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ABSTRACT
NAVIGATING IDENTITY: AN EXAMINATION OF INTERSECTIONAL DISCRIMINATION AND SUICIDAL IDEATION AMONG LGBQ LATINX INDIVIDUALS

Jaclyn B. Pachicano, M.S.
Marquette University, 2024

Suicide is one of the leading causes of death in the United States, with LGBQ Latinx adults showing higher risk for suicidality and related mental health outcomes. Experiences of discrimination, including heterosexism and ethnic discrimination, are often connected to increased risk for suicidal ideation. In addition to intersectional experiences of discrimination, LGBQ Latinx people often feel an incompatibility between their sexuality and ethnic identity, known as conflicts in allegiances (CIA), possibly increasing risk of suicidal ideation. It remains unclear what mechanisms connect intersectional discrimination and suicidal ideation.

The current study expands on intersectional research by utilizing the Interpersonal Theory of Suicide (IPTS) to examine how experiences of intersectional discrimination along with CIA contribute to developing thwarted belongingness, perceived burdensomeness, and, in turn, heightened suicidal ideation. A sample of 100 LGBQ Latinx adults completed self-report measures assessing experiences of intersectional discrimination, feelings of conflicts of allegiances, thwarted belongingness, perceived burdensomeness, and suicidal ideation.

Moderated-mediational analyses were conducted to examine the ability of IPTS constructs (thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness) to mediate the relationship between intersectional discrimination and suicidal ideation, while also considering the moderating influence of CIA on the intersectional discrimination – IPTS constructs pathway. Results for the moderated-mediational model were non-significant. However, post-hoc analyses revealed notable findings regarding the moderating ability of CIA on the relationship between day-to-day discrimination and thwarted belongingness.

Results extend previous research by contributing to the understanding of the unique intersectional experience of LGBQ Latinx people and how it may contribute to risk factors for suicidal ideation, specifically thwarted belongingness. The current study is the first to examine the role of CIA utilizing an IPTS framework.
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Navigating Identity: An Examination of Intersectional Discrimination and Suicidal Ideation among LGBQ Latinx Individuals

Suicide is the second leading cause of death for people ages 10 to 34 in the United States, accounting for 14% of all suicides in the country (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2021). According to the CDC (2021), over 10% of people in the United States have thought about suicide. Generally, LGBQ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer)\textsuperscript{1} and Latinx people are high risk for suicidal ideation and related mental health issues (Gulbas et al., 2019; McKay et al., 2019; Pollitt & Mallory, 2021; Woodward et al., 2014). For example, suicide risk is significantly higher among LGBQ people, with 23.4% of high school students and 5.5% of LGBQ people ages 18 to 25 reporting attempting suicide in the past year (Ivey-Stephenson et al., 2020; SAMHSA, 2020). In a study examining suicide attempts of LGBQ people of color, suicide attempts were most elevated for LGBQ Latinx adults between ages 18 and 27 (Layland et al., 2020). When examining disparities, empirical literature often notes discrimination and experiences related to marginalized identities as contributing factors to elevated suicide risk (Brenes, 2021; de Lange et al., 2022; Layland et al., 2020; Salentine et al., 2020). Despite the frequent acknowledgement of the role of discrimination, there are limited studies that intentionally examine the mechanisms through which the intersecting experiences of discrimination contribute to suicidal ideation among LGBQ Latinx people (Toomey et al., 2017).

When conceptualizing discrimination experienced by LGBQ Latinx people, it is often difficult to determine if an instance of discrimination is isolated to a specific identity (i.e., LGBQ identity or ethnic identity). The concept of intersectionality directly addresses this issue by proposing that an individual’s experiences of oppression (e.g., discrimination) and privilege

\textsuperscript{1} The author utilizes the word \textit{queer} to refer to non-heterosexual sexualities that are not encompassed by the terms \textit{lesbian}, \textit{gay} or \textit{bisexual} (Worthen, 2023).
cannot be parsed apart, given that they are experienced simultaneously (Crenshaw, 1989).

Despite the rise of intersectionality theory in the field of psychology, existing literature on
LGBQ people of color tends to be additive in nature (e.g., measuring heterosexism and ethnic
discrimination separately) (Akibar & Langroudi, 2021; Sarno et al., 2015). Since experiences of
discrimination are not so easily categorized for people with multiple marginalized identities,
discrimination cannot be accurately captured by using an additive approach (Toomey et al.,
2017). While psychology research has begun to develop intersectional measures, they are not the
norm when studying people with multiple marginalized identities.

In addition to experiencing intersectional discrimination, LGBQ Latinx people are often
tasked with needing to find a way to integrate conflicting identities. Conflicts in allegiances
(CIA) is a concept developed to describe the identity clash that happens between one’s sexual
orientation and one’s cultural background. Oftentimes, people are afraid they are betraying one
identity by prioritizing the other. For example, LGBQ Latinx people express feeling that the
LGBQ community is white-centric and is not aware of issues that are specific to LGBQ people
of color (Harper et al., 2004; Parmenter, Galliher, Wong, et al., 2021). Another example, is that
LGBQ Latinx people sometimes decide not to disclose their sexual orientation to family in hopes
of maintaining cultural values (Gray et al., 2015). In both cases, LGBQ Latinx people end up
compromising part of one identity to prioritize the other, which often results in a feeling that the
two identities are incompatible.

It is essential to consider how intersectional discrimination and CIA contribute to high-
risk mental health outcomes, such as suicide risk in LGBQ Latinx people. Discrimination
communicates that LGBQ Latinx people do not belong in their daily environments and has been
linked to increase risk for suicidal ideation (Hwang & Goto, 2008; Sutter & Perrin, 2016; Vargas
et al., 2020). In addition, CIA may exacerbate the relationship between discrimination and suicide-related risk factors. CIA may communicate to LGBQ Latinx people that they do not fully belong with their cultural community or the LGBQ community. The conflict and energy dedicated to trying to strike a balance between identities may lead a person to develop low self-esteem or think they are more trouble than they are worth. The Interpersonal Theory of Suicide (IPTS) presents two constructs that contribute to suicidal ideation: thwarted belongingness (the belief that one does not belong or feels isolated) and perceived burdensomeness (the perception of being a liability or burden to loved ones) (Joiner, 2005). The current study anticipates that CIA will contribute to a sense of thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness, both concepts of IPTS. While the link between experiences of discrimination and suicidal ideation has been established by extant literature, more research is needed to better understand the mechanisms of the relationship. The current project examines how experiences of intersectional discrimination along with conflicts in allegiances (CIA) contribute to developing thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness, and, in turn, heightened suicidal ideation.

**Background**

**Defining Suicide-related Terms**

There are a variety of terms used to talk about suicide, which all refer to related yet distinct concepts. *Suicidality* is the overarching umbrella term referring to all suicide-related behaviors and thoughts, including fatal and non-fatal attempts and ideation (Cash & Bridge, 2009). O’Carroll et al. (1996) developed definitions of terms related to suicidality that are widely used throughout empirical literature and therefore used in the current paper. The specific terms of interest are suicide, suicide attempt, suicidal behaviors, and suicidal ideation. *Suicide*, also referred to as *completed suicide*, refers to death from self-inflicted injury with the (explicit or inferred) intention to kill oneself. A *suicide attempt* is a non-fatal, potentially self-injurious
behavior with the (explicit or inferred) intention to kill oneself. *Suicidal behavior* is potentially self-injurious behavior with an (explicit or inferred) intention to kill oneself or make it appear like there was an intent to die. *Suicidal ideation* refers to thoughts of engaging in suicidal behavior (O’Carroll et al., 1996). The current project focuses primarily on suicidal ideation with the intention to better understand the mechanisms that precede suicidal behavior. Further conceptualization for suicidal ideation will be discussed in the context of IPTS.

**The Interpersonal Theory of Suicide**

Joiner (2005) originally proposed the Interpersonal Theory of Suicide (IPTS) to explain suicidality through an individual’s desire for suicide and ability for suicide. The theory has since been expanded upon by Van Orden and colleagues (2010). The foundational assumption of IPTS is that people die by suicide because they can (ability) and they want to (desire). Desire for suicide is conceptualized by two constructs: *thwarted belongingness* and *perceived burdensomeness*. These constructs of desire for suicide significantly predict self-reporting of suicidal ideation in study samples (Joiner et al., 2009). While Joiner (2005) uses the phrase *desire for suicide*, this concept is synonymous with *suicidal ideation*. The constructs contributing to suicidal ideation (thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness) may be found independent of each other, but frequently overlap and interact. For example, an individual’s lack of social relationships might contribute to developing both a sense of perceived burdensomeness and thwarted belongingness.

**Thwarted Belongingness**

The first construct of IPTS contributing to suicidal ideation is *thwarted belongingness*. This is described as an individual’s feeling or perception of being alone and having a lack of mutually supportive connections. Thwarted belongingness does not have to be consistent with a
person’s actual belonging, but only focuses on one’s own perception or interpretation of belongingness or social isolation. The concept focuses on the unmet need to belong and specifically the most pervasive, chronic, and severe manifestation of the unmet need (Van Orden et al., 2012). Some common indicators of thwarted belongingness include living alone, having a non-intact family, being socially withdrawn, experiencing intimate partner violence, loss through death or divorce, and family conflict (Van Orden et al., 2010). Joiner (2005) explains the concept was developed from empirical literature that found social isolation and lack of social support as key indicators of suicidality.

**Perceived Burdensomeness**

The second construct of IPTS that contributes to suicidal ideation is perceived burdensomeness. This concept refers to the belief that one is a burden to close others (Joiner, 2005). It functions on the assumption that “people would be better off if I were gone” (Van Orden et al., 2012). The two elements of this concept are 1) the perception of being a liability to others to the point that thinking one’s death would be more valuable to others, and 2) emotions and cognitions of self-hatred. Perceived burdensomeness is related to low self-esteem, self-blame, and extreme shame. Van Orden et al. (2010) offers burden-related risk factors, which include unemployment, incarceration, homelessness, serious physical illness, and communications that a person perceives oneself as expendable, unwanted, or as a burden. Thoughts and feelings related to perceived burdensomeness include feeling like you are a failure or you let others down, frequently thinking of mistakes and shortcomings, and not feeling motivated (Van Orden et al., 2008).
Research on IPTS

To date, research on IPTS generally shows support for the theory and constructs. A systematic review and meta-analysis conducted by Chu and colleges (2017) examined 130 empirical articles on IPTS through the end of March 2016. Included samples consisted of primarily undergraduate or community-based samples, people from ages 18-24, and majority women. Combining the samples resulted in 59,698 participants. The meta-analysis indicated that the interaction of thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness significantly predicted suicidal ideation (Chu et al., 2017). When analyzing the constructs separately, the meta-analysis found that perceived burdensomeness was more strongly related with suicidal thoughts and behaviors compared to thwarted belongingness. The authors note that while effect sizes ranged from weak to moderate, the same is generally true for the significance of other well-studied predictors of suicidality.

Another core review of empirical literature on IPTS shows mixed support for the model, with studies often highlighting the strength of a particular IPTS component. Ma et al. (2016) reviewed 58 empirical studies and found that perceived burdensomeness was the stronger predictor of suicidal ideation, with 82.6% of studies reporting a significant relationship. In some studies, it was found to be a significant predictor of suicidal ideation above and beyond thwarted belongingness (Ma et al., 2016). Perceived burdensomeness was the most researched IPTS construct; however, thwarted belongingness proved to be a modest predictor of suicidal ideation as well. When analyzing the interaction between the constructs, 66.6% of the studies found the interaction between perceived burdensomeness and thwarted belongingness significant in predicting suicidal ideation (Ma et al., 2016). Overall, research to date on IPTS shows the strongest support for perceived burdensomeness as a predictor of suicidal ideation. While
thwarted belongingness has some empirical support, this concept has been less frequently studied and exhibits a weaker relationship to suicidal ideation.

