Developmental Psychology
2000, Vol. 36, No. 2, 241–250

Copyright 2000 by the American Psychological Association, Inc.
0012-1649/00/$5.00 DOI: 10.1037//0012-1649.36.2.241

Sexual Identity, Attractions, and Behavior Among Young Sexual-Minority Women Over a 2-Year Period

Lisa M. Diamond
University of Utah

NOTICE: THIS MATERIAL MAY BE PROTECTED BY COPYRIGHT LAW (TITLE 17, U.S. CODE)

Previous research suggests that the sexual identities, attractions, and behaviors of sexual-minority (i.e., nonheterosexual) women change over time, yet there have been few longitudinal studies addressing this question, and no longitudinal studies of sexual-minority youths. The results of 2-year follow-up interviews with 80 lesbian, bisexual, and "unlabeled" women who were first interviewed at 16–23 years of age are reported. Half of the participants changed sexual-minority identities more than once, and one third changed identities since the first interview. Changes in sexual attractions were generally small but were larger among bisexuals and unlabeled women. Most women pursued sexual behavior consistent with their attractions, but one fourth of lesbians had sexual contact with men between the two interviews. These findings suggest that there is more fluidity in women's sexual identities and behaviors than in their attractions. This fluidity may stem from the prevalence of nonexclusive attractions among sexual-minority women.

The transition from a heterosexual to a gay male, lesbian, or bisexual identity is frequently described as a discovery of one's authentic self, after which little change in sexual identity, attractions, and behavior takes place. However, several researchers have noted that this model does not adequately represent women's experiences (Golden, 1987, 1996; Kitzinger, 1987; Kitzinger & Wilkinson, 1995; Rust, 1993; Sophie, 1986). Women are more likely than men to experience sexual behaviors or attractions over the life course that run counter to their ascribed identities (Bell, Weinberg, & Hammersmith, 1981; Chapman & Brannock, 1987; Dixon, 1984; Rust, 1992; Sophie, 1986), to report changes in sexual attractions over time (Weinberg, Williams, & Pryor, 1994), and to ascribe a role for choice, circumstance, and change in both sexual identity and sexual attractions (Esterberg, 1994; Golden, 1996; Whisman, 1996).

As a result, some researchers, clinicians, and laypeople have colloquially described women's sexuality as relatively fluid. Yet there is little consensus on the meaning of this claim or how it might be empirically tested. The term *fluidity* has been used to refer to longitudinal changes in sexual identity, attractions, and behavior as well as contemporaneous inconsistencies among these domains. Not only might these phenomena have different causes, but they have different implications for conceptualizations of *sexual orientation,* generally understood as an individual's essential predisposition to experience sexual attractions for persons of the same sex, the other sex, or both sexes (Bell et al., 1981; Money, 1988). *Sexual identity,* in contrast, refers to the self-concept an individual organizes around this predisposition (Cass, 1984), typically labeled (in this culture) *gay, lesbian,* or *bisexual.* It is noteworthy that these labels need never be disclosed to others (Cohen & Savin-Williams, 1996). Whereas sexual orientation is presumed to be early developing and stable (Bell et al., 1981; Green, 1988; Money, 1988), sexual identity is presumed to develop in adolescence or adulthood and to vary as a result of social, historical, and cultural factors (Kitzinger, 1987; Rust, 1993; Weinberg et al., 1994).

Fluidity in sexual identity, then, might simply amount to changing the label applied to one's sexual orientation under different circumstances. Fluidity in sexual attractions, however, implies change at the level of sexual orientation itself, given that sexual attractions are considered a critical index of sexual orientation. Fluidity in sexual behavior could arise for a number of reasons. In some cases it might result from changes in underlying attractions; in other cases, from environmental factors such as restricted access to same-sex partners. Clearly, fluidity in identity, attractions, and behavior may occur with different frequencies and for different causes and should be independently assessed.

