceptance (Woodford et al., 2018). Finally, the SEM findings indicate that social support from friends moderated the relationship between intersectional discrimination and mental health. This finding has also been found in numerous studies (Scandurra et al., 2017; Wong et al., 2014), demonstrating that social support from friends is an important resilience-promoting factor in the face of discrimination to mitigating the impact on mental health.

**Experiencing Intersectional Discrimination**

Intersectional discrimination scores were low among the sample, considerably lower than those found by Scheim and Bauer (2019), who investigated intersectional
discrimination in a general context, which would include non-2SLGBTQ+ settings. It is not surprising to find overall low frequency levels for intersectional discrimination given that the survey inquired about discrimination experiences in leisure spaces where participants spent most of their free time. If individuals did not feel comfortable in a specific leisure space, or experienced high levels of social exclusion, they likely would not spend most of their free time in these spaces (Formby, 2017). In terms of participants’ perceived comfort within their selected leisure spaces, analysis found that overall ($M = 5.83$ on a 7-point scale) and across various subgroups ($M$ range $5.70 – 5.95$; analysis not shown) participants reported moderate to high levels of comfort. Also, just under half of participants identified spending most of their time in virtual settings, which may be somewhat difficult spaces to notice discrimination, especially subtler acts. For the current sample, a comparison on intersectional discrimination scores between virtual and in-person leisure spaces did not show a difference in means for intersectional discrimination ($t(530) = -1.12, p = 0.26$; analysis not shown). Despite the low intersectional discrimination scores, just over 60% of participants experienced at least one incident of intersectional discrimination in the 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces where they spent most of their free time, and intersectional discrimination affected participants’ social and mental wellbeing.

Additionally, the findings indicate that specific identities and their intersections can increase one’s risk for experiencing intersectional discrimination. The main effect of disability and its interaction with gender were statistically significant. These results suggest that disability might still be a highly marginalized identity within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces (Moreno et al., 2017), including among TGNC and cisgender subgroups. In addition, the simple slope analysis indicates that disability appears to play a greater role in experiencing intersectional discrimination among cisgender individuals.
compared to TGNC individuals. This specific finding can seem counter-intuitive to the understanding of intersectionality; however, it is possible that disability is a particularly influential risk factor among cisgender individuals since it may be the only disadvantage they contend with in these spaces, while TGNC individuals also must deal with gender-based discrimination in addition to disability, thereby limiting the role disability has on experiencing intersectional discrimination for them compared to cisgender people with disabilities. This unexpected result adds to the dearth of literature around the experiences of TGNC people with disabilities (Moreno et al., 2017). Future exploration of these findings through qualitative studies will allow for a richer understanding of the nuanced experiences related to the intersections of gender and disability, including potential differences between those living with visible versus invisible disabilities.

The lack of significant findings for the main effects of gender and race and their interactions were unexpected and contradict Scheim and Bauer’s (2019) findings. Again, the fact that Scheim and Bauer (2019) examined intersectional discrimination in a general context might explain this difference between study findings. In the present study, it is possible that racialized and TGNC participants, including those who are both racialized and TGNC, spend most of their free time in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces where their multiple marginalized identities are welcomed, such as Facebook and Reddit groups, or social and advocacy groups specifically for racialized TGNC individuals (Case & Hunter, 2012). That is, they might have sought spaces, such as counterspaces, where they could spend time with similar marginalized individuals to protect themselves from the discrimination that they experience in wider society and in other 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, as exemplified by the creation of ballroom communities for racialized TGNC individuals (Telander et al., 2017; Wong et al., 2014). Counterspaces
can contribute to positive identity formation for those with multiple marginalized identities, help resist negative narratives about their identities, and build relationships/community with other members (Case & Hunter, 2012). Focusing on race, it is also possible that the Black Lives Matter movement has begun to shift discourse within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces to raise concerns of racism and contribute to the acceptance of racialized members (Greey, 2018).

Future studies are warranted to examine the role gender and race have on the lives of 2SLGBTQ+ people within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces generally and within “problematic” spaces compared to only those spaces where individuals spend most of their time. It will be important to explore the ways in which racialization interacts with the participants’ gendered and sexual experiences in the context of intersectional discrimination in these spaces. Future quantitative studies should also consider exploring the racial and gender diversity of the leisure space, as this may be playing an influential role in experiences of discrimination among racialized TGNC individuals.

Limitations and Future Research

The study has methodological strengths, including using a sample from Canada and the United States and having a relatively large composition of TGNC, racialized, and disabled participants. However, there are several limitations to note, which future studies should address alongside the future research directions discussed above. The study is based on cross-sectional data; thus, the findings cannot conclude causal relationships. The use of a convenience sample calls into question the generalizability of the findings, but as noted, the gender, racial, and disability diversity of the sample are strengths. As it was not possible to draw a random sample of individuals involved in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, a thorough recruitment strategy was used to ensure a diverse and sufficiently large enough sample size for the proposed analyses. Related to
the sample, the average age of respondents was 30 years old; research with older participants may produce other findings given the developmental differences associated with age and varying reasons for participating in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces.

Concerning acts of resistance, the large percentage of missing data (38.32%) is an issue and future studies need to ensure participants complete these items, even if they report facing no discrimination. It is possible that individuals skipped the questions if they did not experience discrimination or did not see it as an issue in their leisure space.

Moreover, the measures of antidiscrimination policies and inclusive leadership practices focuses on respondents’ awareness of the existence of such policies or practices, thus it is possible that some leisure settings might have antidiscrimination policies or leaders engage in inclusive practices, but the participants might not be aware of them. Future research could objectively assess the presence of antidiscrimination policies by reviewing policy documents and survey organizational leaders about their knowledge of and implementation of inclusive practices.

Though the sample was diverse and sufficiently large for the current analyses, some groups reflecting interactions of three identities of gender, race, and disability were small (range $N = 25 – 122$), which raises concerns about statistical power. Future studies should aim to recruit larger samples which will enable researchers to address this concern, while also permitting them to examine specific identities (e.g., nonbinary, Indigenous, mobility disability) as well as more nuanced intersections of identity (e.g., Black TGNC with a visual disability). Additionally, it would be worthwhile for future research to consider intersectional discrimination in all leisure spaces, which might capture spaces that are comfortable and those that are not so. Moreover, follow-up qualitative studies are necessary to derive an in-depth understanding of diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people’s involvement within leisure spaces and to learn how they get
engaged and stay engaged, while also understanding how intersectional discrimination impacts their involvement and persistence in these spaces.

**Policy Directions**

The findings offer policy implications related to inclusive leisure spaces for diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people. Since social wellbeing helps to explain the relationship between intersectional discrimination and mental wellbeing, it would be prudent to consider strategies within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces that can enhance participants’ social wellbeing within these spaces, especially among those who face exclusion. As the results suggest, reducing intersectional discrimination can promote greater belonging, and in turn improved mental health. Therefore, though intersectional discrimination was low among participants, its demonstrated effects on social wellbeing and the mediating role of social wellbeing of the discrimination—mental wellbeing relationship highlight the need for interventions that address intersectional discrimination and foster social wellbeing. While the moderation findings should be interpreted with caution, implementing antidiscrimination policies and promoting inclusive leadership practices can help to mitigate the negative effects of intersectional discrimination. Possible interventions to make sure all members feel welcomed in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces include policies promoting the use of inclusive language and the pronoun(s) a participant uses themselves, checking in about participants’ comfort levels regularly, responding to incidents of discrimination when they arise (and doing so in a culturally-responsive way), creating accessible spaces for people with both visible and invisible disabilities, promoting awareness of various diverse identities and centring their needs, as well as having a diverse group of leaders and members (Theriault, 2017). Structural level interventions include ensuring antidiscrimination policies and practices specifically address disability and critically examining the leisure spaces and
whether/how they uphold systems of power and oppression (e.g., ableism in leisure spaces; Moreno et al., 2017).

**Conclusion**

Notwithstanding the study limitations, the results offer insights into how intersectional discrimination within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces can contribute to poor outcomes, namely social wellbeing related to the leisure space and overall mental wellbeing, as well as the various resilience-promoting factors within these spaces that can mitigate the negative impact of intersectional discrimination. The results also shed light on disability and its intersection with gender (especially for cisgender participants) as risk factors for experiencing intersectional discrimination. As of publication, this study is the first to examine these relationships through quantitative research using a Canadian and United States-based sample. Antidiscrimination policies and inclusive leadership practices may be beneficial in reducing the negative impact of intersectional discrimination within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces on diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people’s social and mental wellbeing. Ongoing work within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces is vital to ensure all people feel welcomed so they can profit from participating in those spaces.
### Tables and Figures for Chapter 2

#### Table 1: Demographic characteristics and descriptive statistics of sample and study variables \((n=548)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristic / Variable</th>
<th>Continuous variables</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>Theoretical Range</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
<th>Skewness (SE)</th>
<th>Kurtosis (SE)</th>
<th>Missing (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.42 (14.14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived comfort in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space</td>
<td>5.83 (1.38)</td>
<td>1, 7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-1.70 (0.11)</td>
<td>2.90 (0.21)</td>
<td>3.47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersectional discrimination</td>
<td>0.36 (0.50)</td>
<td>0, 3</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.88 (0.11)</td>
<td>3.96 (0.21)</td>
<td>2.92%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space</td>
<td>5.97 (0.99)</td>
<td>1, 7</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>-1.72 (0.11)</td>
<td>4.67 (0.21)</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space</td>
<td>6.09 (0.98)</td>
<td>1, 7</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-1.53 (0.11)</td>
<td>3.49 (0.21)</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive mental health</td>
<td>34.31 (12.89)</td>
<td>1, 65</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.07 (0.11)</td>
<td>-0.63 (0.21)</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological distress</td>
<td>0.97 (0.79)</td>
<td>0, 4</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.83 (0.11)</td>
<td>0.24 (0.21)</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts of resistance</td>
<td>2.06 (0.71)</td>
<td>0, 3</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>-0.99 (0.13)</td>
<td>0.58 (0.27)</td>
<td>38.32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support from friends</td>
<td>5.77 (1.13)</td>
<td>1, 7</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>-1.29 (0.11)</td>
<td>2.02 (0.21)</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antidiscrimination policies</td>
<td>0.78 (0.28)</td>
<td>0, 1</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-0.53 (0.10)</td>
<td>-1.09 (0.21)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership practices</td>
<td>0.64 (0.36)</td>
<td>0, 1</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>-1.27 (0.10)</td>
<td>0.80 (0.21)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorical variables</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
<th>Categorical variables</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Racial Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender man</td>
<td>100 (18.2%)</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>361 (65.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender woman</td>
<td>144 (26.3%)</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>73 (13.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans man</td>
<td>50 (9.1%)</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>18 (3.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans woman</td>
<td>17 (3.1%)</td>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>12 (2.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-binary</td>
<td>122 (22.3%)</td>
<td>Latin American</td>
<td>17 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse gender</td>
<td>115 (21.0%)</td>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>2 (0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed race</td>
<td>65 (11.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Country of Residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual/Pansexual</td>
<td>167 (30.5%)</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>269 (49.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>94 (17.2%)</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>279 (50.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>94 (17.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>134 (24.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse sexuality</td>
<td>59 (10.7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorical variables</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
<th>Categorical variables</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No disability</td>
<td>278 (50.7%)</td>
<td>Less than $29,999</td>
<td>136 (24.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental/emotional</td>
<td>210 (38.3%)</td>
<td>$30,000 to 69,999</td>
<td>175 (31.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic illness</td>
<td>123 (22.4%)</td>
<td>$70,000 to 99,999</td>
<td>84 (15.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>92 (16.8%)</td>
<td>$100,000 or more</td>
<td>85 (15.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/mobility</td>
<td>56 (10.2%)</td>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>68 (12.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>16 (2.9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td>16 (2.9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>13 (2.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol and other substance use disorder</td>
<td>9 (1.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest Level of Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school or less</td>
<td>103 (18.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community college/trade school</td>
<td>39 (7.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some university</td>
<td>119 (21.7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor degree</td>
<td>163 (29.7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>101 (18.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional degree</td>
<td>21 (3.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>2 (0.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* No concerns were found in terms of missing data for all variables, except for acts of resistance (n=338). Diverse sexuality includes Two-Spirit, asexual, demisexual, androphilic, abrosexual, heterosexual, questioning, and unsure. Diverse gender includes Two-Spirit, agender, demigender, genderqueer, gender nonconforming, genderfluid, nonbinary, pangender, and questioning. Proportion of individuals with disabilities does not add up to 100% because 167 individuals selected more than one disability.
Table 2: Comparison of intersectional discrimination by gender, race, and disability status subgroups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersectional Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>F(df)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racialized TGNC</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.37 (0.47)</td>
<td>0.844 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racialized cisgender</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.33 (0.53)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White TGNC</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>0.40 (0.51)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White cisgender</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>0.32 (0.51)</td>
<td>8.371 (3)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racialized disabled</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.40 (0.56)</td>
<td>8.371 (3)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racialized no disability</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.31 (0.42)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White disabled</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>0.50 (0.57)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White no disability</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>0.24 (0.40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGNC disabled</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>0.43 (0.52)</td>
<td>8.724 (3)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGNC no disability</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.32 (0.45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender disabled</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.54 (0.69)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender no disability</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0.23 (0.37)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Intersectional discrimination measure ranged from 0-3.

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001.
**Table 3:** Moderation effects of the interaction between gender and disability on intersectional discrimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cisgender Standardized Coefficient (SE)</th>
<th>TGNC Standardized Coefficient (SE)</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effects of disability on intersectional discrimination</td>
<td>0.281 (0.068)**</td>
<td>0.111 (0.053)*</td>
<td>-0.410, 0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001.*
**Table 4:** Moderation effects of intersectional discrimination on the wellbeing outcome at different levels of the moderator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Standardized Coefficient (SE)</th>
<th>Medium Standardized Coefficient (SE)</th>
<th>High Standardized Coefficient (SE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social support from friends on mental wellbeing</td>
<td>0.114 (1.879)</td>
<td>1.780 (1.523)</td>
<td>3.447 (1.762)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antidiscrimination policies on social wellbeing in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space</td>
<td>-0.892 (0.127)***</td>
<td>-0.692 (0.115)***</td>
<td>-0.491 (0.175)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antidiscrimination policies on mental wellbeing</td>
<td>0.406 (2.354)</td>
<td>1.890 (1.983)</td>
<td>4.185 (2.199)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive institutional leadership practices on social wellbeing in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space</td>
<td>-0.752 (0.118)***</td>
<td>-0.577 (0.101)***</td>
<td>-0.403 (0.146)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive institutional leadership practices on mental wellbeing</td>
<td>1.010 (2.528)</td>
<td>1.549 (2.008)</td>
<td>4.107 (2.087)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p* < .05, ** *p* < .01, *** *p* < .001.
Figure 1: Full structural equation model with mediation and moderation 2-way interactions of gender, race, and disability (N=538). Notes. 5 models were run and included in this figure (one for the main variables of interest and one for each of the four moderators). 2SLGBTQ+ = Two-Spirit, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer. Rectangles represent observed variables; ovals represent unobserved latent variables. Values next to each arrow represents the value of the standardized coefficients. Model fit indices: $\chi^2(27)=122.738, p<0.001$, $\chi^2/df=4.546$, CFI=0.892, TLI=0.840, SRMR=0.098, RMSEA=0.080 (0.066,0.095). Model calculated with 10,000 bootstrap replications. *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001
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Chapter 3: Policing belongingness within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces: A mixed methods study

Abstract

The climate of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces can contribute to diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people’s sense of belonging and satisfaction within these spaces, but researchers do not often consider holistic conceptualizations of climate encompassing psychological and experiential aspects. This mixed methods study seeks to understand the holistic climate of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, including the factors that contribute to various constellations of climate, narratives of psychological and experiential climate, and the factors underpinning hostile and welcoming climates. Using latent profile analysis, three climate profiles emerged: contentious, ambivalent, and welcoming climates. Gender, disability, and organizational factors predicted profile membership. Further, each profile was associated with a progressively greater sense of belonging in and satisfaction with the leisure space, whereby lower scores on these outcomes were found for the contentious climate and higher scores for the welcoming climate. Follow-up interviews explored experiences and perceptions of discrimination among diverse participants representing each profile. The global theme of policing belongingness was found. Some participants perceived negative climates and reported facing systemic oppression attributed to gender identity and expression, race, and disability, all of which contributed to their poor sense of belonging in certain 2SLGBTQ+ spaces. Participants identified factors underpinning the climate to explain their levels of belonging and inclusion, including a dismissive attitude toward marginalization on other non-2SLGBTQ+ social identities, invisibility versus representation of diversity, “take space to make space,” having meaningful conversations, and implementing progressive leadership practices. The findings promote a holistic understanding of climate in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces and how climate shapes social outcomes, highlighting the need to address experiences of discrimination and perceptions of negative climate to ensure participants’ inclusion.

Keywords: 2SLGBTQ+; leisure; discrimination; belonging; climate; latent profile analysis
Introduction
Leisure experiences are socially and culturally constructed, often taking place in physical or virtual settings. In their free time, Two-Spirit, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and other sexually- and gender-diverse (2SLGBTQ+) people participate in leisure spaces and activities, and ones expressly for 2SLGBTQ+ people, such as bars, sport clubs, choirs, and chatrooms. Such spaces can offer safety from heterosexism and homophobia (Browne & Bakshi, 2011; Weeden et al., 2016), and participants can develop a sense of self and belonging to the 2SLGBTQ+ community (Arnold et al., 2018; Valentine & Skelton, 2003), freely express themselves (Weeden et al., 2016), and find support (Case & Hunter, 2012; Vo, 2020). Defined as connection, inclusion, acceptance, and support by other members, belonging is integral to realize the benefits of participating in these leisure settings (Testa et al., 2015). Unfortunately, many of these spaces have been created from a heterosexual, cisgender, white, ableist, monosexual ideology (Vo, 2021a) that marginalizes transgender/gender nonconforming (TGNC), racialized, disabled, and other participants with non-dominant identities.

Although many scholars have examined the experiences of 2SLGBTQ+ people in general leisure settings (Anderson et al., 2016; Baiocco et al., 2018; Cunningham & Pickett, 2018; Melton & Cunningham, 2013; Symons et al., 2016), the research on their experiences in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces has tended to focus on gender and sexuality (e.g., Browne & Bakshi, 2011; Johnson, 2005; Litwiller, 2021), although there has been a recent shift toward using an intersectionality lens (e.g., Held, 2016; Knee, 2018).

Many researchers thus far have often employed qualitative methods to illustrate that diverse members (e.g., TGNC, racialized, disabled) experience societal systems of oppression within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, such as cisgenderism, racism, and ableism, which can negatively impact their sense of belonging (Carter & Baliko, 2017;
Cheslik & Wright, 2021; Held, 2016; Jaspal, 2017; Knee, 2018). While informative, this research is limited in that researchers tend to overlook psychological aspects of inclusion/exclusion, which is a core part of a group’s or organization’s climate (Garvey & Rankin, 2015; Woodford et al., 2016; Woodford & Kulick, 2015). Further, to develop the most comprehensive understanding of climate, mixed methods designs are beneficial; quantitative data can provide opportunities to learn from a large sample and examine the relationships between climate and potential inputs and outcomes, while qualitative data insights can provide context and a richer understanding of the relationships that exist regarding the climate, social identity and organizational factors, as well as social outcomes (e.g., belonging and satisfaction with the 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space). For this study, I use mixed methods to understand the holistic climate of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, including the factors that contribute to various constellations of climate, narratives of psychological and experiential climate, and the factors underpinning varying climates for 2SLGBTQ+ people.

The Climate of 2SLGBTQ+ Leisure Spaces

In this study, organizational climate is understood to include both perceptions and experiences that contribute to individuals’ sense of safety and belongingness in particular settings (Garvey & Rankin, 2015; Woodford & Kulick, 2015). Much of the 2SLGBTQ+ climate research focuses on schools (e.g., Hong et al., 2016; Woodford & Kulick, 2015) and workplaces (e.g., Holman, 2018; Velez et al., 2013), with emerging literature examining community climate (e.g., Oswald et al., 2018; Paceley et al., 2020). These researchers, similar to those addressing climate for racialized (Reid & Radhakrishnan, 2003) and other marginalized groups (Toft, 2020), conceptualize climate as consisting of psychological and experiential aspects. Psychological climate refers to one’s perceptions of attitudes that other people in the setting have toward
minority groups (Woodford et al., 2016; Woodford & Kulick, 2015). In addition, scholars often assess psychological climate in terms of feelings of safety and comfort and being welcomed within a space (Garvey & Rankin, 2015), which they found to be associated with one’s sense of belonging in school (Collier et al., 2013; Woodford & Kulick, 2015) and job satisfaction in the workplace (Velez et al., 2013). Related to leisure experiences, negative attitudes and prejudice toward 2SLGBTQ+ people remain prevalent in sports and physical activity settings (Cunningham & Pickett, 2018; Gill et al., 2006), while perceptions and attitudes of racism and ableism are well documented in 2SLGBTQ+ settings (Cheslik & Wright, 2021; Giwa & Greensmith, 2012; Jaspal, 2017; Moreno et al., 2017). The latter concerns for racialized and/or disabled individuals in leisure settings are troubling because these marginalized participants sometimes perceive threats to their safety despite being in supposed safe spaces (Fox & Ore, 2010). As such, the benefits of being in these spaces may not be realized for these participants. Extrapolating from the climate research conducted in schools and workplaces, positive perceptions of climate in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces could contribute to greater feelings of social connection to the setting and other members.

Experiential climate encompasses behaviours, including verbal assaults, physical threats, and microaggressions, towards individuals within the setting (Velez et al., 2013; Woodford et al., 2016; Woodford & Kulick, 2015), and has been found to underpin negative outcomes, including diminished belonging (Carter & Baliko, 2017; Woodford & Kulick, 2015). Within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, researchers have often focused on the behavioural exclusion of certain members. They have found that certain bodies are often deemed not welcome or “othered” through microaggressions in those spaces, suggesting that, for example, participants must fit within the gender binary, be able-bodied, or even physically fit, in order to participate (Carter & Baliko, 2017).
2SLGBTQ+ bars and clubs, racialized people are often policed, and sometimes even barred from entry (Held, 2016; Jaspal, 2017). Disabled people frequently hide their disability when entering 2SLGBTQ+ spaces if they can or they are excluded altogether from these settings (Toft, 2020). These discriminatory experiences often result in marginalized people’s negative self-perceptions and sense of exclusion from these spaces (Held, 2016; Jaspal, 2017; Toft, 2020).

To fully understand climate in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, we must examine both experiential and psychological aspects, and consider how those aspects contribute to participants’ social outcomes (e.g., sense of belonging and satisfaction). To approach climate holistically, we should use methods that examine distinct categories based on key aspects of the leisure environment (e.g., latent profile analysis), as well as explore their relationship with outcomes. Moreover, we need to understand the role of sexuality, gender, race, and disability to understand how different groups experience and perceive the climate. Moreover, with growing awareness of equity, diversity, and inclusion, organizational leaders may be adopting strategies, such as antidiscrimination policies and inclusive leadership practices, to foster inclusive climates; however, researchers have not investigated these strategies in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces. Finally, although quantitatively examining holistic climate can offer much-needed insights, we also should explore narratives that explain the relationship between climate and belonging, particularly the factors that underpin the climate-outcome relationship. Accordingly, I engaged in a mixed method study utilizing an online quantitative survey and virtual qualitative interviews.

**Study Methodology and Research Questions**

For the present study, I use a mixed methods design involving an online survey and follow-up interviews to understand the holistic climate of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces,
including the factors that contribute to various profiles of climate, narratives of experiential and psychological climate, and the factors underpinning hostile climates for some 2SLGBTQ+ people. Specifically, I quantitatively explored the following questions: (1) What are the profiles of climate, examining both experiential and psychological indicators of climate? (2) What social identities (gender, sexuality, race, disability),

demographics (age, country of residence), and organizational (antidiscrimination policies, inclusive leadership practices) factors are associated with membership in each profile? (3) How do the profiles relate to outcomes (sense of belonging in the 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space, satisfaction with the 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space)? And qualitatively, I asked: (1) What does holistic climate look like in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces? (2) What are the perceptions of the climate? (3) What kinds of discriminatory experiences do participants face? (4) How do these perceptions and experiences relate to participants’ sense of belonging in these spaces across the different climate profiles? (5) What factors underpin the different climate profiles and explain participants’ belonging in these spaces? I conducted the study over 10 months during the COVID-19 pandemic and the study was informed by a community advisory group. The Wilfrid Laurier University Research Ethics Board approved the study.

Quantitative Survey Sample and Procedure

For the quantitative phase, I use a confidential online survey ($N = 548$) of participants from Canada and the United States. See Table 1 for details about the social identities and demographics of survey participants. For the survey, I used purposive sampling and recruited respondents via social media ads and posters through 2SLGBTQ+

---

10 Consistent with other scholars who use quantitative methods to study intersectionality (e.g., Else-Quest & Hyde, 2016; McCall, 2005), I use social identities (e.g., gender, race, disability) as indicators of their respective systems of oppression (e.g., cisgenderism, racism, ableism).
organizations and community groups in both countries. I used quota sampling to recruit at least 100 racialized and 100 TGNC participants. Interested individuals completed a screening survey and eligible individuals were provided a link to the consent form and study survey, which took participants between 20-60 minutes to complete. Participants received or had $10 donated to a 2SLGBTQ+ organization. I administered the surveys using XM Qualtrics. I used quality control procedures (e.g., fraudulent scores, IP address monitoring) and questions (e.g., separate questions about age and year of birth) to authenticate responses. At the end of the survey, respondents were invited to participate in a follow-up virtual interview. Consistent with my integrated design, each participant’s data from the two phases were matched.

**Measures**

Descriptive statistics are reported in Table 1. Average scores are reported for all multi-item continuous measures. All continuous measures are scored so that a higher score indicates more of the phenomenon. When completing measures concerning 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, respondents reported on the space in which they spent most of their leisure time in the past two years. For each adapted and newly developed multi-item scale, factor analysis produced a single-factor solution with item loadings greater than 0.4.

**Climate**

Climate indicators included two measures of psychological climate, namely perceived climate and perceived comfort in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space, and intersectional discrimination assessing experiential climate.

**Perceived Inclusive Climate.** A six-item scale about overall climate within the 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space was adapted from the National LGBTQ College Climate Survey (Rankin et al., 2010). The items use semantic differential questions related to
friendliness (vs. hostile), caring (vs. indifferent), cooperative (vs. uncooperative), welcoming (vs. unwelcoming), respectful (vs. disrespectful), as well as overall positive environment (vs. negative environment); all scored on a 7-point scale with a higher score indicating a more positive assessment of the climate ($\alpha = .95$).

**Perceived Comfort in 2SLGBTQ+ Leisure Space.** Taken from the National LGBTQ College Climate Survey (Rankin et al., 2010), respondents rated their comfort level with the climate/environment of the 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space (1 = very uncomfortable, 7 = very comfortable).

**Intersectional Discrimination.** An adapted version of the Intersectional Discrimination Scale (Scheim & Bauer, 2019) was used. The stem sentence (“because of who you are”), which invites participants to indicate how often they experienced each listed form of discrimination related to their identities, such as race, gender, sexuality, and disability (to name a few listed in the stem sentence), was revised to focus on leisure spaces. Also, two items were added, including an open-ended item to capture discrimination incidents not reflected in the other items, and the reference period was changed from one year to two years (0 = never, 3 = almost every time; $\alpha = .91$). The final 11-item scale addressed different forms of discrimination that individuals directly faced with some items addressing indirect or witnessing discrimination experiences, including being told they or people like them do not belong, or hearing others joke or laugh about them, or people like them.