For the current study, IPTS was chosen over other popular theories of suicide due to its comprehensive nature, modernity, and pervasive use throughout empirical literature (Chu et al., 2017). IPTS accounts for a vast variety of different risk factors for suicide, which may better capture the distinctive and intersecting experiences of people with marginalized ethnic and sexual identities. Given that both intersectional discrimination and CIA are interpersonal concepts by nature, IPTS allows a continuity of an interpersonal examination of risk for suicidal ideation. Currently, much of the existing literature on IPTS consists of majority White samples, with little focus on marginalized groups (Chu et al., 2017). This suggests there is a significant gap in the literature examining IPTS within the context of multiple marginalized identities and even more so for the intersection of unequal social relations (i.e., discrimination and CIA). This could be due to common use of convenience sampling in research, but also a reflection of the primary focus of research in suicidality. Despite an overall underrepresentation of groups with multiple marginalized identities in IPTS research, a handful of studies have examined the utility of IPTS in marginalized groups, finding predictive value in the constructs among Latinx people and LGBQ people (Acosta et al., 2017; Fulginiti et al., 2020; Garza & Pettit, 2010; Oakey-Frost et al., 2021; Woodward et al., 2014).

An Intersectional Framework

Intersectionality originated through the work of Black feminism and critical race theory. The concept is first attributed to the Combahee River Collective in the 1970s. The Black feminist group expressed the difficulty of separating racism from sexism given that they are experienced simultaneously (Combahee River Collective, 1977). Kimberlé Crenshaw formally coined the
term “intersectionality” in 1989 to highlight how using a single-axis analysis of racism and sexism distorts the multidimensionality of Black women’s experiences of discrimination (Crenshaw, 1989). Women of color led the literature examining interacting social systems, expanding intersectionality scholarship to include ethnicity, sexuality, class, and ability status (Anzaldúa, 1987; Bilge & Denis, 2010; Davis, 2011; Lorde, 2012). The current project focuses on the intersections of ethnic discrimination and heterosexism as specifically experienced by LGBQ Latinx people. 

Ethnic discrimination refers to the negative judgment and differential treatment of individuals because of their membership in a specific ethnic group (Williams, 1999). Heterosexism is defined as “an ideological system that denies, denigrates, and stigmatizes any non-heterosexual form of behavior, identity, relationship, or community” (Herek, 1990, p. 316). As with all systems of oppression, ethnic discrimination and heterosexism manifest at a societal level through customs and structures and at an individual level through attitudes and behaviors (Herek, 1990). Intersectionality states that systems of oppression are experienced simultaneously and cannot be separated. Based on this assumption, for the purposes of the project, discrimination refers to a combination of the aforementioned axes of oppression.

When discussing discrimination, another notable experience is that discrimination is often anticipated by marginalized groups. Anticipated discrimination refers to the expectation that a person will encounter discrimination, which often leads to increased stress and vigilance (Scheim & Bauer, 2019). Empirical literature has shown that anticipated discrimination is associated with psychological distress, suicidal ideation, and avoidance of health services (Scheim & Bauer, 2019; Zimmerman & Miller-Smith, 2022). Anticipated discrimination is often not captured in discrimination measures whereas day-to-day discrimination tends to be most commonly studied. Day-to-day discrimination refers to a wide range of experiences including
microaggressions (i.e., small everyday slights), passive actions (e.g., being treated like you are rude), and active actions (e.g., being asked offensive questions) (Scheim & Bauer, 2019).

The term “intersectionality” has become increasingly popular in psychology over the past decade (Grabe, 2020; Shin et al., 2017). A notable criticism of the contemporary use of intersectionality is that it has been diluted and used as a buzzword to simply mean “multiple identities.” In a 2020 interview, Crenshaw expressed that the true meaning of intersectionality has been distorted (Steinmetz, 2020). Intersectionality experienced a rapid rise to popularity and acceptance in many fields such as cultural studies, political studies, humanities, and social sciences. Collins (2015) explains that the erosion of original concepts of theories and frameworks facilitates their quick acceptance in different domains, leading to a misrepresentation of the original ideas. In other words, the current popularized use of intersectionality is significantly different from the concept proposed by Crenshaw in 1989. Crenshaw’s original definition of intersectionality focuses on sociocultural systems and a person’s experiences within these systems which create power dynamics through oppression and privilege (Crenshaw, 1989; Moradi & Grzanka, 2017). The modern interpretation of intersectionality frequently omits the importance of sociocultural systems of power and instead focuses on multiple identities. Critics explain that intersectionality is mentioned instead of used, primarily by recognizing and incorporating diverse identities but not addressing systems/structures of power and their role in privilege and oppression (Grzanka & Miles, 2016; Moradi & Grzanka, 2017). This approach to intersectionality often consists of examining differences in outcomes based on multiple marginalized identities without thoroughly considering the structural context which engender the disparities. While acknowledging disparities is important, intersectionality is a social justice-
based concept which necessitates analysis of systems of power to ultimately address inequality and demand social change.

**Approaching Intersectionality in Research**

Even when examining systems of power in the context of marginalized people, oftentimes an additive or multiplicative approach is used (Akibar & Langroudi, 2021). For example, studies may use a measure of heterosexism and a separate measure of ethnic discrimination to capture the experiences of discrimination for LGBQ Latinx people. However, an intersectional approach assumes that the experiences of LGBQ Latinx people cannot be easily divided into separate forms of discrimination. As illustrated by Bowleg (2013), an intersectional experience is like a cake: once you bake it, you cannot separate it out into the main ingredients. In a study by Harnois et al. (2022) assessing daily discrimination, about half of the participants indicated it was difficult to connect a singular identity to an experience of discrimination. To this end, multiple intersectional discrimination measures have been developed within the past two decades, such as the Intersectional Discrimination Index, which measures experiences of discrimination without attributing it to a specific identity (Schein & Bauer, 2019). The current study utilizes intersectional measures to capture the experiences of LGBQ Latinx people to better align intersectional theory and research methods.

Pairing an intersectional framework with IPTS to examine suicidal ideation in LGBQ Latinx people allows for a dimensional analysis of the varied interpersonal factors and pathways that contribute to suicidal ideation. IPTS captures how individual-level relationships and the way in which a person perceives their relationships contribute to an individual’s suicidal ideation. Intersectionality considers a broader perspective, emphasizing a person’s relationships with sociocultural systems of power and how these systems are involved in a person’s experiences of
privilege and oppression. Utilizing an intersectional framework for IPTS facilitates a better understanding of how experiences of oppression and different systems of power (heterosexism and ethnic discrimination) contribute to the different constructs of suicidal ideation. It combines experiences at a direct interpersonal level with the broader dynamic, interpersonal, societal context.

**Discrimination and IPTS**

Discrimination and suicidal ideation have been linked via thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness. Evidence for the interaction of discrimination and IPTS constructs can be seen through examining the ability of thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness to mediate the relationship between discrimination and suicidal ideation among LGBQ youth (Wyman Battalen et al., 2021). This study found that discrimination was indirectly associated with greater depressive symptoms via perceived burdensomeness and thwarted belongingness. Discrimination was also indirectly related to increased suicidal ideation through perceived burdensomeness (Wyman Battalen et al., 2021). It is important to note that for this study, the discrimination measure was a general discrimination measure and did not focus specifically on heterosexism or discrimination based on sexuality, indicating that other types of oppression might be involved in responses. Participants included multiple racial and ethnic groups. The support for a mediational model suggests that perceived burdensomeness and possibly thwarted belongingness may provide pathways explaining the relationship between discrimination and suicidal ideation, in turn supporting the use of an intersectional framework to better understand the mechanisms by which discrimination and IPTS constructs contribute to suicidal ideation.
The following sections provide a review of the existing literature exploring the relationships between discrimination, IPTS constructs, and suicidal ideation. As previously mentioned, most of the existing literature does not use an intersectional framework of assessing the many dimensions of discrimination, and instead typically focuses on either just heterosexism or ethnic discrimination (Akibar & Langroudi, 2021; Sarno et al., 2015). While the current study strives to maintain an intersectional framework, non-intersectional studies (e.g., studies focusing on only LGBT experiences or only Latinx experiences) are included in the following sections in an attempt to provide a comprehensive and holistic review of the relevant research as it currently stands.

**Discrimination and Thwarted Belongingness**

Thwarted belongingness is characterized by feelings of isolation, alienation, and the lack of feeling socially connected or integrated (Joiner et al., 2009). Isolating and preventing social connectedness is one tactic used by systems of power to maintain inequalities. Stereotypes, stigma, denying access, and segregation are all ways in which systems of power utilize discrimination to alienate groups of people, developing and maintaining social inequality (Alexander, 2012; Collins, 2015; Herek, 1990). Given that isolation and thwarted belongingness are tactics of discrimination, it is likely that thwarted belongingness is a potential pathway that explains the connection between experiences of discrimination and suicidal ideation.

Experiences of multiple forms of discrimination have been linked to increased distress, hopelessness, depressive symptoms, and suicidal ideation (Grollman, 2012; Pascoe & Richman, 2009; Tobler et al., 2013). Vargas et al. (2021) conducted a study examining depressive symptoms, suicidal ideation, and discrimination in a sample of 390 Latinx adolescents. Results found that experiences of discrimination were related to increased suicidal ideation (Vargas et
In LGBQ adults from different racial/ethnic groups, Layland et al. (2020) demonstrated there was a stronger relationship between experiences of sexuality-related discrimination and suicidal behaviors with some or no support of a predictive relationship between ethnic discrimination and suicidal behaviors. Layland et al. (2020) showed that reported suicide attempts were 4.5 times higher for LGBQ Latinx adults who reported sexuality-related discrimination compared to those who did not report sexuality-related discrimination. Results may suggest that experiences of sexuality-related discrimination are more salient in relation to suicidal behaviors. Alternatively, using an intersectional framework, experiences of sexuality-related discrimination and racial/ethnic discrimination cannot be separated. It is possible that the measure used for sexuality-related discrimination better reflected the intersectional discrimination experienced by LGBQ Latinx adults when compared to the measure for racial/ethnic discrimination in this study.

**Discrimination and Thwarted Belongingness in young LGBQ Latinx people.** One predictor of suicidality that is common in literature of LGBQ and Latinx groups is bullying based on sexuality or ethnicity (Giano et al., 2021; Lardier et al., 2020a; Mueller et al., 2015). Previous empirical studies have found links between bullying and feelings of thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness (Brailovskaia et al., 2020). Bullying tends to be more strongly linked to feelings of alienation and therefore is considered a risk factor for thwarted belongingness (Kerse & Babadag, 2019; Vergara et al., 2019). Many studies have utilized the Youth Risk Behavior Survey to examine the relationship between experiences of bullying and suicidality given the high-risk period of adolescence for suicidal ideation (Baiden et al., 2020; Boyas et al., 2019; Mueller et al., 2015; Pollitt & Mallory, 2021; Villarreal-Otálor et al., 2020). Although the literature on bullying is not adult-focused, it is important to highlight
because it demonstrates the connection between discrimination (specifically the intersections of heterosexism and ethnic discrimination), thwarted belongingness, and suicidal ideation. The current study adds to the literature by examining links between the aforementioned constructs within the context of adulthood.

Multiple studies examined the bullying experiences of LGBQ Latinx youth or LGBQ youth of color. Boyas and colleagues (2019) examined suicidal ideation, planning, and attempts among Latinx Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual (LGBQ) people ages 12 and older. Bullying was a significant predictor of suicidal ideation, planning, and attempts, and 70% of the participants reported the bullying was related to their sexual orientation (Boyas et al., 2019). Furthering the understanding of the connection between bullying based on marginalized identities and suicidality, Lardier and colleagues (2020) found that bullying victimization mediated the relationship between LGBQ identity and suicidal ideation for LGBQ Latinx high school students. Both studies provide evidence that the bullying experiences of LGBQ Latinx youth contributes to their risk for suicidal ideation. Despite the high risk, the authors identified that having social support through home or school environments acted as a buffer for the relationship between bullying and suicidal ideation (Lardier et al., 2020). LGBQ Latinx youth experience thwarted belongingness and alienation through experiences of bullying based on sexuality and ethnicity, but feelings of belonging in other areas of life serve as protective factors for thwarted belongingness and suicidal ideation.

