Journal of Bisexuality

ISSN: 1529-9716 (Print) 1529-9724 (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/wjbi20

Sexual Minority Reflections on the Kinsey Scale and the Klein Sexual Orientation Grid: Conceptualization and Measurement

M. Paz Galupo, Renae C. Mitchell, Ashley L. Grynkiewicz & Kyle S. Davis

To cite this article: M. Paz Galupo, Renae C. Mitchell, Ashley L. Grynkiewicz & Kyle S. Davis (2014) Sexual Minority Reflections on the Kinsey Scale and the Klein Sexual Orientation Grid: Conceptualization and Measurement, Journal of Bisexuality, 14:3-4, 404-432, DOI: 10.1080/15299716.2014.929553

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/15299716.2014.929553

Journal of Bisexuality, 14:404–432, 2014

ISSN: 1529-9716 print / 1529-9724 online
DOI: 10.1080/15299716.2014.929553

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Sexual Minority Reflections on the Kinsey Scale and the Klein Sexual Orientation Grid: Conceptualization and Measurement

M. PAZ GALUPO, RENAE C. MITCHELL, ASHLEY L. GRYNKIEWICZ, and KYLE S. DAVIS
Towson University, Towson, Maryland, USA

This research investigated responses of sexual minority individuals to two sexual orientation scales regarding how well the scales capture their sexuality. Participants were self-identified sexual minorities (including lesbian, gay, bisexual, pansexual, queer, fluid, and asexual) who represented a range of gender identities. Using thematic analysis, three themes were identified related to the conceptualization of sexual orientation, and three for its measurement. Themes for conceptualization were comprehensiveness, dichotomies, and beyond sex and gender. Themes related to measurement were measurement structure, terminology, and response mode. Discussion focuses on considerations for scale development to better capture experiences of sexual minorities.

KEYWORDS Kinsey, KSOG, Klein, sexual minority, gender binary, sexual orientation binary

INTRODUCTION

Although attempts to define and measure sexual orientation began in the 1860s, sexual orientation remains an elusive concept today (Epstein, McKinney, Fox, & Garcia, 2012; McCabe, Hughes, Bostwick, Morales, & Boyd, 2012; Moradi, Mohr, Worthington, & Fassinger, 2009; Morgan, 2013; Ross, Daneback, & Masson, 2012; Sell, 1997; Vrangalova & Savin-Williams, 2012). Psychological research in this area has almost exclusively focused on obtaining a useful, operational definition of *sexual orientation* with the goal of allowing for objective assessment of this characteristic in future research.

Address correspondence to M. Paz Galupo, PhD, Psychology Department, Towson University, 8000 York Road, Towson, MD 21252-0001, USA. E-mail: pgalupo@towson.edu

This study focuses on the ways in which knowledge of the subjective experience of sexuality among sexual minorities may complicate the objective conceptualization and measurement of sexual orientation.

Conceptualization and Measurement of Sexual Orientation

The development of the Kinsey Scale and the subsequent Klein Sexual Orientation Grid (KSOG) represented major advancements in the field of human sexuality. Both of these scales were designed to objectively assess sexual orientation based on research that incorporated information regarding the lived experiences of sexual minority individuals. The following sections describe the development of each scale, their contributions to the conceptualization of sexual orientation, as well as their historical and current use in human sexuality research.

The Kinsey Scale: Understanding Sexual Orientation on a Continuum

The Heterosexual-Homosexual Rating Scale, more commonly referred to as the "Kinsey Scale," was developed by Alfred Kinsey and his two colleagues, Wardell Pomeroy and Clyde Martin (1948), in an effort to more accurately describe individuals' sexual behavior and interests. Based on extensive interviews with heterosexual and sexual minority participants, the scale was intended to illustrate that sexuality does not fall neatly into the dichotomous categories of exclusively heterosexual or exclusively homosexual. Rather, Kinsey theorized one's sexual behavior and interests fall along a continuum between these two extremes and are subject to change over time. Thus, the Kinsey Scale constitutes one of the first attempts to acknowledge the diversity and fluidity of human sexual behavior. Kinsey felt that it was important to focus on behavior and distance measurement from sociocultural labels that may be associated with stigma and discrimination (Drucker, 2010, 2012). The way the Kinsey Scale is used in current research, however, obscures this intent.

Despite the availability of the Kinsey Scale, assessment via sociocultural labels (i.e., heterosexual, homosexual, and bisexual) is the predominant modality for determining the sexual orientation of research participants (Diamond, 2008; Morgan, 2013; Worthington & Reynolds, 2008). Even when researchers use the Kinsey Scale in determining participants' orientation, the raw scores are most often used in conjunction with the three identity labels mentioned above (Diamond, 2008; Morgan, 2013; Vrangalova & Savin-Williams, 2012) by which individuals in the middle of the scale are grouped together under the label of *bisexual*. This process obscures within-group differences, but research has also shown that measures of sexual orientation do not always correlate with individuals' self-identification labels

(Morgan, 2013; Worthington & Reynolds, 2009). Thus, Kinsey's conceptualization of sexual orientation as continuous, fluid, and beyond sociocultural labels is lost in the use of his scale in current research. As noted by Weinrich (2014/this issue), Kinsey avoided using what today would be called sexual orientation labels (such as "heterosexual" or "bisexual") as nouns. Moreover, the ratings were applied by the researchers after the fact; they were not chosen (or even known) by the participants in any way. This underscores the methodological discrepancy between Kinsey's studies and recent research.

The Klein Sexual Orientation Grid: Illuminating Bisexual Experiences

The KSOG was developed by Fritz Klein in an effort to further explore the complexities of human sexual thoughts, feelings, and behaviors. Klein was particularly interested in understanding the experience of individuals attracted to more than one gender (i.e., nonmonosexual). In addition, he aimed to move beyond the univariate conceptualization of sexual orientation reflected in the Kinsey Scale itself, and the categorical notion of orientation that continued to be reflected in the use of the scale by contemporary researchers (Klein, Sepekoff, & Wolf, 1985). The original KSOG achieved this goal by assessing seven domains of human sexuality at three different points of measurement, thus offering a more expanded definition of sexual orientation than the one-dimensional Kinsey Scale.

Although the theory behind the KSOG represents an attempt to further understand the diversity of nonmonosexual individuals, research in pursuit of this goal is scant (Thompson & Morgan, 2008; Weinrich & Klein, 2002). For example, in attempting to further explore the conceptualization of sexual orientation as either categorical or continuous, Weinrich and Klein's (2002) cluster analysis of the KSOG revealed five distinct categories of sexual orientation, three of which reflected nonmonosexual identities. Based on participants' KSOG scores, the authors labeled these three clusters "bi-heterosexual," "bi-bisexual," and "bi-lesbian," thus reflecting, perhaps for the first time, the diversity of nonmonosexuality as assessed by the KSOG (Weinrich & Klein, 2002). Thompson and Morgan (2008) continued this line of research and suggested a possible further classification of some women's sexual orientation as "mostly straight." Partially based on KSOG scores, the authors concluded that "mostly straight" women were a group qualitatively distinct from either "exclusively straight" or bisexual/lesbian women in terms of sexual identity and behavior (Thompson & Morgan, 2008).

Although these research studies align with Klein's goals in developing the KSOG, many other researchers continue to perpetuate a binary conceptualization of sexual orientation by using the KSOG on samples that only

contain monosexual participants (e.g., Colzato, Hooidonk, van den Wildenberg, Harnick, & Hommel, 2010; Perry, Walder, Hendler, & Shamay-Tsoory, 2013). Still others conform to a three-identity paradigm in which nonmonosexual individuals are grouped together based on either certain KOSG cutoff scores or researcher-identification labels (e.g., Floyd & Stein, 2002; Snyder, Weinrich, & Pillard, 1994). Thus, though the KSOG has allowed researchers to investigate the divergent experiences among nonmonosexual individuals, much of the current research either does not include such individuals as participants or limits investigation to those that (1) self-identify as bisexual, (2) choose the label *bisexual* from among three options, or (3) are labeled bisexual by the researchers.