**Sociodemographics and 2SLGBTQ+ Organizational Level Factors**

**Sociodemographics.** Social identities and demographics included sexuality, gender, age, racialized status, age, disability status, and country of residence. Respondents could identify multiple answers for sexuality and gender; they were also given an open textbox if their identity did not match any of the available response options. See Table
Antidiscrimination Policies. This three-item index, adapted from the Diversity Policies subscale of the 2SLGBTQ+ Perceptions of Campus Climate Scale (Woodford, personal communication, 2019) asked participants about their awareness of antidiscrimination policies within the 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space. Responses included no, yes, and don’t know; sample item: “Procedures for reporting discrimination are available or publicized.” Responses for “don’t know” and “no” were grouped together, as exploratory analysis showed no significant differences between these responses in relation to the climate measures and social outcomes. A higher score reflects more antidiscrimination policies exist of which participants are aware.

Inclusive Leadership Practices. This five-item index, adapted from the Institutional Leadership subscale from the 2SLGBTQ+ Perceptions of Campus Climate Scale (Woodford, personal communication, 2019) asked participants about inclusive leadership practices within the specified 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space. Responses included no, yes, and don’t know; sample item: “Leaders treat the wellbeing of every participant as important.” Like the policy scale and for the same empirical reasons, “don’t know” and “no” responses were grouped together. A higher score indicates the presence of more inclusive leadership practices.

Outcomes

Sense of Belonging in 2SLGBTQ+ Leisure Space. This seven-item scale was developed from the Sense of Belonging Scale (Dugan et al., 2012) for postsecondary campuses and the Community Connectedness Scale (Testa et al., 2015) for 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree; α = .92); sample items: “I feel

---

11 See study website for more details: https://lgbtq2sthrivingoncampus.ca/en_ca/
accepted as a part of the community.” and “It provides a group of people with whom I can be myself.”

**Satisfaction with 2SLGBTQ+ Leisure Space.** This three-item scale asked respondents to rate their level of satisfaction with the 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space. I adapted one item from the Campus Climate subscale (Reid & Radhakrishnan, 2003) and created the other two items (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree; sample item: “I plan to continue participating in this space/activity;” \( \alpha = .78 \)).

**Statistical Analyses**

To answer the first quantitative research question in understanding the complexity of climate in terms of both psychological and experiential, I used latent profile analysis (LPA). LPA statistically assigns each case to their most likely latent subgroup based on observed data (Williams & Kibowski, 2016), which for this study included the three climate measures. Using Mplus v.8.6 software (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2021), latent profile models were explored that included two to seven profiles. Models of best fit were assessed using eight criteria: Akaike’s Information Criterion (AIC), the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC), Sample-size adjusted Bayesian Information Criterion (SSA-BIC), Consistent Akaike’s Information Criterion (CAIC), Vuong-Lo-Mendell-Rubin Likelihood Ratio (VLMR), Adjusted Lo-Mendell-Rubin Likelihood Ratio (ALMR), Bootstrapped Likelihood Ratio Test (BLRT), and entropy. Lower values of AIC, BIC, SSA-BIC, and CAIC indicate better fit, while significant \( p \)-values for VLMR, ALMR, and BLRT indicate that the model with more profiles is more adequate (Williams & Kibowski, 2016). Models including profiles with fewer than five percent of the participants classified were rejected (Hamza & Willoughby, 2013). Finally, higher entropy values indicate greater accuracy of the classification, but is not used as an indicator to select the model used (Pastor et al., 2007). To determine the model with
the best fit, these criteria along with the parsimony and substantive interpretability of
the latent profile solutions were considered (Morin, 2016).

To identify the model of best fit, I conducted the LPA six times with more
profiles added for each analysis (see Table 2 for the indices of fit). The AIC, BIC, SSA-
BIC, and CAIC all continued to decrease and the p-values for the VLMR and ALMR
increased as each model was tested; however, through assessing these values using the
elbow plot (not shown), I identified the second model as the point in which the slope of
the curve decreased, demonstrating diminishing gains in model fit as each additional
profile was added (Morin, 2016). Finally, I selected the three-profile model because it
had the largest number of profiles and each profile contained more than five percent of
the sample (Hamza & Willoughby, 2013). The p-values for the VLMR, ALMR, and
BLRT remained significant (< 0.05) for the three-profile model.

Once the number of profiles was identified, I conducted additional analysis in
Mplus to answer the second and third research quantitative questions to determine the
social identity, demographic, organizational factors, and outcomes associated with
profile membership. I used the DCAT auxiliary command to examine categorical
variables, and the BCH auxiliary command for continuous variables (Asparouhov &
Muthen, 2014). These tests consider participants’ profile membership probabilities
without impacting the nature of the profiles identified, which provides the opportunity
to compare the profiles on the covariates (Bravo et al., 2018; Meyer et al., 2015; Wang
et al., 2016).

Qualitative Semi-Structured Interview

To select participants for the qualitative phase, I assigned each participant a profile (1,
2, or 3) based on the probability (>90%) that they would fall into each. Among those
who expressed interest in being interviewed, using purposive sampling in terms of
diverse identities and survey participants’ response to the open-ended question about an experience of discrimination in the leisure space, I recruited across the three profiles. I invited 45 survey participants for an interview and 22 individuals completed an interview (range 40-90 minutes). The sample was diverse with 14 identifying as TGNC individuals, 15 identifying as racialized individuals, and 11 identifying as disabled individuals (see Table 3 for demographic characteristics of interview participants). Participants were provided $50 e-gift card or had $50 donated to a 2SLGBTQ+ organization. Interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim.

During the interviews, I explored participants’ engagement in the 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces/activities they identified in their survey responses, including experiences of discrimination related to their own and others’ marginalized identities. I asked participants to describe how welcomed they felt in the leisure setting and further explored one of the scenarios they cited in their survey. Finally, I asked about organizational and social norms and other aspects within the space. In their narratives, some participants referred to other 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces and even contrasted previous negative experiences with positive and welcoming experiences reported in the survey. Throughout the interview phase, I engaged in reflexive journaling to track my thinking, concerns, and feelings to aid in analysis.

**Thematic Analyses**

To address the five qualitative research questions, I conducted a thematic analysis of the interviews. I began the analysis by listening to the interview recordings and reading the transcripts to immerse myself in the data. In NVivo 12 (QSR International, 1999-2022), I assigned attributes (i.e., social identity, demographics, and profile number) to each case/participant. My formal analysis process began by developing an initial coding framework based on two of the longer interviews. I assigned codes to the raw data and
organized those codes into categories or themes (Ritchie & Lewis, 2006). Then, I analyzed the remaining transcripts using the coding framework, adding emerging codes as needed. Once all transcripts were analyzed, I examined axial codes to identify connections across them to develop global themes via a conceptual map (Creswell, 2016; Ritchie & Lewis, 2006). I completed member-checking (Creswell, 2016) after thematic analysis by following up with participants to ensure the themes reflect the essence of what participants’ narratives, which confirmed the thematic analysis. I assigned pseudonyms to participants after data analysis.

Results

Quantitative Findings: Overview

The quantitative findings involved the creation and selection of climate profiles using the procedures detailed above. I also describe the differences across the different profiles based on the three indicators used to create the profiles. Next, I explain the association of the profile membership with social identities, demographic characteristics, organizational factors, and social outcomes (i.e., belonging and satisfaction in the 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space).

Profiles and Profile Probability

Table 4 includes the bivariate correlations between the three indicators comprising the profiles. There were low percentages of missing values (0.55% - 3.47%). As previously described, I had selected the three-profile model because it best fit the data. To facilitate understanding and discussion of the profiles, based on constellation of climate data reflected in each, I labelled them as contentious climate (Profile 1), ambivalent climate (Profile 2), and welcoming climate (Profile 3). Table 5 shows the mean probabilities for most likely latent profile membership, representing the quality of classification. The
analysis identified high probabilities of belonging in the assigned profiles (range: 0.898 – 0.978) and low probabilities of belonging in a different profile (range: 0.000 – 0.083). The means of each continuous variable used as profile indicators were standardized using the mean and standard deviation of the overall sample and plotted in Figure 1.

The contentious climate profile was the smallest profile \((n = 46)\) and participants reported high levels of intersectional discrimination and low levels of perceived climate and perceived comfort in the 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space. The ambivalent climate profile was intermediate in size \((n = 112)\) and participants reported moderate levels of all three indicators. The largest profile, the welcoming climate profile \((n = 390)\) comprised participants who reported low levels of intersectional discrimination and high levels of perceived climate and comfort in the 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space.

**Variables Associated with Profile Membership**

Table 6 illustrates the associations of participants’ social identities, demographic characteristics, and organizational factors and outcomes with their latent profile membership. I examined the probabilities of participants with various characteristics being classified within each profile; I saw a significant difference \((p = .001)\) between the ambivalent and welcoming climate profiles in terms of the likelihood of identifying as disabled, and the difference between the contentious and welcoming climate profiles was approaching significance \((p = .06)\). Participants in the welcoming climate profile had the lowest probability of identifying as disabled \((0.43)\), followed by the contentious climate profile \((0.59)\) and ambivalent climate profile \((0.64)\). When I examined the gender binary variable (TGNC vs cisgender), there was a significant difference \((p = .05)\) between the ambivalent and welcoming profiles with a greater probability of being TGNC in the ambivalent profile \((0.64)\) than in the welcoming profile \((0.52)\). I did not
observe significant differences across profiles for age, sexuality, or racialized status.

For the two organizational factors, levels of antidiscrimination policies and inclusive leadership practices were significantly different between both the contentious \((p = .006 \text{ and } p < .001, \text{ respectively for policies and practices})\) and ambivalent \((p < .001 \text{ for both policies and practices})\) climate profiles compared to the welcoming climate profile. For antidiscrimination policies, the welcoming climate profile had a greater presence of policies \((M = 0.71)\) compared to the contentious \((M = 0.52)\) and ambivalent \((M = 0.55)\) climate profiles. Similarly for inclusive leadership practices, the welcoming climate profile had the highest presence of practices \((M = 0.87)\), followed by the contentious \((M = 0.56)\) and ambivalent \((M = 0.55)\) climate profiles.

In terms of outcomes, I identified significant differences across the three profiles for belonging \((p < .001 \text{ in all comparisons})\) and satisfaction \((p < .001 \text{ in all comparisons except between contentious and ambivalent where } p = .019)\), where the contentious climate profile had the lowest level of both variables, followed by the ambivalent climate profile and the welcoming climate profile with the highest levels (Table 6).

**Qualitative Findings: Overview**

For this study, I draw on the participants’ narratives of their engagement with the leisure setting reported in the survey as well as other spaces they described during the interview. The latter cases provided context to their overall engagement, and in some situations were useful comparators to their recent experiences. Across the narratives, the global theme of policing belongingness in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces was identified (Figure 2), such that no matter the source of the discrimination, and if it was directly or indirectly experienced, it seemed to relate to an experience of policing who belongs in the leisure space. This global theme is comprised of three sub-themes: (1) holistic climate; (2) policing diverse participants; and (3) factors underpinning holistic climates.
Holistic Climate: Psychological and Experiential Climate

Perceptions of the Climate

Many participants in the welcoming climate profile and some in the ambivalent climate profile identified feeling welcomed in some 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces—those in which they tended to spend a lot of their free time—where their sexuality is embraced or where they also shared identities with a majority of members (i.e., those in dominant groups in those spaces). Some individuals with marginalized identities, including TGNC, racialized, and/or disabled individuals, sought out and were affiliated with spaces where their multiple identities were welcomed, such as a campus-based social group for queer and trans people of colour or a Facebook group for autistic TGNC individuals. These individuals felt welcomed in those settings because their unique identities are appreciated, while they, and many others, felt excluded in general 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, such as gay bars, 2SLGBTQ+ sports teams, and other spaces that do not appreciate intersectional identities. Jason (genderfluid, racialized, disabled) clarified: “Folks who don’t feel welcome into the [general leisure] spaces have broken off and created their own spaces.” When talking about these exclusionary spaces (not reported in the survey), participants shared negative perceptions of the climate as marginalized people, causing them to feel invisible and have a diminished sense of belonging. For example, Sam (nonbinary, racialized, non-disabled) explained the complexity of their experiences of belonging in various spaces:

Because I’m not female-identified, I would probably be welcomed briefly in women’s spaces or lesbian circles except my partner is male-bodied so that would promptly make me not welcome, but I’m not comfortable with those spaces. … I am not welcome in gay male spaces even [though] that’s the direction I tend to identify because I’m not visibly male enough.
These perceptions of climate relate to the experiences that people encounter in various 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings.

**Experiential Climate**

Collectively, participants shared illustrations of when they faced discrimination themselves, as well as others when they observed others being discriminated against (explained in the next section). As per the design of the interview, participants were asked to speak to examples of discrimination reported in their survey responses, but they also shared additional situations, including in general 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces (e.g., 2SLGBTQ+ sports teams, gay bars, and clubs). In terms of the profiles, most participants from the contentious and ambivalent climate profiles described personal experiences of discrimination, whereas most from the welcoming climate profile described observations of discrimination directed at other marginalized people, and only a few of them discussed personal experiences of discrimination in the setting. For those in the welcoming climate profile, they referred to spaces that were not identified in the survey and were general 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces. Notwithstanding the direct or indirect discrimination described, aligning with their reported perceptions, participants referred to these experiences/observations in general 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, rather than spaces created for various intersections of 2SLGBTQ+ people. Both direct and indirect discrimination involved comments (e.g., insults, invalidations) conveying that the target must fit certain standards of “queer” or “trans” to belong. Taylor (nonbinary, racialized, non-disabled, ambivalent climate) described being told that “I wasn’t queer enough. I didn’t belong in that space. If I want to prove to people that I’m queer … I need to completely change my presentation to appear the way that they want me to.” This type of policing was often directed at TGNC, racialized, and disabled individuals.
Policing Diverse Participants

Across the interviews, aligned with the idea of policing who belongs, these experiences were attributed to being different or outside of the dominant group in terms of gender identity and expression, race/ethnicity, and/or disability. Additionally, some participants described experiences or observations of rejection in sexual or romantic contexts and a complete disregard for the target’s existence due their race and disability, respectively. As seen below, reported experiences of direct and indirect exclusion were often related to being TGNC, racialized, or disabled in general 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings.

Gender Identity and Expression/Cisgenderism

Many TGNC participants described experiencing a form of policing through slights and negative comments, for example, comments related to the target not expressing their gender in a binary way (i.e., man or woman). Through their comments, the perpetrators suggested what the “right” trans experience should look like, which centred around fitting within the gender binary by completing hormone therapy and gender-affirming surgery. Arnold (trans man, white, non-disabled, ambivalent climate) reasoned this observation among white trans perpetrators who compare themselves to others who hold multiple marginalized identities and “they get really defensive about it” because “that makes [them] feel like [they] don’t feel enough hardship.”

Another example involved transmisogynistic ridicule in a women’s softball league, where Jay (nonbinary, racialized, disabled, welcoming climate) overheard exclusionary comments directed at a trans woman from fellow cisgender women players reminding the trans woman that they did not belong in that space: “They weren't okay with that [trans woman] playing in the league…there was a lot of animosity towards that person, a lot of transphobic jokes, and how that person should not be here … [that] this is a women’s league.”
Unfortunately, many TGNC participants often negotiated experiences of having their bodies policed, which resulted in their exclusion from the 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space. Sam (nonbinary, racialized, non-disabled, ambivalent climate) explained their frustration with having their gender identity and expression policed for not being “visibly queer enough for the queer community particularly because [they are] trans, agender, genderfluid, leaning trans-masculine.” Sam explained that their gender identity and expression, or lack of concern for fitting within a particular gender category contributed to their isolation from various 2SLGBTQ+ spaces, whether by choice or not.

A few cisgender and TGNC participants described microaggressions through invalidations or jokes directed at TGNC individuals who could pass as straight cisgender people, which worked to bar them from entering that 2SLGBTQ+ space. Taylor (nonbinary, racialized, non-disabled, ambivalent climate) explained:

There’s more people trying to keep people in check, but that has also led to some not great experiences among different people who are having the way that they describe their identity policed or jokes [are said] about people who do not fit a queer expectation of what a queer person should look like or should act like. So, I think that very often people who look like me [appearing gender-conforming] … are seen as following homonormativity, which is not the case. And also [are] perceived to either be straight or cisgender, which again is not the case. So, I think that can be really troublesome for folks in feeling as though they don’t belong in a space.

Unfortunately, this act of gatekeeping contributed to many participants’ exclusion from 2SLGBTQ+ spaces and even being selective with whom they engaged in these spaces. As Pat (genderfluid, racialized, non-disabled, welcoming climate) said:
“the division within LGBT and especially even within the trans umbrella alone is what has historically kept me from engaging, so that was distressing. … I’m constantly wondering like, am I going to be kicked out for not being [trans] enough?” This feeling of not being “enough” due to the policing that occurs in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings is also seen in relation to race but not with disability (discussed below).

**Race/Racism**

Similar to gender identity and expression, various race-based experiences of exclusion involved policing by others that often took place when participants do not fit a particular cast of what it is to be a racialized 2SLGBTQ+ person. Erin (cisgender woman, racialized, non-disabled, ambivalent climate) referred to her inability to enter certain leisure spaces to be able to connect with other 2SLGBTQ+ people who share her heritage.

I am a Latina woman, but I’m also very pale. And I know that there are spaces that I don’t access because I don’t look the way that a lot of other Latina or Hispanic women think that a Latina or Hispanic woman should look. I don’t go because there’s a lot of conversation around white passing and presenting… and it’s so heart-breaking.

Another form of discrimination participants in the welcoming climate profile observed is related to rejection of racialized individuals in romantic or sexual contexts. For example, Marla (cisgender woman, racialized, non-disabled, welcoming climate) described: “On Grindr, I’ve heard about people specifically saying, even having racial slurs in their bio, like, I don’t want to date X, Y, Z.” This idea negated the quality of racialized people as sexual or romantic partners. The exclusion and rejection due to race in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings contributed to people’s diminished sense of belonging, which people with disabilities experienced in a different way.
Disability/Ableism

Disability-related discrimination reflected a complete disregard of disabled 2SLGBTQ+ people within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces; participants in all three climate profiles described such experience. Ash (nonbinary, white, disabled, contentious climate) described their disability as a challenge to participating in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces: “My biggest problem is LGBTQ+ spaces just are sometimes physically inaccessible. Disabled queer people exist, but I think the system has no consideration of that.” Likewise, a few others discussed group members attempting to engage marginalized individuals, such as TGNC or racialized individuals, but they overlooked disabled individuals. This issue was exemplified by Jordan (nonbinary, white, disabled, welcoming climate) about their workplace 2SLGBTQ+ support group: “It is overall inclusive, and I do feel okay recommending it to trans folks … The two leaders were people of colour, so I felt like people could talk about race and stuff. But … disability stuff? I don’t know.” Essentially, disabled people are policed in these spaces through inadvertent erasure and the challenges (e.g., mobility, intellectual dis/ability) they might face when accessing 2SLGBTQ+ settings. Overall, the exclusion related to gender identity and expression, race, and disability all relate to people’s negative perceptions of the climate and their diminished sense of belonging in those leisure spaces.

Factors Underpinning the Climate of 2SLGBTQ+ Leisure Spaces

The factors underpinning the climates—both the quantitative profiles and the qualitative narratives—involves five main processes, namely a dismissive attitude toward marginalization on other social markers, invisibility vs representation of diversity, “take space to make space,” meaningful conversations, and progressive leadership practices. Members across all climate profiles discussed these processes, including the absence of select factors. That is, participants from all climate profiles discussed the absence of
such processes or negative experiences in relation to these processes that contributed to their exclusion in general 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, usually places where they did not spend a lot of their free time. Participants from the welcoming climate profile referred to opportunities for some processes, such as “take space to make space,” meaningful conversations, and progressive leadership practices, that supported their inclusion, predominantly in specific 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, where their multiple identities are appreciated and they spent a lot of their leisure time (e.g., a discussion group for queer and trans students of colour). These factors are further described in the subsequent sections.

**Dismissive Attitude**

Many participants attributed feelings of not being welcomed to an attitude among other members that these spaces were created for 2SLGBTQ+ people—individuals who were marginalized—which somehow allowed them to speak openly negatively about TGNC, racialized, and/or disabled individuals, and to permit exclusionary actions if they wished. Such discourses, in turn, perpetuate negative narratives about marginalized groups within the space and essentially police who belongs in the space. For example:

> Queer spaces are not [created in] a vacuum … We all grow up and we all learn racist and ableist thoughts … Then we come to a space and still bring all those brainwashed things … I think that sometimes it becomes even harder to challenge those ideas in a group already meant for marginalized communities. Let’s say you’re in a [2SLGBTQ+] group, and then you say, “hey, don’t be anti-Black or don’t be fat-phobic.” Somebody might say, “oh my gosh, we’re just trying to have a safe space for us queer people, and you’re just trying to make it a negative place.” You can’t critique me because I have this [marginalized] identity. Because of that layer, that this group is meant for a specific community,
then it can be difficult to ask folks to not be bigoted. (Erica, cisgender woman, racialized, non-disabled, welcoming climate)

*Invisibility Versus Representation of Diversity*

This process referred to a lack of diverse identities being represented at all levels of the 2SLGBTQ+ space and the need for representation, including among the leadership and the general membership. Many participants in all three climate profiles described the lack of representation in general 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces where they did not spend a lot of their leisure time, and how representation has contributed to their sense of belonging in specific 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces where they spent a lot of their free time. Many marginalized participants felt invisible and that there was a lack of representation within general 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces which often exclude TGNC, racialized, and/or disabled people. Referring to their TGNC identity within a 2SLGBTQ+ curling group in a small city, Tryst (nonbinary, white, disabled, welcoming climate) described this as: “There’s a bit of a narrower identity, fewer models of ways to be [a] LGBTQ [person]. There was kind of a lack of queerness about it.” Moreover, George (cisgender man, white, non-disabled, welcoming climate) explained that the diversity of the 2SLGBTQ+ community needs to be reflected in 2SLGBTQ+ spaces: “We do come in all sizes, shapes, and colours. That's an important thing to celebrate and encourage in [the men’s group].”

Supporting representation, James (cisgender man, racialized, non-disabled, welcoming climate) noted that visible diversity helps “people feel a little more at ease. I feel it’s very inclusive.” Unfortunately, Casey (nonbinary, white, disabled, welcoming climate) identified a similar concern for a general 2SLGBTQ+ space regarding representation of TGNC participants: “If more trans people were there, then I would feel more comfortable. But if I feel isolated as the only trans person there, then how are
more trans people supposed to feel safe in the space? It’s a catch-22.” Moreover, Pat (genderfluid, racialized, non-disabled, welcoming climate) noted the difference in comfort level when there was a racial mix of facilitators in a group: “Because one of the facilitators was Black [in a gender support group], I instantly had a feeling of, they’re making the effort … I feel it adds a lot.”

“Take Space to Make Space”
Related to the need for representation at all levels, some multiple marginalized participants from all three climate profiles described a practice to address the lack of considerations for intersectionality and the absence of space for marginalized members in general 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings, often where they did not spend a lot of their free time: “take space to make space.” Ash (nonbinary, white, disabled, contentious climate) explained: “[There] is an intense focus on universal gay experiences. The idea of oh, all gay people do this. … But I think sometimes, the ultra-focus prevents intersectional identities from taking that space.” Reflecting the lack of concern for intersectionality, Jackson (agender, racialized, non-disabled, welcoming climate) described an experience where racism was not discussed within a 2SLGBTQ+ student group:

During a momentous point with queer racial justice and racial injustices in the country, there was no discussion. The response I received [when raising the issue] was because there’s white people there, they’re not going to talk about things that don’t pertain to them.

Several participants’ narratives suggested that there seemed to be amnesia regarding the heterogeneity of the 2SLGBTQ+ community, or even a disinterest in broadening the scope to encompass diverse identities and related experiences. In doing so, an absence of space remains for diverse 2SLGBTQ+ members, contributing to their exclusion in certain 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces.
To resist, Taylor (nonbinary, racialized, non-disabled, ambivalent climate) described the concept of “take space to make space:” “If you’re someone who takes up a lot of space, maybe step back a little bit, and if you’re someone who doesn’t take up space, maybe come forward.” In doing so, this concept prioritized the various needs and comfort level of members. Similarly, as a white nonbinary person, Ash (nonbinary, white, disabled, contentious climate) described this need to be mindful of the space dominant groups take up:

Know when your voice is wanted. I know that I can’t be the centre of a conversation about racism in the LGBTQ community because I have contributed to racism in the LGBTQ community. So, I think recognizing when certain voices do need to be silenced in the name of improvement.

It is not so much silencing certain voices, but more about raising and centring the voices of marginalized individuals within the space.

*Having Meaningful Conversations*

Meaningful conversation referred to practices employed by members and leaders to call people in rather than calling them out whenever they noticed discriminatory practices occurring. Many participants from all climate profiles engaged in meaningful conversations, including when addressing issues. Ty (nonbinary, racialized, disabled, welcoming climate) explained that calling out occurred when people point out problematic situations or comments, but do not explain what was problematic, while calling in engaged people in conversations about the problematic nature of the situations or comments and comes from a place of learning. The act of calling out, commonly found in spaces where participants spent little time, often resulted in members becoming defensive and sometimes withdrawing from their engagement within the leisure space, while calling in, usually observed in spaces where participants spent most of their time,
supports their desire to continue their participation. Taylor (nonbinary, racialized, non-disabled, ambivalent climate) offered an example when they described learning about the use of the acronym NB to refer to both nonbinary and non-Black, and engaging in discussions with Black nonbinary individuals that they already had a relationship with about the appropriateness of the acronym, which they ascertained being “more productive than the one on the [Facebook] page where it was primarily people just calling out rather than calling in.” Part of what makes the conversation meaningful was the emphasis on learning and building relationships to ensure that people did not get defensive when uncomfortable or difficult discussions arose. As Jackson (agender, racialized, non-disabled, welcoming climate) noted, “It’s hard to have that conversation [difficult conversation] with people who are unwilling to receive that information.”

*Progressive Leadership Practices*

Noted by some participants from all three climate profiles, this process refers to actions that leaders of the space engaged in to create unwelcoming spaces for the participants in two types of places: those where they did not spend a lot of their free time and those that led to welcoming spaces where they spent most of their leisure time. Regarding the former, some leaders were described as perpetuating an unwelcoming environment for some members, including policing members, not acting to address issues and other members’ behaviours, and involving marginalized members in a tokenistic way. Some leaders were observed bullying other members and policing who should belong in the space. In some cases, leaders seemed to lack concern for the social exclusion that took place, or did nothing to address discrimination. Ty (nonbinary, racialized, disabled, welcoming climate) described a concern that led to no response among the leadership of their 2SLGBTQ+ group:
That space was almost exclusively white, and there was a lot of pain there … Me and some other folks of colour [tried] to make it better, [but] there was a lot of microaggressions that would happen, and us pouring our hearts out to leadership and not a lot of response.

The lack of leadership response was disappointing for individuals, especially when they sought out an intervention. Participants involved in larger 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces with paid and volunteer staff often noted that the staff and volunteers, like the organization’s leader, were unable to interact with marginalized 2SLGBTQ+ people, which made people feel unwelcomed. Kit (agender, racialized, disabled, welcoming climate) explained: “If you have a volunteer who has a different background, or a volunteer who has a racial prejudice or not much exposure to people who are disabled, then there’s that mismatch that can cause people to feel unwelcomed.” Finally, in some cases, the leaders tried to involve certain people to make the leadership look inclusive. Tryst (nonbinary, white, disabled, welcoming climate) described a situation of being objectified and used where the organization chose them to be a spokesperson for the TGNC community because they “passed so successfully, I’m kind of like a poster child for trans people.”