Prospective research is indispensable, given the dearth of longitudinal data on sexual orientation (Gonsiorek & Rudolph, 1991; Herdt, 1990). In the past decade, four longitudinal studies have been published on lesbian, gay male, or bisexual (e.g., sexual-minority) individuals (Pattatucci & Hamer, 1995; Stokes, Damon, & McKirnan, 1997; Stokes, McKirnan, & Burzette, 1993; Weinberg et al., 1994). Given the difficulty of conducting prospective research on stigmatized minority populations, these studies have made an invaluable contribution to the literature on this topic. Yet they do not constitute a sufficient empirical base to support definitive claims regarding female sexual fluidity, particularly because only the first and last of these studies included women. Weinberg et al. (1994) collected 5-year follow-up data on a small sample of women (n = 27) and men (n = 28) recruited through a San Francisco bisexual organization in the early 1980s, nearly all of

Selected findings from this research were presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Research on Adolescence, San Diego, March 1998. I gratefully acknowledge the participation and assistance of the people at the recruitment sites, as well as Ritch Savin-Williams and Cindy Hazan for their comments on an earlier version of this article.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Lisa M. Diamond, Department of Psychology, University of Utah, 390 South 1530 East, Room 502, Salt Lake City, Utah 84112-0251. Electronic mail may be sent to diamond@psych.utah.edu.

whom were over 30 years old. This study is particularly valuable because of its long time frame and its inclusion of both men and women. However, because longitudinal assessments were collected from bisexuals only, it does not permit comparisons between changes experienced by lesbian and bisexual women. Pattucci and Hamer (1995) collected 18-month follow-up data from 175 lesbian, bisexual, and heterosexual women. This study had a shorter time frame than that of Weinberg et al., but it is distinguished by its substantially larger and more diverse sample. Unfortunately, the authors averaged respondents' ratings of sexual attraction, fantasy, behavior, and self-identification, preventing comparisons among different domains over time.

Most important, both of these studies were conducted with adults who identified themselves as members of sexual minorities in the 1970s and 1980s. Contemporary young women identify themselves in a social environment characterized by vastly greater visibility and acceptance of same-sex sexuality, factors that are known to influence experiences and expressions of same-sex sexuality (Bell & Weinberg, 1978; Gagnon, 1990; Laumann, Gagnon, Michael, & Michaels, 1994). Such women may have more freedom than previous cohorts to adopt identities and engage in behaviors that accord with their underlying sexual attractions, leading to more consistency and stability in identity, attractions, and behavior over time. The current research examines this possibility by presenting 2-year follow-up data on a sample of adolescent and young adult sexual-minority women who were first interviewed shortly after they first relinquished heterosexual identities (Diamond, 1998). Because it is the first prospective study of sexual-minority women of this age and cohort, this study makes a unique contribution to research on female sexual orientation.

Previous Research

Sexual Identity

The process by which sexual minorities come to acknowledge their sexual orientation is called *sexual identity development,* which has been modeled as a linear sequence of psychological stages beginning with tentative questioning of one's sexuality and ending with the adoption of an identity label corresponding to one's sexual orientation (for a review, see Cohen & Savin-Williams, 1996). As Sophie (1986) noted, these models presume that once individuals "come out" to themselves as lesbian, gay, or bisexual, no further change occurs. Yet for many sexual-minority women, the first sexual-minority identity they adopt is not the last. Rust (1992) found that among 400 adult sexual-minority women, 75% of the bisexual respondents had once identified themselves as lesbian, and over 40% of the lesbian respondents had once identified themselves as bisexual.

Fluidity between lesbian and bisexual labels may be an inevitable consequence of the fact that most sexual-minority women experience attractions for both sexes, although in widely varying degrees (Laumann et al., 1994). From the beginning of the modern gay movement in the 1970s, individuals with bisexual attractions have tended to adopt lesbian or gay identities because they lacked knowledge about the existence of bisexuality or encountered prejudice against bisexuals within lesbian and gay male communities (Fox, 1995; Rust, 1993). Many such individuals changed identity labels after discovering the concept of bisexuality or entering environments more supportive of bisexuality.

Contemporary young sexual-minority women have far more information about same-sex sexuality than their counterparts had in previous generations (Fox, 1995; Rust, 1992), perhaps making it easier for them to accurately "match" their sexual orientation to an appropriate identity label. For this reason, identity changes are expected to be less common among contemporary young women than among previous cohorts when Rust's (1992) data are used as a basis for comparison.[1] This effect may be most noticeable among bisexual women, given the vastly increased visibility and perceived legitimacy of bisexuality in the current social climate. Mainstream magazines, television shows, and films increasingly address the topic of bisexuality, and most gay–lesbian political and social organizations now include the word *bisexual* in their titles. Thus, contemporary young women with bisexual attractions may be more likely to identify themselves as bisexual from the outset rather than after an initial period of lesbian identification.