Sexual Diversity Beyond Bisexuality

Recently, research investigating the experience of nonmonosexual individuals prompted the need to explore sexual diversity beyond bisexuality. The emergence of diverse identity labels such as pansexual, queer, and fluid has prompted researchers to reconsider the way in which nonmonosexuality is conceptualized (Diamond, 2008; Elizabeth, 2013; Kuper, Nussbaum, & Mustanski, 2012; Morgan, 2013). Increasing evidence demonstrating within-group differences and skewed distributions of various sexual orientation scale scores among individuals self-identified using traditional identity labels highlight the limitations of a three-identity paradigm (Epstein et al., 2012; McCabe et al., 2012; Morgan, 2013; Ross et al., 2012; Worthington & Reynolds, 2009). Recent research has also highlighted important differences in the lived experiences among nonmonosexual individuals, including experiences of prejudice related to their sexual orientation identity (Mitchell, Davis, & Galupo, 2014).

Growing attention has also been paid to the experiences of sexuality among transgender individuals, whose gender identity or expression does not fit into traditional gender categories (i.e., male and female) or is different from their gender assigned at birth (Beemyn, 2003; Kenagy, 2005; Kuper et al., 2012). There has been a historical tendency to conflate gender identity with sexual orientation in describing research participants as part of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) community (Lev, 2004; Lombardi, 2009; Zimman, 2009). Aside from the clear distortion of the distinct concepts of sexual/romantic attraction and gender, this conceptualization is particularly problematic as it minimizes and marginalizes gender minority experiences that may differ from those of individuals whose gender identity is congruent with their sex assigned at birth (cisgender individuals). Furthermore, collapsing these concepts can obscure group differences and may therefore limit the reliability and validity of research findings (Moradi et al., 2009).

PURPOSE OF THE PRESENT STUDY

This research explores sexual minority individuals' qualitative responses regarding the ways in which the Kinsey Scale and the KSOG capture (or fail to capture) their sexuality. A diverse sample of sexual minority participants, including individuals who (1) identify outside the traditional sexual orientation labels (i.e. pansexual, queer, fluid, asexual) and (2) identify as transgender, were recruited to complete an online questionnaire. Based on participant answers to open-ended questions, this research aims to make a direct comparison between responses to the Kinsey Scale and the KSOG. Results will highlight conceptual and methodological issues surrounding the continued use of the Kinsey Scale and the KSOG in research investigating sexual orientation and identity.

METHOD

Participants and Recruitment Procedure

Participants represented a convenience sample of 285 individuals who self-identified as nonheterosexual. These 285 individuals represented 36.7% of all individuals who accessed the survey online ($n = 776$) and exclude those who (1) did not complete the survey ($n = 330$), (2) did not answer at least one of the variables of interest ($n = 160$), and (3) identified as heterosexual ($n = 1$). Approximately one third of participants self-identified primarily as monosexual (31.5%), whereas 65.8% identified as nonmonosexual, and 2.8% identified as asexual. Monosexual participants represented those who self-identified as lesbian (18.5%) or gay (12.2%) or homosexual (0.8%). Nonmonosexual participants included bisexual (24.1%), pansexual (16.8%), queer (19.6%), and fluid (1.4%) participants. A small minority of participants identified as "other" (3.8%). Participants were also diverse in terms of gender identity. Approximately one half identified as cisgender women (51.4%), whereas 17.8% identified as cisgender men, and 30.4% identified under the transgender umbrella (including, but not limited to, identities such as trans man, trans woman, genderqueer, bigender, and gender nonconforming).

Participants represented all regions of the continental United States, residing in 36 states and Washington, D.C., and ranged in age from 18 to 65 ($M = 26.52$, $SD = 8.97$). Although 79.4% of the sample identified as White, there was some diversity in the sample, with 20.4% of participants self-identifying as racial minorities, specifically, 0.3% Native American, 2.4% Asian/Asian American, 3.1% Hispanic/Latino/a, 2.1% African American/Black, and 10.1% other/biracial. With regard to social economic status, participants self-identified as 20.3% working class, 16.4% lower-middle class, 37.8% middle class, 16.1% upper-middle class, and 1.4% upper class. In terms of educational background, 1.7% had some high school education,

5.9% completed 12th grade, 2.1% had completed vocational school, 39.8% had some college education, 17.8% had earned a bachelor's degree, 13.2% were enrolled in an advanced degree program, and 15.7% had obtained an advanced college degree.

Initial recruitment announcements were distributed on social networking websites and online message boards. Some of these resources were specific to local communities and others had a national reach. In addition, some targeted specific nonmonosexual communities (e.g., bisexual, pansexual, and queer communities) whereas others engaged the LGBT community more broadly. Snowball recruitment methodology was also employed as some participants passed the survey to additional sexual minority social networks or specific friends and acquaintances. Just more than one half of participants were recruited via Facebook (55.2%) whereas another 11.2% were recruited from Tumblr and Twitter, combined. The remaining participants were recruited directly from a friend (6.6%), by receiving a forwarded link to the survey (6.3%), or finding the post on a research-oriented website/message board (14.9%).

Measures

Kinsey Scale

In contemporary research, the Kinsey Scale is typically presented as a self-report measure that allows participants to provide a single rating for their sexual behaviors and interests. Scores for this scale range from 0 (*exclusively heterosexual*) to 6 (*exclusively homosexual*). Scores 1 through 5 identify individuals with varying levels of same- and other-sex attraction and sexual behavior. For this study we utilized a version of the Kinsey Scale that includes an additional "X" category for those who do not fit within the 0 to 6 continuum. This "X" category was intended to describe "asexuality" or individuals who identify as "nonsexual" (see Kinsey et al., 1948, p. 656; Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, & Gebhard, 1953, pp. 472, 474). To improve understanding among participants by using more descriptive language, "X" was relabeled "asexual" in this study.

Klein Sexual Orientation Grid

This study used a modified version of the Klein Sexual Orientation Grid (KSOG; Keppel & Hamilton, 1998). The scale's three measurement domains (past, present, and ideal) were represented in three columns whereas eight domains of human sexuality were displayed in rows. The scale included six of the seven original domains used by Klein: sexual attraction, behavior, and fantasies, emotional and social preference, as well as self-identification. Keppel and Hamilton (1998) modified the KSOG by redefining Klein's original

seventh "lifestyle" domain as "community," and by adding a domain for political identity. In using the scale, respondents rated the resulting 24 variables on a 7-point Likert-type scale from 1 (*other sex only/heterosexual only*) to 7 (*same sex only/gay only*).

Procedure

As part of a larger online study on sexual minority experiences, this analysis focused on participants' free-response answers to two open-ended questions. Participant responses to the open-ended questions were not restricted in length. Participants were first presented with the Kinsey Scale and then the KSOG, in that order. For each, participants completed the scale and then were asked to respond to the following question: "In what ways did this scale capture or fail to capture your sexuality?" Inclusion criterion for this sample focused on an open-ended response to at least one of the two questions. Prior to answering the research questions, participants provided basic demographic information about themselves.

Thematic Analysis

Using an inductive method we sought to characterize the way in which sexual minority participants discuss their sexuality with regard to the Kinsey Scale and the KSOG. Participant responses included a critique of the scales as well as a characterization of sexuality in general. Members of the research team included a professor of psychology, two graduate students in clinical psychology, and one graduate student in counseling psychology. All members of the research team read participant responses to the two questions and generated overall coding categories that occurred in response to both scales.

In a recursive process outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006), participant responses were read and discussed several times before the coding themes were agreed upon by members of the research team. Analysis began with the research team members independently familiarizing themselves with the data and noting any topics that occurred in participant responses to both scales. These initial topics were discussed by the research team as a group; this resulted in an initial list of codes.

Members of the team again worked independently to evaluate the comprehensiveness of the initial codes by attempting to label the individual responses in the data set with the established codes and noting instances in which the list of codes was not adequate. The team met again as a group to discuss the results of the evaluation, as well as to organize the initial codes into overall themes. Codes were collapsed and expanded to arrive at three

initial themes for the conceptualization of sexual orientation, and three for its measurement. The thematic analysis centers on the explication of all six themes as well as a comparative analysis of the ways in which these themes were expressed similarly and differently across the two scales.