Contrastingly, inclusive leadership practices that reinforce a culture of safety and learning contributed to inclusion within the 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space where the participants spent most of their leisure time, as described by many members of the ambivalent and welcoming climates. This process often involved reminders of the importance of safety within the space and the diversity of members so that people acknowledged and welcomed differing lived experiences. George (cisgender man, white, non-disabled, welcoming climate) described a reminder given by a leader in a social group: “We are inclusive here. We respect that everybody is different, that
everyone has a different story … We do not discriminate here. It doesn’t matter what you look like or what your body type is.” Similarly, James (cisgender man, racialized, non-disabled, welcoming climate) explained what his choir leaders would remind them at the start of each session: “It doesn’t matter where you’re from or what your identity, if you have something to say, we will try and listen and be respectful.” As a strategy to create a culture of safety and inclusion, Ty (nonbinary, racialized, disabled, welcoming climate) described creating community agreements as a leader within their 2SLGBTQ+ spaces to “help people be more respectful of everybody else and more understanding.” These community agreements included discussions around safety and inclusion, being mindful of the space people took up, calling in instead of calling out, and focusing on impact over intention. In reference to a virtual space, Arnold (trans man, white, non-disabled, ambivalent climate) described moderators:

Shutting down a conversation when they see it starting to go off the rails …
They’ll make a large post as a reminder that this isn’t tolerated at all … We’re not here to specifically silence anybody but we’re also not going to tolerate anybody being a bigot. They put in the work and do frequent reminders that this is a place for everybody.

Another inclusive leadership practice involved removing barriers to entry and gatekeeping practices, which only participants in the ambivalent and welcoming climate profiles identified. Sam (nonbinary, racialized, non-disabled, ambivalent climate) explained the way their group attempted to overcome gatekeeping practices:

It’s been made clear on our national and local chapters many times in the virtual spaces … If you even say, “Such and such person shouldn’t be here because they’re not queer or they’re not queer enough,” you’re the one that’s going to get a talking to or booted … There is zero tolerance for that.
For both virtual and in-person spaces, part of this practice is to monitor the situation continuously and when incidents arise to catch them before it gets too far and enforce that all are welcomed in the space. As several participants mentioned, it can be difficult for moderators in online spaces to constantly monitor, so some incidents might be missed. Some participants noted that for in-person settings, leaders, staff, volunteers, and other members need to have appropriate training to recognize issues and confidence to feel comfortable enough to step in when situations arise, including cisgenderism, racism, and ableism.

Discussion

In this study, I provide evidence for a holistic understanding of climate in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces—that is addressing both experiential and psychological climate and engaging both quantitative and qualitative data. The quantitative findings indicate that the climate of these spaces where participants spend most of their leisure time can be positive for many members, mixed for others, and negative for some. Further, gender, disability, as well as organizational factors might play a role in predicting profile membership. That is, TGNC and disabled participants are more likely to be in the contentious and ambivalent climates profiles. In addition, individuals in the welcoming profiles are more likely to report policies and leadership practices compared to those in the contentious or ambivalent climates. Further, climate matters in terms of belonging and satisfaction, with the greatest levels of these outcomes reported among those belonging to the welcoming climate, followed by the ambivalent and contentious climate profiles, respectively.

The qualitative findings suggest that 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces—including those that are welcoming based on the profiles—are susceptible to cisgenderism, racism, and ableism, and members who are TGNC, racialized, and/or disabled often are
policing within these same spaces. Like the quantitative findings suggest, facing discrimination can lead to a diminished sense of belonging and inclusion. Numerous factors, including a dismissive attitude, invisibility vs representation of diversity, “take space to make space,” meaningful conversations, and progressive leadership practices, underpin the holistic climate, be it positive, negative, or mixed. The findings overall address the dearth of scholarship on climate in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, as well as provide deeper insight into both experiential and psychological climate. The following sections discuss the climate profiles and what they entail quantitatively and qualitatively, the quantitative covariates and the qualitative attributions of discrimination and policing within these spaces, as well as the organizational factors and factors underpinning the climate that contribute to the exclusion and inclusion of diverse members from certain 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces.

Profiles of Climate

The three climate profiles (contentious, ambivalent, and welcoming) demonstrate an expected variation in the indicators for both experiential and psychological climate. For example, the contentious climate profile shows high incidence of intersectional discrimination and low reports of positive psychological climate. In contrast, the welcoming climate profile shows a low incidence of discrimination and high reports of affirming psychological climate. The qualitative findings indicate that discrimination can take many forms in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, including direct and indirect experiences. Sadly, for diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people, the participants’ narratives highlight that they faced/observed discrimination in general 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings (not spaces where they spent most of their free time) related to being made to feel like they were not “good enough” to fit in, whether that was because they did not appear queer enough, trans enough, or enough of some other subgroup of the 2SLGBTQ+
Interestingly, direct experiences of discrimination were commonly discussed by interview participants in the contentious and ambivalent climate profiles, while indirect or ambient experiences of discrimination (i.e., witnessing discrimination) were discussed by those in the welcoming climate profile. For those in the latter group, they referred to spaces in which they did not spend a lot of their leisure time. Though the intersectional discrimination scale includes items addressing indirect discrimination, the qualitative findings highlight the need to specifically examine indirect/ambient discrimination in future quantitative studies to better understand the overall climate, thereby explicitly addressing another vital part of the climate. Other researchers have demonstrated the importance of examining direct and indirect discrimination separately on outcomes (Silverchanz et al., 2008; Woodford & Kulick, 2015).

Consistent with other research in schools and workplaces (Aragon et al., 2014; Goulet & Villatte, 2020; Velez et al., 2013; Woodford & Kulick, 2015), the quantitative results indicate that the profiles are related to variations in the sense of belonging in and satisfaction with the 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space, with variations reflecting the order of the profiles that emerged. The qualitative findings provide a more nuanced picture of the connection between climate and belonging, highlighting that diverse participants face exclusion via policing of belonging, namely in general 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings or those where they did not spend a lot of their free time. That is, based on being their TGNC, racialized, or disabled status, participants or their counterparts were policed for being who they are, resulting in a diminished sense of belonging, or rather exclusion from such settings (discussed further below). Belonging is necessary to realize the range of positive outcomes that 2SGLBTQ+ leisure spaces can offer; thus, it is pertinent that efforts are made to create a positive climate in these settings, which includes ensuring low levels of intersectional discrimination and high levels of perceived inclusive climate.
and comfort in the 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space. The holistic view of climate to encompass experiential and psychological climate across both quantitative and qualitative components provides a unique way to understand the overall climate of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings.

**Quantitative Covariates and Qualitative Attributions of Climate**

Across the quantitative and qualitative findings, important and, at times, contradictory findings emerged about factors shaping the climate. Across all three profiles, interview participants felt welcomed in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings for their sexuality; however, TGNC, racialized, and/or disabled individuals often did not feel welcomed in general 2SLGBTQ leisure spaces where they did not spend a lot of their leisure time because of experiences of direct or indirect discrimination and feelings of being excluded. The quantitative results suggest gender plays a role in predicting membership only between the ambivalent and welcoming climate profiles, with TGNC being more likely to be in the ambivalent profile. Considering other scholars have documented negative perceptions and experiences among TGNC individuals in 2SLGBTQ+ settings (Carter & Baliko, 2017; Garvey & Rankin, 2015), this clustering is expected.

Indicating the importance of gender across profiles and in general leisure spaces, interview participants described various forms of discrimination related to gender identity and expression (i.e., cisgenderism). For TGNC participants, this included having their gender policed by both cisgender and other TGNC members of various 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, suggesting certain types of bodies (transitioned or not, gender passing or not) are allowed to enter certain spaces, while others are prohibited. Specifically, TGNC individuals described ridicule or invalidations for not transitioning to present as a man or woman in trans-specific spaces, for being trans in binary-gendered sports activities for the 2SLGBTQ+ community, or for passing so well that
they are not considered “trans enough” in general 2SLGBTQ+ settings. These findings are supported by research from general settings, where TGNC individuals were not allowed to enter spaces, for example, washrooms that “match” their gender as defined by others (Hoskin, 2019) and transgender athletes, specifically, were completely barred from participating in sporting events (Jones et al., 2017). It is also substantiated by findings examining 2SLGBTQ+ spaces, where TGNC people are subjected to normative gender expression expectations by cisgender and other TGNC people (Hoskin, 2019), including in ways that contribute to the “passing complex” and need to transition (Arayasirikul & Wilson, 2019).

Disability also significantly varied by the climate profiles, indicating the presence of ableism in certain climate profiles. The probability of being disabled within the ambivalent climate profile was significantly higher than the welcoming climate profile (probability within the contentious climate profile was approaching significance compared to the welcoming climate profile). Since people with disabilities have often been excluded from 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces and treated poorly by other 2SLGBTQ+ people (Moreno et al., 2017; Toft, 2020), the clustering of the sample in terms of climate in this way indicates that disabled people were facing exclusion in the spaces where they spend most of their leisure time. The clustering for disabled people aligns with discussions among interview participants where they felt policed even upon entry to certain spaces because disability was completely disregarded in many 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces. These findings are a reminder that diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people are still socially excluded from 2SLGBTQ+ settings for being who they are, and that these spaces—including the spaces where participants spent most of their free time—are rife with ableism despite being safe from heterosexism.
Quantitatively, racialized status did not show a clear pattern in terms of profile membership overall (i.e., indicating no significance in racism across the profiles), although the difference was approaching statistical significance between the ambivalent and welcoming climate profiles. These findings, however, were unexpected given other scholars reporting racism and negative experiences by racialized members in 2SLGBTQ+ spaces (Giwa & Greensmith, 2012; Held, 2016; Jaspal, 2017). The low number of cases within the contentious climate profile might have obscured the potential for racialized status to be a significant covariate with the climate profiles. Furthermore, the qualitative results identified racism across the profiles, including experiences of direct racism in spaces where they did not spend a lot of their free time and experiences of indirect racism observed by white participants. Specifically, similar to previous research (Held, 2016; Vo, 2020), interview participants described experiences of racial discrimination where they or others are barred from entry into certain 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces for not fitting a certain typecast or their physical features are judged for their worthiness of belonging through a fetishizing of their bodies.

It is possible that racialized participants in the survey could have identified being part of spaces where both their race/ethnicity are embraced, though they had varied experiences and perceptions of the climate of these spaces. As reflected in the qualitative findings, TGNC, racialized, and/or disabled participants often seek spaces where their multiple identities are welcomed, such as a campus-based social group for queer and trans person of colour or a Facebook group for autistic TGNC individuals. These spaces could include counterspaces, where people socialize with other marginalized individuals to safeguard from the discrimination they face in society and other 2SLGBTQ+ settings; for example, ballroom communities for racialized TGNC
individuals (Arnold et al., 2018). Such spaces can lead to a positive sense of self and strong sense of community, as well as a resistance of harmful narratives related to their marginalized identities (Case & Hunter, 2012).

Organizational Factors and Factors Underpinning the Climate

At the organizational level, it seems logical to find quantitatively that greater presence of antidiscrimination policies and inclusive leadership practices is related to membership in the welcoming climate compared to a lower presence of such policies and practices in the contentious and ambivalent climates. School climate researchers suggest that inclusive policies and practices are valuable in reducing incidents of victimization (Peter et al., 2016) and increasing the likelihood of intervening when such incidents arise (Kosciw et al., 2016; Mayberry et al., 2013)—all factors that make spaces more inclusive. Furthermore, the fact that more participants in leadership roles were more likely to be found in the welcoming climate profile (see Appendix A, Table 2) suggests that they were likely to play a role in shaping the climate, which is similar to what occurs within schools as teachers and administrators set the tone for the climate in the way they interact with students, in how they respond to bullying, and apply antidiscrimination policies (Baams et al., 2017; Slatten et al., 2015). These findings are further explained by the qualitative findings that suggest numerous factors underpinning the climate, including a dismissive attitude toward marginalization on other social markers, invisibility vs representation of diversity, “take space to make space,” meaningful conversations, and progressive leadership practices.

Moreover, members from all three climate profiles perceived these various processes to, in their experience, enable the exclusion or inclusion of all members. Many of these processes are aligned with recommendations to improve inclusion within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings (Bailey, 2005; Cerezo & Bergfeld, 2013; Theriault, 2017).
Further, participants with multiple marginalized identities attributed factors underpinning the climate, such as a dismissive attitude toward marginalization based on other social markers (e.g., gender, race, disability) and invisibility vs representation of the diversity, in general 2SLGBTQ+ settings to their sense of exclusion. It is, therefore, necessary to consider these strategies in creating inclusive spaces for diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people. It would be important to expand future quantitative research by addressing the qualitatively identified factors underpinning the climate, and research should examine the different impacts of organizational level interventions on the perceptions and experiences of diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces.

**Limitations and Future Research**

This study has numerous methodological strengths, including the use of mixed methods, engaging an advisory committee, and diverse survey and interview samples in terms of gender, race, and disability status with participants from Canada and the United States. There are, however, limitations that should be understood and hopefully addressed in future research, along with future research directions including those previously noted. The survey used cross-sectional data, thus prohibiting making causal conclusions. The use of convenience sampling limits the generalizability of the survey findings. The focus on spaces where individuals spent most of their free time might have skewed some survey findings, although individuals across all profile reported directly or indirectly experiencing discrimination. It would be prudent in future research to encompass both spaces where people spend a lot of their time and those where they do not spend much time, or inquire specifically about hostile spaces. As previously mentioned, future quantitative research could also parse out ambient discrimination (i.e., indirect experiences) to better understand the variations in climate.
In addition, though the survey sample was large and diverse, the emerging profiles ranged in size from 46 to 390 cases. The small size of the contentious profile might explain why some covariates were approaching statistical significance; hence, research with larger samples is recommended. The qualitative sample reported various experiences and perceptions of the climate, including experiences not captured by the survey. Participants from each profile were recruited, although more participants within the ambivalent and contentious climate profiles would have helped to better understand the differences in experiences for participants within those climates compared to the welcoming climate profile.

Research, Policy, and Practice Implications

As the first study to utilize LPA to holistically examine the climate of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, I found that this method is an appropriate approach to examining climate considering the diversity and heterogeneity of the 2SLGBTQ+ sample and the larger community. In addition, the richness of the narratives and their complementary and sometimes contradictory nature establishes the value of a mixed methods design, particularly in understanding the nuances experiences of direct and indirect discrimination.

Based on the findings, there are numerous policy and practice implications for creating inclusive 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces for diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people. Using Bailey's (2005) conceptual model of social inclusion in activity settings, we can consider inclusion in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces from four dimensions: spatial (e.g., bring together people from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds to engage in the share activity), relational (e.g., create a sense of belonging and acceptance among members with different identities), functional (e.g., provide opportunities to develop new skills and knowledge), and power (e.g., improve social networks, sense of pride and
community, and social capital). We must employ inclusive strategies to create more positive climate in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces by addressing or abolishing gatekeeping practices that police who belongs, training leaders of these spaces to be aware of divisive acts and responding when discriminatory behaviours arise, as well as raising the visibility and representation of the diversity and intersectionality of the 2SLGBTQ+ community (Cerezo & Bergfeld, 2013; Theriault, 2017). Safety and tolerance requires an active engagement in challenging norms and prejudices toward marginalized people to improve the climate of 2SLGBTQ+ for diverse members (Cerezo & Bergfeld, 2013). This includes speaking up and intervening when harassment occurs. The structural level interventions, including greater presence of antidiscrimination policies and inclusive leadership practices, are necessary to address the social norms and practices within the 2SLGBTQ+ leisure that might be contributing to hostile climates. Beyond these interventions, study participants identified other inclusion strategies, such as taking space for diverse 2SLGBTQ+ members and engaging in meaningful conversations.

Finally, 2SLGBTQ+ organizational leaders should consider intersectionality in the planning and implementation of leisure spaces and activities. The lack of consideration of intersectionality ignores the heterogeneity of the 2SLGBTQ+ community, which has been identified to be concerning, as much of the 2SLGBTQ+ scholarship has tended to group the 2SLGBTQ+ community as a single entity (Moreno et al., 2017; Toomey et al., 2017). This particular perspective may be related to a sense homonormativity, whereby a certain “acceptable” 2SLGBTQ+ person should exist to ensure the safety of not just the queer person who is cisgender, white, able-bodied, and monosexual, but also the cisgender heterosexual person (Fox & Ore, 2010; Vo, 2021a). The 2SLGBTQ+ community must overcome this sense of homonormativity and account for the full, diverse lives of 2SLGBTQ+ people to ensure that all are welcomed.
Conclusion

Through this study, I provide insights into a holistic understanding of climate in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, including systems of oppression related to gender, race, and disability (i.e., cisgenderism, racism, ableism), antidiscrimination policies, and inclusive leadership practices as possible inputs to shaping the climate, as well as sense of belonging and satisfaction as outcomes of the climate profiles. The results offer in-depth knowledge of psychological and experiential climate for diverse 2SLGBTQ+ in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, particularly around policing belongingness in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces as documented in the qualitative findings. Further, participants with multiple marginalized identities attributed factors in various 2SLGBTQ+ settings to their sense of exclusion or inclusion. Notwithstanding some of the study limitations, this study represents the first one to holistically examine the climate of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces using both quantitative and qualitative data. I found that the climate in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings can be contentious, ambivalent, and welcoming for different people. These results reflect the nuances of safe spaces and direct us to create more welcoming environments for all members. Exploring the application of the factors underpinning the climate can help ensure that all 2SLGBTQ+ people are welcomed in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces so that they could proffer from the many benefits of these settings.
Table 1: Social identities, demographic characteristics, and descriptive statistics of sample and study variables (N=548)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuous variables</th>
<th>M(SD)</th>
<th>Theoretical Range</th>
<th>Skewness (SE)</th>
<th>Kurtosis (SE)</th>
<th>Missing (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>30.42 (14.14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersectional discriminations</td>
<td>0.36 (0.50)</td>
<td>0, 3</td>
<td>1.88 (0.11)</td>
<td>3.96 (0.21)</td>
<td>2.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived climate</td>
<td>5.84 (1.25)</td>
<td>1, 7</td>
<td>-1.41 (0.11)</td>
<td>1.92 (0.21)</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived comfort in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space</td>
<td>5.83 (1.38)</td>
<td>1, 7</td>
<td>-1.70 (0.11)</td>
<td>2.90 (0.21)</td>
<td>3.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antidiscrimination policies</td>
<td>1.93 (1.09)</td>
<td>0, 3</td>
<td>-0.53 (0.10)</td>
<td>-1.09 (0.21)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership practices</td>
<td>3.89 (1.39)</td>
<td>0, 5</td>
<td>-1.27 (0.10)</td>
<td>0.80 (0.21)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space</td>
<td>5.97 (0.99)</td>
<td>1, 7</td>
<td>-1.72 (0.11)</td>
<td>4.67 (0.21)</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space</td>
<td>6.09 (0.98)</td>
<td>1, 7</td>
<td>-1.53 (0.11)</td>
<td>3.49 (0.21)</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorical variables</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
<th>Categorical variables</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Racial Identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender man</td>
<td>100 (18.2%)</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>361 (65.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender woman</td>
<td>144 (26.3%)</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>73 (13.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans man</td>
<td>50 (9.1%)</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>18 (3.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans woman</td>
<td>17 (3.1%)</td>
<td>Indigeneous</td>
<td>12 (2.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-binary</td>
<td>122 (22.3%)</td>
<td>Latin American</td>
<td>17 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse gender</td>
<td>115 (21.0%)</td>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>2 (0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed race</td>
<td>65 (11.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Disability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual/Pansexual</td>
<td>167 (30.5%)</td>
<td>No disability</td>
<td>278 (50.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>94 (17.2%)</td>
<td>Mental/emotional</td>
<td>210 (38.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>94 (17.2%)</td>
<td>Chronic illness</td>
<td>123 (22.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>134 (24.5%)</td>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>92 (16.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse sexuality</td>
<td>59 (10.7%)</td>
<td>Physical/mobility</td>
<td>56 (10.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>16 (2.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td>16 (2.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>13 (2.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>269 (49.1%)</td>
<td>Alcohol and other substance use disorder</td>
<td>9 (1.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>279 (50.9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Diverse gender includes Two-Spirit, agender, demigender, genderqueer, gender nonconforming, gender fluid, nonbinary, pangender, and questioning. Diverse sexuality includes Two-Spirit, asexual, demisexual, androphilic, abrosexual, heterosexual, questioning, and unsure. Disability exceeds 100% because 167 individuals selected more than one disability.
Table 2: Fit of the compared latent profile models with increasing numbers of profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of profiles (k)</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>fp</th>
<th>AIC</th>
<th>BIC</th>
<th>SSA-BIC</th>
<th>CAIC</th>
<th>p-value VLMR</th>
<th>p-value ALMR</th>
<th>p-value BLRT</th>
<th>Entropy</th>
<th>Profiles with &lt;5% sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1932.47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3884.93</td>
<td>3928.00</td>
<td>2896.25</td>
<td>3938.00</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1836.15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3700.30</td>
<td>3760.59</td>
<td>3716.15</td>
<td>3774.59</td>
<td>0.0237</td>
<td>0.0266</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1769.45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3574.90</td>
<td>3652.41</td>
<td>3595.27</td>
<td>3670.41</td>
<td>0.0085</td>
<td>0.0099</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1712.99</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3469.99</td>
<td>3564.72</td>
<td>3494.89</td>
<td>3586.72</td>
<td>0.6247</td>
<td>0.6369</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1668.12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3388.24</td>
<td>3500.20</td>
<td>3417.67</td>
<td>3526.20</td>
<td>0.0619</td>
<td>0.0663</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-1634.45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3328.91</td>
<td>3458.10</td>
<td>3362.86</td>
<td>3488.10</td>
<td>0.7724</td>
<td>0.7781</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* LL = loglikelihood; fp = number of free parameters; AIC = Akaike Information Criteria; BIC = Bayesian Information Criteria; SSA-BIC = Sample-size-adjusted BIC; CAIC = Consistent AIC; VLMR = Vuong-Lo-Mendell-Rubin Likelihood Ratio Test for k-1 profiles vs k profiles; ALMR = Adjusted Lo-Mendell-Rubin Likelihood Ratio Test for k-1 profiles vs k profiles; BLRT = Bootstrapped Likelihood Ratio Test for k-1 profiles vs k profiles.
Table 3: Key social identities and demographic characteristics of interview participants (N = 22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Pseudonym</th>
<th>Sexual Identity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Racialized Status</th>
<th>Dis/Ability</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Pansexual</td>
<td>Nonbinary</td>
<td>Racialized</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Ambivalent Climate (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Diverse Sexuality</td>
<td>Nonbinary</td>
<td>Racialized</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Ambivalent Climate (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>Cisgender Man</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Welcoming Climate (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilary</td>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>Cisgender Woman</td>
<td>Racialized</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Welcoming Climate (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>Nonbinary</td>
<td>Racialized</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Welcoming Climate (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ty</td>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>Nonbinary</td>
<td>Racialized</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Welcoming Climate (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Pansexual</td>
<td>Genderfluid</td>
<td>Racialized</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Welcoming Climate (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jen</td>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>Cisgender Woman</td>
<td>Racialized</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Contentious Climate (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marla</td>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>Cisgender Woman</td>
<td>Racialized</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Welcoming Climate (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>Diverse Sexuality</td>
<td>Genderfluid</td>
<td>Racialized</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Welcoming Climate (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica</td>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>Cisgender Woman</td>
<td>Racialized</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Welcoming Climate (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>Nonbinary</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Welcoming Climate (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>Agender</td>
<td>Racialized</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Welcoming Climate (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>Gender Nonconforming</td>
<td>Racialized</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Ambivalent Climate (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>Agender</td>
<td>Racialized</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Welcoming Climate (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>Trans Man</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Ambivalent Climate (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>Pansexual</td>
<td>Nonbinary</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Welcoming Climate (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>Nonbinary</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Contentious Climate (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>Cisgender Woman</td>
<td>Racialized</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Ambivalent Climate (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tryst</td>
<td>Diverse Sexuality</td>
<td>Nonbinary</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Welcoming Climate (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geri</td>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>Genderqueer (Cisgender)</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Welcoming Climate (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>Cisgender Man</td>
<td>Racialized</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Welcoming Climate (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Descriptive statistics and correlations between profile indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile Indicators</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Perceived climate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Perceived comfort in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.630***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Intersectional discrimination</td>
<td>0.531***</td>
<td>-0.422***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Total sample size varies between 529-545 due to missing data on some variables.

***p<.001.
Table 5: Average latent profile probabilities for most likely latent profile membership (row) by latent profile (column)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Profile 1</th>
<th>Profile 2</th>
<th>Profile 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contentious</td>
<td>0.978</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalent</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>0.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcoming</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6: Associations of participants’ social identities and demographic characteristics key factors with latent profile membership (N=548)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contentious Climate Probability or M (S.E.)</th>
<th>Ambivalent Climate Probability or M (S.E.)</th>
<th>Welcoming Climate Probability or M (S.E.)</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>29.95 (2.13)</td>
<td>27.98 (1.36)</td>
<td>31.25 (0.77)</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender man</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender woman</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender man</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender woman</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse gender</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender binary (TGNC vs. cisgender)</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.64 [3]</td>
<td>0.52 [2]</td>
<td>5.10*</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexuality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual/pansexual</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse sexuality</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racialized (vs. white)</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.43 [3*]</td>
<td>0.31 [2*]</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability (vs. none)</td>
<td>0.59 [3*]</td>
<td>0.64 [3]</td>
<td>0.43 [1*,2]</td>
<td>13.40**</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident of Canada (vs. US)</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antidiscrimination policies</td>
<td>1.59 (0.17) [3]</td>
<td>1.56 (0.12) [3]</td>
<td>2.09 (0.06) [1,2]</td>
<td>19.52***</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership practices</td>
<td>2.66 (0.24) [3]</td>
<td>3.20 (0.18) [3]</td>
<td>4.27 (0.06) [1,2]</td>
<td>66.36***</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonging in leisure space</td>
<td>4.44 (0.22) [2,3]</td>
<td>5.38 (0.07) [1,3]</td>
<td>6.34 (0.04) [1,2]</td>
<td>180.49***</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with leisure space</td>
<td>5.07 (0.20) [2,3]</td>
<td>5.60 (0.10) [1,3]</td>
<td>6.37 (0.14) [1,2]</td>
<td>79.86***</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Square brackets denote significant difference between profiles ($p<.05$), unless otherwise noted.  
**$**p<.01, ***$p<.001, *approaching significance $p<.05.$
Figure 1: Plot of the standardized means of profiles on class indicators compared to overall sample mean.
**Figure 2:** The relationship of sub-themes that contribute to the global theme of policing belongingness in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces.
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Chapter 4: Understanding Resilience and Wellbeing among 2SLGBTQ+ People in 2SLGBTQ+ Leisure Spaces: A Mixed Methods Study

Abstract

2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces are important for 2SLGBTQ+ people’s wellbeing, yet some of these venues can be exclusionary for transgender/gender nonconforming, racialized, and disabled people. There is a gap in understanding the relationship between the climate of these spaces and mental health outcomes, as well as resilience-promoting factors and processes. In this manuscript, I report quantitative findings on the association between experiential climate (intersectional discrimination) and psychological climate (perceptions of an inclusive climate) and psychological distress and positive mental health, and the moderating role of 2SLGBTQ+ pride, resilient coping, and social support from friends, and qualitative findings about the processes underlying resilience, including how people understand and cope with discrimination. In adjusted models, experiential climate was positively associated with psychological distress, while psychological climate was positively associated with positive mental health. Numerous main effects were found for the resilience factors, but no moderation relationships were significant. To explain the impact of climate on mental health, interview participants exemplified emotional and cognitive reactions to discrimination. Importantly, they engaged in behaviours to cognitively process and even resist negative climate in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings, including “passing” behaviours, intervening, and exiting and finding new leisure spaces. The quantitative findings highlight the differential effects of two dimensions of climate on mental health, and the qualitative findings illuminate areas to consider in further understanding the impacts of climate and the resilience and resistance of 2SLGBTQ+ people participating in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces.