**Discrimination and Thwarted Belongingness in LGBQ People.** Discrimination, rejection, and beliefs that one will never belong are strong predictors of suicidal ideation when specifically examining thwarted belongingness in LGBQ people. Internalized homophobia, anticipated/actual rejection, discrimination, and concealing one’s identity have all been linked to
increased perceptions of thwarted belongingness, negative mental health outcomes, and suicidal ideation (Meyer, 2003; Puckett et al., 2015; Salentine et al., 2020). Specifically, hopelessness about thwarted belongingness mediated the relationship between discrimination and a person’s frequency of suicidal ideation (Salentine et al., 2020). The results provided by Salentine et al. (2020) exhibit how sexuality-based discrimination contributes to how a person perceives themself interpersonally.

**Discrimination and Perceived Burdensomeness**

Perceived burdensomeness, a construct contributing to suicidal ideation, is characterized by feeling like a burden to close others and thinking people would be better off if oneself were dead (Van Orden et al., 2012). In general, empirical literature on IPTS supports perceived burdensomeness as a stronger predictor of suicidal ideation in comparison to thwarted belongingness (Chu et al., 2017). The same pattern is observed in studies focusing on LGBQ youth and adults and Latinx samples (Garza & Pettit, 2010; Pérez-Rojas et al., 2021; Woodward et al., 2014; Wyman Battalen et al., 2021). The strength of perceived burdensomeness over thwarted belongingness may be attributed to other factors involved in the studies, or it may truly be a more statistically significant predictor of suicidal ideation.

**Discrimination and Perceived Burdensomeness in LGBQ People.** In a survey study of LGBQ adults, perceived burdensomeness was found to be a predictor of suicidal ideation, whereas thwarted belongingness did not predict suicidal ideation (Woodward et al., 2014). The authors explain that the significance of perceived burdensomeness might be due to internalized heterosexism or the belief that one’s sexuality is a burden to family and close others. This study consisted of a primarily White sample and did not explore racial/ethnic differences. For lesbian women, perceived burdensomeness predicted suicidal ideation to the extent that individuals with
high reports were seven times more likely to report suicidal ideation when compared to those with low reports of perceived burdensomeness (Woodward et al., 2014). For bisexual women, those with high reports of perceived burdensomeness were five times more likely to report suicidal ideation when compared to bisexual women with low reports of perceived burdensomeness (Woodward et al., 2014). In gay men, those with higher levels of perceived burdensomeness were three times more likely to report suicidal ideation when compared to their counterparts with low perceived burdensomeness (Woodward et al., 2014).

Interestingly, when examining heterosexist rejection from parents, rejection was only weakly correlated with perceived burdensomeness (Woodward et al., 2014). Explicit rejection from loved ones might not be a key predictor of perceived burdensomeness for some LGBQ people, necessitating further examination of other factors related to parental rejection and perceived burdensomeness. In alignment with the emphasis on perception for the construct of perceived burdensomeness, anticipation of rejection of sexual orientation, a form of discrimination, by loved ones may have a bigger impact on perceived burdensomeness than experienced rejection. For this reason, the current study explores the relationship between anticipated discrimination and perceived burdensomeness in addition to experiences of discrimination.

**Discrimination and Perceived Burdensomeness in Latinx People.** Multiple other studies have explored factors contributing to perceived burdensomeness in Latinx people. Specifically in college students, ethnic discrimination was connected to higher levels of suicidal ideation via perceived burdensomeness (Pérez-Rojas et al., 2021). Hwang and Goto (2008) reported that Latinx college students commonly experienced discrimination accusing them of doing something wrong such as cheating or breaking the law. Frequent accusations of doing
something wrong may lead to increased self-blame or self-hatred, which is a risk factor for developing perceived burdensomeness. Latinx students may internalize these experiences to believe there is something wrong with them, resulting in the idea that people might be better off without them.

**Navigating Ethnic Identity and Sexual Orientation**

The extant literature establishes the link between discrimination, thwarted belongingness, and perceived burdensomeness in various LGBQ and Latinx samples. However, there is a noticeable lack of examining how the intersection of sexuality and ethnicity contribute to thwarted belongingness, perceived burdensomeness, and suicidal ideation (Toomey et al., 2017). One way to address this dearth in literature is to examine factors unique to the experience of LGBQ Latinx people. For example, empirical studies have shown that factors such as strong ethnic identity, connectedness to the LGBQ community, and cultural values prioritizing family (e.g., *familismo*) function as protective factors or moderators for the relationship between discrimination and suicidal ideation (Busby et al., 2020; Cheref et al., 2019; Oakey-Frost et al., 2021; Walker et al., 2008). These protective factors may look effective when using an additive approach to understand the LGBQ Latinx experience; however, an intersectional framework adds another dimension to understanding the role of ethnic identity and sexual orientation in suicidal ideation.

Oftentimes, for LGBQ Latinx people, ethnic identity and sexuality are at odds with each other, which can result in needing to constantly adjust engagement and expression of ethnic identity and sexuality (Morales, 1989). Families can hold heterosexist cultural values, and LGBTQ communities can be discriminatory, fetishizing, or dismissive of LGBQ Latinx people (Parmenter, Galliher, & Maughan, 2021; Robinson, 2015). The experience of not being able to
fully integrate one’s identities in prominent social support settings may result in a person not experiencing the same protective value of involvement in identity-focused communities. Several studies demonstrate that strong ethnic identity, connectedness to the LGBTQ community, and cultural values prioritizing family are not significant buffers for the relationship between discrimination and suicidal ideation and sometimes are related to higher suicidal ideation or depression (Flanders et al., 2019; Garza & Pettit, 2010; Hong et al., 2018; Rogers et al., 2020). This concept, known as conflicts in allegiances, is explored in the context of IPTS in the current study.

**Conflicts in Allegiances**

Conflicts in allegiances (CIA) is a concept originally proposed by Edward Morales (1989). He described how the awareness of belonging to an ethnically marginalized group and being LGBQ creates the desire for the two identities or lifestyles to remain separate (Morales, 1989). There is often an anxiety about betraying one community when preference is given to the other (Morales, 1989). CIA refers to the state of conflict that arises from the belief or perception that one’s sexuality and one’s ethnic identity are incompatible. Oftentimes, this conflict may be a product of experiences of discrimination, which communicate to LGBQ Latinx people that certain identity aspects or expressions are unaccepted in a specific environment and need to be suppressed. CIA may manifest as feeling conflicted when being involved in a predominately-white LGBTQ community because it seems like a rejection of Latinx identity (Harper et al., 2004). Similarly, CIA may arise and a person may feel like they are betraying their LGBQ identity when not disclosing sexuality to family members due to the desire to adhere to certain Latinx values (Sarno et al., 2015). CIA is a type of tight-rope walking act which requires a
person to figure out how to move in and out of incompatible communities while still maintaining a sense of authenticity of one’s LGBQ and Latinx identities.

**CIA and Discrimination**

Previous empirical literature on CIA has found that the concept is related to experiences of ethnic discrimination and heterosexism. In the foundational study that lead to the development of the CIA scale, Sarno and colleagues (2015) found that CIA was positively correlated with maternal heterosexism and ethnic discrimination in the LGBQ community (Sarno et al., 2015). These findings indicate that discrimination in either sexuality-related or ethnicity-related domains is associated with a feeling of conflict between the two identities. Additionally, CIA was negatively correlated with outness to family (Sarno et al., 2015). While the directionality of the relationship cannot be determined from the study, it is possible that heterosexism in the family or anticipated heterosexism might delay or prevent coming out to family members, further exacerbating the incompatibility between LGBQ and ethnic identities. In a study examining stress among LGBQ Latinx people, Noyola and colleagues (2020) found that expectations about traditional gender roles related to a person anticipating familial rejection of sexuality. Similarly, in another study examining racial/ethnic differences in coming out for lesbians, results indicated that Latinx lesbians were the least likely to come out to family members and had a higher tendency to come out at an older age (Aranda et al., 2015). Both studies present support for the concept of CIA, the desire to keep ethnic identity and sexuality separate, and the conflict between navigating incongruent identities.

While some people may respond to discrimination by externalizing the experience and acknowledging the ignorance or prejudice of people around them, others may internalize the experience (Gray et al., 2015). CIA is an example of how a person may internalize experiences
of discrimination. They may view experiences of discrimination as something they need to figure out how to navigate in order to address incompatible identities. The continuous weight of CIA in the face of discrimination may result in feelings of perceived burdensomeness (i.e., self-blame, thinking others would be better off without them) and thwarted belongingness (i.e., isolation, feeling one does not belong).

**CIA and Mental Health Outcomes**

A budding area of research has started to explore how CIA connects to negative mental health outcomes. A study of Black, Asian, and Latinx LGBQ individuals found that CIA was associated with higher levels of depression (Santos & VanDaalen, 2016). Another study of LGBQ racially/ethnically marginalized adults found that higher CIA was associated with higher levels of anxiety (Santos & VanDaalen, 2018). Shepherd et al. (2023) examined CIA as a mediator for the relationship between intersectional discrimination and depression among Latinx LGBQ adults. Results indicated that higher levels of CIA exacerbated the relationship between intersectional discrimination and depression (Shepherd et al., 2023). Given that the measure was developed in 2015, there is still a large gap in understanding how CIA relates to mental health outcomes. Notably, there are no studies examining how CIA relates to suicidal ideation or the mechanisms through which the two constructs might be related. The current study explores how the intersectional concept of CIA relates to the IPTS concepts of thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness and in turn, suicidal ideation.

**CIA and Thwarted Belongingness**

CIA brings up the possibility that a LGBQ Latinx person may not fully belong in neither the LGBQ community nor the Latinx community. In LGBQ spaces, a person encounters ethnic discrimination and in Latinx spaces, they encounter heterosexism. The challenge and inability to
find a fully accepting community aligns with the IPTS concept of thwarted belongingness. Although, to the author’s knowledge, there is no extant literature on CIA and thwarted belongingness, some studies have demonstrated similar difficulty in negotiating LGBQ and ethnic identities and its connection with thwarted belongingness.

Boyas and colleagues (2019) describe some possible experiences of LGBQ Latinx people that contribute to higher suicidal ideation including lacking family support and acceptance, having unsupportive peer relationships, and experiencing negative social interactions. All these experiences could contribute to not only developing CIA, but also to a person’s perceptions of being alone and having a lack of mutually supportive connections. Discrimination can function to isolate someone and communicate that they do not belong. The multiple forms of discrimination faced by LGBQ Latinx people, in addition to the related identity conflicts, likely contribute to developing perceptions of thwarted belongingness.

Another notable study looked at ethnic identity and suicide risk in Latinx young adults. Oakey-Frost and colleagues (2021) utilized IPTS to examine the relationship between perceived burdensomeness, thwarted belongingness, ethnic identity attachment, and suicidal ideation. Results indicated that lower ethnic identity attachment was related to greater suicide risk (Oakey-Frost et al., 2021). In the tested model, perceived burdensomeness acted as a mediator between ethnic identity and suicidal ideation while thwarted belongingness acted as a moderator (Oakey-Frost et al., 2021). The results demonstrate that identity-related factors (e.g., CIA) are important to consider when examining IPTS pathways to explain suicidal ideation. In context of the current project, LGBQ Latinx people may experience low levels of ethnic identity attachment due to CIA, resulting in higher risk to develop feelings of perceived burdensomeness and thwarted belongingness.
In a comparable way to thwarted belongingness, CIA may also predict perceived burdensomeness. Constant difficulty integrating LBGQ and Latinx identities may lead a person to develop liability-related beliefs such as “I am unwanted” or “I am a burden to my family.” Depending on one’s own expectations of sexuality or cultural values, a person may also feel self-blame or shame along with low self-esteem. A person may develop feelings of perceived burdensomeness if they believe they do not meet the expectations of loved ones.