RESULTS

Framing of Participants' Responses

As noted above, this study focused on participant feedback related to the accuracy of the Kinsey Scale and the KSOG in capturing their experience of sexuality as self-identified sexual minority individuals. However, the following issues should be noted upfront as they create an understanding of the larger framework from which participants were responding.

First, though participants were asked to detail the accuracy of each scale, it is important to note that some participants rejected the idea of a scale outright. One participant indicated "I think we don't need a scale . . . people should just identify how they want . . . especially because it can change." Another participant expressed a similar sentiment, "Sexual identity is an identity you give yourself. It can be as complex or simple as you desire. But no one can give you this identity. A scale cannot measure anyone's identity." Another participant agreed that "sexual orientation is far more complex than a simple scale." The reasons for rejecting such a scale included the notion that it was not possible to capture sexual orientation or identity quantitatively. Some of these responses pointed to the complexity of sexuality whereas others noted that a scale could not capture the changing nature or fluidity of sexuality. One participant suggested "it would best be discussed face to face."

Second, when interpreting participant responses it is important to consider the order effect created by first presenting the Kinsey Scale and then the KSOG to all participants. The Kinsey Scale requires a single numerical response and was likely better known to participants overall. The modified version of the KSOG requires 24 responses. When analyzing participant responses to the two questions, it became clear that many participants were providing a reaction to the KSOG in ways that made a comparison with the Kinsey Scale explicit. For example, some people simply noted that the KSOG "has a better range," has a "more rounded view," "gave more options," and "was more confusing" when compared to the Kinsey Scale.

When describing their responses to the two measurement scales, two categories of themes emerged across participant responses: conceptualization and measurement. In addition, three themes emerged for conceptualization and three for measurement (see Table 1).

TABLE 1 Participants' Responses to the Kinsey Scale and the Klein Sexual Orientation Grid

	Themes	Subthemes
Conceptualization	Comprehensiveness	Complexity Sexual fluidity: Changes across time and life span Sexual fluidity: Changes across partner and social context Dimensions of sexuality Who/what is left out
	Dichotomies	Sexual/romantic Desire/behavior Behavior/identity Binary conceptualization of sex, gender, and sexual orientation
	Beyond sex and gender	
Measurement	Measurement structure	
	Terminology	
	Response mode	

Conceptualization

Participants' responses largely centered on the conceptualization of sexuality. Three main themes emerged related to conceptualization: (1) comprehensiveness, (2) dichotomies, and (3) beyond sex and gender.

Comprehensiveness

When discussing the conceptualization of sexuality participants often focused on the comprehensiveness of the scales. Participant responses specifically focused on whether each of the scales captured the full scope of their unique experiences of sexual orientation. They also spoke of the components needed for a truly comprehensive understanding of sexuality in general. Under comprehensiveness several subthemes emerged: (1) complexity; (2) sexual fluidity: changes across time and life span; (3) sexual fluidity: changes across partner and social context; (4) dimensions of sexuality; and (5) who/what is left out.

Complexity. In their discussion of the scales' comprehensiveness, participants often raised the issue of complexity. Most often the Kinsey scale was described as being too simple, as exemplified in the following participant response: "It's just too simplistic. For me it could never tell the whole story." Another participant noted the way in which the Kinsey Scale does not quite capture the complexity of her experience, "I feel that I can be a

mix between asexual and exclusively homosexual, but this is not an option." Another simply stated that the Kinsey Scale has "too few options."

Although the Kinsey Scale was characterized as being too simplistic, the KSOG, in contrast, was more likely to be characterized by participants as complex. Sometimes this complexity was regarded positively. For example, "This scale covered just about all of the factors I could think of in sexuality, including a few factors I had never even considered. Very thorough in comparison to the Kinsey Scale." Similarly, another participant stated, "It's helpful that it takes into account the past, present, and ideal. It's also helpful that it identifies so many components of sexual orientation that are often neglected." Although the KSOG "speaks to many more variances of sexuality and self-identity," some participants saw the complexity of the KSOG as a liability. For example, one participant noted "It seems to be too complicated to be clear." Another participant agreed, suggesting the scale "is more complicated than it needs to be." The trade-off between confusion and complexity was sometimes acknowledged by the participants: "This was a little confusing, but as a bisexual I appreciated all the options."

Sexual fluidity: Changes across time and life span. Many participants responded to the scales in ways that suggested an understanding of their sexuality as fluid in the ways that it changes across time and life span. In these responses sexual fluidity was characterized as change that occurs across time. Sometimes the timeframe shifted across years, whereas other times it shifted across weeks, days, or even hours. One participant noted, "I identify as bisexual and feel equally attracted to men and women on average, but this is fluid over time, which gender I may have a preference for. It can change as often as weekly." Another replied, "All of these factors change so often for me, I could have completely different numbers in a few hours."

That participants conceptualized their sexuality as fluid across time and life span is reflected in the following responses to the Kinsey Scale. One participant indicated, "Either or—two options only—fits my mood, tastes, temperament now, but life/desire is not so fixed." Another participant stated, "This scale can only apply to how I have been feeling/identifying lately, which is different from how I identified last year and may be different from how I identify next year." When participants raised the issue of fluidity across time and life span in response to the Kinsey Scale, it was to note the shortcomings of the scale in capturing their experience of the temporally fluid nature of sexuality.

Although the Kinsey Scale does not specify a timeframe for considering sexual orientation, the KSOG includes two different measurement timeframes (past and present) as well as an ideal. Some participants responded to this distinction positively. For example, one participant stated, "I think it is much more nuanced than Kinsey so there is space for varied identities across time." Another participant, when asked how the KSOG captures or fails to capture lived experience, responded, "It doesn't fail at any point for me. It captures my past and present and takes into account my ideal future." From

the perspective of the participants, the KSOG is a good measure because it "considered the historical and future significance" and "captured how [my] sexuality has evolved." It is important to note that ideal is not described by Klein as being tied to a future designation. Rather, ideal is what "you would choose to be if it were a matter of volition" (Klein et al., 1985, p. 41). However, it was clear that many participants did interpret ideal as a "future ideal." Likewise, though the majority of participants who brought up the timing in response to the KSOG saw it as a positive distinction, at least one participant felt that an overall total rating would have been a useful addition, "I wish that there had been a choice for total in time frame. My sexual self-concept is based on my whole life and not limited to any one of the choices given."

Although the KSOG provides individuals the opportunity to rate components of their sexual orientation at different time points, not all participants saw this as an advantage. Some viewed this temporal distinction as a source of confusion due to the lack of specificity in operationally defining these timeframes. Many of these responses reflected how participants interpreted the "past" option. "It captures my identity better in that it has different rankings for the past and present, as well as the ideal. However, I am not certain what counts as 'past' on the Klein grid." Other participants referenced how "the past is not a monolith. I felt differently at different points in my personal past," and their answers indicated that age influences how they interpret the past (e.g., "When you get to my age PAST spans a long time so it is hard to characterize with one number for each dimension"). Participants also noted that the way past is interpreted may differ based on the point of initial coming out as a sexual minority: "I considered 'past' to be before I came out which greatly impacted my answers. If past was defined as more recent past, my answers would have been more similar to my present answers" and "I don't know how I feel in the future or what will always be right for me. And I don't know if past means before I came out or the years since leading up til now." Sexual minority participants who were also gender minorities noted additional ways of demarking the past based on gender identity.

> While the aspects of past, present, and ideal bring necessary nuance to my answers and communicate my sexual expression before my transition, it still does not capture my sexual expression as a genderqueer transwoman for whom the labels "same" and "opposite" sex are incoherent.