Keywords: 2SLGBTQ+ people; climate; leisure; discrimination; resilience; resistance; wellbeing
Introduction
Leisure spaces that are created specifically for two-spirit, lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, queer, and other sexually- and gender-diverse (2SLGBTQ+) people, such as queer community centres, lesbian bars, and trans chatrooms, offer their participants safety from societal heterosexism and transphobia (Browne & Bakshi, 2011; Lewis & Johnson, 2011) and can help participants cope with such discrimination and promote their mental health (Case & Hunter, 2012; Vo, 2020). Unfortunately, many 2SLGBTQ+ spaces operate within a homonormative lens (Oswin, 2008; Vo, 2021a), thus those who are marginalized within the 2SLGBTQ+ community, including transgender/gender nonconforming (TGNC), racialized, and/or disabled individuals often feel unwelcomed and face discrimination in these spaces (Carter & Baliko, 2017; Fox & Ore, 2010; Marine & Nicolazzo, 2014). Consistent with minority stress theory (Hendricks & Testa, 2012; Meyer, 2003), it is well established that discrimination is a risk factor for poor mental health outcomes among 2SLGBTQ+ people in schools (Aldridge & Mcchesney, 2018; Colvin et al., 2019), workplaces (Holman, 2018), and the general community (Bostwick et al., 2014; Cyrus, 2017), and that not all individuals are affected by discrimination in the same way because of resilience-promoting factors, such positive coping skills and social support (Meyer, 2015; Wong et al., 2014). Further, in the face of discrimination, 2SLGBTQ+ people process such experiences through emotional, cognitive, and behavioural reactions (Nadal, 2013). Despite this collective research, little is known about how discrimination within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces affects individuals’ mental health and the factors that might promote resilience to the negative effects of discrimination. Given the pivotal role of 2SLGTQ+ leisure spaces in promoting positive outcomes, generally, it is important to understand and address these issues within 2SLBTQ+ leisure spaces so that all participants can benefit from these
spaces and thrive (Browne & Bakshi, 2011; Iwasaki et al., 2005; Parry et al., 2013).

To learn as much as possible about these topics, especially considering the lack of research examining the intersection of discrimination, resilience, and mental health within 2SLGBTQ+ spaces, it is worthwhile to explore these topics using mixed methods. I do so in this manuscript by reporting on quantitative findings investigating the relationship between 2SLGBTQ+ discrimination in leisure spaces and mental health, and resilience-promoting factors that moderate that relationship, as well as qualitative findings about how individuals process and react to discrimination, including resisting discrimination. Because discrimination within organizations and groups is often understood as the climate of these spaces, I adopt that conceptualization in this study, specifically focusing on experiential and psychological climate. Through this research I aim to provide researchers, practitioners, and policymakers with much-needed empirical insights to inform their efforts to promote 2SLGBTQ+ inclusion and wellbeing.

**Climate and Impacts on Mental Health**

Minority stress theory purports that people with marginalized identities, such as 2SLGBTQ+ people, experience discrimination, prejudice, and stigma due to their marginalized identities (i.e., gender and sexuality for 2SLGBTQ+ people), and the chronic stress associated with these stressors contributes to poor mental health outcomes (Hendricks & Testa, 2012; Meyer, 2003), such as depression, anxiety, and suicide ideation (Cyrus, 2017; English et al., 2018; McConnell et al., 2018; Meyer, 2003). Like in workplaces, schools, and the general community, stressors related to discrimination within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces can encompass experiential climate, such as being mistreated by others or witnessing others being mistreated (Cerezo & Bergfeld, 2013; Woodford & Kulick, 2015), and psychological climate, such as feelings of discomfort,
being unsafe, and exclusion (Woodford & Kulick, 2015). All participants within a setting experience its climate, but those from marginalized groups often report encountering discrimination more frequently and feeling less welcomed compared to their non-marginalized counterparts (Carter & Baliko, 2017; McConnell et al., 2021; Velez et al., 2014; Walker & Melton, 2015). It is thus important to examine the impact of climate in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings on participants’ wellbeing.

Researchers have documented issues of discrimination and exclusion within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces for trans, racialized, disabled and other marginalized groups, and have concluded that many 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings have been created from a monosexual, cisgender, white, and ableist standpoint that favours a homonormative ideology (Oswin, 2008; Van Ingen, 2003; Vo, 2021a). This ideology essentially instils the idea or norm that there is a “right” way to be a 2SLGBTQ+ person and to engage in leisure experiences, and the right way is to have a single same-sex partner, be visibly male or female (i.e., not TGNC), be racially or ethnically white, and be able-bodied. Experiencing cisgenderism, racism, and ableism in these spaces can cause targeted persons to feel excluded and unsafe (Carter & Baliko, 2017; Cheslik & Wright, 2021; Held, 2015; Lewis & Johnson, 2011). Homonormativity underpins the climate of leisure spaces, which, in turn can shape participants’ wellbeing. Aligned with minority stress theory, negative climate characterized by discrimination and feelings of exclusion can contribute to poor mental health outcomes (Formby, 2017), but, to date, researchers have given little attention to investigate these factors.

Leisure researchers have focused on the experiences of 2SLGBTQ+ people and the value of these experiences to one’s identity, sense of community, and wellbeing (Capous-Desyllas & Johnson-Rhodes, 2017; Carter & Baliko, 2017; Iwasaki et al., 2005; Johnson & Dunlap, 2011; Lewis & Johnson, 2011). Some scholars have studied
the climate of 2SLBTQ+ leisure spaces; however, they have tended to focus on experiential climate and on outcomes limited to one’s sense of self and social outcomes (e.g., belonging, inclusion) (Carter & Baliko, 2017; Held, 2015; Jaspal, 2017; Lewis & Johnson, 2011). Thus, there is a gap in understanding the relationship between climate (especially psychological climate) within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure contexts and mental health outcomes.

Results from research assessing the climate in other contexts, such as schools and workplaces, found that a negative or hostile climate is associated with poor mental health and thus highlights the importance of addressing this gap. In schools, discrimination, including harassment and microaggressions, and negative perceptions of campus climate (e.g., characterized by negative attitudes toward sexual minorities, perceived safety of 2SLGBTQ+ people, and ability to be open about sexual identity) can escalate the risk for low self-esteem, as well as depression, psychological distress, and suicide ideation (Collier et al., 2013; Hong et al., 2016; Woodford & Kulick, 2015). Other scholars have reported similar findings concerning anti-2SLGBTQ+ discrimination in workplaces and perceptions of a hostile work environment being associated with poor mental health outcomes, including psychological distress, depression, and anxiety (Holman, 2018; Velez et al., 2013). Despite evidence of the negative effects of discrimination and perceptions of hostile social environments on mental health, these topics are under-investigated in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, though, in theory, such spaces aim to foster participants’ mental health. As well, broadly, much of the research addressing mental health among 2SLGBTQ+ people has focused on negative mental health outcomes, such as depression, anxiety, and suicide ideation; yet, many scholars suggest integrating positive psychology in 2SLGBTQ+ research to encompass both positive and negative dimensions of wellbeing (DeBlaere et al., 2010;
Herrick et al., 2014; Vaughan & Rodriguez, 2014). Thus, there is a need to adopt a holistic understanding of mental health, one that addresses both negative (e.g., distress) and positive aspects (e.g., positive emotions, optimal psychological functioning). In the current study, I expand on previous mental health research by measuring both positive and negative aspects, while also exploring resilience.

**Climate and Resilience**

In addition to identifying a pathway between minority stressors and poor mental health, minority stress theory identifies factors that can increase resilience to the detrimental effects of minority-related stressors (Hendricks & Testa, 2012; Meyer, 2003; Meyer, 2015). Within this theory, Meyer (2015) defines resilience as individual and interpersonal factors that can help buffer the negative impact of discrimination on 2SLGBTQ+ people’s mental health. At the individual level, positive coping skills have been found to buffer the negative impacts of discrimination on 2SLGBTQ+ people’s mental health (Meyer, 2003; Meyer, 2015). For this study, I explore resilient coping rather than positive coping skills because the former, aligned with the concept of resilience, inherently infers individuals have previously successfully adapted to stressors (Sinclair & Wallston, 2004), while the latter refers to efforts individuals make to adapt to stress but does not indicate success (Meyer, 2015). Further, resilient coping encompasses resistance in the sense that people consciously choose to engage in specific actions to respond to and resist stressors. Interpersonally, high social support from peers, for example, can moderate the negative effects of discrimination on 2SLGBTQ+ youth’s mental health, such as reducing the risk of suicidal ideation (Johns et al., 2018). Previous scholars have identified 2SLGBTQ+ pride as an important factor to mental health, whereby greater 2SLGBTQ+ pride is associated with more positive mental health and decreased depressive symptoms (Kertzner et al., 2009; Rostosky et
In a study conducted with 2SLGBTQ+ university students, pride moderated the link between victimization and depression for trans students, with the results suggesting that the level of pride mattered for trans students who encountered high levels of victimization and held high levels of pride with these students reporting greater depression symptoms; those reporting low pride were impacted similarly by victimization regardless of the level of victimization (Woodford et al., 2018). Related to pride, as Meyer (2003) suggests, identity valence (i.e., self-evaluation) might predict mental health challenges, where, for example, negative valence is inversely related to depression. As such, 2SLGBTQ+ pride might moderate mental health outcomes.

To fully understand resilience within 2SLGBTQ+ spaces, it is useful to understand resistance as well. Resilience and resistance are similar and complementary concepts in that they can both promote positive outcomes in the context of adversity (e.g., discrimination), but resilience passively develops for individuals as the result of an existing factor (Colpitts & Gahagan, 2016; Meyer, 2015), whereas resistance involves active or conscious actions that individuals take to confront adversity and create environments where they can thrive (Case & Hunter, 2012). That is, resilience-promoting factors are often pre-existing, thus, in the case of coping skills, enabling individuals to better cope with discrimination compared to those who do not have such skills. Conversely, resistance involves intentional actions (e.g., intervening) to address discrimination. To fully understand the climate-mental health relationship, especially in terms of promoting protection from its negative effects, there is a need to identify the role of individual and interpersonal resilience-promoting factors and extend our insights by documenting the various resilience and resistance strategies employed by 2SLGBTQ+ people within the context of negative climate. Such insights will be
instrumental to organizational leaders who are committed to finding ways to support members’ sense of agency to influence change and foster inclusion for all.

Study Purpose

For this manuscript, I draw on data from a larger mixed methods study examining the climate of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, mental health and social outcomes, as well as resilience-promoting factors. The current manuscript focuses on climate, mental health, and resilience and uses the minority stress theory (Hendricks & Testa, 2012; Meyer, 2003) as a basis for testing relationships between these concepts, and reports on both quantitative and qualitative findings. Specifically, for the present study, I use a mixed methods design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011) to explore intersections of climate, mental health, and resilience/resistance. My quantitative research questions are: (1) What is the association between climate and participants’ mental health, specifically psychological distress and positive mental health? (2) Does 2SLGBTQ+ pride, resilient coping, and social support from friends moderate the climate-mental health relationship? Because little is known about both the experiential and psychological climates of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, in addressing question one, I first examine the separate effects of each type of climate and then examine the effects of both types of climate together in contributing to mental health outcomes. My qualitative research questions are: (1) How do 2SLGBTQ+ people process a negative climate in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, in terms of their emotional, cognitive, and behavioural reactions? (2) Connected to behavioural reactions, what do resilience and resistance processes look like? I explore both emotional and cognitive reactions to a negative climate to better understand quantitative findings about the relationship between climate and mental health outcomes, while those addressing behavioural reactions help to advance understanding of resilience and resistance.
Methods

I collected data between January and October 2021 using an online survey followed by personal virtual interviews. Data from the two phases were integrated. The study was informed by a community advisory committee and received approval from Wilfrid Laurier University’s Research Ethics Board.

Survey: Sample and Procedures

Five-hundred and forty-eight participants comprise the survey sample. Though a diverse sample, more than half of the participants identified as TGNC and white. In terms of sexuality, the largest group identified as bisexual/pansexual and for disability, just over half reported no disability. See Table 1 for additional details about respondents’ demographics. I recruited survey respondents via purposive sampling through social media ads and virtual posters through Canadian and American 2SLGBTQ+ organizations and community groups. Quota sampling was used to recruit a minimum of 100 racialized participants and 100 TGNC participants. I used a screening survey to determine eligibility (i.e., over 16 years old, member of the 2SLGBTQ+ community, participated in a 2SLGBTQ+ leisure setting/activity in the past two years, resident of Canada or United States). Eligible participants were provided with an electronic link to the consent form and survey. Study participants received or had $10 donated an 2SLGBTQ+ organization. Surveys were conducted using XM Qualtrics and I used Qualtrics’ fraudulent scores and IP address monitoring, as well as quality-control questions to promote data integrity. At the end of survey, participants could express interest in joining the qualitative phase.

Measures

I report on study descriptive statistics for study variables in Table 1. Unless otherwise stated, average scores are used for multi-item scales that have continuous response sets.
All continuous scales are scored so that higher scores reflect more of the phenomenon of interest (e.g., high score on positive mental health indicates greater positive mental health).

**Social Identities and Demographic Characteristics**

Social identities and demographics included sexuality, gender, age, race, racialized status, disability, and country of residence. See Table 1 for additional information.

**Climate Indicators**

I assessed two dimensions of climate: experiential climate and psychological climate. I operationalized the former as intersectional discrimination, which is a measure that encompasses experiencing discrimination due to the multiplicity of identities that 2SLGBTQ+ people hold. I operationalized psychological climate as perceived inclusive climate, which refers to a range of dimensions in relation to how welcomed individuals feel in a leisure setting. For these two measures, I asked participants to respond to the questions based on their experiences within the 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space/activity where they spent most of their free time over the past two years.

**Intersectional Discrimination.** I used an adapted version of the Intersectional Discrimination Scale (Scheim & Bauer, 2019) that was originally used with a racially, gender, and sexually diverse sample (no psychometric properties reported for the original scale). I adapted the scale by specifying 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, referring to experiences in the past two years and adding two items (i.e., discrimination by a group leader/captain; an ‘other’ category to capture types of incidents not reflected in the scale’s items) (0 = never, 3 = almost every time). The 11-item scale addressed various experiences of discrimination, including being treated as if one is less smart or less capable than others or being told to think, act, or look more like others ($\alpha = .91$). To reflect intersectionality, the stem sentence stated, “Please tell us how often you have
experienced any of the following types of discrimination because of who you are. When we say, ‘because of who you are,’ this includes both how you describe yourself and how others might describe you. For example, race, ethnicity, ancestry, nationality, religion, gender, sexuality, age, weight/body shape or size, disability, or income.” This measure was used because it refers to incidents of discrimination due to all aspects of one’s sense of self, which can help understand experiences due to racism, cisgenderism, ableism, and other systems of oppression without having to ask about each system of oppression, thereby reducing the respondent burden.

**Perceived Inclusive Climate.** Adapted from the National LGBTQ College Climate Survey (Rankin et al., 2010), the scale asked participants to score six characteristics of climate (i.e., friendliness, caring, cooperative, welcoming, respectful, and overall positive environment) within the 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space. Respondents used a seven-point scale to rate each item ($\alpha = .95$). No psychometric properties were reported for the original scale.

**Mental Health Outcomes**

**Positive Mental Health.** Participants were asked how they felt over the past 30 days on 13 items$^{12}$ related to positive mental health using the Mental Health Continuum Short Form (MHC-SF; Lamers et al., 2011). Scores for each item (0 = never, 5 = every day) were summed to produce an overall score ($\alpha = .92$). The scale items asked about three aspects of wellbeing: emotional, social, and psychological. The original measure showed strong internal consistency, $\alpha = .89$ and demonstrated validity with a representative sample with adults ages 18 to 87 years old (Lamers et al., 2011).

---

$^{12}$ The original measure was comprised of 14 items. One item (satisfied with life) was unintentionally excluded from the survey.
Psychological Distress. Participants reported their psychological distress on six items for the past 30 days using the Kessler-6 Psychological Distress Scale (Kessler et al., 2002). Items asked about feeling depressed, hopeless, restless, worthless, nervous, and that everything was an effort (0 = none of the time, 4 = all of the time; \( \alpha = .82 \)). The original measure demonstrated strong internal consistency (\( \alpha = .89 \)) with a United States sample that also oversampled racialized participants (Kessler et al., 2002).

Resilience-Promoting Factors

2SLGBTQ+ Pride. Respondents reported their sense of 2SLGBTQ+ pride based on three items from the identity affirmation subscale of the LGB Identity Scale (Mohr & Kendra, 2011) that I adapted for 2SLGBTQ+ identities (not just lesbian, gay, and bisexual identities). A sample item is “I am proud to be 2SLGBTQ+” (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree; \( \alpha = .91 \)). The subscale in the original study demonstrated strong internal consistency (\( \alpha = .89 \)) and was found valid among LGB college students (Mohr & Kendra, 2011).

Resilient Coping. Respondents indicated their ability to cope from the Brief Resilient Coping Scale (Sinclair & Wallston, 2004). The four items included statements that described coping-related behaviours and actions, such as “I look for creative ways to alter difficult situations” (1 = does not describe me at all, 7 = describes me very well; \( \alpha = .68 \)). The measure has previously demonstrated acceptable internal consistency (\( \alpha = .75 \)) with a sample of 2SLGBTQ+ adults (Tabler et al., 2021).

Social Support from Friends. Respondents were asked to report their perceived support from their friends using the Friends Subscale of the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (Dahlem et al., 1991). Sample items included: “I can count on my friends when things go wrong” (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree; \( \alpha = .92 \)).
The original measure demonstrated strong internal consistency, $\alpha = .91$, and was found valid among college students (Dahlem et al., 1991).

**Statistical analyses**

I conducted all analyses using IBM SPSS Statistics 26. For multi-item scales, I ran Cronbach’s Alpha to assess internal consistency (range 0.68—0.95). To assess factorial validity, for all adapted and newly created multi-item scales I ran factor analysis, which produced single-factor solutions with item loadings more than 0.4. Thereafter, I ran descriptive statistics for all variables. To answer the first quantitative research question, I ran bivariate correlations between the climate, mental health, and moderator variables. Next, for each mental health outcome, I ran a series of linear regression models. To identify the unique effects of each of the two dimensions of climate on the mental health outcomes, model one included intersectional discrimination, model two included perceived inclusive climate, and model three included both types of climate variables. Each model included the three resilience-promoting variables and demographic controls (age, gender identity [cisgender vs TGNC], sexuality, racialized status, disability status, and country of residence). I tested a total of six linear regression models initially. Then, to address the second quantitative research question to identify resilience-promoting factors, I created interaction terms with each resilience-promoting factor and climate variable and ran separate linear regression models with the interaction terms to examine the unique effect of each moderator; thus, I tested a total of 12 linear regression models with moderation effects for this latter analysis (2 climate indicators x 2 outcomes x 3 moderators). I examined all models for multi-collinearity and no concerns were identified (Field, 2018).

**Qualitative Semi-Structured Interviews: Sample and Procedures**

Twenty-two individuals comprise the qualitative sample. Fourteen participants identify
as TGNC, eight as bisexual or pansexual, 15 as racialized, and 11 as disabled. See Table 2 for the sample’s demographic characteristics. Among interested survey respondents, based on their scores for the climate measures and written responses to an open-ended question about an experience of discrimination in the leisure space, I invited 45 individuals to participate in the interviews. For the selection process, I wanted participants with a range of scores for and reported incidents of discrimination, while prioritizing TGNC and racialized individuals. Interviews lasted on average 60 minutes (range: 40-90 mins). Participants received a $50 gift card or had $50 donated to a 2SLGBTQ+ organization.

Using a semi-structured interview guide, I inquired about participants’ experiences with and perceptions of the climate in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces/activities. Questions explored feelings of belonging in general 2SLGBTQ leisure spaces and what contributed to those feelings, including interpersonal and organizational aspects. Next, I asked about the situations that they reported on in the survey regarding discrimination in relation to dimensions of their identity, including race, gender, or disability. Participants shared narratives about their experiences or observations of discrimination and the general climate. While I referred to spaces/activities where they spent most of their free time over the past two years, participants also discussed settings where they did not spend a lot of time but have experienced or observed discrimination or a hostile environment (I present the qualitative findings regarding the climate in another manuscript for the larger study). Following Nadal’s (2013) framework of dealing with microaggression: emotional, cognitive, and behavioural reactions, which loosely reflect outcomes and the resilience/resistance to discrimination. I prompted participants to reflect on the thoughts and feelings that arose during those situations, as well as any actions they took following the incident. I further inquired about why they chose to act
in that way, and anything else that might help them overcome or process the
discrimination/hostile climate, which would contribute to their resilience. I kept a
reflexive journal to reflect on ideas, issues, and emotions following each interview. I
also kept an audit trail with memos of decisions and deviations to the methodology,
including coding decisions.

**Thematic analyses**

I familiarized myself with the data by listening to the interview recordings and reading
the transcripts. I created cases and classified them in NVivo v.1.6.1 by assigning
attributes, such as social identities and demographic characteristics. To answer the two
qualitative research questions, I followed Ritchie and Lewis (2006) analysis approach
that involved coding the raw data, descriptive account of the themes, and explanatory
account of the connecting concepts. Using two of the longer interviews, I created an
initial coding framework by open coding the raw data (data management), and then
grouped codes into themes (descriptive account) (Ritchie & Lewis, 2006). Using the
coding framework, I analyzed the remaining transcripts, creating new codes as needed.
After analyzing all of the transcripts, I engaged in an explanatory account by making
linkages to the literature (Creswell, 2016; Ritchie & Lewis, 2006). Following thematic
analyses, I contacted participants to engage in member checking (Creswell, 2016) to
ensure themes demonstrate participants’ experiences and reflections. I assigned each
participant a pseudonym after data analysis.

**Results**

**Exploratory Analysis: Climate, Mental Health Outcomes and Resilience-Promoting
Factors**

Significant bivariate correlations between the mental health outcomes and the climate
variables and resilience-promoting factors illustrate small effect sizes (Table 3). Specifically, in terms of climate and mental health outcomes, negative correlations were seen between intersectional discrimination and positive mental health, as well as perceived inclusive climate and psychological distress. Alternatively, positive correlations were observed between intersectional discrimination and psychological distress, and perceived inclusive climate and positive mental health. Concerning the resilience-promoting factors and the mental health outcomes, each was positively associated with positive mental health and negatively associated with distress.

Explanatory Analysis: Linear Multivariable Regression and Moderation Analysis

As displayed in Table 4, concerning the effects of intersectional discrimination on the mental health outcomes, when only adjusting for this climate indicator, it was positively associated with psychological distress ($p < .05$) and as a positive predictor of psychological distress in the full model ($p < .05$). In contrast, intersectional discrimination was not significantly associated with positive mental health in any model. Perceived inclusive climate was positively associated with positive mental health when examining only this climate indicator ($p < .05$) and was approaching significance ($p = .055$) when adjusting for intersectional discrimination in the full model.

Turning to the main effects of the resilience-promoting factors, select significant relationships existed across all models. Excluding 2SLGBTQ+ pride, which was not significant in models predicting psychological distress that included perceived inclusive climate, all resilience-promoting factors were significantly associated with the two mental health outcomes. For distress, each significant factor was negatively associated with the outcome, whereas for positive mental health, they were positively associated. No significant relationships for the moderation interactions were found (see Appendix).
A, Table 3). Despite these results, the qualitative findings provide insights into resilience processes in relation to the variations in climate that individuals perceived and experienced in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces.

**Qualitative Findings**

Below I explore participants’ emotional, cognitive, and behavioural reactions to the climate of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces. Broadly, these dimensions reflect outcomes of discrimination and resilience/resistance to discrimination. In other words, participants reacted with feelings (emotional) and thoughts (cognitive) that arose following the experience or observation of discrimination (i.e., outcomes), while they responded to discrimination via actions (behavioural) taken to deal with the discrimination that they face (i.e., resilience/resistance). Initial reactions often involved an emotional component whereby participants described feelings of anger and frustration or sadness, disappointment, and exhaustion. In terms of the cognitive aspect, they shared thoughts that involved internalized self-doubt, shame, or humiliation, as well as decision-making about whether and how to respond. Findings concerning behaviours demonstrate a level of personal agency, including ignoring the situation, intervening, and leaving to find more welcoming spaces. I explore each theme further below. In sharing their experiences in leisure spaces, some participants discussed personal experiences in the spaces where they spent a lot of time, while others tended to refer to observed discrimination or experiences in general 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings (e.g., bars, choirs, social groups) where they did not spend a lot of time.

**Feelings Due to Discrimination**

Many participants not only felt anger and frustration, but they also felt sadness, disappointment, and exhaustion that discrimination even occurred within those 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings. A few individuals only described one type of feeling,
while several others described multiple feelings. As an example, Kit (agender, racialized, disabled) described their frustration to a microaggression directed at them within a 2SLGBTQ+ community centre, where the perpetrator assumed that because Kit was racialized, they did not grow up in the United States:

My immediate thought is, it’s 2020, 2021. We should be past that, and it’s not like we’re in a small town … I feel like you should know better. You should at least be able to be aware of other people’s contexts or cultures, and you should stop making assumptions. So it’s more of a frustration for me.

As part of their anti-racism work within a 2SLGBTQ+ student group, Ty (nonbinary, racialized, disabled) was frustrated with the lack of response or efforts to engage in self-reflection by white members of the group, which led to Ty feeling exhausted:

I was frustrated because it just seemed like an impossible problem to fix. When I was a grad student and was running these anti-racist [sessions], [white 2SLGBTQ+ people] did come, but most of them didn’t have anything to say, and they didn’t really put in the work … The energy it takes to educate people about your identities is exhausting, and it just felt like that compounded trauma of education over and over again.

These feelings described by participants reflect the toll that discrimination has on their mental health. These feelings occurred in tandem with participants’ cognitive reactions, the thought process that occurred when they experienced or observed discrimination.

**Thought Processes During Incidents: Negotiating Discrimination**

Participants negotiate their experiences or observations of discrimination by two key thought processes: internalizing reactions leading to self-doubt, shame, or humiliation,
and deciding whether and how to respond to incidents. For several participants, they internalized the discrimination, turning it into a sense of self-doubt, shame, or humiliation. For example, Taylor (nonbinary, racialized, no disability) expounded the feelings of self-doubt from being told they were not queer enough to be in that particular 2SLGBTQ+ leisure setting: “When I was in college, I had to wear combat boots and flannel or plaid or no one is going to believe me that I’m actually a queer person.” Alternatively, Marla (cisgender woman, racialized, no disability) explained: “I was angry because [the perpetrator] was somebody that I knew. There’s a bit of shame or humiliation because they’re talking about me … and laughing about it.”

During incidents of discrimination, participants often decided whether and how they should respond. Their decision process included considering the nature of the incident and the context where it occurred. For Jen (cisgender woman, racialized, disabled), the fleeting nature of the microaggression made it less important and did not warrant any kind of response. She further suggested that focusing on intention rather than the impact of the microaggression helped her ignore the incident.

Many participants described themselves as being nonconfrontational or not wanting to “make a big deal of it,” but for some, the context mattered and facilitated action. As James (cisgender man, racialized, no disability) explained, his response might be different if the incident occurred in a more intimate group:

I don’t really see it as a big issue that I’m going to call them out … Obviously, if I’m chatting with a few friends from the choir … maybe we’ll unpack it a little more because there’s just the four or five of us.