When identity transitions do occur, they are expected to be consistent with sexual attractions. Among Rust's (1992) respondents, the majority of lesbians reported that more than 75% of their sexual attractions were to women, whereas the majority of bisexuals reported that fewer than 75% of their sexual attractions were to women. Notably, the same implicit boundary emerged in the first wave of data from the current sample (Diamond, 1998), suggesting some degree of cultural consensus regarding the distinction between lesbian and bisexual orientations. Thus, it is expected that women whose same-sex attractions fluctuate across this 75% boundary between Time 1 and Time 2 will be more likely to change identity labels than will women whose attractions do not.

Same-Sex Attractions

Sexual attractions are typically considered the most reliable indicators of sexual orientation (Marmor, 1980). Although sexual behaviors and identities are significantly structured by historical circumstances, cultural norms, and social opportunities, the ratio of one's same-sex to other-sex attractions is generally taken to represent one's underlying predisposition to experience attractions for women, men, or both. This is commonly represented as a "Kinsey rating" between 0 and 6 (Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948). A rating of 0 represents exclusive other-sex attractions, a rating of 6 represents exclusive same-sex attractions, and a rating of 3 represents equal degrees of same-sex and other-sex attractions.

The Kinsey scale has been criticized for its implicit presumption that same-sex sexuality varies in inverse proportion to other-sex sexuality. Shively and DeCecco (1977) recommended conceptualizing heterosexuality and homosexuality as independent, parallel dimensions rather than as opposite ends of a single, bipolar continuum. Although this approach is more flexible and theoretically sophisticated than the bipolar approach, its validity and practical significance remain unknown. Two recent articles that collectively summarized over 100 studies of sexual orientation found that almost none measured same-sex and other-sex attractions as par-

[1] Although Rust's (1992) data were published less than 10 years ago, the mean age of her participants was approximately 30 and the mean age at which they first questioned their sexual identities was 18. Thus, her respondents typically underwent sexual questioning in the late 1970s and early 1980s, whereas the women in the current sample typically did so in the early to mid-1990s.

allel, independent dimensions (Chung & Katayama, 1996; Sell, 1996). One reason for this may be that the independent-dimension approach is better suited to assessing the intensity of same-sex and other-sex attractions than their relative frequency. For example, a woman who almost never experiences attractions to men would typically be considered a lesbian even if her (rare) other-sex attractions were as intense as her same-sex attractions. Thus, although the intensity of her attractions should not be modeled on a bipolar continuum, forcing a trade-off between same-sex and other-sex attractions, such a continuum can meaningfully represent the fact that she is far more frequently attracted to women than to men.

Stability of Same-Sex Attractions

One's propensity to experience same-sex attractions more often, less often, or equally as often as other-sex attractions is generally presumed to be stable over the life course, although subjective awareness of sexual attractions may fluctuate. Some sexual minorities report that they were wholly unaware of same-sex attractions in childhood and early adolescence (Diamond, 1998; Golden, 1987, 1996; Shuster, 1987), yet others attest that these attractions were always present, albeit unacknowledged (Savin-Williams, 1996). Once sexual minorities acknowledge same-sex attractions, one might expect these attractions to stabilize. However, Weinberg et al.'s (1994) longitudinal study found that approximately 60% of bisexuals gave a different Kinsey rating for sexual–romantic attractions after a 5-year interval. This figure was 50% in Stokes et al.'s (1997) 1-year follow-up study of predominantly bisexual adult men. Using averaged Kinsey ratings of sexual attraction, fantasy, sexual behavior, and self-identification, Pattatucci and Hamer (1995) found that only 20% of sexual-minority women gave different ratings after a 12–18-month period. Bisexuals were more likely than lesbians to do so. In both studies, most changes were only one Kinsey point in magnitude.

Thus, although sexual minorities often recollect substantial differences between attractions experienced in adulthood and those experienced in childhood or adolescence, large-scale changes in adult attractions appear uncommon. One possible explanation for this discrepancy is that the maturational processes of adolescence may heighten variability in adolescent sexual feelings. This view is fairly common among both laypeople and scientists (Kitzinger & Wilkinson, 1995; Money, 1990; Remafedi, 1990). Yet because no longitudinal studies have assessed changes in sexual attractions over the transition between adolescence and young adulthood, this view is without empirical support. The current research directly addressed this issue by comparing the frequency and magnitude of young sexual-minority women's changes in sexual attractions with those reported in studies of previous cohorts. Among contemporary young women, larger changes were expected among bisexual and unlabeled women than among lesbians, and younger respondents were expected to undergo greater changes in attractions than were older respondents.