These findings regarding sexual fluidity across time raise some practical implications in the usage and interpretation of KSOG scores. For many self-identified sexual and gender minorities milestones in past experiences such as "coming out" or "transitioning" were more salient than discrete timeframes when interpreting past experiences. Heterosexual cisgender individuals (with and without same-sex attractions) are likely to use different reference points for thinking through their past experiences when compared to those of

self-identified sexual minorities. In addition, the timing and experience of coming out and/or transition vary among sexual (Morgan, 2013) and gender (Galupo, Krum, Hagen, Gonzalez, & Bauerband, 2014; Zimman, 2009) minorities. It is important, then, to note that scores on the KSOG may not be comparable when making distinctions across sexual minorities and even among individuals who share the same identity.

Sexual fluidity: Changes across partner and social context. In many cases participants discussed fluidity with regard to changes in sexuality across time. However, many participants also described their sexuality as fluid when discussing shifts across relationships, changes in partner, and social context. This theme mostly emerged through participants' reflection on how their responses on the two scales would change (or have changed) along with changes in their life/partner/relationship circumstances.

Fluidity across partner and social context was clear in participants' responses to the Kinsey Scale. For example, one participant responded, "My feelings are fluid, especially since I have found a partner. Due to that partner's sex, my normal sexual feelings are inclined toward that side of the scale, but only because that is the one person I have chosen." Other participants noted, "This scale doesn't take relationships into account. I'm bisexual, but don't date men often. However, I'm equally attracted to men and women" and

> I fluctuate all over the chart given my current relationships status. I'm currently dating a woman, so I'm primarily heterosexual, but I've dated men and folks who identify in between. I don't really fit most scales because I don't identify as a particular orientation, I just am.

Sexual fluidity across partner and social context was also evident in participants' responses to the KSOG. Often this was discussed by participants in ways that were prompted by the different response dimensions of the KSOG: past ("My past would have been different if I hadn't grown up in a tiny rural town in the 70s. My present would be different if I weren't in a monogamous relationship with a straight partner of the opposite sex, which does not reflect my history"), present ("My choice of one partner drastically skews that 'present' questions"), and ideal ("I didn't mark an 'ideal' for some because I am monogamous thus either [i.e., both] my ideal future emotional and sexual behavior will reflect the gender of the person with whom I eventually marry/commit to"). Although some participants believed their sexuality transcended their current partner/social context, others felt that their current situation was more central to their experience. This is evident in the following response:

> It was a little confusing as I have never settled along on any particular spot on the LGBT line. Was straight, thought I was completely lesbian,

> settled comfortably as bi, married a man and by all intents and purposes everyone assumes I am complete hetero unless I speak up. Am definitely not hetero, being in a completely monogamous hetero marriage does not make me any less bi/pan plus I have that part of me that identifies more as a man than a woman to begin with. Am I a bi-leaning-gay woman or a bi-leaning-straight man? I don't really know. Nor do I think it strictly matters at the moment. I am with the person I want to spend the rest of my life with and who loves me as I am, uncertainties and all. We are monogamous so who else I am attracted to is largely irrelevant.

Dimensions of sexuality. In their responses to both the Kinsey Scale and the KSOG participants described different domains or dimensions of sexuality. Although the Kinsey Scale was described by participants as limited to attraction (e.g., "It solely measures attraction to biological sex without accounting for gender or a host of other factors which affect attraction"), the KSOG was more likely to be seen as encompassing multiple factors. One participant stated, "It asked about my fantasy and physical attraction as well as behavior." Others noted, "I like the fact that there are multiple variables, which acknowledges that orientation is more than just sexual attraction" and "I like how Klein incorporates different time periods as well as different ways people choose to identify (for example, I may politically identify as queer but still only sleep with opposite sex people)."

The multiple dimensions of the modified KSOG (sexual attraction, sexual behavior, sexual fantasies, emotional preference, social preference, self-identification, political identity, community identity) were often met positively. One participant responded that the KSOG was "much more comprehensive and had many more dimensions." Another indicated, "It's good to break down these factors and not assume that they're all tied together neatly." Sometimes participants saw the acknowledgement of multiple aspects of sexuality as another way in which their sexuality was fluid,

> I like that this scale includes social, emotional, sexual, and fantasy. I'm a fluid mama! I've always felt that it's a unique combination of ALL of them that makes me who I am. And I'm happy to express my bisexuality (sexuality) through fantasy alone now.

Although rating multiple dimensions resonated with some participants, others contested the need for some of the dimensions included in the KSOG. In particular, community identity (originally termed lifestyle by Klein et al., 1985) and political identity were not universally embraced: "It is a bit more detailed, but to me it is not as important to have a community identity to identify strongly as a gay man," and "My political and community identities are important, but have no real bearing on my sexual identity. I see them as being incidentally important, but not integral parts of my expression of my gayness." Another participant questioned the relationship among the

dimensions and also made distinctions between sexual orientation and sexual identity,

> This scale fails because it lumps in a lot of variables that have nothing to do with or little to do with sexual orientation. B [sexual behavior], E [social preference], F [self-identification], G [political identity], and H [community identity], are all independent of and separate from sexual orientation (although they can be part of sexual identity).

The rating of ideal was also questioned by many of the participants as noted in the following quotations: "For me, there is also no such thing as an 'ideal' here—sexual orientation simply IS, and can change through time . . . not something I aspire to becoming or being in a more ideal world," and "There is no 'ideal' if by that you mean what I think I *should* be or would *prefer* to be. This scale didn't make me feel known or identified."

Who/what is left out. Many of the comments related to comprehensiveness specifically spoke to the ways that the measurement of sexuality via the Kinsey Scale and the KSOG led to the exclusion of certain experiences or individuals due to an adherence to "rigid categories" of sex, gender, and sexual orientation. One participant responded, "This scale is really only applicable to self-identified hetero-, homo-, and bisexual people." Overall, participants noted that the experiences of pansexual, fluid, queer, transgender, and gender variant individuals are not accurately reflected in either of these scales. Likewise, individuals attracted to people whose identities do not fall within binary categories of sex, gender, and sexual orientation are overlooked (e.g. "This scale cannot reflect transgender/transsexual/genderqueer people, either for the test-taker or for those to whom they are sexually attracted," "It again does not allow for gender variations among self and partners," and "It's difficult for the scale to address relationships with people who are not cisgendered, it also doesn't allow for discussion on other gender dynamics, such as butch-femme, that are so vital to my own experience").

A number of participants offered detailed responses related to their specific situations to illustrate how their experience cannot be represented by these scales:

> If the Kinsey Scale is Earth, I'm floating far away out of the galaxy. What does being "homosexual" or "heterosexual" mean for me? When I hook up with a cis fag, it's not a hetero relationship. What about my relationships with gender-fluid or intersex people? I tend to exist outside of the English language.

> As a person who has both dated females and males as a female, and females and FTMs and MTFs as a male, this does not adequately delineate who I am actually attracted to—those who were born female at birth, regardless of their current gender identity.

> As a gender queer individual, hetero and homo don't work for me—they are both dependent on the idea that everyone is M or F. What is a homosexual orientation for me? One in which I'm only attracted to other genderqueer femme bois? What is a heterosexual orientation for me? My ID says F and my primary partner's says M, but we have the queerest relationship this side of the Castro. To Kinsey, I'm pretty sure I don't exist.

One participant summed it up by saying "This scale measures several fictional concepts and fails to account for the real diversity of human experience/attraction/identity." In response to the KSOG, participants also noted that sexual desire was inherent in the measurement and therefore the experiences of asexual individuals or those under the asexual umbrella could not be accurately captured. As one participant noted, "not experiencing attraction, not engaging in sexual behavior, and not experiencing sexual fantasies were not options." Similarly, another participant expressed that "It was difficult to understand as far as how I was supposed to answer, given that I am a romantic asexual, but I am also theoretically grey-panromantic/pansexual."

Participants in this study did not raise similar concerns about the Kinsey Scale as we chose to include a version of the scale that allowed a response of asexual (Kinsey et al., 1948; Kinsey et al., 1953). It should be noted that although Kinsey described a category of individuals that did not experience sexual response, he did not include such a designation in the scale itself (Przybylo, 2013). One participant even acknowledged this by saying "The fact that asexual is not really on the actual Kinsey scale would indicate a failure. I also feel that my asexual identity is more complicated than a simple checked box."