The context of online spaces presents unique challenges in terms of taking action. As a few participants noted, speaking up about discriminatory incidents in online spaces can be difficult and so “people kind of ignore it” (Hilary, cisgender woman,
racialized, no disability). In relation to this difficulty, some participants indicated that it might be difficult to even notice hostile incidents when they occurred, particularly in virtual settings.

As part of their decision-making process on how to respond, some participants weighed the benefits and risks to continued participation in leisure spaces where they faced or observed discrimination. Kit (agender, racialized, disabled), for example, engaged in a conscious decision-making process: “thinking about how much benefit do I get from [participating in the space], or how willing I am to put up with that kind of thing given the cost and benefits to it.” Similarly, Tryst (nonbinary, white, disabled) noted that they thought about ending their involvement with a 2SLGBTQ+ curling club after an incident of trans microaggression in which the perpetrator used another TGNC person’s deadname (i.e., name used before transitioning), but Tryst did not leave: “it’s imperfect, but I still think the social benefits kind of outweigh the negatives for me.”

These processes of weighing the benefits and costs contribute to people’s eventual response to the discrimination.

**Resilience and Resistance: Actions in Response to Discrimination**

Rather than simply internalizing the negative messages and letting it diminish their wellbeing, related to decision-making processes about taking action, many participants described specific behavioural responses to discrimination. These included “passing” behaviours, speaking to leaders or peers within the space, and finding another leisure space.

**“Passing” behaviours.** Although not a commonly discussed topic, a few participants explained that they engaged in “passing” or “masking” behaviours to fit in with the majority, so that they could avoid incidents of discrimination. For example, Jordan (nonbinary, white, disabled) used “neurotypical passing” or “autistic masking”
when they are in general 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces by altering their “tone of voice, facial expression, and phraseology … [to] how a neurotypical person might be expected to communicate.” They equated it to their experience of pretending to be a cisgender woman.

**Intervening.** Some participants talked to the leader or their peers within the space about discrimination they experienced or observed. Doing so provided them with different perspectives on the incident and the opportunity to share their frustrations, which, in a way, validated their feelings around the incident and made them feel like they were not alone. Marla (cisgender woman, racialized, no disability) hypothesized about responding to a derogatory joke about Black men made by a racialized friend after the fact: “why they thought it was funny, why they felt like it was appropriate to share that to other people, maybe they could reconsider their own biases even though that’s pretty blatant.” Thus, confronting perpetrators would help to understand the intention and even shift the negative narrative around marginalized groups toward a more informed, positive view. Unfortunately, speaking up did not lead to change in some situations, which was frustrating and exhausting for some individuals, such as Ty (nonbinary, racialized, disabled): “We would pour our hearts out to leadership and not get a response. They would say, ‘Shit, you’re right.’ But nothing else happened.” As many participants emphasized, there was a need to not only raise awareness about discriminatory experiences, but also some type of response at the leadership level, at the minimum was required to change and address discriminatory behaviours.

**Finding new spaces.** Regrettably, some participants ended their participation in the leisure space and found new spaces. Several participants described leaving certain problematic online spaces and finding other virtual groups where participants’ identities
were celebrated, and they felt welcome. Arnold (trans man, white, no disability) explained regarding finding community on Facebook:

There were just a lot of people in there who were trans-medicalists. [They] had a very rigid image of what trans people should look like in order to make cisgender people like us. And there was a lot of really overt negativity and it was just really bringing down my mood whenever I would check up on it. Eventually I just left … I found another Facebook group specifically for fat transmen … it’s just a very nice supportive little community where nothing about the fat phobia in the trans community gets dismissed, and it feels very good.

For in-person groups, a few participants contemplated leaving their group, but continued visiting the venue anyway to give it another chance. For this group of individuals, they often explained that there were not many other physical 2SLGBTQ+ spaces that they could access, such as gay bars or social group to meet other 2SLGBTQ+ people.

These different behaviours reflect participants’ resilience, their “bouncing back” from the discrimination as well as resistance, including exercising their agency and finding an alternate space. They did not let the negativity affect their wellbeing. In a way, the actions taken indicated participants’ agency to protect themselves from discrimination and resist the negative narratives about who they were as people.

Discussion

This study’s findings further the understanding of the intersection between the climate of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, mental health, and resilience. Drawing on the bivariate and multivariable results, the main quantitative findings were that climate was associated with participants’ mental health, specifically in the full multivariable models where greater intersectional discrimination was associated with greater distress, whereas
higher perceptions of an inclusive climate were associated with higher levels of positive mental health. As I discuss below, these specific findings are intriguing in that particular types of climate were related to particular aspects of mental health. Though numerous factors were found to be protective for the mental health outcomes in the adjusted analysis, none of them moderated the climate-mental health relationship. To help explain these findings, the qualitative results indicated individuals have various reactions to discrimination, including anger and frustration, internalizing self-doubt, making decisions about responding, with behavioural reactions comprising ignoring the situation or intervening, and in some cases leaving the space find a more welcoming one. Moreover, these findings give a picture of what resilience looks like for participants, including for some engaging in resistance by exercising their agency.

Overall, these findings contribute to the limited research on the climate of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, particularly using a mixed methods design. The collective results highlight the need to address the experiential and psychological climate in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, support those who are negatively impacted by a hostile/non-inclusive climate, and strengthen protective factors, as well as build individuals’ sense of agency to respond to discrimination in meaningful ways that help them thrive.

Uniquely, I examined both negative and positive dimensions of mental health. This is a valuable contribution considering much of the 2SLGBTQ+ scholarship has focused on deficits of this population (DeBlaere et al., 2010; Herrick et al., 2014; Vaughan & Rodriguez, 2014); thus, I add to the scholarship on the strengths-based perspective of 2SLGBTQ+ lives. Now I discuss the findings in more detail, drawing from each phase of the project.

**Experiential and Psychological Climate and Mental Health Outcomes**

Concerning the relationship between climate and participants’ mental health, important
nuanced results emerged when considering the bivariate and multivariable findings. At the bivariate level, I found a significant relationship between both climate indicators and each mental health outcome. In particular, for the deficit-oriented variable of psychological distress, greater intersectional discrimination was correlated with higher distress, while greater perceptions of an inclusive climate was correlated with less distress. The relationships were reversed for positive mental health, a strengths-based variable, whereby greater intersectional discrimination was correlated with lower positive mental health and greater perceptions of an inclusive climate correlated with high positive mental health. Consistent with minority stress theory and previous research (Collier et al., 2013; Holman, 2018; Hong et al., 2016; Velez et al., 2013; Woodford & Kulick, 2015), these results can suggest that a hostile experiential climate can threaten one’s mental health (i.e., greater distress and lower positive mental health), while perceptions of inclusion can foster one’s mental health (i.e., lower distress and greater positive mental health). However, in the adjusted multivariable analysis, particular aspects of climate demonstrated an enduring effect, namely intersectional discrimination on psychological distress and perceived inclusive climate on positive mental health. These findings are partially supported by previous research. Among sexual minority college students, Woodford et al. (2014) found in both bivariate and multivariable analyses that experiential climate was associated with both anxiety and depression (negative aspects of mental health), but measures of psychological climate were not significant at either level. Yet, research examining alcohol and drug use among this population suggests that both experiential and psychological climate partially explain these outcomes (Reed et al., 2010).

Climate researchers have not previously examined positive indicators of mental health, thus the finding that psychological climate predicts positive mental health
including when controlling for intersectional discrimination is unique. These collective results indicate the need to address experiential and psychological climate in understanding and promoting participants’ mental health, with desirable outcomes realized on negative and positive aspects of mental health.

Discrimination negatively impacted interview participants in terms of their emotional and cognitive reactions (i.e., feelings and thoughts). Specifically, many participants felt anger, frustration, sadness, disappointment, and exhaustion, while others internalized self-doubt, shame, and humiliation. These reactions are similar to those described by Nadal (2013) regarding microaggressions that 2SLGBTQ+ people face, including discomfort/lack of safety, anger and frustration, sadness, and embarrassment/shame. In the way participants described their reactions, they often begin with the feelings of anger and frustration or sadness, disappointment, and exhaustion. These feelings then contribute to participants’ thought processes where they internalize their reactions as self-doubt, shame, and humiliation, and then decide whether and how to respond. These emotional and cognitive responses reflect the negative impact that discrimination has on their mental health.

Participants’ emotional and cognitive reactions to discrimination are natural considering these venues are supposed to be safe spaces (Fox & Ore, 2010), yet contradictory to these ideals, individuals face discriminatory comments or actions that make them feel unsafe or that they do not belong because of who they are. These feelings are similar to those documented by other researchers examining experiences of racialized people (Jaspal, 2017), disabled individuals (Cheslik & Wright, 2021), and other diverse members (Carter & Baliko, 2017) in dedicated settings for 2SLGBTQ+ people. This points to the need to create more inclusive climates for all 2SLGBTQ+ individuals to feel safe and welcomed, considering the value of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure.
spaces in enhancing the wellbeing of 2SLGBTQ+ people (Browne & Bakshi, 2011; Lewis & Johnson, 2011).

**Resilience-Promoting Factors, Resilience, and Processing Discrimination**

The regression analyses, testing the moderation relationships of each resilience-promoting factor on psychological distress and positive mental health, did not produce significant results. The lack of finding a moderation relationship with any of these resilience-promoting factors could be due to the minimal distribution of scores (i.e., variability) for intersectional discrimination and all the resilience-promoting factors, although these variables demonstrated a main effect with select outcomes. That is, the three resilience-promoting factors were considered protective against diminished positive mental health and increased psychological distress. It is possible the focus on 2SLGBTQ+ spaces where people spent most of their time in the past two years might have contributed to the low variation in these scores; therefore, it would be valuable for future studies to examine experiences across all venues, including those where individuals do not spend a lot of time because they have previously experienced some type of exclusion or discrimination in those places. Notwithstanding this result, I found that 2SLGBTQ+ pride, resilient coping, and social support from friends played a protective role with intersectional discrimination and perceived inclusive climate on positive mental health, as well as with perceived inclusive climate on positive mental health, while the latter two resilience-promoting factors played a protective role with perceived inclusive climate on psychological distress. This protective role for these three factors has been documented by other researchers in other settings (Johns et al., 2018; Kertzner et al., 2009; Rostosky et al., 2018; Wong et al., 2014). As other scholars argue, these resilience-promoting factors are important considerations for understanding the wellbeing of 2SLGBTQ+ people (Colpitts & Gahagan, 2016; Meyer, 2015), and this
study extends this conclusion to their leisure experiences.

The interview participants responded to discrimination in various ways, including “passing” behaviours, speaking to leaders or peers, or finding new spaces. These behavioural responses to the discrimination resemble what Nadal (2013) suggests are two main processes that occur in the face of microaggressions: acceptance and conformity or resilience and empowerment. Acceptance and conformity relate to individuals in this study engaging in decision-making processes to determine whether and how to respond and deciding not to respond because of context-dependent rationalizing, downplaying the nature/intent of the incident, weighing benefits and risks to continued participation, and deciding the benefits to continued participation were greater than the risk. Some participants described “passing” behaviours as a way to conform so that they did not need to deal with the discrimination, similar to heterosexual or cisgender “passing” behaviours related to identity management and self-protection described by other scholars (Arayasirikul & Wilson, 2019; Moreno et al., 2017; Toft, 2020).

As Nadal’s (2013) second process of behavioural responses, resilience and empowerment refer to individuals having consciously thought about the incidents and moved toward actions that support their own wellbeing. For this study, interview participants’ behavioural responses involved intervening or finding new spaces to convene. To intervene, individuals talked to their leaders and peers as a way to validate or process their thoughts or feelings (Nadal, 2013). Other participants drew on their self-confidence to confront perpetrators when able to do so. This approach to processing the experience reflects individuals’ agency in resisting discrimination (Case & Hunter, 2012).
Rather than continuing to endure the discrimination, some participants noted leaving that space and finding another venue where they could belong, which might include counterspaces—spaces where marginalized people visit that support their resistance to negativity and exclusionary norms and practices that occur elsewhere (Case & Hunter, 2012). Participants identified virtual social groups on social media (e.g., Facebook, Reddit, Discord) as an example of a counterspace where they could find other members who share similar multiple marginalized identities; for example, one participant joined a Facebook group for fat trans men because they found fat phobia to be dismissed in the trans community, or another participant found solace with a Facebook group for nonbinary individuals with autism. In these virtual settings, members can amplify the voices of those who are marginalized and build solidarity with lived experiences in the external world, all in an effort to resist the negativity they faced elsewhere, whether it is in mainstream society or general 2SLGBTQ+ spaces (Case & Hunter, 2012). The shift toward action exemplifies resilient coping behaviours among participants because, as previously described, such behaviours refer to successful adaptation to stressors, while coping tends to focus on adapting to stressors (i.e., discrimination) but does not indicate success (Meyer, 2015; Sinclair & Wallston, 2004). While resilient coping was found to be a protective factor for mental health and not a moderator, the participants’ behavioural reactions to discrimination demonstrate the importance of resilient coping in contributing to people’s wellbeing. Moreover, resilient coping indicates resistance as these individuals have consciously chosen to engage in specific actions to respond to and resist the stressors.

**Limitations and Future Research Directions**

The present study has many methodological strengths, such as using a mixed methods design, sampling participants from Canada and the United States, and recruiting diverse
samples with people who are TGNC, racialized, and disabled. Some limitations must be considered when considering the findings. The cross-sectional nature of the data means that causal conclusions cannot be made, while the convenience sample limits the external validity of the findings, despite the diversity of the sample. Although there was a high proportion of racialized participants within the survey and interview data, Black, Indigenous, Latin American, and Middle Eastern participants were limited. Thus, future studies should seek strategies to recruit those groups. Due to the pandemic, many physical and in-person operated 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces and activities did not meet, resulting in the high participation in virtual spaces. Future studies should examine the variations in climate between virtual and in-person spaces. Further, since the study focused on venues where participants spent most of their time in the past two years, data for intersectional discrimination are likely lower than if assessing spaces that one infrequently visits or has left. Similarly, those for perceptions of intersectional discrimination are likely high for this reason. It is also possible that engaging in such spaces could inflate the scores for pride, resilient coping, and peer support, which were high among the sample. Thus, future research should encompass places where individuals spend little time to better understand social exclusion within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces. A larger sample with a greater variation, as opposed to somewhat skewed scores, would help examine the moderation relationships. In addition, future studies with larger samples should examine resilience for particular groups (e.g., racialized TGNC) taking into account intersectionality, as well as investigate additional resilience-promoting factors, such as coping skills, self-mastery, self-efficacy, and sense of optimism.

Despite a range of scores on the climate indicators, about a third of interview participants tended to refer to observations of discrimination that occurred in other
2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings, rather than those reported in their survey (i.e., where they spent most of their free time in the past two years). These discussions helped to understand ambient discrimination as an important part of climate, but participants’ reflections on how they responded tended to focus on behavioural responses. Future research should focus on participants’ experiences in any 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space where they personally faced discrimination to explore more about their emotional and cognitive reactions, alongside their behavioural reactions. Moreover, additional explorations should include both general 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces (e.g., bars, choirs) and group-specific leisure spaces (e.g., social groups for racialized TGNC individuals) to understand the variations in experiential and psychological climate.

**Conclusion and Practice Implications**

In this study, I found a bivariate association between the experiential and psychological climate and psychological distress and positive mental health, with enduring effects found for experiential climate on distress and psychological climate on positive mental health in adjusted models. Overall, these relationships demonstrate the importance of creating positive climates to ensure participants’ mental health is not negatively affected by discrimination and poor perceptions of the climate. In addition, the qualitative findings provide insights into how 2SLGBTQ+ people process discrimination and how that reflects resilience and resistance processes. There is a clear need to shape 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings in ways that welcomes all members to support their wellbeing, but also strengthens resistance strategies.

Scholars have recommended numerous inclusion practices (Bailey, 2005; Cerezo & Bergfeld, 2013; Theriault, 2017), including creating space for and engaging in meaningful conversations; representation of diversity at all levels; inclusive leadership that reinforces safety and learning; taking space to make space; checking in with self
and others; eliminating gatekeeping practices; creating antidiscrimination and inclusion policies that are adhered to; focusing on the diverse needs of marginalized members; and having empathy for new members or those who are open learning. Therefore, these strategies are vital to support inclusion and potentially create more welcoming climates, whereby fewer incidents of discrimination occur, along with positive perceptions of an inclusive climate in the 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space. Uniquely, this study highlights the role of resistance to a hostile climate. Bystander intervention training that prepares leaders, staff, and volunteers to recognize and respond to discrimination as soon as possible is a recommended strategy. In addition, there is a need to create and support 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces for particular groups, such as racialized TGNC individuals or disabled TGNC individuals, which can be considered counterspaces. These spaces are often venues that embrace and celebrate participants’ multiple identities. Notably, the creation of such unique settings for in-person engagements might be difficult in geographically remote locations, thus it might be effective to offer virtual options to supplement or provide an alternative to general 2SLGBTQ+ spaces.

As of publication and to the best of my knowledge, I am the first researcher to quantitatively examine both the experiential and psychological dimensions of climate in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, along with the relationships between these indicators of climate and mental health outcomes. I also investigated the impact of climate on both positive and negative dimensions of mental health, as well as explored resilience, thereby adding to the scholarship on the multidimensional aspects of 2SLGBTQ+ people’s mental health rather than simply focusing on these individuals’ negative outcomes. Furthermore, through this study, I contribute to scholarship on how individuals react and respond to negative climates specifically within 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces. Overall, this study provides evidence about the usefulness and benefits
of mixed methods research in understanding climate, mental health, and resilience-promoting factors, including integrating acts of resistance as part of resilience. Future research should seek to augment the strategies that support inclusion of diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people so that everyone can benefit from what these spaces offer, namely, to enhance their wellbeing.
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Table 1: Social identities, demographic characteristics, and descriptive statistics of sample and study variables (N=548)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuous variables</th>
<th>M(SD)</th>
<th>Theoretical Range</th>
<th>Skewness (SE)</th>
<th>Kurtosis (SE)</th>
<th>Missing (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>30.42 (14.14)</td>
<td>0, 3</td>
<td>1.88 (0.11)</td>
<td>3.96 (0.21)</td>
<td>2.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersectional discrimination</td>
<td>0.36 (0.50)</td>
<td>0, 3</td>
<td>-1.41 (0.11)</td>
<td>1.92 (0.21)</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived climate</td>
<td>5.84 (1.25)</td>
<td>1, 7</td>
<td>-0.07 (0.11)</td>
<td>0.24 (0.21)</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive mental health</td>
<td>2.64 (0.99)</td>
<td>0, 5</td>
<td>0.83 (0.11)</td>
<td>0.29 (0.21)</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological distress</td>
<td>0.97 (0.79)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-1.54 (0.11)</td>
<td>3.08 (0.21)</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SLGBTQ+ pride</td>
<td>5.96 (1.14)</td>
<td>1, 7</td>
<td>-0.58 (0.10)</td>
<td>0.29 (0.21)</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilient coping</td>
<td>5.09 (0.99)</td>
<td>1, 7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.02 (0.21)</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support from friends</td>
<td>5.77 (1.13)</td>
<td>1, 7</td>
<td>-1.29 (0.11)</td>
<td>2.02 (0.21)</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorical variables</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
<th>Categorical variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Racial Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender man</td>
<td>100 (18.2)</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender woman</td>
<td>144 (26.3)</td>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans man</td>
<td>50 (9.1)</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans woman</td>
<td>17 (3.1)</td>
<td>Indigenous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-binary</td>
<td>122 (22.3)</td>
<td>Latin American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse gender</td>
<td>115 (21.0)</td>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual/Pansexual</td>
<td>167 (30.5)</td>
<td>No disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>94 (17.2)</td>
<td>Mental/emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>94 (17.2)</td>
<td>Chronic illness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>134 (24.5)</td>
<td>Intellectual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse sexuality</td>
<td>59 (10.7)</td>
<td>Physical/mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alcohol and other substance use disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>269 (49.1)</td>
<td>Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>279 (50.9)</td>
<td>Speech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Diverse sexuality includes Two-Spirit, asexual, demisexual, androphilic, abrosexual, heterosexual, questioning, and unsure. Diverse gender includes Two-Spirit, agender, demigender, genderqueer, gender nonconforming, genderfluid, nonbinary, pangender, and questioning. Proportion of individuals with disabilities does not add up to 100% because 167 individuals selected more than one disability.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Pseudonym</th>
<th>Sexual Identity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Racialized/White</th>
<th>Dis/Ability</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Pansexual</td>
<td>Nonbinary</td>
<td>Racialized</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Diverse Sexuality</td>
<td>Nonbinary</td>
<td>Racialized</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>Cisgender Man</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilary</td>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>Cisgender Woman</td>
<td>Racialized</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>Nonbinary</td>
<td>Racialized</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ty</td>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>Nonbinary</td>
<td>Racialized</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Pansexual</td>
<td>Genderfluid</td>
<td>Racialized</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jen</td>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>Cisgender Woman</td>
<td>Racialized</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marla</td>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>Cisgender Woman</td>
<td>Racialized</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>Diverse Sexuality</td>
<td>Genderfluid</td>
<td>Racialized</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica</td>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>Cisgender Woman</td>
<td>Racialized</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>Nonbinary</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>Agender</td>
<td>Racialized</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>Gender nonconforming</td>
<td>Racialized</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>Agender</td>
<td>Racialized</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>Trans Man</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>Pansexual</td>
<td>Nonbinary</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>Nonbinary</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>Cisgender Woman</td>
<td>Racialized</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tryst</td>
<td>Diverse Sexuality</td>
<td>Nonbinary</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geri</td>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>Genderqueer (Cisgender)</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>Cisgender Man</td>
<td>Racialized</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Correlations between climate indicators, mental health outcomes, and resilience-promoting factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Intersectional discrimination</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Perceived inclusive climate</td>
<td>-0.531***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Positive mental health</td>
<td>-0.179***</td>
<td>0.229***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Psychological distress</td>
<td>0.204***</td>
<td>-0.145**</td>
<td>-0.666***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 2SLGBTQ+ pride</td>
<td>-0.163***</td>
<td>0.147**</td>
<td>0.273***</td>
<td>-0.099*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Resilient coping</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.527***</td>
<td>-0.354***</td>
<td>0.180***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Social support from friends</td>
<td>-0.193***</td>
<td>0.181***</td>
<td>0.477***</td>
<td>-0.303***</td>
<td>0.262***</td>
<td>0.270***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001
Table 4: Effects of climate indicators on mental health outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome: Psychological Distress</th>
<th>b (SE)</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>b (SE)</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>b (SE)</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersectional discrimination</td>
<td>0.151 (0.059)</td>
<td>0.096*</td>
<td>0.034, 0.268</td>
<td>0.143 (0.070)</td>
<td>0.090*</td>
<td>0.005, 0.280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived inclusive climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.021 (0.024)</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>-0.068, 0.026</td>
<td>-0.001 (0.028)</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.057, 0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SLGBTQ+ pride</td>
<td>0.005 (0.027)</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-0.048, 0.057</td>
<td>-0.004 (0.027)</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>-0.056, 0.049</td>
<td>0.0003 (0.027)</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>-0.050, 0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilient coping</td>
<td>-0.299 (0.054)</td>
<td>-0.216***</td>
<td>-0.405, -0.193</td>
<td>-0.306 (0.054)</td>
<td>-0.218***</td>
<td>-0.413, -0.199</td>
<td>-0.298 (0.054)</td>
<td>-0.215***</td>
<td>-0.405, -0.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support-friends</td>
<td>-0.128 (0.027)</td>
<td>-0.183***</td>
<td>-0.181, -0.074</td>
<td>-0.130 (0.027)</td>
<td>-0.186***</td>
<td>-0.184, -0.076</td>
<td>-0.126 (0.028)</td>
<td>-0.180***</td>
<td>-0.180, -0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>25.377***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.952***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.528***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome: Positive Mental Health</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intersectional discrimination</td>
<td>-1.275 (0.846)</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td>-2.936, 0.387</td>
<td>-0.352 (0.995)</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>-2.307, 1.604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived inclusive climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.818 (0.336)</td>
<td>0.079*</td>
<td>0.158, 1.478</td>
<td>0.767 (0.399)</td>
<td>0.073*</td>
<td>-0.017, 1.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SLGBTQ+ pride</td>
<td>1.232 (0.378)</td>
<td>0.109*</td>
<td>0.489, 1.975</td>
<td>1.206 (0.374)</td>
<td>0.107**</td>
<td>0.472, 1.940</td>
<td>1.233 (0.379)</td>
<td>0.109**</td>
<td>0.487, 1.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilient coping</td>
<td>8.105 (0.763)</td>
<td>0.357***</td>
<td>6.607, 9.604</td>
<td>8.251 (0.761)</td>
<td>0.360***</td>
<td>6.757, 9.746</td>
<td>8.223 (0.762)</td>
<td>0.362***</td>
<td>6.726, 9.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support-friends</td>
<td>3.423 (0.387)</td>
<td>0.301***</td>
<td>2.664, 4.183</td>
<td>3.358 (0.383)</td>
<td>0.295***</td>
<td>2.607, 4.110</td>
<td>3.379 (0.389)</td>
<td>0.295***</td>
<td>2.615, 4.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>51.868***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53.178***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47.962***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.508</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Age, gender, sexuality, racialized status, disability status, and country of residence were included in all models as control variables. CI = confidence interval.

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001, + approaching significance p < .05
Figure 1: Emotional, cognitive, and behavioural reactions to discrimination in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces

**Emotional Reactions to Discrimination**
- Anger, frustration
- Sadness, disappointment, exhaustion

**Cognitive Reactions to Discrimination**
- Internalized self-doubt, shame, humiliation
- Deciding whether and how to respond

**Behavioural Reactions to Discrimination**
- “Passing” behaviours
- Speaking to leaders or peers
- Finding new spaces
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Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion

The overall study makes theoretical and pragmatic contributions to understanding and addressing the climate of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, its consequences on individuals’ wellbeing, and their resilience to adversity. It also offers implications for future research investigating these issues. As seen in the three manuscripts, each manuscript advanced scientific knowledge and offered results that can inform practice and policy within leisure spaces related to fostering inclusion and wellbeing. The overall study is especially noteworthy because by examining both experiential and psychological climate and engaging with quantitative and qualitative data, the findings offer a fulsome understanding of the climate of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces. Further, I go beyond this by identifying multi-level factors that shape an individual’s experiences and perceptions of the climate and how that climate affects their social wellbeing within the leisure space and both positive and negative dimensions of mental health. Equally important, concerning resilience, the findings provide insight into a range of factors, including structural ones specific to 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces and acts of resistance that can be developed, strengthened, and enacted to help bolster individuals against the negative effects of a hostile climate. Specific findings were discussed in the respective manuscripts; therefore in this chapter, I aim to examine findings that cut across all three manuscripts and reflect on their contributions to and implications for research guided by the theories comprising my theoretical framework outlined in the introductory chapter, namely in relation to minority stress theory, climate research, resilience theory, and intersectionality. As previously noted in chapter 1, I chose not to explicitly engage with whiteness theory in my dissertation due to the limited data collected around this topic because, even with probing and prompting participants did not elaborate on the norms and practices that uphold systems of oppression (i.e., whiteness) beyond making general observations about racial
diversity or lack thereof within the leisure setting. I then provide a discussion of the implications for both micro (clinical) and macro (policy and organizational) practice, including noting implications for clinical assessments and interventions with 2SLGBTQ+ people.