Perceived burdensomeness related to CIA may particularly arise when deciding whether to come out to a member of a person’s ethnic community or family. Hill and Pettit (2012) examined the mediating effects of perceived burdensomeness and thwarted belongingness for the relationship between sexuality and suicidal ideation. The study included 198 gay, lesbian, and bisexual college students, over 70% of which identified as Latinx. Results indicated when people experienced or anticipated high levels of rejection concerning sexual orientation, perceived burdensomeness also increased, which in turn predicted higher suicidal ideation (Hill & Pettit, 2012). This supports the idea that negative cognitions such as “my sexuality does not meet others’ expectations” or “my worth is conditional on my sexuality” may contribute to perceived burdensomeness. Anticipating rejection could be connected to CIA and can add to a person’s perceived burdensomeness. In two studies examining outness and wellbeing, outness was not related to psychological well-being for Latinx participants whereas it was positively related for other ethnic groups (Delucio et al., 2022; Roberts & Christens, 2020). These results suggest that there are unique elements of being out for LGBQ Latinx people that complicate how outness relates to positive mental health. CIA offers a piece of the explanation for the complex relationship between sexuality and mental health outcomes.
Current Study

Previous research demonstrates a strong relationship between discrimination and suicidal ideation among LGBQ and Latinx people, potentially explaining increased suicide risk among these populations (Layland et al., 2020; Salentine et al., 2020; Vargas et al., 2021). Despite the clear connection between discrimination and suicidal ideation, there is a lack of research examining intersectional experiences of discrimination and the pathways which lead to increased suicidal ideation. The literature reviewed suggests that discrimination is associated to increased thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness, which predict suicidal ideation. The current study expands on the existing literature by using an intersectional framework to examine the experiences of discrimination faced by LGBQ Latinx people and its relation to thwarted belongingness, perceived burdensomeness, and suicidal ideation. Specifically, the current study examines the ability of thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness to mediate the relationship between discrimination and suicidal ideation for LGBQ Latinx people. Factors such as CIA may interact with experiences of discrimination to influence feelings of thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness. For this reason, CIA will be examined as a moderator for the relationship between discrimination and thwarted belongingness/perceived burdensomeness. As such, the current study has the following aims:

Aim 1: Establish the predictive ability of experiences of intersectional discrimination on suicidal ideation

Hypothesis 1: Anticipated discrimination and day-to-day discrimination will predict suicidal ideation. Consistent with the empirical literature outlined earlier, it is predicted that higher endorsement of anticipated and day-to-day discrimination will predict greater suicidal ideation among LGBQ Latinx adults.
Aim 2: Establish predictive ability of CIA on thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness

*Hypothesis 2A:* CIA will predict thwarted belongingness. Specifically, higher CIA will predict greater endorsement of thwarted belongingness. Based on the literature that suggests CIA relates to feeling like a person does not belong in specific communities due to incompatible identities, it is predicted that CIA will be a stronger predictor of thwarted belongingness than perceived burdensomeness.

*Hypothesis 2B:* CIA will predict perceived burdensomeness. Specifically, higher CIA will predict greater endorsement of perceived burdensomeness. Given the relative novelty of CIA, it is important to examine its individual relationship to thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness before examining it as a moderator to better understand the role of CIA in IPTS and suicidal ideation.

Aim 3: Examine a moderated parallel mediational model that links experiences of anticipated intersectional discrimination to suicidal ideation via perceived burdensomeness and thwarted belongingness while accounting for the moderating role of CIA on the indirect effect.

*Hypothesis 3:* a significant conditional indirect effect will be demonstrated, such that, thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness will mediate the relationship between anticipated discrimination and suicidal ideation, while CIA will moderate this mediational model (Figure 1). The conditional indirect effect will be stronger for high CIA, such that, greater CIA will interact with anticipated
discrimination to result in heightened perceived burdensomeness and thwarted belongingness.

**Aim 4:** Examine a moderated parallel mediational model that links experiences of day-to-day intersectional discrimination to suicidal ideation via perceived burdensomeness and thwarted belongingness while accounting for the moderating role of CIA on the indirect effect.

_Hypothesis 4:_ a significant conditional indirect effect will be demonstrated, such that, perceived burdensomeness and thwarted belongingness will mediate the relationship between day-to-day discrimination and suicidal ideation, while CIA will moderate this mediational model (Figure 2). The conditional indirect effect will be stronger for high CIA, such that, greater CIA will interact with day-to-day discrimination to result in heightened perceived burdensomeness and thwarted belongingness.

**Method**

**Participants**

Participants included 100 cisgender LGBQ Latinx adults. Participants were initially screened for eligibility for the current study if they (a) identify as Latinx, (b) identify as LGBQ, gay, lesbian, or bi+ (i.e., attracted to multiple genders), (c) identify as cisgender, (d) are at least 18 years of age, (e) literate in English. In the sample, 69 participants identified as women and 31 as men. The mean age of the sample was 29.13, and ages ranged from 18 to 57. Regarding sexuality, 45 participants identified as bisexual, 42 as gay or lesbian, and 13 as another label (i.e., pansexual or queer). 93 participants identified as Hispanic or Latinx, 3 as AfroLatinx, and 4 as another label (i.e., mixed race or indigenous). For place of birth, 70 participants reported being
born in the United States and 30 in another country. 61 participants had parents who were both born outside of the United States while 39 participants had at least one parent who was born in the United States. Regarding income, 41 participants reported a household income of $75,000 or more, 26 reported an income between $50,000 to $75,000 and 33 reported an income of less than $50,000.

Materials

Demographics. Participants were asked for demographic information including age, gender, sexual orientation, race, income, nativity, and parent nativity.

Intersectional Discrimination. The Intersectional Discrimination Index (InDI; Scheim & Bauer, 2019) is a 31-item self-report measure that assesses experiences of discrimination without attributing the cause of discrimination. The index is divided into three scales, two of which will be used for the current study: anticipated discrimination (InDI-A) and day-to-day discrimination (InDI-D). For the InDI-A, participants are asked to rate nine items of anticipated discrimination on a Likert scale from 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). A sample item includes, “I expect to be pointed at, called names, or harassed when in public.” The scale is scored by calculating the mean scores, with total scores ranging from 0 to 4 and higher scores indicating more experiences of anticipated discrimination. For the InDI-D, participants are asked to rate 9 statements of day-to-day discrimination experienced in the past 12 months using a 3-point scale ranging from 0 (never) to 2 (yes, many times in the past year). A sample item includes, “Because of who you are, have you been told you should think, act, or look more like others.” The scale is scored by summing the items to develop a frequency score ranging from 0-18 with higher numbers indicating more experiences of daily discrimination. The InDI has been utilized with both Latinx and LGBQ samples in previous research (Jones & Briones, 2022;
Quinn et al., 2022). The measure demonstrated good reliability in both LGBQ samples ($\alpha = 0.89$ to .91) and Latinx samples ($\alpha = 0.89$) (Jones & Briones, 2022; Quinn et al., 2022). The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for the current study was .79 for the INDI-A and .77 for the INDI-D.

Conflicts in Allegiances. The conflicts in allegiances scale (CIA; Sarno et al., 2015) is a 6-item self-report measure that assesses the extent to which a person identifies incompatibility between their sexuality and ethnic identity. Participants rate items using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (disagree strongly) to 7 (agree strongly). Sample items include, “I have not yet found a way to integrate being [l/g/b] with being a member of my cultural group,” and, “I feel as if my sense of cultural identity is at odds with my [l/g/b] identity.” To score the measure, items 1 and 4 are reversed scored and then a total score is created by calculating the mean of the items. Total scores range from 1 to 7. Higher total scores indicate higher conflict between sexuality and ethnic identity. The CIA scale has previously been used in diverse study samples that included LGBQ Latinx people and demonstrated good internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.80$ to .86) (Jackson et al., 2020; Parra & Hastings, 2020; Santos & VanDaalen, 2018; Sarno et al., 2015). The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for the current study was .83.

Thwarted Belongingness and Perceived Burdensomeness. The Interpersonal Needs Questionnaire (INQ; Van Orden et al., 2012) is a 15-item self-report measure developed to measure the IPTS constructs of thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness. The measure is divided into two subscales, 9 items for thwarted belongingness and 6 items for perceived burdensomeness. Participants rate statements based on how they have been feeling recently using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not at all true for me) to 7 (very true for me). Sample items include, “These days, I think I make things worse for the people in my life,”
and, “These days, I often feel disconnected from other people.” To score the measure, items 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, and 15 are reversed scored. Scores for the thwarted belongingness (items 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15) and perceived burdensomeness (items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6) subscales are calculated by summing the scores of the items in each subscale. Total scores for thwarted belongingness range from 9 to 63 and total scores for perceived burdensomeness range from 6 to 42. Higher scores indicate higher endorsement of thwarted belongingness or perceived burdensomeness. The INQ has previously showed good internal consistency with Latinx for thwarted belongingness (α = .90 and .959) and perceived burdensomeness (α = .73 and .93) (Acosta et al., 2017; Hsieh et al., 2022). Additionally, the measure has demonstrated good internal consistency in LGBQ samples for thwarted belongingness (α = .91) and perceived burdensomeness (α = .91) (Woodward et al., 2014). The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for the current study was .91.

**Suicidal Ideation.** The Suicidal Ideation Attributes Scale (SIDAS; van Spijker et al., 2014) is a 5-item self-report measure that assesses the presence and severity of suicidal thoughts in the past month. The measure was developed specifically for community and internet-based research (Batterham et al., 2014). Participants respond to questions using a 10-point scale, with higher scores indicating more severe suicidal ideation. Sample items include, “In the past month, how often have you had thoughts about suicide? (0 = Never, 10 = Always),” and, “In the past month, to what extent have you felt tormented by thoughts about suicide? (0 = Not at all, 10 = Extremely).” The total SIDAS score is calculated by summing the items, with the 2nd item being reverse scored. Total scores range from 0 to 50, with higher scores indicating more intense suicidal ideation. The SIDAS has previously been used with both LGBQ and Latinx populations.
and demonstrated good internal consistency (α = 0.83 to .93) (Jackson et al., 2022; Pachankis et al., 2020, 2022). The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for the current study was .78.

**Procedures**

Data collection started in March 2023 and concluded in January 2024. Recruitment of participants consisted of distribution via email and social media through community Latinx organizations, LGBQ organizations, suicide prevention organizations and services, online Facebook forums, and Instagram pages. Additionally, flyers were hung up in multiple neighborhoods in the Chicago, Milwaukee, and Miami areas. Participants completed the study using an online survey via Qualtrics after completing screening questions to determine eligibility. Participants completed self-report measures on demographic information, discrimination, CIA, thwarted belongingness, perceived burdensomeness, and suicidal ideation. Upon completion, participants were provided with a list of local and national mental health resources. Participants were given the option to enter a raffle for one of four $20 Amazon gift cards.

**Results**

**Data Screening**

Data was screened prior to analysis to ensure the accuracy of data entry, missing values, and determination of multivariate assumptions, including linearity, normality, multicollinearity, and homoscedasticity (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). For the analysis of missing data, due to the necessity of completed data for proper testing of the hypotheses, cases with 10% or more missing responses were deleted from the final dataset and not included in the analysis. 86 cases were deleted during this process, the majority of them from participants who opened the survey but did not respond to any survey items and therefore did not respond to any items. Given that the
survey was distributed through online and social media channels, multiple validity checks were put in place to increase the quality of responses and decrease the likelihood of fraudulent or bot responses. Validity checks included utilization of Qualtrics fraud detection (i.e., Q_BallotBoxStuffing, Q_RecaptchaScore, and Q_RelevantID), attention check questions (i.e., multiple choice and short answer), and identifying cases that were completed in an unreasonable amount of time (i.e., 5 minutes or less). 14 cases were deleted for failing one or more of the aforementioned validity checks.