Dichotomies

In addition to comprehensiveness, a second theme related to conceptualization emerged that focused on the dichotomous assumptions implicit in these measures of sexual orientation. Participant-identified dichotomies relevant to the measurement of sexuality included (1) sexual/romantic; (2) desire/behavior; (3) behavior/identity; (4) binary conceptualization of sex, gender, and sexual orientation.

Sexual/romantic. Participants' responses revealed their experience of a distinction between sexual and romantic interest. This distinction was brought up with the Kinsey Scale to note the scale does not adequately capture this difference, as evidenced by the following quotation, "Physically I am attracted to both sexes equally, but prefer to be in relationships with the same sex. The scale doesn't capture that distinction." Other participants made similar comments: "This scale does not capture the difference between

emotional relationships, sexual encounters, and the combination of the two" and

> It also fails to acknowledge when there is a discrepancy between sexual and romantic orientation—most people would identify with the term "verisexual" meaning that romantic and sexual attraction roughly match up, but asexuals and demisexuals cannot express the genders that they are attracted to without implying that they experience sexual attraction the same way verisexuals do.

Participants viewed the KSOG as more nuanced in making the sexual/romantic distinction:

> It correctly distinguishes emotional and social preference as distinct from one another, and also distinct from specifically sexual feelings. Although all these areas overlap I think it is useful to compartmentalize them in this way. This scale helped me understand the complexity of how I feel and how I identify.

Not all participants, however, felt that this difference was framed accurately: "I feel that there are too many identity labels in this particular scale, as I only consider who I am romantically attracted to, and who I am sexually attracted to."

Desire/behavior and behavior/identity. Participants also emphasized a difference between desire and behavior and between behavior and identity. The following quotations make clear that participants were reading the Kinsey Scale as being too focused on behavior: "The scale implies behavior rather than attraction or emotion," "It makes no distinction between feelings and behavior," and "Too cut and dry. It failed to count emotions versus actions." The distinction participants often made between behavior and identity was clear in the following quotation about the KSOG: "I feel that, while this scale came close to capturing my sexual identity, it fails because it takes into account your experience but often a person's experiences differ greatly from what they identify as."

Binary conceptualization of sex, gender, and sexual orientation. The Kinsey Scale and KSOG were similarly critiqued by participants as adhering to a binary conceptualization of sex and gender, and as such failing to capture the true range and nature of sexuality. In response to the Kinsey Scale, participants commented, "It operates on the gender binary, whereas people can actually have a huge range of gender identities and expression, not just male and female"; "The Kinsey scale doesn't take into account anything outside of the gender binary—so if I were attracted to someone who doesn't identify strictly as male or female, I would not be able to identify my attraction to that person as heterosexual or homosexual"; and "Being exclusively

heterosexual or homosexual implies fixed gender roles and static modes of sexuality for each individual."

Participants noted the same problem with the KSOG: "Again with the gender binary!" "It falls into the same traps as the Kinsey scale by assuming fixed, binary poles for gender identity and sexual attraction," and "It still operates on a gender binary. Am I still having homosexual attractions if I find myself attracted to a drag queen? What about trans*? I find this problematic."

Participants also noted that both scales assumed a binary conceptualization of sexual orientation. In response to the Kinsey Scale, one participant noted,

> The scale definitely showcases the continuum that is sexual orientation, however it points to a more sexual orientation binary (that the continuum only includes varying degrees of homosexual and heterosexual relations). Sexual orientation cannot be fully understood in such a way, and this type of scale cannot fully capture all types of sexualities.

Another participated remarked, "The Kinsey scale is most flawed in that it assumes that heterosexual and homosexual attractions are at some kind of tug-of-war, where they are both independent variables."

Participant responses also noted the unique position of individuals who are nonmonosexual, "It linguistically constructs bisexuality and pansexuality as existing between two binary poles, which always positions bisexuality in relationship to being between hetero/homosexuality." Responses to the KSOG revealed the same problematic assumptions regarding the dichotomous conceptualization of sexual orientation, as illustrated by the following quotations: "Again, just like with the Kinsey scale, I'm not in ANY way part homo/hetero. I'm bisexual which is a distinct orientation totally SEPARATE from the others," "It still portrays bisexuality as 'half gay, half straight' which can be used to delegitimize bisexuality, tone down its complexity, and portray those who aren't attracted to all genders the exact same way as not being 'true' bisexuals," and

> Again this grid much like Kinsey's scale fails to recognize that there are other types of sexualities that do not fall under the categories "homo" or "hetero." How can this grid be an accurate descriptor of my orientation when . . . neither of these includes my experiences.

Beyond Sex and Gender

A persistent critique of the Kinsey Scale and KSOG was that the definition of *sexual orientation* was anchored on the sex of the target of attraction. Many participants pointed to other, more important, factors that inform their sexuality. "My sexual identity does not have anything to do with the sex of

the person I am attracted to. I am attracted to personality and androgyny," "I simply want to find someone I have a chemistry with, regardless of their gender," and

> I don't exactly feel I am heterosexual or homosexual. I would be happy to date anyone regardless of gender whatsoever. They can have no gender (or be an alien from Jupiter) and it would make no difference to me as long as they were mentally stimulating.

Measurement

Although the majority of the responses focused on the ways in which sexuality was conceptualized by the two scales, three distinct themes emerged that centered on the way in which sexual orientation was measured. Participants commented on (1) measurement structure, (2) terminology of scales, and (3) response mode.

Measurement Structure

For the Kinsey Scale and the KSOG participants commented on the way in which sexuality was structured and measured on a continuum. In critiquing the measurement structure of the Kinsey Scale one participant noted that "the idea that sexuality is a continuum (or gender, for that matter) is more progressive than the idea that it is binary, but still leaves out those of us who are off the line altogether." In particular, participants questioned the idea of nonmonosexual identities such as bisexual or pansexual being a middle point in a continuum between heterosexuality and homosexuality: "Kinsey is too simplistic, too linear, especially for bi/fluid people. Equally heterosexual and homosexual—what does that even mean?" Similar critiques were offered for the KSOG (e.g. "It's an improvement from the Kinsey scale, but it still situated sexuality as being on a continuum between two 'poles"'). Other participants pointed out that though their same- and other-sex attractions were independent from one another the structure of the Kinsey Scale and the KSOG required conflating those dimensions (e.g., "My attraction to women has nothing to do with my attraction to men. Being forced to rate them on a continuum is inaccurate").

In response to the KSOG participants often noted the ways that it could be seen as an improvement to the Kinsey Scale but suggested that fluidity was still not captured.

> The organization of a grid doesn't seem to pinpoint the fluidity of my sexual attraction and preferences. I do feel that the grid is a better

> reflection than the scale, yet, there are still issues of categorization of sexual identity.

Rejecting the notion of a continuum, participants offered their own ideas about the nature of sexual orientation and how a measure should be structured to capture its essence: "Sexuality is FLUID, it doesn't belong on a straight line, it belongs in a blob or a sphere with no boundaries," "I think it is more of a four point graph chart than a scale, and mine tends to move around, it is much more fluid,"

> It's more of a 3-D grid than a single axis. If other people to whom I am attracted don't fit the hetero-homo axis, how do I describe my attraction to them? If I am fundamentally likely to be attracted to male-identifying bio-females, does that make me hetero or homo? You see my dilemma.

> I would prefer a scale that perhaps first asks if I am monosexual or bisexual, and then asked about preferences that included transgender (how can being with a trans partner ever be predominantly heterosexual or homosexual?—such dichotomies fail to capture fluidity).