**Minority Stress Theory**

I contribute to minority stress theory research by expanding the study of discrimination to include that perpetrated by 2SLGBTQ+ people, widening the scope of distal stressors to encompass climate, namely both experiential and psychological climate, as well as examining both positive and negative aspects of mental health. Minority stress theory (Hendricks & Testa, 2012; Meyer, 2003) outlines a minoritized identity-discrimination-outcome pathway for 2SLGBTQ+ people, which is illustrated by the study findings. However, unlike other minority stress research conducted with 2SLGBTQ+ people, which tends to examine experiences of anti-2SLGBTQ+ discrimination, such as heterosexism assumably perpetuated by cisgender heterosexual people, my findings demonstrate this pathway in the context of 2SLGBTQ+ spaces, thus considering discrimination perpetrated by other 2SLGBTQ+ people and relatedly used measures that were not specifically addressing anti-2SLGBTQ+ discrimination. The manuscripts “Examining Intersectional Discrimination and Wellbeing” and “Policing Belongingness,” in particular, offer innovative findings in this regard, and the manuscript “Understanding Resilience and Wellbeing” advances understanding of minority stressors to include perceptions of the climate (discussed in the next section).

There have been calls for research to better understand underlying factors to the minority stress-mental health pathway (Hatzenbuehler, 2009), and the manuscript “Examining Intersectional Discrimination and Wellbeing” responds directly to this call. In that manuscript, I documented that social wellbeing in the 2SLGBTQ+ space mediates the connection between
intersectional discrimination and mental health outcomes. This mediation finding suggests that 2SLGBTQ+ individuals who faced greater intersectional discrimination in these settings are at risk for negative mental health through lowered social wellbeing. This finding provides evidence that poorer social wellbeing (operationalized as low belonging and low satisfaction with the leisure space) in a 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space explains why members who face higher levels of intersectional discrimination are more likely to have diminished mental health, thereby illuminating the importance of belonging in these spaces. The results add a unique dimension to understanding the poor outcomes of diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people due to discrimination via the documented mediation pathway; similar findings have been found in general community settings for TGNC individuals (Barr et al., 2016), racialized people (Frost & Meyer, 2012), and individuals with intellectual disabilities (Tallentire et al., 2020). In theory, 2SLGBTQ+ spaces exist to create community among participants, and as my findings indicate, when this does not occur because of discrimination, participants’ mental health can be negatively impacted.

The manuscript, “Examining Intersectional Discrimination and Wellbeing,” involved integrating minority stress and intersectionality theories by exploring the role of gender, race, and disability status in experiencing intersectional discrimination, which helps to advance minority stress theory by explicitly considering diversity among 2SLGBTQ+ people in terms of experiencing stressors (intersectional discrimination, in this case). In adopting an intersectional lens, specifically using intercategorical approach (Bauer & Scheim, 2019; Else-Quest & Hyde, 2016; Rouhani, 2014), disability and its interaction with gender were found to be risk factors for experiencing intersectional discrimination (as shown through exploratory analyses with intersectional groups and structural equation modeling with two-way interactions), thus providing quantitative evidence that particular groups within the 2SLGBTQ+ community are
more likely to face exclusion within 2SLGBTQ+ spaces. Relatively little is known about the role of diversity within 2SLGBTQ+ communities on experiencing minority stressors (Cyrus, 2017), thus this study and others like it (e.g., Balsam et al., 2011; McConnell et al., 2018) shed light on how particular members of the 2SLGBTQ+ community face additional stressors because of their other marginalized identities.

My work offers methodological implications for future minority stress theory research. A pivotal implication concerns the use of mixed methods broadly across the dissertation and specifically in the two manuscripts “Policing Belongingness” and “Understanding Resilience and Wellbeing,” which are both mixed methods studies. Minority stress research conducted with the 2SLGBTQ+ population tends to use quantitative methods (e.g., McConnell et al., 2018; Meyer et al., 2008; Testa et al., 2015), which is useful in identifying the statistical relationships between factors. However, the context of those relationships and underlying processes are not well understood. My research exemplifies the benefit of using mixed methods in minority stress research, providing a framework to understand the leisure experiences of diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people in the quantitative data, as well as to qualitatively explore additional processes that are not well understood in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings, such as resistance. Broadly, the quantitative component offered insight into the various relationships with key concepts, such as intersectional discrimination, its risk factors, and impacts on social wellbeing in 2SLGBTQ+ spaces and mental health in “Examining Intersectional Discrimination and Wellbeing;” the relationship between climate profiles, their covariates, and related social outcomes in “Policing Belongingness;” and the relationship between climate indicators, mental health outcomes, and resilience-promoting factors in “Understanding Resilience and Wellbeing.” The qualitative findings from “Understanding Resilience and Wellbeing” about reactions to discrimination,
especially those about cognitive processing and internalization, help to shed light on factors that might underlie the quantitative links between climate and mental health outcomes. The narratives concerning emotional reactions to discrimination in this study also suggest possible underlying pathways as well as factors that could contribute to greater distress and lower positive mental health. Similarly, the qualitative results reported in “Policing Belongingness” help to explain membership in the three climate profiles and their association with belonging and satisfaction with the leisure space, as well as the relationship between intersectional discrimination and social wellbeing reported in the manuscript, “Examining Intersectional Discrimination and Wellbeing.”

Specifically, in terms of reporting both quantitative and qualitative findings in one manuscript, both “Policing Belongingness” and “Understanding Resilience and Wellbeing” demonstrate the utility of this approach for minority stress research. For instance, in “Policing Belongingness,” the qualitative data explained the factors underpinning the climate that contribute to participants’ belonging and inclusion in the 2SLGBTQ+ leisure space. Moreover, the qualitative data in “Understanding Resilience and Wellbeing” helped to better understand the quantitative findings on the processes related to climate and mental health, but also added to them by providing insight into resistance processes in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings. Therefore, the strength of the mixed methods design involved complementing the quantitative and qualitative data, while offering opportunity for participants to tell stories that help to explain and provide context to the quantitative data.

Climate Research

Though theories of climate were not explicitly articulated in my original framework, my engagement with minority stress theory involved expanding the concept of discrimination, specifically distal minority stressors to include climate, both experiential and psychological
climate. As seen in “Policing Belongingness” and “Understanding Resilience and Wellbeing,” the overall study contributes to an understanding of climate in 2SLGBTQ+ spaces (and more broadly) by showing the value of examining both experiential and psychological climate, including examining their specific effects and overall effects via profile analysis. For instance, by assessing the unique effects of these two dimensions of climate in “Understanding Resilience and Wellbeing,” the findings indicate that both aspects matter for mental health, with groundbreaking findings emerging across these two indicators in the multivariable analyses indicating differential effects for negative and positive aspects of mental health. Specifically, when adjusting for each climate indicator, regression results suggest that intersectional discrimination is a risk factor for distress and perceptions of inclusion is a protective factor for positive mental health. These findings highlight the value of examining both forms of climate, and provide the evidence that researchers, practitioners, and policymakers need to include experiential and psychological climate in their understanding of minority stressors and strategies to address climate concerns within leisure contexts.

With few exceptions (e.g., Woodford & Kulick, 2015), minority stress researchers tend to focus on experiences of discrimination, thus my work demonstrates the value of also examining perceptions of inclusion/exclusion. In conceptualizing climate holistically using latent profile analysis (LPA) in “Policing Belongingness,” I used a case-centered approach inclusive of experiential and psychological climate to understand the role of climate profiles on social outcomes. Methodologically approaching the study of climate and essentially using experiential and psychological climate as minority stressors through latent profiles makes an important contribution to studies of inclusion and wellbeing. Only recently have scholars started to assess
climate using a case-centered approach (e.g., Albers et al., 2018; Earnshaw et al., 2018; Kiang et al., 2019; Magno et al., 2019; Woodford et al., 2021).

Considering the importance of social wellbeing (i.e., belonging and satisfaction with the leisure setting) within 2SLGBTQ+ spaces as found in “Examining Intersectional Discrimination and Wellbeing,” in “Policing Belongingness,” I focused on further understanding the role of climate on social wellbeing indicators. Using a holistic conceptual approach to measuring climate via LPA, findings suggesting that the nature of the climate profile across psychological and experiential aspects (i.e., contentious, ambivalent, and welcoming climate profiles) are associated with varying levels of these social wellbeing outcomes, and provide further evidence of the exclusionary nature of 2SLGBTQ+ spaces for some participants as well as the connection between climate and social wellbeing. Though not reported in the manuscripts, similar patterns are seen with mental health outcomes, whereby going from the more hostile climate profile to the more welcoming one is associated with lower scores on positive mental health and higher scores on psychological distress. Evidently, both experiences of discrimination and perceptions of climate are vital to conceptualizing and examining climate/minority stressors. Further, the experiential and psychological climate contributes to people’s belonging in those spaces and to participants’ mental health.

Resilience Theory

Drawing on quantitative and qualitative data in this study, I examined resilience in terms of resilience-promoting factors, while also investigating acts of resistance. This focus adds to the study of minority stress and climate by examining factors that can help buffer participants from the negative effects of an unwelcoming, hostile, or mixed climate. It also contributes to research that is attempting to move away from a deficits or negative focus by examining strengths and
focusing on positive psychology (DeBlaere et al., 2010; Herrick et al., 2014; Vaughan & Rodriguez, 2014). My work also specifically advances resilience research in several ways. Across the quantitative analyses, factors included 2SLGBTQ+ pride, resilient coping, social support from friends, antidiscrimination policies, and inclusive leadership practices. Compared to other factors, such as social support, little is known about structural factors in promoting resilience, and pride and resilient coping are under-investigated with the 2SLGBTQ+ population. As reported in “Examining Intersectional Discrimination and Wellbeing,” antidiscrimination policies and inclusive leadership practices moderated the relationship between intersectional discrimination and social wellbeing, while those two factors and social support from friends moderated the relationship between climate and mental health. In “Understanding Resilience and Wellbeing,” I found that 2SLGBTQ+ pride, resilient coping, and social support from friends played select protective roles, but none of these factors moderated the climate-mental health relationship. Even considering the non-significant moderation results in that manuscript, these varied findings provide insights about the nature of resilience in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces—that these factors might have either a protective and/or moderating role on the climate-mental health relationship. These findings also address the pressing need for resilience to be included in minority stress research (McConnell et al., 2018; Meyer, 2015; Scandurra et al., 2017).

The qualitative results concerning factors underpinning the climate-belonging relationship and the strategies that participants used to process negative climates reported in both manuscripts “Policing Belongingness” and “Understanding Resilience and Wellbeing,” respectively, also offer critical insights about resilience, complementing it with resistance. The findings further suggest future work to revise the acts of resistance measure to include not only the concept of intervening but also “take space to make space” and engaging in meaningful
conversations. Many of the factors and strategies are similar to various factors that promote resilience (e.g., self-mastery, self-efficacy) and relate to actions taken to resist negative narratives of themselves and the subgroups to which they belong via engagement in counterspaces. Importantly, some of the behavioural reactions to discrimination outlined in the manuscript “Understanding Resilience and Wellbeing,” such as intervening or leaving the space, draw on the individual’s agency and represent resistance. The results indicate that resilience and resistance are vital concepts to examine in the context of the impact of experiential and psychological climate on belonging and mental health for 2SLGBTQ+ individuals. Moreover, the use of mixed methods helps to explain the processes involved in the climate-belonging relationship and the impact of climate on mental health, while exploring resistance through nuanced stories that recognize individuals’ agency, which I was not able to properly assess using the acts of resistance measure in the survey. Thus, the use of mixed methods was vital to capture the essence of people’s experiences of resilience and resistance.

**Intersectionality**

Other scholars recommend that the study of intersectionality and its application requires both quantitative and qualitative approaches (Bowleg & Bauer, 2016; Rouhani, 2014). Therefore, the use of mixed methods design is valuable to this work and in documenting inequities and unjust, harmful power relations. In terms of quantitative assessment, I adapted Scheim and Bauer's (2019) Intersectional Discrimination Index and applied it to 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces. The use of this scale represents an important contribution to the literature addressing intersectionality, and the adapted version is a tool available for leisure researchers to use, though I offer some suggestions for improvement in the manuscript “Examining Intersectional Discrimination and Wellbeing.” In terms of the quantitative application of intersectionality, I applied
intersectionality as per the intercategorical approach (Bauer & Scheim, 2019; Else-Quest & Hyde, 2016; Rouhani, 2014) by examining two-way and three-way interactions (“Examining Intersectional Discrimination”) and examining the covariates of membership in climate profiles (“Policing Belongingness”). In addition to the collective findings across these two manuscripts helping to close the gap concerning the experiences of particular 2SLGBTQ+ subgroups, they show the benefits of engaging with intersectionality in quantitative research and demonstrate the use of intercategorical analysis (Bauer & Scheim, 2019; Else-Quest & Hyde, 2016; Rouhani, 2014).

Additionally, highlighting the value of mixed methods research for intersectionality research, as seen in the manuscript “Policing Belongingness,” the qualitative findings offer insights into the variations in experiences for different subgroups as found in the quantitative analysis (i.e., disability), as well as findings that differed from the quantitative results (i.e., race). In the case of both the statistically significant findings identified in the quantitative results, the qualitative narratives helped to explain these findings by shedding light in the complex ways oppressions can occur in 2SLGBTQ+ spaces for those with diverse identities. For instance, in terms of disability, participants described experiences of ableism where disability was often disregarded, resulting in their erasure from 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, challenges in entering these sites due their inaccessibility, and even having to mask or ignore their disabilities or the difficulties that they face while in these settings. As such, disabled participants must balance their need to engage with other 2SLGBTQ+ people (often those with little experience with disabilities) or endure heterosexism in disability-friendly spaces (Moreno et al., 2017). Notably, I did not find race to be associated with elevated risk for experiencing intersectional discrimination in the quantitative results in “Examining Intersectional Discrimination and
Wellbeing.” Yet interview participants described instances of racism in some 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings in “Policing Belongingness.” For example, some racialized people are barred from entry into some 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings or their bodies are policed and controlled in ways, such as rejection or objectification, that make them feel unsafe in some spaces. These aspects of racism are not addressed by the intersectional discrimination measure, which not only could help to explain why race was not found to be a risk factor, but also calls into question the construct validity of the measure for racialized participants. Overall, these illustrations of ableism and racism, as well as the findings reported in “Policing Belongingness,” indicate the importance of mixed methods in intersectionality research, and how the qualitative results can inform future quantitative studies.

To address the narrow use of intersectionality, including essentializing particular identities (e.g., whiteness, queerness) and focusing on simply having multiple marginalized identities, Collins and Bilge (2016) suggest intersectionality can be analyzed through six domains: power, social inequities, relationality, context, complexity, and social justice. In essence, everyone has multiple social positionalities (sexuality, gender, race, disability) that contribute to varying levels of power and privilege, which, in turn, lead people to different social inequities, as exemplified by my study whereby the interaction of gender and disability, for example, resulted in increased risk of intersectional discrimination. It seems, however, certain identities become more salient for some people depending on the context. While “Examining Intersectional Discrimination and Wellbeing” showed that gender and disability were associated with elevated risk of experiencing intersectional discrimination, as noted, further examination of the subgroups illustrated that disabled cisgender participants had a higher risk than disabled TGNC participants. As I posited in my discussion of this unexpected finding in that study
(“Examining Intersectional Discrimination and Wellbeing”), context and relationality likely play a role in understanding this variation in risk, such that disability—a minoritized identity—is perhaps the only prominent concern for cisgender individuals so ableism might have seemed daunting for this group, and the intersection of being disabled and TGNC seemed to not increase the risk for the latter group as much. This likely points to other factors at play, including settings where both marginalized identities can thrive (i.e., counterspaces) and where individuals can develop more positive self-perceptions. Further explicated in the qualitative component of the manuscript “Policing Belongingness,” participants described instances of cisgenderism, racism, and ableism in various 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings, which help to locate the quantitative findings from the manuscript “Examining Intersectional Discrimination” about the risk factors. As discussed earlier, while race and its interaction with gender and/or disability were not significant risk factors to experiencing intersectional discrimination, the qualitative findings in “Policing Belongingness” illustrate racism exists within some 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings. Plainly, the lived experience of intersectionality is complex and is simply not a matter of holding multiple identities that contribute to social inequities, but requires understanding the context, including participants’ narratives of these. My research demonstrates the need for and benefits of applying intersectionality to the study of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, as well as provides methodological examples of how to effectively do so using mixed methods.

Considerations for Future Research

Reflecting on the overall study, I offer recommendations for other researchers to consider in their work in exploring 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces as well as climate/minority stressors, generally, including research using online surveys. Specifically, I offer recommendations related to redeveloping the measure of intersectional discrimination, examining different 2SLGBTQ+
leisure settings, engaging with whiteness theory in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure research, and conducting effective online survey research with 2SLGBTQ+ populations and in general. These considerations supplement the directions for future research identified in the three manuscripts and those described earlier in this chapter, such as for researchers to employ mixed methods designs in future minority stress research, climate research, and intersectionality research.

The Intersectional Discrimination Index (Scheim & Bauer, 2019) used in this study to assess experiential climate comprised of items focused on personal experiences of discrimination with a few items encompassing ambient discrimination alongside direct experiences. As other researchers indicate, ambient discrimination is another important aspect to examine to comprehensively understand the climate (Hong et al., 2016; Silverchanz et al., 2008; Woodford et al., 2014). Future research should seek to integrate ambient discrimination more explicitly into the intersectional discrimination measure, while also testing its reliability and validity with diverse 2SLGBTQ+ individuals. A comprehensive measure might include two subscales, one to address direct or personal experiences, and another to address indirect or ambient experiences (i.e., observing others experiencing discrimination or aspects within the environment). Measuring intersectional discrimination in this way can be helpful in parsing out the effects of direct/personal and indirect/ambient experiences, while providing insights into variations in experiential climate and the importance and prevalence of direct experiences, indirect experiences, or both, in different 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings.

There is a need to examine diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people’s experiences and perceptions of climate in a variety of environments, including virtual and in-person settings, as well as general 2SLGBTQ+ spaces (e.g., bars, choirs, sports groups) and group-specific 2SLGBTQ+ spaces (e.g., Facebook groups for trans individuals with autism). Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, a
majority of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces and activities that often met in-person did not operate, resulting in the more frequent use of virtual leisure settings, including groups on social media and Zoom events. About 63.1% ($n = 346$) of participants identified spending most of their free time in a virtual setting over the past two years. Researchers should examine and compare differences in experiential and psychological climate for virtual and in-person settings.

It also might be useful to consider various leisure spaces, including those in which individuals spend most of their free time and general “casual” spaces, such as bars and cafes. I designed the survey so that participants assessed their experiences of discrimination within spaces and activities where they spent most of their free time over the past two years, yet many of the interview participants discussed experiences of discrimination in general, drop-in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings (e.g., choirs, sports groups), which might not necessarily have been the same spaces addressed in their survey responses. Also in the interviews, participants described welcoming climates within group-specific 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces (e.g., social groups for racialized trans individuals), which could be the spaces they addressed in the survey responses, but my analysis did not address this factor (due to concerns about statistical power).

To understand variations in the climate and the factors contributing to the differences, it is, therefore, vital for researchers to conduct future studies across an array of venues, including online and in-person as well as general and group-specific, and to address the type of venue in their analyses, while also examining overall 2SLGBTQ+ leisure experiences and not limit analyses to those in which one is most engaged.

Though I did not explicitly engage with whiteness theory in my research, I recommend scholars do so to interrogate the dominant (white) identity and the systems that uphold their dominance, including norms and practices that privilege whiteness and normalizes systems of
oppression (Arai & Kivel, 2017; Green et al., 2007; McDonald, 2009). Though I was not able to gather enough detailed data to apply whiteness theory in an in-depth manner in my work, I acknowledge that some participants made insightful observations aligned with understanding the dominance of whiteness in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces. That is, some participants discussed the racial diversity or lack thereof within the leisure settings they accessed, describing the composition of different 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces—from the membership to the leadership—as being relatively white. As well, some participants described policies and practices, including the lack of interventions by white leaders, which operate to uphold whiteness and disregard other identities, thereby upholding a white homonormative ideology (Oswin, 2008; Vo, 2021). Of note, these experiences mirror my experiences as outlined in my positionality statement in Chapter 1 and, as described by participants in the manuscripts “Policing Belongingness” and “Understanding Resilience and Wellbeing,” the whiteness of such spaces meant that racialized members often felt excluded and sought other spaces where their racialized identity could be welcomed and where they could learn about living at the intersections of sexuality, gender, and race. As discussed by some interview participants, their pursuance of and belonging in spaces that embraced their intersecting identities helped them better understand their various lived intersections, as well as shaped their perspectives on living their authentic selves. In addition to the composition and practices of 2SLGBTQ+ spaces, those dominated by whiteness essentially do not consider intersectionality, which is precisely how whiteness operates, thus leading to the dominance and privileging of white participants. And, these dynamics and outcomes extend to other marginalized identities, including disability, thereby making it difficult for people with these identities to feel like they belonged in those spaces, and eventually making these individuals seek other more welcoming spaces. The limited data and interpretations I offer
provide evidence for the potential of engaging with whiteness theory to make explicit the dominant structures that uphold systems of oppression that lead diverse individuals to problematic experiences that diminish the benefits of participating in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings, including consequences to their overall wellbeing.

Finally, the use of online surveys and social media advertisements have been identified as viable options to conduct research with 2SLGBTQ+ populations, who are often difficult to reach for research due their marginalization in mainstream society and sometimes desire to conceal their sexual/gender identity/identities (Bates et al., 2019; Guilloy et al., 2018). Based on the demographics of my survey and interview participants, it seems that online research is effective for engaging younger 2SLGBTQ+ people (e.g., the average age in my survey sample was 30 years old), leaving out the older population. While I attempted to recruit participants through programs and organizations specific for 2SLGBTQ+ older adults, my survey sample was comprised of 12.4% \((n = 68)\) of individuals 50 years of age or older. Exclusion of older participants prohibits addressing ageism as part of an intersectional analysis. To address this issue, other researchers might consider using snowball sampling particularly among older participants. Likewise, a more comprehensive approach, such as respondent-driven sampling, would have been beneficial in ensuring the sample represents the diversity of the 2SLGBTQ+ population (Michaels et al., 2019). Moreover, the option of completing a telephone survey might help to recruit more older adults. While I attempted to address difficulties in accessing and completing the online survey by offering accommodations for a telephone or Zoom-administered survey on the recruitment website and screening survey, I did not receive any such requests.

Ensuring the integrity of data in online studies is a significant challenge (McInroy, 2016; Sterzing et al., 2018) and one that I had to plan for and strengthen while implementing my
dissertation. Initially, the survey included data integrity strategies (e.g., multiple choice and open-text quality control questions, Captcha). However, additional tactics were needed given the suspicious responses upon initial launch; upon review, all 167 responses submitted during the survey’s initial launch were deemed to be fraudulent, possibly from bots (e.g., IP address outside North America, nonsense open-text responses), thus I closed the survey and deleted these data. To strengthen my data integrity strategy, after obtaining research ethics approval for modifications to my research protocol, I implemented a separate screening survey that collected basic demographic information as well as activated metadata functions (e.g., bot detection, repeat response, ballot box stuffing) in Qualtrics. Similar to the initial survey launch, I reviewed every screening survey response and the metadata (e.g., IP address, fraud and duplicate scores) to judge the validity of submissions, as recommended by other researchers (McInroy, 2016; Sterzing et al., 2018). I emailed those eligible to join the study a participant code and link to the main survey. I reviewed participants’ responses to the quality control questions in the main survey, which resulted in the exclusion of 39 survey submissions from the dataset. With the additional data integrity strategies overall, approximately 6.0% of responses were classified as fraudulent.

Based on my experiences, I recommend that researchers include a separate screening survey step and quality control questions in their surveys, implement metadata functions, and regularly review survey submissions to screen for fraudulent respondents and bots and to ensure valid responses are provided.

I hope researchers will find these suggested directions for future research helpful in comprehensively understanding climate in various 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings, including among older individuals. I also hope that the lessons I learned and advice I offer regarding conducting
Implications for Micro and Macro Practice

Through this study, consistent with my pragmatic approach, I contribute not only to research, but also to micro (clinical) and macro (policy and organizational) practice. As such, the results offer implications for social work, leisure sciences, public health, and other fields concerned with equity, diversity, inclusion, and the wellbeing of 2SLGBTQ+ people and other marginalized communities. Broadly, micro practitioners need to engage in competent inclusive practices with diverse service users that support their wellbeing and recognize intersectionality and the complex challenges they face, including within 2SLGBTQ+ spaces. On the macro level, it is important for practitioners to identify and implement strategies that address systems of oppression and homonormativity in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings, which include supporting training to ensure leaders and members have the skills and confidence to intervene when microaggressions occur, as well as creating equity, diversity, and inclusion frameworks for application in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces.

Many micro practice interventions, including with service users from vulnerable groups, including 2SLGBTQ+ people, focus on fostering wellbeing, and leisure activities can help to realize this outcome (Ching-Teng, 2019; Kelly & Doherty, 2017). As part of the assessment phase, micro practitioners often seek to identify the challenges that service users face, including experiences of discrimination, as well as sources of strengths. My findings clearly direct practitioners to explore involvement in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure activities as a source of discrimination/stress and to not assume such involvement is necessarily a source of strength or resilience. Clearly, social workers and other practitioners must consider intersectionality as a key
exploring climate, wellbeing, resilience, and resistance

contributor to diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people’s lived experience, and is particularly poignant for TGNC, racialized, and/or disabled individuals. 2SLGBTQ+ people are not monolithic and should not be understood as a singular community (Carter & Baliko, 2017). When planning interventions, which might consider becoming involved in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure activities, it is also important that micro practitioners understand that due to exclusion in leisure settings, diverse 2SLGBTQ+ individuals might face negative experiences in these sites, and as my results also suggest, some might seek or even create their own affirming, intersectional leisure spaces. Such understanding can equip practitioners with knowledge of aspects to explore with service users when considering their past and current leisure experiences in assessments and when considering engagement in such activities as part of an intervention. With such understanding, micro practitioners can recognize the complexity of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces, especially for those holding other marginalized identities.

At a macro level, practitioners must recognize, understand, and address the homonormative nature of certain 2SLGBTQ+ spaces, including how the dominance of certain identities (cisgender, white, non-disabled, monosexual) are upheld in 2SLGBTQ+ spaces that then contribute to diverse people’s experiences of systemic oppression, including through the interpersonal interactions, perceptions of the climate, and organizational policies, practices, and norms. It is often by design that some settings remain exclusive and others inclusive of marginalized identities (Hartal, 2017; Oswin, 2008). Thus, more effort must be placed into ensuring leaders and members of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces understand equity, diversity, and inclusion, and know how to apply such a lens to structures and practices within those settings so that issues of exclusion are addressed (ideally prevented), and all members feel welcomed. A starting place is training on recognizing and intervening on incidents of discrimination, given it
can offer important benefits, such as identity formation and social support, to those who experience exclusion (Baams et al., 2017; Slatten et al., 2015), but overall transformation is needed in the long-term. There is a need to continue seeking strategies that increase people’s belonging in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings, which can include interventions that improve experiential and psychological climate.