Sexual Behavior

Many adolescents engage in sexual behavior inconsistent with their sexual attractions (Kitzinger & Wilkinson, 1995; Laumann et al., 1994; Rust, 1992; Savin-Williams, 1998), and therefore such behavior is not a reliable index of adult sexual orientation (Remafedi, 1990). Heterosexual adolescents might experiment with same-sex behavior out of curiosity, and sexual-minority adolescents might experiment with other-sex relationships for the same reason. Sexual-minority youths might also engage in other-sex behavior to hide their same-sex sexual orientation or because they do not have access to same-sex partners. Yet recent increases in the visibility of same-sex sexuality and the proliferation of gay–lesbian–bisexual community settings appear to have created greater opportunities for sexual minorities to engage in same-sex sexual contact in supportive environments. Thus, in this research I explored the association between Time 1 attractions and subsequent sexual behavior among contemporary young women.

Particular attention was devoted to lesbians who violate traditional models of sexual orientation by pursuing other-sex behavior. Because this group is expected to be small in number, this area of investigation is intended to be exploratory, serving to guide future hypothesis building rather than to support robust conclusions. Research on adult women in previous cohorts has found that many openly identified lesbians (40% in Rust's, 1992, sample) periodically engage in other-sex behavior (Chapman & Brannock, 1987; Rust, 1992). One potential explanation for these findings concerns the pressure women have historically faced to engage in traditional marriage and family arrangements at the expense of their own sexual gratification (Gagnon, 1990; Pillard, 1990). Such pressure may prompt some lesbians to engage in relationships with men despite their preference for women. Another potential explanation is that the pervasive stigmatization of same-sex sexuality leads some lesbians to consider returning to heterosexual behavior and a heterosexual identity, even after lengthy periods of lesbian identification. Such women may "test" this possibility by engaging in other-sex sexual relationships. Both of these explanations are consistent with Rust's (1992) finding that women who came out in the relatively repressive 1970s were more likely to engage in subsequent other-sex behavior than were those who came out in later, more tolerant decades.

Not only do contemporary young lesbians encounter less pressure to marry than did women in previous cohorts, but they face an environment of unprecedented (albeit not universal) tolerance of same-sex sexuality. For these reasons, they might forego unwanted other-sex sexual contact entirely. In the current research, I examined whether this was the case and also explored one of the unexpected findings that emerged in the first wave of data: One fourth of lesbians listed a man (typically a high-school boyfriend) among their strongest prior attractions despite having reported almost no current attractions to men (Diamond, 1998). In exploratory analyses, I investigated whether these women eventually pursued male sexual partners or switched to a bisexual identity since the first interview.

Method

Participants

Participants were 80 women between the ages of 18 and 25 years who were initially interviewed in person as part of a longitudinal study of sexual identity development among young women (Diamond, 1998). The original sample consisted of 89 women; 9 women could not be located for follow-up. At the initial assessment, all participants had a nonheterosexual sexual identity or declined to label their sexual orientation. Data presented here

were collected during 2-year follow-up interviews conducted over the phone. Sampling took place across a range of settings, including (a) lesbian, gay, and bisexual community events (i.e., picnics, parades, social events) and youth groups in two moderately sized cities and in a number of smaller urban and rural communities in central New York state; (b) classes on gender and sexuality issues taught at a large, private university in central New York; and (c) lesbian, gay, and bisexual student groups at a large private university, a large public university, and a small, private, women's college in central New York.

The sampling strategy relied heavily on social and support groups for lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals as well as on college classes; however, limitations were associated with each group. Organized community groups underrepresent individuals who choose not to openly identify themselves as lesbian, gay, or bisexual, as well as those with little interest in a social or support group organized around that identification. Recruitment in college courses on gender and sexuality was undertaken in an attempt to sample these underrepresented groups; such classes often draw women who acknowledge same-sex attractions but who do not identify themselves as lesbian or bisexual. However, these settings overrepresent White, highly educated, upper middle-class women.

I met with each group and described the nature and aims of the research, explained the selection criteria (rejection or questioning of heterosexual identification), and distributed flyers describing the research and documenting approval by the Cornell University Committee on Human Subjects. Interested participants were asked to provide their names and phone numbers at that time or to contact me by phone or electronic mail. Ninety-five percent of the women attending lesbian, gay, or bisexual youth/student groups or community events volunteered for the study; those who declined to volunteer cited lack of interest as the reason. Response rates for college classes on gender and sexuality are inestimable because it is unknown how many students in each class met the selection criteria. Women who were uncomfortable with their sexuality or with the questioning of their sexual identity were likely to be underrepresented. Efforts were made to include these women by emphasizing that identification as lesbian or bisexual was not a criterion for participation, that interviews were confidential, and that they would not be audio- or videotaped.