Terminology

Another theme that emerged related to the measurement of sexual orientation had to do with the terminology used by each of the scales. With regard to the Kinsey Scale, both "incidentally" and "predominantly" were highlighted by participants as problematic. This terminology is used to help conceptualize points 1, 2, 4, and 5 (where 1 = *predominantly heterosexual, incidentally homosexual*; 2 = *predominantly heterosexual, but more than incidentally homosexual*; 4 = *predominantly homosexual, but more than incidentally heterosexual*; and 5 = *predominantly homosexual, incidentally heterosexual*). Participants noted that "the language 'incidentally' is odd and offensive," and "I don't think 'incidentally' is a good word. It implies an accident or mistake." One participant responded that the term "makes it seem like all that matters is the actual sexual interaction with another partner and does not seem to include feelings toward someone of either gender that one may or may not have acted upon." Another participant noted, "I think the use of the term 'predominantly' is problematic. It seems to be based on frequency of partner choice, rather than any measure of quality of relationship."

Participants also critiqued the phrasing of some of the dimensions on the KSOG.

> The rating system is ambiguous and confusing. For example, "Social Preference"—as a gay man who mostly hangs out with heterosexual

> men, would I choose close to 1 on the scale? 1 is defined as "Other sex; Hetero." This would mean heterosexual women only—it would exclude gay men, gay women, and . . .

Another participant noted that the terminology used in the KSOG "lacked a way to differentiate between the 'Gay Community' and the 'Queer Community.'" Both of these quotes demonstrate that for some participants it was unclear how to interpret phrases used in the presentation of the KSOG.

Response Mode

The final theme in the measurement category focused on the response mode required for the two scales. Many of these responses focused on having to choose a single, whole number. For example, one participant responded to the Kinsey Scale by saying "This scale didn't capture my sexual identity too well because it made me choose one specific number, but the truth is, I'm probably anywhere from a 3.9 to 5.9)." Similar responses were offered for the KSOG: "I would have liked to be able to answer 6.5 or 3.25 on some questions" and "these thoughts and experiences are hard to quantify, even through more dimensions. Numbers aren't very accurate at representing my thoughts and feelings and behavior." Participants also expressed difficulty with choosing one point on a continuum for many of the dimensions on the KSOG,

> I wish that there were an "all of the above" option. For example, I don't only socialize with lesbians or only with bi folk or only with straight people. I socialize with people from many different walks of life. I'm involved with all sorts of politics.

DISCUSSION

This research provides a beginning point from which to understand sexual minority individuals' experience in completing two of the most common sexual orientation scales used in sexuality research: the Kinsey Scale and the KSOG. This research allows for a direct comparison between participant responses to these two scales. In addition to shedding light on the way these specific scales capture (or fail to capture) the full scope of their experiences of sexuality, participant responses also revealed the ways in which they ultimately believe sexual orientation should be conceptualized and measured. In this way these findings highlight practical implications for sexuality researchers.

Limitations of This Study and Directions for Future Research

When thinking through these findings it is important to note that participants were discussing sexual orientation in direct response to prompts regarding how well the Kinsey Scale and the KSOG captured their sexuality. It is likely that if different sexual orientation measures were used as the basis for questions about the accuracy of measurement, additional themes may have emerged. A systematic investigation of other sexual orientation measurements currently being used in research will be necessary to be able to extend these findings.

One limitation of this research is that our participants represent a convenience sample collected online. Online recruitment and sampling is particularly useful for LGBT research where participants may have heightened concern about privacy and where participants may not otherwise have access for participation (Riggle, Rostosky, & Reedy, 2005). Online sampling, however, has been shown to disproportionately represent educated, middle class, White individuals (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2008), and our sample demographics certainly reflect this trend. Thus, interpretation of these data should be noted within the sample demographics. In addition, we recruited participants who identify as "sexual minorities," which we used as a broad term intended to encompass many different sexual identities. However, this terminology may have resonated with some identities more than others, and some potential participants may have been excluded if they do not identify with the terminology we used.

This sample encompasses a broad spectrum of sexual minority identities. We also designed our recruitment to specifically include sexual minorities who were also gender minorities (either identified within the transgender spectrum or those who had a transgender history or experience). It is important to note that heterosexual individuals, neither transgender nor cisgender, were not included in this sample. Future research is necessary to explore the ways in which heterosexual individuals may have similar or different responses to sexual orientation scales. In addition, these findings highlight the way in which participant identity impacted their answers. It will be important, therefore, for future research to systematically allow for comparisons across participants' sexual orientation and gender identity in understanding the conceptualization and measurement of sexual orientation.

Implications for the Measurement of Sexual Orientation in Research

It is important to note that by design this study centered on the experiences of self-identified sexual minority participants. Our goal was to better understand how sexual orientation scales capture the range of experiences among sexual minorities rather than to provide a direct comparison with heterosexually identified individuals. Our recruitment strategy ensured that our

sample included a diverse range of sexual minority participants (e.g., lesbian, gay, bisexual, pansexual, fluid, queer, asexual) who also represented a range of gender identities (e.g. cisgender, transgender, trans woman, trans man, genderqueer, gender variant, gender fluid). These findings provide useful considerations for researchers when critiquing sexual orientation measures for use with sexual minority participants. Overall, these findings emphasize (1) the disconnect between sexual orientation measurement and sexual minority experience and (2) intersections of identity.

Disconnect Between Sexual Orientation Measurement and Sexual Minority Experience

Participants indicated that there were several ways in which the Kinsey Scale and the KSOG failed to capture their experience of sexuality. First, the present findings highlight the ways in which these sexual orientation measures do not sufficiently capture the fluidity of sexual experience. Many sexual minority participants described their sexuality as fluid across time and social context. These findings resonate with contemporary theories and models of sexual orientation that emphasize fluidity (Diamond, 2008; Ross et al., 2012). The salience of fluidity is further exemplified in the present sample where seven participants chose "fluid" as their primary sexual identity and an additional seven individuals wrote in variations of fluid or flexible when providing additional labels that described their sexual identity.

Second, it was clear from their responses that participants often interpreted the scales in ways that highlighted milestones that are unique to sexual and gender minorities. For example, participants discussed their interpretation of the questions on the KSOG whereby they anchored their definition of past in relation to their "coming out" as sexual minorities. It is important for researchers to note that among sexual minority individuals, coming-out experiences vary in timeframe and process (Morgan, 2013) and these variations may affect responses on sexual orientation scales. Similarly, because heterosexually identified individuals (with and without same-sex attractions) would not use "coming out" as a lens for responding on these scales, their responses may not be interpreted within a comparable context to those of sexual minorities.

Past research has also established that "coming out" as transgender differs from coming out as a sexual minority in important ways (Zimman, 2009). This process may be different still for individuals who identify as sexual and gender minorities (Galupo, Bauerband, et al., 2014). The present findings suggest that "coming out" as transgender and/or the salience of transgender history impacted how participants responded to these sexual

orientation scales. Because definitions of *sexual orientation* are anchored on dichotomous notions of sex/gender, transgender individuals often found the measurement of sexual orientation to be complicated by their process of gender transition or by their nonbinary identity.

Third, participant responses problematized the scales' inherent assumption that sexual orientation exists on a continuum anchored by dichotomous concepts of sex, gender, and sexual orientation. Many participants indicated that the scales used language that did not resonate with their experience (heterosexual vs. homosexual—Kinsey Scale; same-sex vs. other-sex and heterosexual vs. gay—KSOG), leading to difficulty in responding to these scales. This was often accompanied by a belief that certain identities and experiences were outside of the scales' conceptualization of sexual orientation. Particularly marginalized were individuals who identified within the transgender umbrella (with regard to gender identity) and those who identified as asexual, bisexual, pansexual, fluid, queer, or otherwise nonmonosexual (with regard to sexual orientation). Thus, the present findings provide a particularly useful context from which to consider research focusing on bisexual and other non-monosexual individuals.

The Case of Bisexuality and Other Nonmonosexual Sexualities

The problems that arise when constructing sexual orientation measures on a continuum anchored by dichotomous notions of sex, gender, and sexual orientation are particularly salient in the case of bisexuality and other nonmonosexual sexualities. Historically, bisexuality/nonmonosexuality has been measured and defined by what it is not: that is, bisexuality is not completely heterosexual and is not completely homosexual. Sexual orientation measures typically assess sexual orientation on a single continuum, with heterosexual on one end and lesbian/gay/homosexual on the other (e.g., the Kinsey Scale). Individuals who fall in between are typically labeled as bisexual and treated as a single, homogenous group by researchers (albeit not by Kinsey). Even the KSOG—which has greatly expanded the conceptualization of sexual orientation—requires individuals to rate their behavior, attraction, and fantasies in terms of where they fall on a continuum somewhere between same- and other-sex-attracted, or to rate their community and political affiliation as falling somewhere between heterosexual and gay.