To support an equity, diversity, and inclusion framework for practice, Bailey (2005) offers a conceptual model of social inclusion in leisure settings that encompasses four dimensions: spatial (e.g., physical engagement of people from varying social backgrounds), relational (e.g., connection and acceptance among members), functional (e.g., opportunities to build new skills and knowledge), and power-related (e.g., social networks, community, and social capital). Macro practitioners can use these four dimensions to work toward creating 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings that foster inclusive climates, particularly concerning various policies and practices that can support inclusion efforts. For instance, practitioners can examine the spatial aspect of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure settings to determine who can or cannot access the space, identify barriers to access, and implement strategies that remove such barriers to foster inclusion. As for the relational dimension, practitioners can increase sense of belonging among leisure space participants (and thereby enhance inclusion) by ensuring antidiscrimination policies exist and practices that reinforce a welcoming climate are employed by leaders and other participants. Regarding the functional aspect, practitioners can identify diversity alongside individual growth and development as well as collective wellbeing as benefits of participating in the leisure activity, and integrate these varied benefits into promotional materials. Practitioners can also examine how power relations contribute to the connections that people make, and how they depend on and utilize those relationships in their everyday lives. As discussed in the three
manuscripts, inclusion of diverse 2SLGBTQ+ members can be achieved through the elimination of gatekeeping practices, training leaders to be aware of and respond to discrimination, increased visibility and representation of diverse members, enhanced antidiscrimination policies, inclusive leadership practices, creating spaces and opportunities specifically for diverse 2SLGBTQ+ members, and engagement in meaningful conversations. As illustrated by the study participants, these practices can have a profound impact on people’s sense of belonging, which then can support their wellbeing in the long-term.

**Conclusion**

As a racialized gay cisgender man involved in an array of 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces throughout my life, I entered this study with rich insights into the complex experiences and complicated relationships that “diverse” 2SLGBTQ+ people often have in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces. Through this study, though not my aim, my experiences and perceptions in various spaces were supported, which further enhanced my strong desire to engage in inclusive practices to ensure my peers are welcomed in all settings, rather than them having to endure the effects of negative or mixed climates. As articulated in the three manuscripts and outlined in this chapter, my research promotes understanding of the nature and consequences of climate in 2SLGBTQ+ spaces, as well as the resilience of 2SLGBTQ+ people, including acts of resistance. My work also illustrates the benefits of mixed methods research, the value of my multi-faceted theoretical framework in helping to understand the contexts within which diverse 2SLGBTQ+ people play, as well as offers findings and recommendations to inform effective micro and macro interventions to support inclusion and wellbeing. Further, the findings present social workers and other practitioners with knowledge to help them to better understand the complexity of 2SLGBTQ+ inclusion, which can and does occur in 2SLGBTQ+ spaces, thus offering areas to
address when working with services users in micro interventions. Finally, I also made contributions to macro practice, including demonstrating the need to continue equity, diversity, and inclusion work within spaces where people spend their leisure time and offering strategies to promote inclusion, so that diverse 2SLGBTQ+ participants can benefit from engaging in 2SLGBTQ+ leisure spaces.

I want to close my dissertation with a story of resistance and a counterspace within the context of the gay cruise:

On my first cruise, my now-great friend suggests that I join him in the “rice paddy,” a place on the dancefloor where Asian gay men tend to gather. Flabbergasted and stunned at the derogatory use of the term, I feel unsettled. At first, I watch from the outside, but then I enter the area with cautious curiosity. Very surprisingly, I felt a sense of community, an openness, a welcome not yet experienced in my life. An overwhelming sense of relief and love wash over me. I notice the revolt against the subjectification of Asian gay men that occurs in the gay community through the notion of “no fats, no femmes, no Asians.” I watch Asian bodies of all shapes and shades oscillate through movements and performances of femininity and masculinity, and not as subjects of the world beyond. I hear and watch these men snap hand-held fans—often seen in East Asian contexts used by women—on each beat of the music. Never have I seen the joys of such Asian-ness embraced and celebrated; there is not just the performance of power among these men, but also a power in their performance.
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Appendix A: Supplementary Results Tables

Table 1: Goodness of Fit for Moderation Relationship, Chapter 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Model Fit Indices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Acts of resistance           | \( \chi^2(37) = 882.644, p < 0.001, \chi^2/df = 23.855, 
                               CFI = 0.350, TLI = 0.034, SRMR = 0.217, 
                               RMSEA = 0.263 (0.248,0.278) \) |
| Social support-friends       | \( \chi^2(37) = 1536.188, p < 0.001, \chi^2/df = 41.519, 
                               CFI = 0.384, TLI = 0.085, SRMR = 0.227, 
                               RMSEA = 0.277 (0.265,0.289) \) |
| Antidiscrimination policies  | \( \chi^2(37) = 777.471, p < 0.001, \chi^2/df = 21.013, 
                               CFI = 0.526, TLI = 0.295, SRMR = 0.158, 
                               RMSEA = 0.194 (0.182,0.206) \) |
| Inclusive leadership practices | \( \chi^2(37) = 1102.461, p < 0.001, \chi^2/df = 29.796, 
                                CFI = 0.443, TLI = 0.172, SRMR = 0.175, 
                                RMSEA = 0.233 (0.221,0.245) \) |

Table 2: Leadership Role as a Covariate to Climate Profiles, Chapter 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contentious Climate</th>
<th>Ambivalent Climate</th>
<th>Welcoming Climate</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probability or ( M ) (S.E.)</td>
<td>Probability or ( M ) (S.E.)</td>
<td>Probability or ( M ) (S.E.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership role (vs. not)</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.10 [3]</td>
<td>0.23 [2]</td>
<td>10.62**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01

**p < .01
Table 3: Moderation Effect of Resilience-Promoting Factors on the Climate Indicators—Mental Health Relationships, Chapter 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome: Psychological distress</th>
<th>b (SE)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intersection discrimination X 2SLGBTQ+ pride (N = 517)</td>
<td>0.057 (0.044)</td>
<td>1.292</td>
<td>-0.030, 0.143</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection discrimination X Resilient coping (N = 522)</td>
<td>-0.073 (0.103)</td>
<td>-0.711</td>
<td>-0.276, 0.130</td>
<td>0.505</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection discrimination X Social support-friends (N = 520)</td>
<td>-0.021 (0.041)</td>
<td>-0.519</td>
<td>-0.103, 0.060</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived inclusive climate X 2SLGBTQ+ pride (N = 517)</td>
<td>-0.000 (0.019)</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>-0.038, 0.037</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived inclusive climate X Resilient coping (N = 522)</td>
<td>0.016 (0.040)</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>-0.062, 0.094</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome: Positive mental health</th>
<th>b (SE)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intersection discrimination X 2SLGBTQ+ pride (N = 510)</td>
<td>-0.449 (0.712)</td>
<td>-0.630</td>
<td>-1.848, 0.950</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection discrimination X Resilient coping (N = 516)</td>
<td>-1.339 (1.565)</td>
<td>-0.856</td>
<td>-4.413, 1.736</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection discrimination X Social support-friends (N = 514)</td>
<td>-0.958 (0.629)</td>
<td>-1.522</td>
<td>-2.195, 0.278</td>
<td>2.318</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived inclusive climate X 2SLGBTQ+ pride (N = 510)</td>
<td>-0.325 (0.308)</td>
<td>-1.056</td>
<td>-0.930, 0.280</td>
<td>1.115</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived inclusive climate X Resilient coping (N = 516)</td>
<td>-0.101 (0.600)</td>
<td>-0.168</td>
<td>-1.279, 1.078</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived inclusive climate X Social support-friends (N = 514)</td>
<td>0.421 (0.289)</td>
<td>1.459</td>
<td>-0.146, 0.988</td>
<td>2.130</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B: Recruitment Plan and Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facebook Twitter Instagram – personal posts</td>
<td>Limited friends list – request friends to share posting</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Hi everyone, I am currently conducting my PhD dissertation project and am recruiting survey participants. If you are a member of the LGBTQ2S+ community and have spent your free time in a LGBTQ2S+ sport clubs, social groups/activities, or other LGBTQ2S+ physical or online spaces in the past 2 years (24 months), please consider filling in this survey. Receive $10 for filling in a survey, or have $10 donated to a LGBTQ2S+ organization of your choice.” Use attached poster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook – groups</td>
<td>“Hi everyone, I am currently conducting my PhD dissertation project and am recruiting survey participants. If you are a member of the LGBTQ2S+ community and have spent your free time in a LGBTQ2S+ sport clubs, social groups/activities, or other LGBTQ2S+ physical or online spaces in the past 12 months, please consider filling in this survey. Receive $10 for filling in a survey, or have $10 donated to a LGBTQ2S+ organization of your choice.” Use attached poster Facebook groups include: LGBTQ+ Opportunities Tri-Cities ON [12-Mar-21] Subtle Queer Asian Leftovers [12-Mar-21] Gaysians ETC Tri-Pride [12-Mar-21] Sexuality in Social Work Interest Group Queer Ontario [19-Mar-21] LGBTQ Research and Researchers in Higher Education and Student Affairs [19-Mar-21]</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email lists and contacts</td>
<td>Faculty of Social Work, Wilfrid Laurier University International Partnership for Queer Youth Resilience’s International Student Training Network Tin’s PhD dissertation committee members and research advisory committee members Team Edmonton (<a href="mailto:sports@teamedmonton.ca">sports@teamedmonton.ca</a>) [sent 27-Feb-21] Vancouver Frontrunners (<a href="https://vancouverfrontrunners.org/contact-us/">https://vancouverfrontrunners.org/contact-us/</a>) [sent 27-Feb-21] – YES The 519 (<a href="mailto:Info@The519.org">Info@The519.org</a>) [sent 27-Feb-21] Pride Toronto (<a href="mailto:office@pridetoronto.com">office@pridetoronto.com</a>) [sent 27-Feb-21] Egale Canada (<a href="https://egale.ca/contact-us/">https://egale.ca/contact-us/</a>) [27-Feb-21] Christine S’s older adults community centre (OACAO)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow Health Ontario</td>
<td>Submit a research posting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://www.rainbowhealthontario.ca/research-policy/submit-your-research/">https://www.rainbowhealthontario.ca/research-policy/submit-your-research/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://www.rainbowhealthontario.ca/health-researcher-directory/tin-vo/">https://www.rainbowhealthontario.ca/health-researcher-directory/tin-vo/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook ads</td>
<td>Design ads for recruitment, based on clicks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paid for $100 Feb 16-22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paid for $48 Mar 4-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paid for $120 Mar 31-Apr 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grindr and Her app ads</td>
<td>Design ads for recruitment, based on clicks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paid for $200 USD for Feb 28-Mar 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Campus Pride Index request survey distribution | (https://www.campuspride.org/research/) [sent 27-Feb-21] – Posted on Research Bulletin (paid ad) |
| Edmonton Pride | (https://www.edmontonpride.ca/) [sent 27-Feb-21] |
| Senior Pride Network | [sent 27-Feb-21] |
| Fierte Canada Pride | [sent 27-Feb-21] – NO |
| My Davie Village (Rainbow Sports in Vancouver) | [sent 4-Mar-21] |
| Gay Hocky Toronto | [sent 4-Mar-21] |
| Out Sport Toronto | [sent 4-Mar-21] |
| Qmunity | [sent 4-Mar-21] – YES |
| Gay Ottawa Volleyball | [sent 4-Mar-21] – YES |
| Ottawa Frontrunners | [sent 4-Mar-21] – YES |
| Rideau Speedeaus | [sent 4-Mar-21] |
| Ottawa Wolves Rugby Football Club | [sent 4-Mar-21] |
| Ottawa Pride Hockey | [sent 4-Mar-21] – YES |
| Lesbian Outdoor Group | [sent 4-Mar-21] |
| It Gets Better | [sent 8-Mar-21] |
| Winnipeg Rainbow Resource Centre | [sent 24-Mar-21] – YES |
| Canadian Centre for Gender and Sexual Diversity | [sent 4-Apr-21] |
| Guelph Pride Committee | [sent 12-Apr-21] |
| National LGBTQIA+ Health Education Center | [sent 12-Apr-21] |
| San Mateo Pride Center | [sent 12-Apr-21] |
| Pacific Pride Foundation | [sent 12-Apr-21] |
| Pride Centre of Edmonton | [12-Apr-21] |
| West End Seniors’ Network | [12-Apr-21] |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rainbow Health Ontario</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facebook ads</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$100 x 4 weeks = $400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grindr and Her app ads</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$50 x 4 weeks x 2 = $400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE WELLBEING & INCLUSION IN
RAINBOW LEISURE STUDY
SURVEY RECRUITMENT

Have you spent any free time in LGBTQ2S+ sport clubs, social groups/activities, or other LGBTQ2S+ physical or online spaces in the past 24 months?

For more info or to participate:
www.thewirlstudy.com

Ethics approval (REB#6710) by Wilfrid Laurier University
THE WELLBEING & INCLUSION IN RAINBOW LEISURE STUDY
SURVEY RECRUITMENT

Do you identify as a member of the LGBTQ2S+ community living in Canada or the US?

Have you spent any free time in LGBTQ2S+ sport clubs, social groups/activities, or other LGBTQ2S+ physical or online spaces in the past 24 months?

If so, please consider filling in a survey about your experiences from the past 2 years.

Receive $10 for filling in a survey, or have $10 donated to a LGBTQ2S+ organization of your choice.

CLICK HERE FOR THE INTEREST SURVEY

For more info:
✉️ Email Tin Vo: tvo@wlu.ca
🌐 Go to: www.thewirlstudy.com

Ethics approval (REB# 6710) by Wilfrid Laurier University.
Appendix C: Consent Form for Online Survey

WILFRID LAURIER UNIVERSITY INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT
The Well-being and Inclusion in Rainbow Leisure (WIRL) Study
Principal Investigator: Tin D. Vo (PhD candidate)
Faculty advisor: Dr. Michael R. Woodford (Professor and Associate Dean)

You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to understand experiences within LGBTQ2S+ leisure spaces and activities and how they affect well-being. The study will focus specifically on community-based spaces. The survey questions will focus on both positive and negative experiences, as well as things that can impact wellbeing, such as coping skills, social support, sense of belonging, substance use, and mental health. There will also be questions about your experience during the COVID-19 pandemic. The researcher is a Laurier graduate student in the Faculty of Social Work working under the supervision of Dr. Woodford.

INFORMATION

At this time, you are being asked to complete an online survey. The survey will take about 20-30 minutes to complete. Responses from about 500 people will be collected for the survey. Participation in the survey is completely voluntary. At the end of the survey, you can indicate interest in participating in a follow-up interview, which will occur once the survey responses are analyzed (roughly March 2021). You can participate only in the survey, if you wish. If you would like help completing the survey, you may contact Tin at voxx0160@mylaurier.ca for support via telephone or virtually through Microsoft Teams.

Please note, most of this form applies to the online survey.

RISKS

You may feel some discomfort or regret when answering questions about your perceptions and experiences, including discrimination, mental health, and substance use. To minimize the impact of the discomfort from these questions, you may take a break and come back to the questions if you wish, or you skip a question(s). A list of resources is provided here [hyperlink the list] and available in key sections of the survey in case you would like some immediate support. You can discontinue the study at any time and to choose not to answer any question without loss of compensation.

BENEFITS

There are no direct benefits from participating in the survey. By joining the study, you have a chance to reflect on your experiences in LGBTQ2S+ leisure spaces/activities and how that relates to your well-being. The research will contribute to the understanding of the experiences and well-being of diverse LGBTQ2S+ people, including transgender and gender non-conforming individuals, and LGBTQ2S+ people of colour. The results will contribute to efforts to foster the inclusion of diverse LGBTQ2S+ people in leisure spaces/activities, including policies and guidelines.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Your responses will be kept private and confidential. No identifying information, such as the name of the city/town where you live, will be collected as part of the study survey. Your information from the interest survey will be linked, but your name and email address will be stored separately from the survey data. Findings will be presented and published in aggregate form, such as numerically or using general descriptions. General participant descriptors (gender, sexuality, race, age, type of leisure space) will accompany any quotations taken from open-ended survey responses.

If you choose to participate in the follow-up interview stage of the study, you will be asked to give your name and contact information. This information will ONLY be used to contact you to arrange the interview. These details will
be stored separately from your survey responses and will be kept until all interviews are completed (roughly August 31, 2021).

All data will be stored on a password protected laptop, a cloud service (Google Drive), and through Qualtrics. All responses will be anonymized by removing all identifying information. The anonymized data will be stored indefinitely and may be reanalyzed in the future as part of a separate research project (i.e., secondary data analysis).

COMPENSATION

For participating in this part of the study, you will receive $10. Instead of receiving $10, you may choose to have the researcher (Tin) donate that $10 to one of the LGBTQ2S+ agencies listed at the end of the survey. If you choose to receive the $10, then you will be asked to provide your name and email address so that you could be contacted for the compensation. The information you provide for the compensation will be separated from your survey responses and will ONLY be used to contact you for your compensation and for no other purpose. This will occur up 4 weeks after you submit the survey.

CONTACT

If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures or you experience adverse effects as a result of participating in this study you may contact the researcher, Tin Vo, at voxx0160@mylaurier.ca or 905-341-0413.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the University Research Ethics Board (REB#6710), which receives funding from the Research Support Fund. If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Jayne Kalmar, PhD, Chair, University Research Ethics Board, Wilfrid Laurier University, 519-884-1970, extension 3131 or REBChair@wlu.ca.

PARTICIPATION

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. You have the right to refuse to answer any question or participate in any activity you choose.

If you withdraw from the study, you can request to have your data removed by checking off the box at the end of the survey that asks whether you would like to have your data included in the study. The researcher will manually delete your data if you check off this box at the end of the survey. Due to the anonymous nature of the survey, your data cannot be removed once you submit the survey. Thus, you cannot withdraw your data after you submit it.

FEEDBACK AND PUBLICATION

The results of this research will be published/presented in a thesis and conference presentation, and possibly journal articles. Results will be published on the study website (www.thewirlstudy.com) by December 1, 2021. No individual responses will be reported. General participant descriptors (gender, sexuality, race, age, type of leisure space) will accompany any quotations taken from open-ended survey responses.

CONSENT

It is advised that you print or save this consent form and/or record the researcher contact information in the case that you have any questions or concerns.

☐ I have read and understand the above information. I agree to participate in this study. (selecting this option will open the survey)
☐ I have read and understand the above information. I do not want to participate in this study. (selecting this option will return you to your browser)
Appendix D: Consent Form for Interview

WILFRID LAURIER UNIVERSITY INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT

The Well-being and Inclusion in Rainbow Leisure (WIRL) Study
Principal Investigator: Tin D. Vo (PhD candidate)
Faculty advisor: Dr. Michael R. Woodford (Professor and Associate Dean)

You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to understand experiences within LGBTQ2S+ leisure spaces and activities and how they affect well-being. The study will focus specifically on community-based spaces. The survey questions will focus on both positive and negative experiences, as well as things that can impact wellbeing, such as coping skills, social support, sense of belonging, substance use, and mental health. There will also be questions about your experience during the COVID-19 pandemic. The researcher is a Laurier graduate student in the Faculty of Social Work working under the supervision of Dr. Woodford.

INFORMATION

At this time, you are being asked to participate in an online interview (via Zoom for Healthcare). The interview will take about 45-60 minutes. About 20-30 people will be interviewed. Participation in the interview is completely voluntary.

RISKS

You may feel some discomfort or regret when answering questions about your perceptions and experiences, including discrimination, mental health, and substance use. To minimize the impact of the discomfort from these questions, you may take a break and come back to the questions if you wish, or you skip a question(s). A list of resources is provided in a separate document in case you would like some support after the interview. You can discontinue the study at any time and to choose not to answer any question without loss of compensation.

BENEFITS

There are no direct benefits from participating in the survey. By joining the study, you have a chance to reflect on your experiences in LGBTQ2S+ leisure spaces/activities and how that relates to your well-being. The research will contribute to the understanding of the experiences and well-being of diverse LGBTQ2S+ people, including transgender and gender non-conforming individuals, and LGBTQ2S+ people of colour. The results will contribute to efforts to foster the inclusion of diverse LGBTQ2S+ people in leisure spaces/activities, including policies and guidelines.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Your responses will be kept private and confidential as you will be assigned a participant code. Your survey and interview data will be linked using the participant code. Findings from the survey and interview will be presented and published as a whole and with general descriptions of the themes. General participant descriptors (gender, sexuality, race, age, type of leisure space) will accompany any quotations taken from the interview. No individual data will be presented.

The contact information you gave me to arrange the interview will be destroyed once the interview is over.
A professional transcription service will be used to transcribe all voice recordings of the interview. The participant code will be used to label each recording. A key for the participant code will be stored in a separate folder and only the primary researcher will have access. All data will be stored on a password protected laptop, a cloud service (Google Drive), and through Qualtrics. All responses will be anonymized by removing all identifying information. The anonymized data will be stored indefinitely and may be reanalyzed in the future as part of a separate research project (i.e., secondary data analysis).

COMPENSATION

For participating in this part of the study, you will receive $50 e-gift card (e.g., Amazon, Apple, Uber). Instead of receiving $50 gift card, you may choose to have the researcher (Tin) donate $50 to one of the LGBTQ2S+ agencies listed at the end of the interview. If you choose to receive the $50, then I will email you the e-gift card. This will occur up 2 weeks after the interview.

CONTACT

If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures or you experience adverse effects as a result of participating in this study you may contact the researcher, Tin Vo, at tvo@wlu.ca or 905-341-0413.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the University Research Ethics Board (REB#6710), which receives funding from the Research Support Fund. If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Jayne Kalmar, PhD, Chair, University Research Ethics Board, Wilfrid Laurier University, 519-884-1970, extension 3131 or REBChair@wlu.ca.

PARTICIPATION

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. You have the right to refuse to answer any question or participate in any activity you choose. If you withdraw from the study, you can request to have your data removed by sending the researcher (Tin) an email (tvo@wlu.ca).

FEEDBACK AND PUBLICATION

The results of this research will be published/presented in a thesis and conference presentation, and possibly journal articles. Results will be published on the study website (www.thewirlstudy.com) by December 1, 2021. No individual responses will be reported. General participant descriptors (gender, sexuality, race, age, type of leisure space) will accompany any quotations taken from open-ended survey responses.

CONSENT

It is advised that you print or save this consent form and/or record the researcher contact information in the case that you have any questions or concerns.

☐ I have read and understand the above information. I agree to participate in the interview.
☐ I have read and understand the above information. I do not want to participate in the interview.

Assigned participant code (combination of letters and numbers): ______________________
Appendix E: The WIRLS Interest Survey

The purpose of the WIRL study is to understand experiences within LGBTQ2S+ leisure spaces and activities and how they affect well-being. The study will focus specifically on community-based spaces/activities, such as LGBTQ2S+ community centres, queer sports clubs, rainbow choirs and knitting groups (to name a few). The survey questions will focus on both positive and negative experiences, as well as things that can impact well-being, such as coping skills, social support, sense of belonging, substance use, and mental health. There will also be questions about your experience during the COVID-19 pandemic.

We are identifying a list of potential survey participants. By answering the questions below, we can determine your eligibility for the study. Also, we want to ensure participants represent the diversity of the LGBTQ2S+ community; thus, your answers to the questions below will help us to have a diverse group of participants.

All individuals who express interest in joining the study will be contacted via email and those selected for participation will be provided with the survey link. All data collected in this interest survey will be kept private and confidential. If you are invited to participate in the study, then your demographic information will be linked to the study data.

1. Do you identify as a member of the LGBTQ2S+ community (i.e., lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, queer, two-spirit, or another minority/diverse sexual and/or gender identity)?
   - Yes
   - No ➔ INELIGIBLE

2. Have you been involved in or attended any LGBTQ2S+ leisure spaces or activities in the past 12 months? Such spaces and activities include in-person or online venues or activities specifically for any member of the LGBTQ2S+ community or subgroups where you spend your free time to interact and/or socialize with other LGBTQ2S+ people on a regular basis (whether that is weekly, every few weeks, or monthly). Consider your experiences before COVID-19 and during the COVID-19 pandemic.
   - Yes
   - No ➔ INELIGIBLE

YES to both, continue; NO to at least 1, end survey message

Because we want to recruit participants who represent the diversity of the LGBTQ2S+ community, please answer the following questions about your identities.

3. How old are you (in years)? [   ]

   - Asexual
   - Bisexual
   - Demisexual
   - Gay
   - Heterosexual
   - Lesbian
   - Man loving man
   - Pansexual
   - Queer
   - Questioning
   - Two-spirit
   - Woman loving woman
   - My sexual identity/orientation is not listed. Instead, my sexual identity/orientation is [OPEN TEXT] (please specify)
   - Prefer not to answer
2. Do you identify as trans? We use trans to include trans, transgender, trans woman, trans man, non-binary, gender non-conforming, genderfluid, genderqueer, and diverse gender identities.
   - Yes, I identify as trans
   - No, I identify as cisgender (i.e., my gender identity matches my birth sex)

3. How do you identify in terms of gender? Please select the option that BEST describes your current gender identity.
   - Agender
   - Demigender
   - Genderqueer
   - Gender non-conforming
   - Genderfluid/Fluid
   - Man
   - Non-binary (enby)
   - Pangender
   - Questioning
   - Trans man
   - Trans woman
   - Two-spirit
   - Woman
   - My gender is not represented on this list. Instead, my gender identity is [OPEN TEXT] (please specify)
   - Prefer not to answer

4. Do you currently live in:
   - Canada
   - United States
   - Another country: [OPEN TEXT] → INELIGIBLE

5. What is your postal code/zip code? [OPEN TEXT]

6. Do you identify as a racialized, person of colour, or Indigenous person?
   - Yes
   - No

7. Racial groups are defined by perceptions of race, colour or other superficial physical characteristics only, not by country of birth, citizenship, or religious affiliation. Do you consider yourself to be (Select all that apply):
   - Asian (e.g., East Asian, South Asian, Southeast Asian, West Asian)
   - Black (e.g., African, Caribbean)
   - Indigenous (e.g., First Nations, Aboriginal, Metis, Inuit)
   - Latin American
   - Middle Eastern
   - Pacific Islander
   - White
   - Bi-racial/mixed race
   - Prefer not to answer
   - My racial group is not listed. It is [OPEN TEXT] (please specify)

8. What year were you born? [OPEN TEXT]

9. What does the third letter in LGBTQ2S+ stand for? [OPEN TEXT]

10. Are you able to complete the survey in English?
11. Do you have access to a computer or a tablet (e.g., iPad) where you could complete the online survey? Given the length of the study survey, it is recommended to complete the survey on a computer or a tablet.
   
   o Yes
   o No → INELIGIBLE

12. If invited to participate, would you be interested and able to complete a one-on-one online interview by Microsoft Teams or telephone? The interview will dive deeper into your experiences in LGBTQ2S+ leisure spaces/activities. Only about 30 people will be invited to be interviewed, and will take place in March/April 2021. The interview will take about 30-45 minutes at a time that is convenient for you. Participation in the interview is completely voluntary and your personal information will be kept confidential, including your contact information, as well as your survey and interview data. If you agree to participate, you will be compensated with a $50 gift card of your choice.
   
   o Yes
   o No

INSERT CAPTCHA TO CHECK FOR HUMAN

Please enter your name and an email address so that we could contact you if you are selected to participate in the study. Your name and email will be stored separately from your survey response and will be deleted once the survey has closed. Your contact information will not be used for any other purpose except to get in touch with you to participate in the study survey.

13. Name:

14. Email address:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this interest survey. We will get in touch with you within 24hrs to notify you if you will be invited to complete the study survey.

 NOTE for REB: If the respondents are eligible and selected for the survey, these data (screening questions) will be retained. Respondents are not eligible if they say “NO” to questions 1, 2, 10, or 11, “Another Country” in question 4, and/or younger than 16 years old. They will also be screened to ensure age and year of birth matches; being racialized and identifying a racial group other than White; and postal code/zip code matches with Canada/US residency. For bot/fraudulent respondent detection, IP address, location, and postal code/zip code will also be compared. Data from interest survey respondents deemed eligible but do not complete the study survey will be kept to describe “drop-outs/non-respondents.”
Appendix F: The WIRLS Online Survey

The Well-being & Inclusion in Rainbow Leisure (WIRL) Study

Thank you for your interest in participating in the WIRL study!