At the beginning of the interview, each woman was asked, "How do you currently label your sexual identity *to yourself,* even if it's different from what you might tell other people? If you're still questioning your sexual identity or you don't apply *any* label to your sexual identity, please say so." All lesbian-identified and bisexual-identified women were categorized according to their chosen identity labels. Any woman who was still questioning her sexual identity or who did not apply a label to her sexual identity was classified as *unlabeled.* Comparisons between women who were still questioning their sexual identities and other unlabeled women on all variables under analysis revealed no significant differences, and they were therefore combined. Because unlabeled women are underrepresented in research on sexual minorities and are entirely absent from longitudinal studies of sexual orientation, their inclusion in the current sample is notable. The mean and median age of the participants was 22 years, and there were no significant age differences across settings or sexual identity categories. Nearly all of the college-aged participants had enrolled in college at one point (71% of respondents), 13% had completed college, 9% had completed high school, and 6% had not completed high school. Three fourths came from families in which at least one parent had completed college. The highest occupational level attained by either parent was professional/technical for 63% of respondents, managerial for 17% of respondents, clerical for 6%, and labor/operative for 14%. In all, 85% of respondents were White, 5% African American, 9% Latina, and 1% Asian American.

Procedure

Time 1 assessments were scripted, face-to-face interviews that I conducted with each woman; approximately 90% of these assessments lasted between 1 and 1.5 hr. When possible, interviews were conducted in a university office. When this was not feasible, interviews were conducted at a location of the participant's choosing, usually her home. Other locations included outdoor parks, coffeehouses, and restaurants. In the course of obtaining informed consent, I told each woman that the interview addressed prior and current sexual attractions and the sexual questioning process. The confidentiality of the interview was stressed, and each participant was instructed of her right to refrain from answering any of the interview questions or to terminate the interview at any time. None of the participants did so. At the close of the interview, each woman was given the opportunity to revise her answers to any of the questions or to add additional remarks.

Time 1 interviews focused primarily on sexual identity development, as described in the first report on this sample (Diamond, 1998). The measure used to assess same-sex attractions was a blank pie chart divided into 16 equal regions totaling 100%. Participants were instructed to "fill this in to represent the percentage of your current sexual attractions that are directed toward the same sex on a day-to-day basis." This yields an estimate of the relative frequency of same-sex versus other-sex attractions, regardless of the intensity of these attractions or the total number of sexual attractions experienced on a day-to-day basis.[2] Relative frequency of attractions was selected for assessment because pilot interviews and published research (e.g., Rust, 1992; Sell, 1996) suggested that this is one of the primary criteria individuals use to evaluate their sexual orientation and select an appropriate sexual identity label.

I reinterviewed 90% of the participants over the phone 2 years later. Four lesbian, 1 bisexual, and 4 unlabeled participants could not be relocated. None of the women who were recontacted declined to be reinterviewed. All follow-up interviews took place within 2 months of the target reinterview date. Each interview followed a standard script and lasted between 20 and 30 min. Because of the sensitivity of the subject matter, neither Time 1 nor Time 2 interviews were recorded. Instead, verbatim transcriptions were handwritten (Time 1) or typed (Time 2) while interviews were conducted. Using the same questions and procedures that were used in the first interview, in the follow-up interview I reassessed current sexual identity and relative frequency of day-to-day same-sex versus other-sex sexual attractions.

During the second interview, each participant indicated the number of men and women with whom she had engaged in sexual contact since the first interview (defined as any sexually motivated intimate contact) by selecting one of four response categories for each sex (0 = *none,* 1 = *one,* 2 = *two or three,* 3 = *four or more*). The number of female partners was divided by the total number of partners to represent the percentage of a respondent's sexual partners over the past 2 years who were women. In computing this index, I used 3 as the numerical estimate for the category of "two or three partners" and 4 for "four or more partners." Thus, a score of zero represents exclusive other-sex partners, a score of 50 represents equal numbers of same-sex and other-sex partners, and a score of 100 represents exclusive same-sex partners.