Given this pervasive research framework, it is not surprising that bisexuality has often been theoretically cast in ways in which a sexuality continuum is evident. It is conceptualized as a stage of uncertainty, confusion, transition, and deviance at its worst (Altshuler, 1984), and as a state of flexibility and fluidity at its best (Diamond, 2008; Zinik, 1985). Although some models emphasize bisexuality as a legitimate and stable identity (Weinberg, Williams, &

Pryor, 2001) this conceptualization is still most often articulated as a hybrid identity that either exists somewhere on the continuum between heterosexuality and homosexuality or is conceptualized as combination of the two. Recent research regarding sexual orientation has expanded the boundaries of bisexuality with labels of 'bi-heterosexual' 'bi-bisexual' 'bi-lesbian' (Weinrich & Klein, 2002), 'bi-curious' (Morgan & Thompson, 2006), 'mostly straight' (Thompson & Morgan, 2008), and 'mostly heterosexual' (Vrangalova & Savin-Williams, 2012). Although this research is refreshing in its conceptualization of sexual orientation beyond the triad of homosexual/bisexual/heterosexual categories, it is essentially aimed at describing finer and finer gradations of sexuality along the same underlying continuum.

Only recently has research acknowledged nonmonosexual identities beyond bisexuality. For example, recent studies focusing specifically on transgender experience have acknowledged the need for conceptualizing pansexual identities (Elizabeth, 2013; Kuper et al., 2012). Once transgender experience is included, the dichotomous conceptualization of sex and gender becomes complicated, as does the dichotomous conceptualization of sexual orientation.

Intersections of Identity

This research also highlights the need for sexuality researchers to be cognizant of the multiple identities participants may be negotiating when completing measures of sexual orientation. A notable portion of participants indicated a sexual identity beyond their primary identification, and many of their responses expressed the opinion that the scales failed to capture their multiple sexual identities/experiences. For example, one participant noted that her dual identities of gay and asexual could not be simultaneously represented on the scales. This was true even for the version of the Kinsey Scale that we used in this research: one that allowed for "asexual" as an option. In addition to having multiple sexual identities, some participants made it clear that their sexual and gender identities affected their potential answers on these sexual orientation scales. Because these scales presumed cisgender experience and because sex is implicitly dichotomized in the conceptualization of sexual orientation, there is an inherent conflation of gender identity and sexual orientation within these scales.

These issues raised by participants emphasize the need to consider these findings within the larger context of intersecting identities. Feminist intersectional theory emphasizes the importance of examining relationships among social identities as intersecting categories of oppression and inequality (Collins, 2000; Crenshaw, 1991; McCall, 2005; Shields, 2008). Past research related to sexual orientation (Anzaldua, 1990; King, 1990; Trujillo, 1991) and more recently gender identity (Futty, 2010; Galupo, Bauerband, et al., 2014; Hines, 2010; Monro & Richardson, 2010; Nagoshi & Brzuzy, 2010) has taken

an intersectional approach; however, it has not been explicitly extended to critiquing sexual orientation measures. Studying sexual orientation and gender identity within this framework allows an understanding of the systems that assume and privilege normative identities (heterosexual/cisgender) and render non-normative identities (sexual minority/transgender) invisible or abnormal. When researching experiences in the LGBT community, in particular, it is important to note that normality is often dually constructed on heterosexual and cisgender experience which contributes to the conflation of sexual orientation and gender identity (Galupo, Bauerband, et al., 2014).

Critiques of sexual orientation measures from an intersectional perspective would ideally highlight the intersections of sexual orientation and gender identity by allowing for (1) a systematic comparison of how well sexual orientation scales capture experiences across sexual orientation and gender identity; (2) a conceptual disaggregation of sex, sexual orientation, and gender identity; (3) visibility of normative (heterosexual/cisgender) and non-normative dimensions of identity (sexual minority/transgender) for sexual orientation and gender identity; and (4) an exploration of normative assumptions inherent in measures of sexual orientation inclusive of monosexuality, monogamy, dyadic sexuality, verisexuality (nonasexuality), and cisgenderism.

Because the initial findings of this research illustrate the need to consider participants' intersecting identities, we further consider this idea in a companion article published in this same issue that focuses on themes related to identity (Galupo, Davis, Grynkiewicz, & Mitchell, 2014/this issue). In this article we systematically consider patterns of responses across both sexual orientation identity (monosexual, plurisexual/nonmonosexual, and asexual) and gender identity (cisgender and transgender).

CONCLUSION

These findings expand our understanding of sexual orientation measurement in important ways. By focusing on sexual minority responses exclusively, these findings allow for a better understanding of their unique conceptualization of sexual orientation. This study, also, provides empirical support behind the many critiques offered by sexuality theorists regarding the limitations of sexual orientation measures. Ultimately, these findings provide points of consideration for research aimed at developing new measures of sexual orientation.

REFERENCES

Altshuler, K. Z. (1984). On the question of bisexuality. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, *38*, 484–493.

Anzaldua, G. (1990). Bridge, drawbridge, sandbar or island: Lesbians-of-color hacienda alianzas [making alliances]. In L. Albrecht & R. M. Brewer (Eds.), *Bridges of power: Women's multicultural alliances* (pp. 216–231). Philadelphia, PA: New Society.

Beemyn, B. (2003). Serving the needs of transgender college students. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education*, *1*(1), 33–50. doi:10.1300/J367v01n01_03

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*, 77–101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Collins, P. H. (2000). It's all in the family: Intersections of gender, race and nation. In U. Narayan & S. Harding (Eds.), *Decentering the center: Philosophy for a multicultural, postcolonial, and feminist world* (pp. 156–176). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Colzato, L. S., van Hooidonk, L., van den Wildenberg, W. P. M., Harinch, F., & Hommel, B. (2010). Sexual orientation biases attentional control: A possible gaydar mechanism. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *1*(13), 1–5. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2010.00013

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, *43*, 1241–1299.

Diamond, L. M. (2008). *Sexual fluidity: Understanding women's love and desire.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Dillman, D., Smyth, J., & Christian, L. M. (2008). *Internet, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method.* New York, NY: Wiley.

Drucker, D. J. (2010). Male sexuality and Alfred Kinsey's 0–6 scale: Toward "a sound understanding of the realities of sex." *Journal of Homosexuality*, *57*(9), 1105–1123. doi:10.1080/00918369.2010.508314

Drucker, D. J. (2012). Marking sexuality from 0–6: The Kinsey Scale in online culture. *Sexuality & Culture*, *16*(3), 241–262. doi:10.1007/s12119-011-9122–1

Elizabeth, A. (2013). Challenging the binary: Sexual identity that is not duality. *Journal of Bisexuality*, *13*, 329–337. doi:10.1080/15299716.2013.813421

Epstein, R., McKinney, P., Fox, S., & Garcia, C. (2012). Support for a fluid-continuum model of sexual orientation: A large-scale internet study. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *59*(10), 1356–1381. doi:10.1080/00918369.2010.508314

Floyd, F. J., & Stein, T. S. (2002). Sexual orientation identity formation among gay, lesbian, and bisexual youths: Multiple patterns of milestone experiences. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *12*(2), 167–191. doi:10.1111/1532-7795.00030

Futty, J. T. (2010). Challenges posed by transgender-passing within ambiguities and interrelations. *Graduate Journal of Social Science*, *7*(2), 57–75.

Galupo, M. P., Bauerband, L. A., Gonzalez, K. A., Hagen, D. B., Hether, S., & Krum, T. (2014). Transgender friendship experiences: Benefits and barriers of friendships across gender identity and sexual orientation. *Feminism & Psychology*, *24*(2), 193–215.