Next, variables were screened for outliers. No significant outliers were identified; thus, no data was omitted or winsorized. Scatterplots were created for each variable to test for linearity and homoscedasticity. All variables of interest were examined for normality by creating histogram graphs for each variable and obtaining skewness and kurtosis variables (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). To determine if a variable violated normality and, thus, was a candidate for transformation, skewness and kurtosis values were divided by their standard error. Data were considered significantly kurtotic or skewed if the obtained z-score was less than -3.29 or greater than 3.29, as suggested by Tabachnick and Fidell (2013). The perceived burdensomeness subscale of the INQ was significantly positively skewed (z-score = 7.39) and significantly kurtotic (z score = 7.64) with the majority of responses in the lower half of the distribution. Scatterplots indicated that perceived burdensomeness was heteroscedastic. Additionally, the SIDAS was also significantly positively skewed (z-score = 4.86). Scores suggest that participants experience a lower sense of perceived burdensomeness and suicidal ideation, as expected for a non-clinical sample.

Due to the violations of normality, square root and log transformation were performed on both variables to determine the most effective transformation. The log transformation effectively
corrected the skewness, kurtosis, and heteroscedasticity for the perceived burdensomeness subscale. While the square root and log transformations on the SIDAS corrected skewness, both transformations resulted in significant kurtosis. Because the transformations for the SIDAS presented no advantage, the original variable was utilized, as suggested by Tabachnick and Fidell (2013). To ensure a comprehensive analysis, the analyses for the current study were conducted utilizing both the transformed and untransformed variables. The untransformed variable is reported to facilitate interpretation of the analysis unless otherwise noted.

Finally, a correlation matrix was computed to test for multicollinearity. None of the variables had a correlation above 0.80, which is an accepted diagnostic cut-off for multicollinearity (Vatcheva et al., 2016). Results for the correlation matrix can be found in Table 2.

**Preliminary Analyses**

Following the data screening, descriptive statistics were obtained for each study variable. Overall, participants reported moderately low levels of thwarted belongingness. For perceived burdensomeness, the mean score was low, indicating that participants do not often feel like a burden to others. The mean score for suicidal ideation in the sample demonstrated a low reporting of suicidal ideation, as expected for a non-clinical sample. Participants responses reflected a moderate experience of CIA, suggesting that there are sometimes in which participants feel that their sexuality and ethnic identity are incompatible. Finally, participants reported a moderate level of day-to-day discrimination and anticipation of discrimination. Mean scores for variables of interest can be found in Table 2.

Mean differences were assessed using independent sample t-tests to assess for significant differences across gender, participant place of birth, and parents’ place of birth and one-way
analyses of variance (ANOVAs) to assess if there were any significant variations across sexuality and income. There was a statistically significant difference in perceived burdensomeness between men and women, \( t(92.1) = -2.42, p = 0.009 \), with women reporting higher perceived burdensomeness \( (M = 11.16, SD = 6.38) \) compared to men \( (M = 8.71, SD = 3.66) \). Additionally, there was a significant gender difference in day-to-day discrimination, \( t(77.05) = -2.22, p = 0.02 \). Women reported more experiences of day-to-day discrimination \( (M = 7.14, SD = 4.52) \) compared to men \( (M = 5.35, SD = 3.32) \).

Regarding place of birth, there was a significant difference in perceived burdensomeness, \( t(97.72) = -2.36, p = 0.01 \), with participants born in the United States reporting significantly higher perceived burdensomeness \( (M = 11.07, SD = 6.53) \) compared to participants born outside of the United States \( (M = 8.83, SD = 2.94) \). Place of birth also had significant differences for suicidal ideation, \( t(70.78) = -1.89, p = 0.03 \). Those born in the United States reported significantly higher suicidal ideation \( (M = 6.67, SD = 7.77) \) compared to participants born outside of the United States \( (M = 3.97, SD = 5.97) \). When comparing parents’ place of birth, there was a significant difference between groups for anticipated discrimination \( t(98) = 1.74, p = 0.04 \). Individuals with both parents born outside of the United States reported significantly more anticipated discrimination \( (M = 2.06, SD = .66) \) compared to individuals with at least one parent born in the United States \( (M = 1.81, SD = .79) \).

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to assess for differences among sexuality between gay/lesbian, bisexual, and other-identifying. Given that group sizes were unequal, results should be interpreted with caution. Thwarted belongingness was statistically significantly different between sexuality groups, \( F(2, 97) = 3.75, p = .027 \). Bonferroni post-hoc analysis revealed that the mean difference between bisexual participants and gay/lesbian participants was statistically
significant ($p = .025$), indicating that bisexual participants reported higher thwarted
belongingness ($M = 30.31$, $SD = 11.22$) compared to gay/lesbian participants ($M = 24.29$, $SD = 9.55$).

Regarding day-to-day discrimination, a one-way ANOVA indicated that there was a
statistically significant difference between sexuality groups, $F(2, 97) = 4.724$, $p = .011$.
Bonferroni post-hoc analysis revealed that the mean difference between bisexual participants and
gay/lesbian participants was statistically significant ($p = .012$), indicating that bisexual
participants reported higher experiences of day-to-day discrimination ($M = 7.98$, $SD = 4.64$)
compared to gay/lesbian participants ($M = 5.38$, $SD = 3.6$).

The assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated for perceived burdensomeness,
as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variances ($p = <.001$), therefore Welch’s ANOVA
was utilized. The perceived burdensomeness score was statistically significantly different
between the sexuality groups, Welch’s $F(2, 28.64) = 4.797$, $p = .016$. The perceived
burdensomeness score increased from the gay/lesbian participants ($M = 8.55$, $SD = 3.31$) to the
bisexual participants ($M = 11.11$, $SD = 6.01$) and the other-identifying participants ($M = 13.92$,
$SD = 8.84$), in that order. Bonferroni post-hoc analysis revealed that the mean difference between
gay/lesbian and other-identifying participants was statistically significant ($p = .009$).

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to assess for differences among income levels
between less than $50,000 (n = 33), $50,000 to $75,000 (n = 26), and $75,000 or more (n = 41).
No statistically significant differences between groups were identified. Participant’s place of
birth was the only variable that presented significant differences between groups for suicidal
ideation, which is the outcome variable of interest. Based on these analyses, participant’s place
of birth was selected as a control variable in the main analyses.
**Aim 1: Establish the predictive ability of experiences of intersectional discrimination on suicidal ideation**

Hypothesis 1 states that anticipated discrimination and day-to-day discrimination will predict suicidal ideation. Specifically, higher endorsement of intersectional discrimination will predict greater suicidal ideation among LGBQ Latinx adults. To test hypothesis one, a hierarchical multiple regression was conducted with suicidal ideation as the outcome. The first step of this regression included participant’s place of birth as the control variable since it was identified as having significant group differences for suicidal ideation in the preliminary analyses. The second step of the regression included anticipated discrimination and day-to-day discrimination. The control variable included in step one explained 2.9% of the variance in suicidal ideation, $F(1, 98) = 2.89$, $R^2 = .029$, $p = .092$. In step two, the addition of anticipated and day-to-day discrimination was significant and explained an additional 9.3% of the variance after controlling for participant’s place of birth, $F(2, 96) = 5.11$, $R^2$ change $= .093$, $p = .008$. The full model of participant’s place of birth, anticipated discrimination, and day-to-day discrimination to predict suicidal ideation was statistically significant, $R^2 = .12$, $F(3, 96) = 4.45$, $p = .006$, adjusted $R^2 = .09$. These results indicate support for hypothesis one, showing that anticipated and day-to-day experiences of discrimination significantly predict suicidal ideation among LGBQ Latinx adults. Full results shown in Table 3.

**Aim 2: Establish predictive ability of CIA on thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness**

Hypothesis 2a states that CIA will predict thwarted belongingness. Specifically, higher endorsement of CIA will predict greater thwarted belongingness among LGBQ Latinx adults. To test hypothesis 2a, a hierarchical multiple regression was conducted with thwarted belongingness
as the outcome. The first step of this regression included sexuality as a control variable, given that the preliminary analyses identified significant differences between sexuality groups for thwarted belongingness. Step two included CIA as a predictor. The control variable included in step one explained 0.2% of the variance $F(1, 98) = .24, R^2 = .002, p = .62$. In step two, the addition of CIA was marginally significant and explained an additional 3.8% of the variance after controlling for sexuality, $F(1, 97) = 3.89, R^2$ change = .038, $p = .051$. The full model of sexuality and CIA to predict thwarted belongingness was not statistically significant $R^2 = .04$, $F(2, 97) = 2.07, p = .132$, adjusted $R^2 = .02$. These results do not support hypothesis 2a, showing that CIA does not predict feelings of thwarted belongingness among the current sample of LGBQ Latinx adults. Full results shown in Table 4.

Hypothesis 2b states that CIA will predict perceived burdensomeness. Specifically, higher endorsement of CIA will predict greater perceived burdensomeness among LGBQ Latinx adults. To test hypothesis 2b, a hierarchical multiple regression was conducted with perceived burdensomeness as the outcome. The first step of the regression included gender, sexuality, and participant’s place of birth as control variables, given that the preliminary analyses identified significant differences between these variable-based groups for perceived burdensomeness. Step two of the regression included CIA as a predictor. The control variables included in step one explained 7.3% of the variance, $F(3, 96) = 2.54, R^2 = .07, p = .061$. In step two, the addition of CIA was not significant and explained an additional 1% of the variance after controlling for the demographic variables, $F(1, 95) = 1.06, R^2$ change= .01, $p = .307$. The full model of gender, sexuality, participant’s place of birth, and CIA to predict perceived burdensomeness was not statistically significant $R^2 = .08$, $F(4, 95) = 2.17, p = .078$, adjusted $R^2 = .04$. These results do not
support hypothesis 2b, showing that CIA does not predict feelings of perceived burdensomeness among the current sample of LGBQ Latinx adults. Full results shown in Table 5.

Aim 3: Examine a moderated mediational model that links anticipated intersectional discrimination to suicidal ideation via perceived burdensomeness and thwarted belongingness while accounting for the moderating role of CIA on the indirect effect.

The PROCESS macro SPSS add-on was used to conduct the moderated mediation analysis, instead of the traditional procedures developed by Baron and Kenny (Baron & Kenny, 1986; Hayes, 2012), which utilizes a non-parametric test called bootstrapping. PROCESS simplifies the input procedure, provides additional information on the analysis, corrects construct bias, reduces Type I error, and does not require the centering of continuous variables (Hayes, 2012). To test for significance, confidence intervals are examined to determine that they do not include the value of 0. To test the moderated mediational model, PROCESS model 7 was utilized for analyses. Participant’s place of birth was entered as a control variable, as previously identified in the preliminary analyses.

Hypothesis 3 predicts that thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness will mediate the relationship between anticipated discrimination and suicidal ideation. For the moderation, it is expected that CIA will moderate the anticipated discrimination—thwarted belongingness (path A) and anticipated discrimination—perceived burdensomeness links (path C), such that greater CIA will exacerbate the relationship, resulting in greater thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness (Figure 1). As shown in Table 6, CIA did not significantly moderate the mediational relationship between anticipated discrimination, thwarted belongingness and suicidal ideation (index = -.14, 95% CI = [-.54, .15], SE = .17). Similarly,
CIA did not significantly moderate the mediational relationship between anticipated discrimination, perceived burdensomeness and suicidal ideation (index = - .40, 95% CI = [-1.06, .32], SE = .34). As such, the results did not support hypothesis 3. Of note, anticipated discrimination significantly predicted both thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness (Table 6).