The purpose of the WIRL study is to understand experiences within LGBTQ2S+ leisure spaces and activities and how they affect well-being. The study focuses specifically on community-based spaces, including online spaces. The survey questions focus on both positive and negative experiences, as well as things that can impact wellbeing, such as coping skills, social support, sense of belonging, substance use, and mental health. There will also be questions about your experience during the COVID-19 pandemic.

We realize there are many terms being used to refer to minority sexual and gender identities. It is not possible to include each unique identity term in this survey. Throughout the survey, we use LGBTQ2S+ to try to be inclusive of all the possible terms used to refer to sexual and gender minority groups/identities, including but not limited to lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, queer, two-spirit, gender non-conforming, non-binary, genderfluid and other diverse gender and sexual identities.

What is the participant code that you were given in the invitation email? (2 letters, 2 numbers)

INSERT CAPTCHA TO CHECK FOR HUMAN

CONSENT FORM PLACED HERE

--- NEW BLOCK OF QUESTIONS/NEW PAGE ---

TITLE: LGBTQ2S+ LEISURE SPACE/ACTIVITY PARTICIPATION

To get things started, the following questions ask about your history with LGBTQ2S+ leisure spaces and activities. To reiterate, LGBTQ2S+ leisure spaces and activities include places and activities specifically for LGBTQ2S+ people where you interact with other LGBTQ2S+ people in your free time. These can include in-person and online venues or activities. For the purpose of this survey, we are most interested in LGBTQ2S+ leisure spaces/activities where people meet/interact on a regular basis (such as, weekly, every few weeks, or monthly).

1. What types of LGBTQ2S+ leisure spaces/activities have you regularly participated in the past two years? Select all that apply.
   - Recreational activities and social clubs (e.g., knitting groups, choir groups, food/cooking clubs, book/reading clubs) for LGBTQ2S+ people
   - Sports clubs and leagues (e.g., running group, bowling league) dedicated to LGBTQ2S+ people
   - LGBTQ2S+ social events (e.g., dances, coffee house)
   - LGBTQ2S+ sex/kink groups/communities/venues
   - LGBTQ2S+ online/virtual discussion forums (e.g., LGBTQ2S+ Facebook group, LGBTQ2S+-dedicated Reddit forum)
   - LGBTQ2S+ Online/virtual events/meetings happening in real-time (e.g., watch parties)
   - Another space/activity not identified above (please specify) - [PIPE IN RESPONSE FOR QUESTION 2]

2. [ONLY ASKED IF MULTIPLE OPTIONS SELECTED IN QUESTION 1; IDENTIFY ONLY RESPONSES SELECTED FROM QUESTION 1] Out of the spaces/activities you have picked, which one did you most often spend time in over the past two years? For the rest of the survey, please think about your experiences in this specific space/activity.
   - Recreational activities and social clubs (e.g., knitting groups, choir groups, food/cooking clubs, book/reading clubs) for LGBTQ2S+ people
3. You just selected [TYPE OF ORGANIZATION/RESPONSE PIPED FROM QUESTION 2]. Please share the name of the organization/group? If you prefer, you may make up a name. The name of this organization/group (real or fake) will be used in questions that follow. [NAME OF ORGANIZATION/GROUP, REQUIRED QUESTION]

4. How often do you visit or participate in [NAME OF ORGANIZATION/GROUP PIPED FROM QUESTION 3]?
   o Daily
   o Weekly
   o A few times a month
   o Monthly
   o Every few months
   o A few times during the year
   o About once during the year

5. Why do you visit or participate in [NAME OF ORGANIZATION/GROUP PIPED FROM QUESTION 3]?
   Please select all that apply.
   o To spend time with other LGBTQ2S+ people
   o To meet other LGBTQ2S+ people
   o To do the activity specifically with other LGBTQ2S+ people
   o To leave the house
   o To find sexual or romantic partner(s)
   o To provide/obtain social support from other LGBTQ2S+ people
   o To meet LGBTQ2S+ people online
   o Other reasons (please specify)

6. Do you play a leadership role in [NAME OF ORGANIZATION/GROUP PIPED FROM QUESTION 3]?
   o I am in a leadership role
   o I am a member

--- NEW BLOCK OF QUESTIONS/NEW PAGE ---

TITLE: YOUR EXPERIENCES IN THE LGBTQ2S+ LEISURE SPACE/ACTIVITY

The following questions ask about your experiences in [NAME OF ORGANIZATION/GROUP PIPED FROM QUESTION 3]. You will be asked about your sense of belonging and discrimination in that organization/group. Some of these questions might be difficult or cause discomfort. If needed, please take a break and come back to these questions, or skip any questions if you feel uncomfortable. If you would like to talk to someone, please see this list of resources [LINK].

7. The following questions ask about your sense of belonging in and satisfaction with [NAME OF ORGANIZATION/GROUP PIPED FROM QUESTION 3]. Thinking about your experiences over the past two years, please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

In regard to [NAME OF ORGANIZATION/GROUP PIPED FROM QUESTION 3],
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel valued as a person in the LGBTQ+ leisure space.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel accepted as a part of the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I belong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can meet other people like me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It provides a group of people with whom I can be myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel supported when I am with other members or participants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It provides a place where I can openly express my feelings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I plan to continue participating in this space/activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend others like me join this space/activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I were new to this city/town, I would definitely join or participate in this space/activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Thinking about [NAME OF ORGANIZATION/GROUP PIPED FROM QUESTION 3], how many people do you consider to be close friends within that organization/group? [OPEN TEXT]

9. Miley Cyrus came in on a wrecking bell. Who came in on a wrecking ball?

--- NEW BLOCK OF QUESTIONS/NEW PAGE ---

**TITLE: YOUR EXPERIENCES IN THE LGBTQ2S+ LEISURE SPACE/ACTIVITY**

As a reminder, some of these questions might be difficult or cause discomfort. If needed, please take a break and come back to these questions, or skip any questions if you feel uncomfortable. If you would like to talk to someone, please see this list of resources [LINK].

10. Please tell us how often you have experienced any of the following types of discrimination because of who you are. When we say, “because of who you are”, this includes both how you describe yourself and how others might describe you. For example, race, ethnicity, ancestry, nationality, religion, gender, sexuality, age, weight/body shape or size, disability, or income. In [NAME OF ORGANIZATION/GROUP PIPED FROM QUESTION 3] over the past two years, because of who you are, have you…
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely/Not often</th>
<th>Occasionally/Sometimes</th>
<th>Almost every time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heard, saw, or read others joking or laughing about you (or people like you).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been treated as if you are unfriendly, unhelpful, or rude.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been called names or heard/saw your identity used as an insult.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been treated as if others are afraid of you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been stared or pointed at.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been told that you should think, act, or look more like others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard that you or people like you don’t belong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been asked inappropriate, offensive, or overly personal questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been treated as if you are less smart or less capable than others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been discriminated against by a group leader/captain.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another form of discrimination not identified above (please specify in the box provided).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Which experience bothered you MOST (e.g., angered, frustrated)? [PIPE IN ONLY RESPONSES THAT THEY RESPOND WITH RARELY OR MORE]
   - Heard, saw, or read others joking or laughing about you (or people like you).
   - Been treated as if you are unfriendly, unhelpful, or rude.
   - Been called names or heard/saw your identity used as an insult.
   - Been made to feel that others are afraid of you.
   - Been stared or pointed at.
   - Been told that you should think, act, or look more like others.
   - Heard that you or people like you don’t belong.
   - Been asked inappropriate, offensive, or overly personal questions.
   - Been treated as if you are less smart or less capable than others.
   - Been discriminated against by a group leader/captain.
   - [PIPED IN FROM QUESTION 1]

12. Please describe the experience -- what, who, where -- and its impact on you. (Please note that quotations might appear in the public domain verbatim. Please read what you have written to make sure that you did not intentionally include personal or identifying information.) [OPEN TEXT]

13. We know it might be hard to determine the reason for the discrimination based on any identity. However, thinking about the issue that bothered you most in [NAME OF ORGANIZATION/GROUP PIPED FROM QUESTION 3], do you think the discrimination was because of any of these reasons? (Select all that apply)
   - Race
   - Ethnicity/ancestry/nationality
   - Religion
   - Gender
   - Sexuality
   - Age
   - Disability
   - Weight/body shape/size
   - Income
   - Housing
   - An aspect of you not list above. Please specify: [OPEN TEXT]
14. Did the person responsible (i.e., the perpetrator) for the act of discrimination that bothered you most have similar or the same identities as you (e.g., similar/same race/ethnicity, similar/same gender)?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don’t know
   - Prefer not to answer

15. Now we would like to learn about how you might have helped to address discrimination in [NAME OF ORGANIZATION/GROUP PIPED FROM QUESTION 3], Please identify how often you may have done any of the following within [NAME OF ORGANIZATION/GROUP PIPED FROM QUESTION 3] over the past two years...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely/ Not often</th>
<th>Occasionally/ Sometimes</th>
<th>Almost every time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have spoken up for myself when treated unfairly or discriminated against.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have spoken up for others when treated unfairly or discriminated against.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I see people who are left out, I check in with them to make sure they are okay.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When they are treated unfairly or discriminated against, I do or say things to try to help them feel they belong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Do you find there are barriers to addressing discrimination in (the) [NAME OF ORGANIZATION/GROUP PIPED FROM QUESTION 3]? Please describe those barriers. (Enter them in the space provided)

17. For this question, drag the slider to one-third of the way on the sliding scale.

--- NEW BLOCK OF QUESTIONS/NEW PAGE ---

TITLE: CLIMATE/ENVIRONMENT OF LGBTQ2S+ LEISURE SPACE/ACTIVITY

These questions ask you to think about the overall climate/environment for people like you in [NAME OF ORGANIZATION/GROUP PIPED FROM QUESTION 3] over the past two years.

18. Thinking about the overall climate/environment of [NAME OF ORGANIZATION/GROUP PIPED FROM QUESTION 3], please select the response that best reflects your perception of it for people like you. When we say, “people like you are”, this includes both how you describe yourself and how others might describe you. For example, race, ethnicity, ancestry, nationality, religion, gender, sexuality, age, weight/body shape or size, disability, or income.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very hostile</th>
<th>Very indifferent</th>
<th>Very uncooperative</th>
<th>Very unwelcoming</th>
<th>Very friendly</th>
<th>Very concerned/caring</th>
<th>Very cooperative</th>
<th>Very welcoming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. Overall, how comfortable are you with the climate/environment in [NAME OF ORGANIZATION/GROUP PIPED FROM QUESTION 3]? [PRESENT IN HORIZONTAL FORM]
   - Very uncomfortable
   - Uncomfortable
   - Somewhat uncomfortable
   - Neutral
   - Somewhat comfortable
   - Comfortable
   - Very comfortable

20. In [NAME OF ORGANIZATION/GROUP PIPED FROM QUESTION 3] over the past two years…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination of people like me is prohibited through anti-discrimination or harassment policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about equity and inclusion policies are available or publicized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures for reporting discrimination are available or publicized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a commitment to equity and inclusion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders treat the wellbeing of every participant as important.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are efforts to prevent discrimination or harassment (e.g., presentations, workshops, reminders).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are public statements from the organization’s/group’s leaders promoting equity and inclusion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leaders openly support issues and concerns of equity and inclusion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- NEW BLOCK OF QUESTIONS/NEW PAGE ---

TITLE: LGBTQ2S+ CONNECTIONS

The following questions ask you about your experiences as a member of the LGBTQ2S+ community. LGBTQ2S+ is intended to be inclusive of the diverse communities.

21. For each of the following statements, please mark the response that best indicates your current experience as an LGBTQ2S+ person. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whenever I think a lot about being LGBTQ2S+, I feel critical of myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whenever I think a lot about being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ2S+, I feel depressed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish I were not LGBTQ2S+.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am glad to be a LGBTQ2S+ person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud to be part of the LGBTQ2S+ community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud to be LGBTQ2S+.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. In general, how many LGBTQ2S+ friends do you have? Enter a number. [OPEN TEXT]

23. What does the second letter stand for in LGBTQ2S+? [OPEN TEXT]

--- NEW BLOCK OF QUESTIONS/NEW PAGE ---

**TITLE: WELL-BEING**

The following questions ask about your well-being. Some of these questions might be difficult or cause discomfort. If needed, please take a break and come back to these questions, or skip any questions if you feel uncomfortable. If you wish to speak to someone about your mental health concerns, please see these resources [LINK].

24. In general, how would you describe your mental health overall?
   - Poor
   - Fair
   - Good
   - Very good
   - Excellent
   - Prefer not to answer

25. During the past month, how often did you feel…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once or twice</th>
<th>About once a week</th>
<th>About 2 to 3 times a week</th>
<th>Almost every day</th>
<th>Every day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Happy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That you had something important to contribute to society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That you belonged to a community (like a social group or your neighbourhood).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That our society is a good place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That people are basically good.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the way our society works makes sense to you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Once or twice</td>
<td>About once a week</td>
<td>About 2 to 3 times a week</td>
<td>Almost every day</td>
<td>Every day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That you liked most parts of your personality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good at managing the responsibilities of your daily life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That you had warm and trusting relationships with others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That you had experiences that challenged you to grow and become a better person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident to think of express your own ideas and opinions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That your life has a sense of direction or meaning to it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. During the past month, about how often did you…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None of the time</th>
<th>A little of the time</th>
<th>Some of the time</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>All of the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You feel so depressed that nothing could cheer you up?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You feel hopeless?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You feel restless or fidgety?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You feel that everything was an effort?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You feel worthless?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You feel nervous?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- NEW BLOCK OF QUESTIONS/NEW PAGE ---

**TITLE: WELL-BEING**

The following questions ask about your use of alcohol and non-prescription drugs. Some of these questions might be difficult or cause discomfort. If needed, please take a break and come back to these questions, or skip any questions if you feel uncomfortable. If you wish to speak to someone about your use of alcohol and other substances, please see these resources [LINK].

27. How often did you drink alcohol in the past month?
   - o Not at all -&gt; SKIP TO QUESTION 28
   - o Less than once a month
   - o Once or twice a month
   - o Once or twice a week
   - o 3-6 times a week
   - o Daily
   - o Prefer not to answer -&gt; SKIP TO QUESTION 28

28. In the past month, how often did you…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Get annoyed by others criticizing your drinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel bad or guilty about drinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel you ought to cut down on your drinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29. How often did you use illicit drugs (including prescription drugs other than their intended use) in the past month?
   - Not at all -> SKIP TO QUESTION 30
   - Less than once a month
   - Once or twice a month
   - Once or twice a week
   - 3 - 6 times a week
   - Daily
   - Prefer not to answer -> SKIP TO QUESTION 30

30. In the past month, how often did you...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Get annoyed by others criticizing your drug use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel bad or guilty about using drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel you ought to cut down on your drug use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get high to get going in the morning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. For this question, please select the word “Rainbow” from the list below.
   - Monochromatic
   - Opaque
   - Rainbow
   - Transparent

--- NEW BLOCK OF QUESTIONS/NEW PAGE ---

TITLE: WELL-BEING

32. The following statements are about your social connections with family members and friends. Please rate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My family really tries to help me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get the emotional help and support I need from my family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends really try to help me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can count on my friends when things go wrong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can talk about my problems with my family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have friends with whom I can share my joys and sorrows.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My family is willing to help me make decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can talk about my problems with my friends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. The following statements focus on your outlook and ability to cope in difficult situations. Please rate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I generally accomplish what I set out to do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a positive attitude about myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I make plans, I am almost certain to make them work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am usually confident about the decisions I make.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am often able to overcome barriers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I am a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see myself as a capable person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to do things as well as most other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I have a number of good qualities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are limited only by what they think possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can pretty much determine what will happen in my life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am generally optimistic about the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often a problem can be solved by taking action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. The following statements focus on your outlook and ability to cope in difficult situations. Please rate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does not describe me at all</th>
<th>Does not describe me</th>
<th>Somewhat does not describe me</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat describes me</th>
<th>Describes me</th>
<th>Describes me very well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
I look for creative ways to alter difficult situations

Regardless of what happens to me, I believe I can control my reaction to it.

I believe I can grow in positive ways by dealing with difficult situations.

I actively look for ways to reduce the losses I encounter in life.

--- NEW BLOCK OF QUESTIONS/NEW PAGE ---

**TITLE: COVID-19, MENTAL HEALTH, AND PARTICIPATION IN LGBTQ2S+ LEISURE SPACES/ACTIVITIES**

The following questions ask you about how the COVID-19 pandemic has affected your mental health and how you spent your leisure/free time.

35. Overall, how would you say the COVID-19 pandemic has impacted your mental health? Would you say your mental health is...?
   - Much worse now
   - Worse now
   - Somewhat worse now
   - About the same
   - Somewhat better now
   - Better now
   - Much better now
   - Prefer not to answer

36. Please rate each of the following in terms of the impact they have had on your mental health, if any.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>During the pandemic...</th>
<th>No impact / No worry</th>
<th>Somewhat of an impact / Somewhat of a worry</th>
<th>Minor impact / Minor worry</th>
<th>Major impact / Major worry</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The possibility of catching COVID-19.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The possibility of a family member catching COVID-19.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social isolation or being apart from others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The challenges of getting necessities (e.g., groceries, prescriptions, other household items).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating with family and/or friends outside of your household by phone, email, or video chats.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
37. How did the COVID-19 pandemic affect your leisure experiences over the past two years? How did the pandemic impact the LGBTQ2S+ leisure spaces/activities you participated in? How did you handle the change, if applicable? You may enter “N/A” if you do not want to answer this question. (Please note that quotations might appear in the public domain verbatim. Please read what you have written to make sure that you did not intentionally include personal or identifying information.) [OPEN TEXT; REQUIRED QUESTION]

--- NEW BLOCK OF QUESTIONS/NEW PAGE ---

TITLE: DEMOGRAPHICS

The following questions ask about who you are as a person (i.e., demographics).

38. Do you describe yourself as having a disability? Disability is defined as a long-term physical, mental, emotional/psychiatric, or learning disability, which may result in a person experiencing disadvantage or encountering barriers to employment, pursuing education, or other opportunities for full participation in society.
   o Yes
   o No -> SKIP TO QUESTION 39

39. Which specific disability? (select all that apply)
   o Hearing
   o Vision
   o Mental/emotional
   o Mobility (e.g., body movement)
   o Speech
   o Learning
   o Chronic illness
   o Developmental
   o Alcohol and other substance use disorder
   o My disability is not listed. Instead, my disability is [OPEN TEXT] (please specify)
   o Prefer not to answer

40. What year were you born? [OPEN TEXT]
41. What, if any, is your spiritual/religious/faith background? (Select all that apply)
   - Atheism
   - Buddhism
   - Christian
   - Confucianism
   - Hinduism
   - Indigenous/Native spirituality
   - Islam
   - Jainism
   - Judaism
   - Orthodox Christian
   - Protestantism
   - Rastafarianism
   - Roman Catholicism
   - Shamanism/Animism
   - Sikhism
   - Zoroastrianism
   - My spirituality/religion/faith affiliation is not listed. Instead, it is [OPEN TEXT] (please specify)
   - No spirituality/religion/faith affiliation
   - Prefer not to answer

42. Were you born in Canada or the United States?
   - Yes -> SKIP TO QUESTION 50
   - No -> GO TO QUESTION 49

43. How long have you lived here? (years)

44. Which of the following best describes the area you live in?
   - Rural area
   - Urban/large city
   - Suburb near large city
   - Small town

45. Please identify your annual household income.
   - Less than $20,000
   - $20,000-$34,999
   - $35,000-$49,999
   - $50,000-$74,999
   - $75,000-$99,999
   - $100,000 or more
   - Prefer not to answer

46. What is the highest level of education that you have attained?
   - High school or less
   - Community college/trade school
   - Some university
   - Bachelor degree
   - Graduate degree
   - Professional degree
   - Prefer not to answer

47. What is your current primary employment status?
   - Employed full-time
   - Employed part-time
   - Unemployed
48. What is your current relationship status?
   - Single
   - Married/Common law/Domestic partnership
   - Dating one person
   - Dating multiple people
   - Divorced
   - Widowed
   - Separated
   - My relationship status is not listed. Instead, it is [OPEN TEXT] (please specify)
   - Prefer not to answer

49. At this time, you may choose to have your data included or withdrawn from the study. Once you submit the survey, you cannot have your data withdrawn from the study due to the anonymous nature of the survey. Do you want your responses to be included in the study?
   - Yes
   - No, I want to withdraw from the study. Please remove my data.

[FOR ALL SURVEY RESPONDENTS]
For your participation, you are entitled to receive $10. Would you like to receive the $10? The money will be sent via Paypal up to 4 weeks after you submit the survey.
   - Yes, please send the money to me. Enter the participant code you were given (2 letters and 2 numbers) [OPEN TEXT]
   - No, I would prefer to have the $10 donated to a LGBTQ2S+ organization. (Go to next page to select the organization.)

[IF RESPONDENTS WANT TO HAVE THE COMPENSATION DONATED]
Which LGBTQ2S+ organization would you like to have the $10 donated to?
   - The Trevor Project
   - Trans Women of Color Collective
   - Rainbow Railroad
   - Qmunity Vancouver
   - 2-Spirits (Two-Spirited People of the First Nations)
   - Sex Worker’s Action Project Hamilton
   - The Okra Project
   - Trans Lifeline
   - 519 Toronto

[END OF SURVEY MESSAGE]
Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Please visit [www.thewirlstudy.com](http://www.thewirlstudy.com) after December 1, 2021 when study results are ready.
Appendix G: The WIRLS Semi-Structured Interview Guide

Preamble: Thank you for agreeing to participate in the interview portion of the WIRL Study and for signing the consent form (if the participant has not signed the consent form, the interview will stop and they will be asked to do so in order for the interview to proceed). Based on the consent form, do you have any questions? As you know, the purpose of the interview is to understand how diverse LGBTQ+ people deal with discrimination within LGBTQ+ leisure spaces/activities, as well as how they navigated the COVID-19 pandemic to address their leisure needs with other LGBTQ+ people.

Please note that participation in the interview is completely voluntary, and you can withdraw at any time without penalty of compensation. All information you give me will be kept private and confidential. No individual responses will be reported.

Because we will be talking about experiences of inclusion and discrimination, you may find it difficult to talk about these questions. If so, we will talk about them at your pace and you can take a break, if you like. Again, you can skip a question or withdraw from the study.

Before we start, do you have any questions for me?

Engagement Questions

In your survey, you said that [NAME OF ORGANIZATION OR GROUP] was one place you spent a lot of time in. Could you describe it? Where is it located? What are the hours? Who sponsors it? What does it look like? Who is there? Who is not there? What times do you go? What is your favourite memory in the space? Least favourite? What are the rules, implicit or explicit for the space? Who do you socialize with? Are there people you avoid? Do you go with others? Who? How often?

How did you come to know about that place? Why did you choose to go there? How often do you visit that space? Is there a cost? Explicit or implicit? What was it like when you first went? Has that changed since you started going? What was your first visit like? How is that different than now?

What does your involvement in [NAME OF ORGANIZATION OR GROUP] mean to you? Has that changed over time? How? Why?

Would you consider [NAME OF ORGANIZATION OR GROUP] an inclusive or safe space for people who share your identity/identities (or people who are like you)? How welcomed do you feel in that space? How are you similar to others in the space? Different? What difference does that difference make? Have you been involved with efforts toward exclusion? Inclusion?

Experiencing intersectional discrimination

As you know, intersectional discrimination is a primary focus of my study. Discrimination can range from subtle acts, such as being called names or heard/saw your identity used as an insult, been told that you should think, act, or look more like others, heard that you or people like you don’t belong, been asked inappropriate, offensive, or overly personal questions, etc.. I am particularly interested in learning more about the experiences of discrimination that related to your non-LGBTQ+ identities, such as race, gender (USE TERMS RELEVANT TO THE PARTICIPANT).

In your survey, you described X experience [PULL FROM SURVEY], and you thought it might have been due to [IDENTITY/IDENTITIES SELECTED IN SURVEY]. Could you give tell me any stories about that experience?

Repeat questions if more than one experience:

Are there other experiences that you’ve had in [NAME OF ORGANIZATION OR GROUP] that could have been discriminatory? What did you experience yourself? If you haven’t experiencing anything yourself, have you
observed others being discriminated because of who they are? How did others experience it based on your observation?

Who was involved? The victim, perpetrator? What were their roles? What were their identities? Were there bystanders? People in authority? Was there resolution? Did it seem satisfying or unsatisfying and why? What did you think about that experience? What kinds of thoughts went through your mind? How did you process that?

How did the experience make you feel? What kinds of feelings arose? Could you describe or explain those feelings? How did you handle those experiences of discrimination? What did you do? (Questions relate to internal mental processing, peer, organizational)

For instance:
- Did you turn to others for support? Who? (Peers with shared identities?) How did they respond?
- Did you talk to leaders about the event? How did they respond? What was the result? Did people without experience in the space get involved? Support you? What did they say and/or do?

What made you decide to respond in that way? Why did you do that? Did you debate continuing or terminating your involvement?

What kinds of things helped you overcome or get through or process that discrimination? Was that easy? Hard? Did you have skills from other environments that you could deploy?

What was the outcome? How did you feel about it?

Are there any other salient experiences you’d like to talk about?

Other injustices

Have you noticed other injustices happening in LGBTQ+ leisure spaces? What space specifically? Can you tell me more about that? Compare or contrast to the most significant one discussed before. Could you describe things that seemed unfair or unjust or wrong in that space? Have you observed anyone being treated poorly? What happened? Who was involved? What about the identities of the victim/perpetrator? Why do you think that happened?

Organizational/Social Norms

In regard to your earlier experiences in [LEISURE SPACE] [SUMMARY OF EARLIER SECTION], let’s now talk about some of the social norms or practices within the space. Social norms are unspoken rules within a particular setting that participants are expected to know. One example might be “no unwanted physical touching” or “personal matters discussed within the space is kept confidential”. Were there any social norms or practices within the LGBTQ+ leisure space that may have precipitated the discrimination? What aspects of the leisure space made it likely for discrimination to occur?

Taking Action

What things within the LGBTQ2S+ leisure space/activity might have helped you overcome this instance of discrimination? Or even prevented it from happening in the first place?

Have you or others worked to make [NAME OF ORGANIZATION OR GROUP] more inclusive or safe for others who hold your identities?

Navigating Leisure Experiences During the COVID-19 Pandemic

In the survey you talked about [REASONS FOR PARTICIPATING IN LEISURE SPACES SELECTED IN SURVEY], how did you meet those needs during the pandemic? What kinds of things did you do? Where did you go virtually or in person? Did you miss the space? The people? What did you do to mitigate that?
What did LGBTQ2S+ leisure spaces/activities mean to you before the pandemic (for example, what it offered)? How did that meaning change during the pandemic, if at all? How important were leisure spaces for you before the pandemic? How important were they during the pandemic? What do you imagine they will be like post-pandemic? Please elaborate.

How did you manage the stressors and uncertainties of the pandemic? What did you do? How did it affect your LGBTQ2S+ identity and the intersectional ones you use.

Wrap-up

Thank you for your time today. I appreciate all the stories you’ve shared. Is there anything you would like to discuss that we have not yet discussed?

For your gift card, which would you like?
- Amazon
- Apple
- Google Play
- Tim Hortons
- Starbucks
- Uber

Instead of a gift card, you could have $50 donated to one of these organizations:
- The Trevor Project
- Trans Women of Color Collective
- Rainbow Railroad
- Qmunity Vancouver
- 2-Spirits (Two-Spirited People of the First Nations)
- Sex Worker’s Action Project Hamilton
- The Okra Project
- Trans Lifeline
- 519 Toronto
- Rainbow Resource Centre Winnipeg
- Welcome Friend Association