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

Galupo, M. P., Krum, T., Hagen, D. B., Gonzalez, K., & Bauerband, L. A. (2014). Disclosure of transgender identity and status in the context of friendship. *Journal of LGBT Issues in Counseling*, *8*, 25–42. doi:10.1080/15538605.2014.853638

Hines, S. (2010). Sexing gender/gendering sex: Towards an intersectional analysis of transgender. In Y. Taylor, S. Hines, & M. Casey (Eds.), *Theorising intersectionality and sexuality* (pp. 140–162). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kenagy, G. P. (2005). Transgender health: Findings from two needs assessment studies in Philadelphia. *Health & Social Work*, *30*(1), 19–26. doi:10.1093/hsw/30.1.19

Keppel, B., & Hamilton, A. (1998). *Using the Klein Scale to teach about sexual orientation*. Boston, MA: Bisexual Resource Center. Retrieved from http://www.qrd.org/qrd/orgs/BRC/1994/klein.txt-07.94

King, D. (1990). Multiple jeopardy, multiple consciousness: The context of a Black feminist ideology. In M. Malson, E. Mudimbe-Boyi, J. F. O'Barr, & M. Wyer (Eds.), *Black women in America: Social science perspectives* (pp. 265–296). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Kinsey, A., Pomeroy, W. B., & Martin, C. E. (1948). *Sexual behavior in the human male*. Philadelphia, PA: Saunders.

Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., Martin, C. E., & Gebhard, P. H. (1953). *Sexual behavior in the human female*. Philadelphia, PA: Saunders.

Klein, F., Sepekoff, B., & Wolf, T. (1985). Sexual orientation: A multivariate dynamic process. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *11*, 35–49. doi:10.1300/J082v11n01_04

Kuper, L. E., Nussbaum, R., & Mustanski, B. (2012). Exploring the diversity of gender and sexual orientation identities in an online sample of transgender individuals. *Journal of Sex Research*, *49*, 244–254. doi:10.1080/00224499.2011.596954

Lev, A. I. (2004). *Transgender emergence: Therapeutic guidelines for working with gender-variant individuals and their families*. New York, NY: Haworth Press.

Lombardi, E. (2009). Varieties of transgender/transsexual lives and their relationship with transphobia. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *56*, 977–992. doi:10.1080/00918360903275393

McCabe, S. E., Hughes, T. L., Bostwick, W., Morales, M., & Boyd, C. J. (2012). Measurement of sexual identity in surveys: Implications for substance abuse research. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *41*(3), 649–657. doi:10.1007/s10508-011-9768-7

McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, *30*, 1771–1800. doi:10.1086/426800

Mitchell, R. C., Davis, K. S., & Galupo, M. P. (2014). Comparing perceived experiences of prejudice among self-identified plurisexual individuals. *Psychology & Sexuality*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1080/19419899.2014.940372

Monro, S., & Richardson, D. (2010). Intersectionality and sexuality: The case of sexuality and transgender equalities work in UK local government. In Y. Taylor, S. Hines, & M. Casey (Eds.), *Theorizing intersectionality and sexuality* (pp. 99–118). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave MacMillan.

Moradi, B., Mohr, J. J., Worthington, R. L., & Fassinger, R. E. (2009). Counseling psychology research on sexual (orientation) minority issues: Conceptual and methodological challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *56*(1), 5–22. doi:10.1037/a0014572

Morgan, E. M. (2013). Contemporary issues in sexual orientation and identity development in emerging adulthood. *Emerging Adulthood*, *1*(1), 52–66. doi:10.1037/a0014572

Morgan, E. M., & Thompson, E. M. (2006). Young women's sexual experiences within same-sex friendships: Discovering and defining bisexual and bi-curious sexual identity. *Journal of Bisexuality*, *6*, 7–34. doi:10.1300/J159v06n03_02

Nagoshi, J. L., & Brzuzy, S. (2010). Transgender theory: Embodying research and practice. *Affilia: Journal of Women and Social Work*, *25*(4), 431–443. doi:10.1177/0886109910384068

Perry, D., Walder, K., Hendler, T., & Shamay-Tsoory, S. G. (2013). The gender you are and the gender you like: Sexual preference and empathetic neural responses. *Brain Research*, *1534*, 66–75. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2013.08.040

Przybylo, E. (2013). Producing facts: Empirical asexuality and the scientific study of sex. *Feminism & Psychology*, *23*(2), 221–242. doi:10.1177/0959353512443668

Riggle, E. D. B., Rostosky, S. S., & Reedy, C. S. (2005). Online surveys for BGLT research. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *49*, 1–21. doi:10.1300/J082v49n01-01

Ross, M. W., Daneback, K., & Mansson, S. (2012). Fluid versus fixed: A new perspective on bisexuality as a fluid sexual orientation beyond gender. *Journal of Bisexuality*, *12*(4), 449–460. doi:10.1080/15299716.2012.702609

Sell, R. L. (1997). Defining and measuring sexual orientation: A review. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *26*(6), 643–658. doi:10.1023/A:1024528427013

Shields, S. A. (2008). Gender: An intersectionality perspective. *Sex Roles*, *59*, 301–311. doi:10.1007/s11199-008-9501-8

Snyder, P. J., Weinrich, J. D., & Pillard, R. C. (1994). Personality and lipid level differences associated with homosexual and bisexual identity in men. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *23*, 433–451. doi:10.1007/BF01541408

Thompson, E. M., & Morgan, E. M. (2008). "Mostly straight" young women: Variations in sexual behavior and identity development. *Developmental Psychology*, *44*, 15–21. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.44.1.15

Trujillo, C. (1991). *Chicana lesbians: The girls our mothers warned us about.* Berkeley, CA: Third Woman Press.

Vrangalova, Z., & Savin-Williams, R. C. (2012). Mostly heterosexual and mostly gay/lesbian: New sexual orientation identities. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *41*, 85–101. doi:10.1007/s10508-012-9921-y

Weinberg, M. S., Williams, C. J., & Pryor, D. W. (2001). Bisexuals at midlife: Commitment, salience, and identity. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, *43*(2), 180–208. doi:10.1177/089124101030002002

Weinrich, J. D. (2014/this issue). Multidimensional measurement of sexual orientation: Present. *Journal of Bisexuality*, *14*, 373–390. doi: 10.1080/15299716.2014.951138

Weinrich, J. D., & Klein, F. (2002). Bi-gay, bi-straight, and bi-bi: Three bisexual subgroups identified using cluster analysis of the Klein Sexual Orientation Grid. *Journal of Bisexuality*, *2*(4), 109–139. doi:10.1300/J159v02n04_07

Worthington, R. L., & Reynolds, A. L. (2009). Within-group differences in sexual orientation and identity. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *56*(1), 44–55. doi:10.1037/a0013498

Zimman, L. (2009). 'The other kind of coming out': Transgender people and the coming out narrative genre. *Gender and Language*, *3*(1), 53–80. doi:10.1558/genl.v3il.533il.53

Zinik, G. (1985). Identity conflict of adaptive flexibility? Bisexuality reconsidered. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *11*, 7–20. doi:10.1300/J082v11n01_02

M. Paz Galupo, PhD, is professor of psychology and director of the Sexual and Gender Identity Lab at Towson University. Her research interests center on the intersections of identity with a focus on sexual orientation and gender identity. Paz currently serves as editor in chief for the *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*.

Renae C. Mitchell, MA, earned her master's in clinical psychology from Towson University. She is currently working as a research assistant in the Department of Family Studies and Community Development and for the Sexual and Gender Identity Lab at Towson University. Her research interests include human sexuality, sexual minority identity and experience, and sexual violence prevention.

Ashley L. Grynkiewicz, MA, earned her master's in clinical psychology from Towson University.

Kyle S. Davis, MA, earned a master's in counseling psychology from Towson University and is currently pursuing a PhD in counseling psychology at the University of Kentucky. Kyle's research interests include plurisexual, asexual, and transgender identity development and lived experiences.