**Aim 4: Examine a moderated parallel mediational model that links experiences of day-to-day intersectional discrimination to suicidal ideation via perceived burdensomeness and thwarted belongingness while accounting for the moderating role of CIA on the indirect effect.**

Hypothesis 4 predicts that thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness will mediate the relationship between day-to-day discrimination and suicidal ideation. It is expected that CIA will moderate the day-to-day discrimination—thwarted belongingness (path A) and day-to-day discrimination—perceived burdensomeness (path C) links, such that greater CIA will exacerbate the relationship, resulting in greater thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness (Figure 2). When examining the moderated mediational model for hypothesis 4, CIA did not significantly moderate the mediational relationship between day-to-day discrimination, thwarted belongingness and suicidal ideation (index = -.05, 95% CI = [ - .14, .01], SE = .04). Similarly, CIA did not significantly moderate the mediational relationship between day-to-day discrimination, perceived burdensomeness and suicidal ideation (index = - .03, CI [ - .14, .09], SE = .06). As such, the results of the current study did not provide support for hypothesis 4. Of note, CIA and day-to-day discrimination were significant predictors of thwarted belongingness, but not perceived burdensomeness. When examining the ability of CIA to moderate the relationship between day-to-day discrimination and thwarted belongingness, the
interaction term was significant and explained 5.51% of the variance \( R^2 \) change = .055, \( F(1, 95) = 5.84, p = .018 \). CIA did not moderate the relationship between day-to-day discrimination and perceived burdensomeness. Of note, day-to-day discrimination was a significant predictor for thwarted belongingness, but not perceived burdensomeness. Full results can be found in Table 7.

**Post Hoc Analyses**

To further examine the relationships between the variables of interest, multiple post hoc analyses were conducted. When testing hypothesis 4, CIA emerged as a significant moderator for the relationship between day-to-day discrimination and thwarted belongingness, prompting further exploration of the moderating abilities of CIA. A moderation analysis (PROCESS model 1) was conducted with day-to-day discrimination as the independent variable, thwarted belongingness as the dependent variable, and CIA as the moderator. Sexuality was entered as a control variable based on preliminary analyses. Both the overall model \( F(4, 95) = 2.77, p = .031, R^2 = .10 \) and the interaction term \( B = -.40, 95\% \text{ CI} [-.72, -.07], t = -2.41, p = .018 \) were significant. Simple slopes for the association between day-to-day discrimination and thwarted belongingness were tested at low (-1 SD), average (mean), and high (+1 SD) levels of CIA. The analyses revealed statistically significant slopes for low levels of CIA \( t = 2.44, p = .016, \text{CI} = [0.18, 1.73] \), but not average or high levels of CIA. As shown in Figure 3, low CIA was associated with low thwarted belongingness in the context of minimal experiences of day-to-day discrimination.

Additional post-hoc analyses were conducted to explore CIA as a moderator for the relationship between day-to-day discrimination and perceived burdensomeness and the relationship between day-to-day discrimination and suicidal ideation. Neither moderation model was significant. Similarly, CIA was not a significant moderator in the models with anticipated
discrimination as an independent variable and thwarted belongingness, perceived burdensomeness, and suicidal ideation as dependent variables in separate analyses. Finally, a hierarchical multiple regression with participant place of birth entered at step one and CIA entered at step two indicated that CIA was not a significant predictor of suicidal ideation above and beyond relevant demographic variables.

When examining hypothesis 3, anticipated discrimination emerged as a significant predictor of thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness. Similarly, when testing hypothesis 4, day-to-day discrimination emerged as a significant predictor of thwarted belongingness, but not perceived burdensomeness. To further explore the relationship between intersectional discrimination and the two IPTS constructs, three hierarchical regressions were conducted to examine the ability of intersectional discrimination to predict thwarted belongingness, perceived burdensomeness, and CIA above and beyond relevant demographic variables identified in preliminary analyses and previous research.

The first regression examined thwarted belongingness as the dependent variable. The full model of demographic variables and intersectional discrimination to predict thwarted belongingness was significant $F(5, 90) = 2.93, R^2 = .14, p = .017$. In step one, sexuality, age, and income were included as control variables, based on preliminary analysis and previous studies. The control variables included in step one explained 3.10% of the variance in thwarted belongingness, $F(3, 92) = .99, R^2 = .031, p = .403$. In step two, the addition of anticipated and day-to-day discrimination was significant and explained an additional 10.9% of the variance in thwarted belongingness after controlling for demographic variables, $F(2, 90) = 5.69, R^2 \text{ change } = .11, p = .005$. Results indicate that intersectional discrimination is a significant predictor of
thwarted belongingness, with anticipated discrimination being a stronger predictor compared to day-to-day discrimination. Full results can be found in Table 8.

The second regression examined perceived burdensomeness as the dependent variable. The full model of demographic variables and intersectional discrimination to predict perceived burdensomeness was significant $F(7, 88) = 3.41, R^2 = .21, p = .003$. In step one, sexuality, participant place of birth, gender, age, and income were included as control variables. The control variables included in step one explained 13.1% of the variance in perceived burdensomeness, $F(5, 90) = 2.71, R^2 = .13, p = .025$. In step two, the addition of anticipated and day-to-day discrimination was significant and explained an additional 8.2% of the variance after controlling for demographic variables, $F(2, 88) = 4.60, R^2$ change = .082, $p = .013$. Results indicate that intersectional discrimination is a significant predictor of perceived burdensomeness, with day-to-day discrimination being the stronger predictor. Full results can be found in Table 9.

The third regression examined CIA as the dependent variable. The full model of demographic variables and intersectional discrimination to predict CIA was significant $F(4, 91) = 5.68, R^2 = .20, p < .001$. In step one age and income were included as control variables. The control variables included in step one explained 11.7% of the variance in CIA, $F(2, 93) = 6.18, R^2 = .12, p = .003$. In step two, the addition of anticipated and day-to-day discrimination was significant and explained an additional 8.3% of the variance after controlling for demographic variables, $F(2, 91) = 4.69, R^2$ change = .083, $p = .011$. Results indicate that intersectional discrimination is a significant predictor of CIA, with day-to-day discrimination being the stronger predictor. Full results can be found in Table 10.

**Combining Discrimination Measures**
As a part of exploratory post-hoc analyses, a mean score was calculated from the INDI-A and INDI-D scales to create a combined total score for intersectional discrimination. While Scheim and Bauer (2019) encourage researchers to modify scoring procedures to aid in improving the measures, there is no existing empirical literature that has combined the scales from the Intersectional Discrimination Index. A combined moderated mediation model based on the previously proposed Figure 1 and Figure 2 was tested with intersectional discrimination as the predictor variable, CIA as a moderator, thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness as the mediators and suicidal ideation as the outcome. The moderated mediational model was not significant. However, CIA significantly moderated the relationship between intersectional discrimination and thwarted belongingness ($B = -.75$, 95% CI $[-1.35, -.15]$, $t = -2.48$, $p = .015$), prompting a more focused analyses of the moderation effect.

A separate moderation analysis was conducted with intersectional discrimination as the independent variable, thwarted belongingness as the dependent variable, and CIA as the moderator. Sexuality was entered as a control variable based on preliminary analyses. Both the overall model ($F(4, 95) = 3.22$, $p = .0159$, $R^2 = .12$) and the interaction term ($B = -.75$, 95% CI $[-1.35, -.15]$, $t = -2.47$, $p = .015$) were significant. Simple slopes for the association between intersectional discrimination and thwarted belongingness were tested at low (-1 SD), average (mean), and high (+1 SD) levels of CIA. The analyses revealed statistically significant slopes for low levels of CIA ($t = 2.85$, $p = .005$, CI $=[.61, 3.40]$), but not average or high levels of CIA. As shown in Figure 4, low CIA was associated with low thwarted belongingness in the context of minimal experiences of intersectional discrimination. The results from this moderation analysis are similar to the results of CIA’s ability to moderate the relationship between day-to-day
discrimination and thwarted belongingness. Further interpretations of the two analyses will be provided in the discussion section.

**Discussion**

Suicide is one of the top causes of death for people in the United States (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2021). Both Latinx and LGBQ people have been identified as high risk groups for suicidal ideation and related mental health issues (Gulbas et al., 2019; McKay et al., 2019; Pollitt & Mallory, 2021; Woodward et al., 2014). While discrimination has been linked to suicide risk and poorer mental health outcomes, few studies have taken an intersectional approach to examine the risk factors for people belonging to multiple marginalized and high risk groups (Brenes, 2021; Salentine et al., 2020; Toomey et al., 2017). Using an intersectional lens allows for a deeper examination of risk factors specific to the LGBQ Latinx experience, such as conflicts in allegiances (CIA), that may not be relevant to people with different intersecting experiences. This project utilizes an intersectional approach to extend the understanding of the role of oppression and interpersonal factors in suicidal ideation for LGBQ Latinx people. Specifically, this study examined thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness as mediators between intersectional discrimination and suicidal ideation as well as CIA as a potential moderator.

Prior to offering an interpretation of the results, it is necessary to reorient to the framework of intersectionality. In empirical literature, intersectionality is often used as a synonym for multiple marginalized identities (Grzanka & Miles, 2016; Moradi & Grzanka, 2017). However, the original definition of intersectionality focuses on systems of oppression and how people live in and are subjected to these systems simultaneously (Crenshaw, 1989; Moradi & Grzanka, 2017). While one of the goals of the current study was to increase the use of
intersectional theory in psychological research, it must be acknowledged that psychological research functions as a system of oppression both historically and currently, from the formulation of new measures, sampling methods, writing styles, interpretations of results, pathologizing marginalized groups, to dissemination (Bharat et al., 2021; Long, 2020; Mullan, 2023). The current study is not exempt from the oppressive norms and roots of psychological research. While trying to maintain an intersectional framework, the discussion also explores some constructs separately (e.g. day-to-day discrimination and anticipated discrimination) with the intention of setting the groundwork for a more comprehensive understanding of how the constructs of interest contribute to suicide risk among LGBQ Latinx people.

Before discussing the main hypotheses, preliminary analyses revealed notable findings for several demographic variables. Age was significantly and negatively correlated with anticipated discrimination, day-to-day discrimination and CIA. In other words, older participants reported lower experiences of both discriminations and CIA. This may be best explained by cohort effects. Over the past few decades, the increase in attention to multicultural and gender studies in academic spaces has facilitated younger generations’ ability to identify and name experiences of discrimination. Similarly, generational differences such as media representation, political climate, and access to information through social media and technology have all contributed to the increased awareness and knowledge that younger cohorts have regarding discrimination, intersectionality, and queerness.

Regarding gender, women reported higher perceived burdensomeness and day-to-day discrimination compared to men. One reason for this difference may be experiences with sexism, such as interpersonal gender discrimination and societal gender roles, including the gendered expectation that women are more emotional and others oriented. The Latinx cultural value of
marianismo describes the expectation that women take on a subordinate, family-oriented role (Castillo et al., 2010). An additional element of marianismo is the expectation that women will quietly endure burdens or suffer with grace for the sake of the family (Castillo et al., 2010). Marianismo can perpetuate sexism through the subordination of Latinx women and may contribute to perceived burdensomeness if a woman believes her sexuality may create family discord.

Regarding nativity, individuals born in the United States experienced more perceived burdensomeness and suicidal ideation compared to those born outside of the United States. Systems of oppression that function through cultural beliefs, governing bodies, and xenophobia likely contribute to the varying experiences of first, second and third+ generation immigrants. These additional intersectional considerations may explain some of the differences in perceived burdensomeness, suicidal ideation, and anticipated discrimination between nativity status. LGBQ Latinx individuals who are born in the United States may struggle to balance their upbringing in American culture with the traditional Latinx values and expectations upheld by their parents. The difficulty navigating different cultural values could contribute to increased perceived burdensomeness. These findings reflect existing research on the immigrant health paradox in which Latinx people born in the United States tend to have worse mental health outcomes compared to Latinx immigrants (Markides & Rote, 2015). One possible explanation is that Latinx immigrants may have higher hope for improving their livelihood, whereas subsequent generations tend to be less hopeful and more aware of oppressive systems in the United States (Markides & Rote, 2015).

Participants with both parents born outside of the United States reported more anticipated discrimination compared to those with at least one parent born in the United States. For people
with both parents born outside of the United States, they may experience more anticipated
discrimination due to heightened immigration stress, such as generational stress/trauma from the
immigration experience, or fear of parental deportation. Several studies have demonstrated post-
traumatic and depressive symptoms related to immigration stress, such as hypervigilance,
heighted fear, feelings of powerlessness, and isolation (Martinez et al., 2015; Salas et al., 2013).
Due to the heightened awareness from immigration stress, this could potentially generalize to
other forms of discrimination, increasing experiences of anticipated discrimination.

When examining differences for sexuality, bisexual participants reported higher
experiences of day-to-day discrimination and thwarted belongingness compared to gay and
lesbian participants. Bisexual people often encounter biphobia in everyday life and in LGBQ
spaces, including assumptions that they are confused about their sexuality or are going through a
temporary phase. A systematic review and meta-analysis of suicidal ideation in bisexual
populations found that bisexual participants consistently reported higher suicidal ideation and
suicide attempts compared to gay, lesbian, and heterosexual participants (Salway et al., 2019).
Another study found that internalized bi-negativity (i.e., the internalization of the belief that
bisexuality is an illegitimate sexual orientation) was associated with higher thwarted
belongingness, which in turn was associated with higher suicidal ideation (Chang et al., 2022). In
addition to internalized bi-negativity, being bisexual often means encountering invalidation of
one’s sexuality from multiple communities, which could contribute to developing a sense of
thwarted belongingness.

Noting that the sample for the current study is a non-clinical sample provides important
context for the mean scores and main findings. The study’s sample consisted of individuals who
were self-motivated to complete the questionnaires on their own time, which suggests no
presence of severe psychopathology. When looking at the mean scores for variables of interest, participants reported relatively low levels of thwarted belongingness and moderately low levels of perceived burdensomeness (M = 27.61 and M = 10.4, respectively). Previous empirical investigation of the INQ indicates that clinical inpatient and outpatient samples typically have thwarted belongingness scores higher than 30 and perceived burdensomeness scores above 12 (Mitchell et al., 2020). A recent study proposed outpatient clinical cut-off scores of 36 and 12 for thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness (Silva et al., 2023). Similarly, participants endorsed low levels of suicidal ideation (M = 5.86). This is comparable to the original validation study of the SIDAS, which found an average score of 5.5 in a community sample with a clinical cut-off score of 21 (van Spijker et al., 2014). Finally, participants reported a moderate level of day-to-day discrimination and anticipated discrimination (M = 6.59 and M = 1.96, respectively). In the original validation study for the InDI, queer Latinx participants reported an average day-to-day discrimination score of 4.70, and an average anticipated discrimination score of 1.74 (Scheim & Bauer, 2019). While the current sample’s anticipated discrimination score is similar to the Scheim & Bauer findings, there is slightly higher reporting of day-to-day discrimination in the sample for the current study.

The main objective of the study was to understand greater risk for suicidal ideation among LGBQ Latinx individuals by examining possible underlying mechanisms connecting experiences of discrimination and suicidal ideation through the frameworks of IPTS and intersectionality. Results demonstrated mixed support for study hypotheses. Hypothesis 1 was supported. Anticipated and day-to-day experiences of discrimination significantly predict suicidal ideation among LGBQ Latinx adults. This largely reflects the findings from existing literature connecting experiences of discrimination to suicidal ideation and other poor mental
health outcomes such as depression, anxiety, and hopelessness (Brenes, 2021; de Lange et al., 2022; Layland et al., 2020; Salentine et al., 2020). Of note, the present study examined the combined impact of anticipated and day-to-day discrimination on suicidal ideation. While previous studies have examined different types of discrimination and their connection to suicidality, the present study is the first to look at the combined effects of anticipated discrimination and day-to-day discrimination on suicidal ideation in LGBQ Latinx individuals. Given that people may experience both anticipated and day-to-day discrimination on a daily basis, it is necessary to examine the constructs together. Both constructs likely impact how a person navigates their daily life, if they have hope for the future, and how they view themselves.

The second aim of the current study was to establish the predictive ability of CIA as a predictor of perceived burdensomeness and thwarted belongingness, both constructs of suicidal ideation through the IPTS. The results did not support hypothesis 2 as CIA did not predict perceived burdensomeness or thwarted belongingness among the current sample of LGBQ Latinx adults. Similarly, post-hoc analyses revealed that CIA was not a predictor of suicidal ideation. This finding is surprising given newer empirical literature on CIA’s predictive ability for negative mental health outcomes such as psychological distress, depression, and anxiety in LGBQ Latinx and Asian samples (Pease et al., 2024; Shepherd et al., 2023).

There could be multiple explanations for the nonsignificant findings. Most simply, it is possible that the sample size was too small to create enough power for a significant relationship or CIA is not relevant to suicidal ideation. More likely, there are other factors involved in the relationship between CIA, thwarted belongingness, perceived burdensomeness, and suicidal ideation. For example, Oakey-Frost et al. (2021) found that lower ethnic identity attachment (i.e., one’s sense of belonging and commitment to their ethnic group) was related to greater suicide
risk, with perceived burdensomeness mediating the relationship and thwarted belongingness moderating it. It is possible that while CIA may be a common experience in LGBQ Latinx individuals, those with lower ethnic identity attachment may look to external validation of their ethnic identity. In this sense, they may be more susceptible to the negative impact of CIA, contributing to thwarted belongingness, perceived burdensomeness, and suicidal ideation. On the other hand, those with a more robust sense of ethnic identity attachment may be less impacted by CIA given the internal stability of their sense of ethnic identity. The same could be theorized regarding attachment to sexuality.

Another factor that could contribute to the relationship between CIA and risk for suicidal ideation is hopelessness, characterized by negative expectancies for the future and a belief that one’s situation will not improve. Overall, hopelessness has been identified as a strong predictor of suicidality (Baumeister, 1990; Beck et al., 1974). In IPTS literature, hopelessness strengthens the relationship between perceived burdensomeness, thwarted belongingness, and suicide risk (Hagan et al., 2015; Tucker et al., 2018). Regarding CIA, hopelessness may be an important variable when assessing its predictive ability for thwarted belongingness, perceived burdensomeness, and suicidal ideation. Those who believe there is no hope in reconciling the conflict between sexuality and ethnic identity may be more prone to developing thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness. Conversely, people who have some social circles in which they feel both identities can peacefully coexist might be less impacted by experiences of CIA. This could be demonstrated by the concept of a chosen family. Oftentimes, when faced with familial rejection, LGBQ people will develop close relationships with others that affirm their sexual identities and allow for identity development (Patrón, 2021). For LGBQ Latinx people, finding a community of LGBQ people of color may help with combating the
hopelessness of CIA, decreasing thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness. Given the relative novelty of CIA in empirical literature, there is much to learn about the way CIA functions within the realm of mental health, necessitating further research.

The third aim of the current study examined a moderated parallel mediational model that links *anticipated* intersectional discrimination to suicidal ideation via perceived burdensomeness and thwarted belongingness while accounting for the moderating role of CIA on the indirect effect. Hypothesis 3 was not supported as the moderated mediational model was not significant. CIA did not moderate the mediational relationship between anticipated discrimination, thwarted belongingness and suicidal ideation nor the relationship between anticipated discrimination, perceived burdensomeness and suicidal ideation. However, anticipated discrimination predicted thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness. This finding prompted further analyses later discussed in the post-hoc analyses section.

Similarly, the fourth aim examined a moderated parallel mediational model that links experiences of *day-to-day* intersectional discrimination to suicidal ideation via perceived burdensomeness and thwarted belongingness while accounting for the moderating role of CIA on the indirect effect. Hypothesis 4 was not supported as the moderated mediational model was not significant. However, several interesting findings appeared when testing this model. CIA and day-to-day discrimination predicted thwarted belongingness, but not perceived burdensomeness. Additionally, CIA moderated the pathway between day-to-day discrimination and thwarted belongingness by exacerbating the relationship. Post-hoc analyses also supported CIA as a moderator between day-to-day discrimination and thwarted belongingness.

The current study was the first study to examine the role of CIA in the context of IPTS, providing foundational knowledge for studies moving forward. Multiple important relationships
emerged from the data, which can facilitate in creating a more robust model examining CIA’s role in IPTS. Given that the main models of the current study were not significant (hypotheses 3 and 4) it is necessary to explore other ways in which the variables are related.

CIA moderated the relationship between day-to-day discrimination and thwarted belongingness. Similarly, in post-hoc analyses that combined anticipated and day-to-day discrimination to better capture intersectional discrimination, CIA moderated the relationship between intersectional discrimination and thwarted belongingness. While the results from the combined measure of discrimination should be interpreted with caution given the exploratory nature of the analysis, both moderations show a similar pattern. The results from the current study reflect findings from earlier research on discrimination, identity conflict, and mental health outcomes. In the present study, lower levels of conflict between ethnic identity and sexuality were associated with lower feelings of thwarted belongingness under conditions of low discrimination. This suggests that lower levels of CIA may act as a protective factor in this context compared to average and high levels of CIA. On the other hand, higher levels of CIA were linked to higher feelings of thwarted belongingness in the presence of low discrimination. However, in the context of average and high discrimination, CIA did not significantly moderate thwarted belongingness, with similar levels observed across all levels of CIA.

In related research, higher levels of identity conflict and CIA have been linked to negative mental health outcomes including anxiety, depression, and psychological distress (Papa & Parmenter, 2023; Pease et al., 2024; Shepherd et al., 2023). In two studies, CIA functioned as a mediator between discrimination or rejection and negative mental health outcomes in the sense that higher experiences of discrimination or rejection predicted higher CIA, which in turn predicted worse mental health outcomes (Pease et al., 2024; Shepherd et al., 2023). In another
study, CIA functioned as a moderator by exacerbating the relationship between intersectional microaggressions and negative mental health outcomes. The present study complements extant research by demonstrating how higher levels of CIA present a risk for developing thwarted belongingness under the condition of low discrimination. Furthermore, decreased conflict between identities can function as a protective factor for thwarted belongingness among LGBQ Latinx adults. Given that the current study is the first to examine CIA and intersectional discrimination in the context of IPTS, further research is necessary to increase understanding of how the constructs interact.

Several notable findings regarding the relationship between discrimination, perceived burdensomeness, and thwarted belongingness prompted post-hoc analyses. Within the two moderated mediational models, higher anticipated discrimination and day-to-day discrimination predicted higher thwarted belongingness. However, only higher anticipated discrimination predicted higher perceived burdensomeness. This finding supports previous research demonstrating that some forms of anticipated discrimination, such as anticipated rejection of sexuality, are related to perceived burdensomeness (Hill & Pettit, 2012). Specifically with friends and family, anticipating discrimination may contribute to a person’s belief that they are an inconvenience or burden to their loved ones. While it can be beneficial to examine anticipated discrimination and day-to-day discrimination separately, examining them together allows for a richer analysis through an intersectional framework.

Post-hoc analysis found that when examined in a regression together, both anticipated discrimination and day-to-day discrimination predicted thwarted belongingness, perceived burdensomeness, and CIA. LGBQ Latinx people may experience both anticipated and day-to-day discrimination on a daily basis, making it difficult to attribute outcomes to one or the other.
For this reason, examining both types of discrimination together provides a more holistic picture of the impact of both internal (anticipated discrimination) and external (day-to-day discrimination) mechanisms of oppressive systems (i.e., heterosexism and ethnic discrimination). Internalized heterosexism, ethnicity-related prejudices, and previous experiences of discrimination may influence one’s anticipated discrimination and assumptions that they do not belong or are a burden to other people. When exploring anticipated rejection of sexuality, one study found that experienced parental rejection was only weakly related to perceived burdensomeness (Woodward et al., 2014) whereas another study demonstrated a strong connection between anticipated rejection and perceived burdensomeness (Hill & Pettit, 2012).

Since coming out is a continuous process, anticipated discrimination and experienced discrimination may work together to inform expectations and beliefs of how a person relates to others at an interpersonal level. Such that fetishization of Latinx people in the LGBTQ community or values that perpetuate heterosexism, like mariamiso, may increase a person’s anticipation of discrimination, which in turn predicts higher feelings of thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness.

Overall, the hypothesized moderated mediational models were not supported but results provided valuable insight into the connection between intersectional discrimination, CIA, thwarted belongingness, and perceived burdensomeness among LGBQ Latinx adults. The current study was the first to reveal CIA’s role in the IPTS, demonstrating that low levels of CIA predict low thwarted belongingness in the context of low discrimination. Furthermore, higher anticipated discrimination and day-to-day discrimination predicted an increase in thwarted belongingness, perceived burdensomeness and suicidal ideation in LGBQ Latinx adults. Generally, the findings
of the study support the existing literature on discrimination, identity conflict, and mental health outcomes in LGBTQ people of color.

**Limitations**

This study has several notable limitations. First, the study is cross-sectional in nature, therefore causal relationships cannot be drawn from the results. Second, the results may not be generalizable. Given that participants are required to disclose their sexuality, the data only includes people who are out to some degree. Results may not generalize to individuals who have decided to conceal their sexuality to minimize CIA, therefore the study may not fully capture the moderating abilities of CIA on experiences of discrimination and thwarted belongingness/perceived burdensomeness. Similarly, the method of participant recruitment may have influenced study results. The study was primarily distributed via organizations and health/community centers with an LGBTQ, Latinx, or suicide prevention focus. Additionally, study flyers were posted in major cities including Chicago and Miami. Due to the nature of study recruitment, many of the participants likely were connected with identity-focused communities. The final sample size of the current study after data cleaning was relatively small (n = 100) which could have impacted the strength of certain relationships, impairing the study’s ability to fully analyze the proposed models. Overall, the study included minimal measures and took about 10 minutes to complete to minimize participant burden and increase chances of participants completing the entire survey. This limited the ability of the study to examine a wider variety of covariates and related constructs.

Measures for thwarted belongingness, perceived burdensomeness, and suicidal ideation while validated in the population of interest, they were not created specifically for a LGBQ or Latinx context. Because of this, the measures may not fully encompass unique experiences of the
population, such as the role of traditional cultural values in thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness or how cultural views of suicide may impact someone’s willingness to endorse suicidal ideation. While the intersectional discrimination index addresses a necessary gap in research, the subscales use different scales and scoring systems, which makes it difficult to combine the subscales to create a total score for the different facets of discrimination. To better understand the combined impact of different facets of intersectional discrimination, it is imperative that future research seeks to validate a combined measure of anticipated and day-to-day discrimination.

**Future Studies**

Future studies should continue to assess suicidal ideation using an intersectional framework for LGBQ Latinx people as well as other marginalized groups. Given the differences in experiences within LGBTQ people and the significant gap in empirical literature, future studies should also examine intersectional discrimination, CIA, and IPTS specifically within the context of experiences of transgender and asexual individuals. Additionally, the current study utilized a community sample, therefore future research should assess discrimination, CIA, and IPTS in clinical populations and those who utilize crisis services.

Different research designs would further enhance the understanding of the constructs of interest. Specifically, a qualitative study design would allow people to share their own experiences of navigating intersectional discrimination and the conflict between sexuality and Latinx identity, aiding the construction of a more robust model of the role of CIA in IPTS. A longitudinal design would also aid in understanding the causal relationship between constructs. Specifically, much of literature is divided into understanding the experiences of either LGBQ Latinx adolescents or LGBQ Latinx adults. A longitudinal design would help to bridge the two
areas of literature by assessing differences in experiences of discrimination, CIA, thwarted belongingness, perceived burdensomeness, and suicidal ideation through the transition from adolescence to adulthood.

Future research should explore the relationship between CIA, thwarted belongingness, perceived burdensomeness, and suicidal ideation to further elucidate when CIA is a risk factor for certain mental health outcomes. Previous literature can inform some of the potential variables to include in future studies. Some relevant variables to explore include: level of outness, rejection from loved ones, endorsement of Latinx cultural values, different realms of social support, religion, identity salience, preexisting mental health conditions, and engagement with community or mental health services (Abreu et al., 2023; Caba et al., 2022; Goodman, 2024; Oakley et al., 2018; Pease et al., 2024; Roberts & Christens, 2020; Shepherd et al., 2023).

**Implications and Conclusion**

LGBQ people are among the higher risk groups for suicidal ideation and related mental health concerns (Gulbas et al., 2019; McKay et al., 2019; Pollitt & Mallory, 2021; Woodward et al., 2014). Experiences of discrimination are often identified as a significant predictor of suicidal ideation and poor mental health outcomes among LGBQ people of color (Brenes, 2021; de Lange et al., 2022; Layland et al., 2020; Salentine et al., 2020). Despite the known connection between discrimination and suicidal ideation, there is minimal research examining the pathways connecting experiences of intersectional discrimination and suicidal ideation among LGBQ Latinx people (Toomey et al., 2017). The goal of the current study was to implement an intersectional approach to better understand how experiences of intersectional discrimination and CIA interact with the IPTS constructs of thwarted belongingness and perceived burdensomeness to predict suicidal ideation in LGBQ Latinx adults.
The current study had multiple notable findings. CIA moderated the relationship between day-to-day discrimination and thwarted belongingness. In the context of low discrimination, people with low identity conflict experienced lower thwarted belongingness, suggesting that higher CIA is a risk factor for thwarted belongingness. The second notable finding is that anticipated and day-to-day discrimination predicted perceived burdensomeness, thwarted belongingness, and suicidal ideation. Results prompt the need to continue research that does not try to separate elements of intersectional oppression and instead constructs more holistic models.

The current study was novel in its approach to not only examining the combined impact of heterosexism and ethnic discrimination, but also examining internal and external manifestations of discrimination (anticipated and day-to-day discrimination, respectively).

While main study hypotheses pertaining to the interaction between discrimination, CIA and IPTS constructs were unsupported, findings are still important in informing future research on an intersectional understanding of the experiences of LGBQ Latinx people and their increased risk for suicidal ideation. The current study elucidated the protective abilities of low levels of CIA in the context of low discrimination. This expands on the previous research which indicates that high feelings of identity conflict present an increased risk for negative mental health outcomes. The results provide foundational knowledge for an intersectional understanding of the role of CIA in predicting risk for suicidal ideation and other negative mental health outcomes among LGBQ Latinx adults.
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Table 1

Participant Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of total sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexuality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay/Lesbian</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latinx</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AfroLatinx</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Birth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in U.S.</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in Other Country</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent Place of Birth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Born Outside of U.S.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Least One Parent Born in U.S.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $50,000</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $75,000</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $75,000</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.32***</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.33***</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|     | M         |        |              |                   |                          |                            |                               |                               |        |                            |                         |                     |
|-----|-----------|--------|--------------|-------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------|-----------------------------|                         |                     |
|     | 29.04     |        |              |                   |                          |                            |                               |                               |        |                            |                         |                     |
|     | 7.48      |        |              |                   |                          |                            |                               |                               |        |                            |                         |                     |

Note. * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001 Spearman correlations reported for gender, sexuality, place of birth, parent place of birth, and annual household income. All other correlations are Pearson correlations.
Table 3

*Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Intersectional Discrimination Predicting Suicidal Ideation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-1.72</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated discrimination</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day-to-day discrimination</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p* < .05, **p** < .001 Full model $F(3, 96) = 4.45$, $R^2 = .12$, $p = .006$
Table 4

Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Conflicts in Allegiances Predicting Thwarted Belongingness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>28.42</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22.33</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexuality</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * p < .05, ** p < .001 Full model $F(2, 97) = 2.07, R^2 = .04, p = .132$
**Table 5**

*Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Conflicts in Allegiances Predicting Perceived Burdensomeness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexuality</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p* < .05, **p** < .001 Full model $F(4, 95) = 2.17, R^2 = .08, p = .078
Table 6

*Moderated Mediation Analysis for Anticipated Discrimination, Thwarted Belongingness, Perceived Burdensomeness, Conflicts in Allegiances, and Suicidal Ideation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediator – Thwarted Belongingness</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predictor: Anticipated Discrimination</td>
<td>10.36*</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator: CIA</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction: Anticipated Discrimination X CIA</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediator – Perceived Burdensomeness</td>
<td>4.87*</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator: CIA</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction: Anticipated Discrimination X CIA</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome - Suicidal Ideation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediator: Thwarted Belongingness</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediator: Perceived Burdensomeness</td>
<td>0.61***</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor: Anticipated Discrimination</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediator – Thwarted Belongingness</th>
<th>Boot ind. effect</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1 SD</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-0.18, 1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-0.11, 1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SD</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-0.40, 1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediator – Perceived Burdensomeness</td>
<td>Boot ind. effect</td>
<td>Boot SE</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 SD</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>0.58, 3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>0.32, 2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SD</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-0.88, 2.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. * p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p < .001. participant place of birth was covaried in analysis. CI = confidence interval
Table 7

*Moderated Mediation Analysis for Day-to-Day Discrimination, Thwarted Belongingness, Perceived Burdensomeness, Conflicts in Allegiances, and Suicidal Ideation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediator – Thwarted Belongingness</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predictor: Day-to-Day Discrimination</td>
<td>1.90*</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator: CIA</td>
<td>3.86**</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction: Day-to-Day Discrimination X CIA</td>
<td>-0.40*</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-2.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediator – Perceived Burdensomeness</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predictor: Day-to-Day Discrimination</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator: CIA</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction: Day-to-Day Discrimination X CIA</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome - Suicidal Ideation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediator: Thwarted Belongingness</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediator: Perceived Burdensomeness</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.58***</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor: Day-to-Day Discrimination</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediator – Thwarted Belongingness</th>
<th>Boot ind. effect</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1 SD</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-0.02, .33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-0.02, .13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SD</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-0.19, .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediator – Perceived Burdensomeness</th>
<th>Boot ind. effect</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1 SD</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-0.07, .53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>0.01, .39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SD</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-0.09, .41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. * p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p < .001. participant place of birth was covaried in analysis. CI = confidence interval*
Figure 3

*Graph Illustrating the Interactions Between Day-to-Day Discrimination and CIA on Thwarted Belongingness.*
Table 8

Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Intersectional Discrimination Predicting Thwarted Belongingness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.19</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>7.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexuality</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated discrimination</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day-to-day discrimination</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * p < .05, ** p < .001 Full model $F(5, 90) = 2.93, R^2 = .14, p = .017.$
Table 9

Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Intersectional Discrimination Predicting Perceived Burdensomeness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexuality</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated discrimination</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day-to-day discrimination</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * p < .05, ** p < .001 Full model $F(7, 88) = 3.41, R^2 = .21, p = .003$. 
Table 10

Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Intersectional Discrimination Predicting CIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated discrimination</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day-to-day discrimination</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.31*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p < .05, **p < .001 Full model $F(4, 91) = 5.68, R^2 = .20, p < .001.
Figure 4

*Graph Illustrating the Interactions Between Intersectional Discrimination and CIA on Thwarted Belongingness.*
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