[2] To assess the reliability of the measure of relative frequency of same-sex attractions, I collected 2-week test–retest data from a sample of 26 sexual-minority men (75% gay, 13% bisexual, 13% unlabeled) and 18 sexual-minority women (22% lesbian, 39% bisexual, 39% unlabeled) recruited from gay, lesbian, and bisexual organizations at Cornell University, where 38% of the original sample was recruited. No participants changed sexual identity labels over the 2-week period. The correlation between the first and second assessment of the percentage of sexual attractions directed toward the same sex was .99 among both men and women. The mean absolute difference between the two assessments was 4 points among women (SD = 4) and 3 points among men (SD = 3). The mean raw difference was −2 among women (SD = 5) and −1 among men (SD = 4). Thus, this measure is highly reliable.

It is important to note that this variable is not equivalent to the relative frequency of same-sex and other-sex sexual acts. Questions regarding the number and nature of sexual acts performed with each partner were considered unnecessarily intrusive, given that consistency among attractions, behavior, and identity (the primary focus of the study) can be assessed without this level of detail. For example, a lesbian-identified woman who engages in sexual contact with a man clearly violates the traditional conceptualization of lesbians as wholly uninterested in other-sex sexual contact, regardless of whether the sexual act consists of genital fondling or full sexual intercourse. Along the same lines, a woman with predominantly same-sex attractions who has more female than male sexual partners can be said to show concordance between her attractions and behavior, regardless of the number of sexual acts performed with each partner. Although same-sex versus cross-sex partner choice is also influenced by external factors such as the availability of each type of partner, this index appeared to be the most intuitively meaningful and the least intrusive summary of participants' sexual behavior between Times 1 and 2.

Results

Sexual Identity

Except where indicated, all significance tests used an alpha of .05. Because of the small sample size, many planned analyses have low statistical power, and this fact must be taken into consideration when interpreting any null findings. The changes in sexual identity before and after the first interview are summarized in Table 1. At Time 1, 29% of participants had changed sexual identity labels after first relinquishing a heterosexual identity (50% of lesbians and 22% of bisexuals). After Time 1, 32% of participants changed identity labels (23% of bisexuals, 21% of lesbians, and 52% of unlabeled participants). When identity changes that occurred both before and after the first interview were taken into account, 51% of respondents changed identity labels more than once since first questioning their sexuality. Bisexual and lesbian women were not differentially likely to report prior identity changes, $\chi^2(1, N = 60) = 1.8$ (*ns*). Altogether, 44% of lesbians at Time 2 had previously identified themselves as bisexual, and 25% of bisexuals at Time 2 had previously identified themselves as lesbian. As predicted, the percentage of bisexuals at Time 2 who reported prior identity changes was lower than that reported by Rust (1993): 25% ($n = 29$) versus 75% ($n = 55$), $p < .001$. However, lesbian women in the current study were not less likely than were Rust's (1993) respondents to report prior identity changes: 44% ($n = 34$) versus 41% ($n = 346$), *ns*.

Table 1
Change in Sexual Identity Before and After Time 1

Identity transition	Before Time 1		After Time 1	
	n	%	*n*	%
No change	63	70	56	70
Unlabeled → lesbian or bisexual			9	11
Lesbian or bisexual → unlabeled	0	0	5	6
Lesbian → bisexual	7	8	3	4
Bisexual → lesbian	19	21	3	4
Lesbian, bisexual, or unlabeled → heterosexual			4	5
Total	89	100	80	100

The prediction that sexual identity changes would concord with the implicit 75% boundary between prototypically lesbian attractions (>75% same sex) and prototypically bisexual attractions (<75% same sex) was confirmed. In all, 25% of respondents reported that their same-sex attractions crossed this boundary between Times 1 and 2, and 61% of these women changed sexual identities. All identity changes were consistent with the boundary. In other words, all women in this group whose same-sex attractions rose above 75% switched to lesbian labels; those whose same-sex attractions dropped below 75% switched to bisexual labels. In comparison, 21% of women whose attractions did not cross the boundary changed identities. This difference was statistically significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 80) = 11.0$, $p = .009$.

Sexual Attractions

Table 2 presents means, standard deviations, and 95% confidence intervals for Time 1 same-sex attractions, Time 2 same-sex attractions, the difference between these attractions (Time 2 − Time 1, denoted "raw change"), and the absolute value of the difference between these attractions (denoted "absolute change") within each identity group. The data of the bisexual and unlabeled women were combined for these analyses after tests revealed no significant differences between them. Raw changes preserve information about the direction of the change, such that positive means indicate increases in attractions from Time 1 to Time 2, whereas negative means indicate decreases. Raw means close to zero may indicate small changes overall or comparable (and perhaps sizable) changes in opposite directions. Mean absolute changes are always positive, representing the total amount of change between Times 1 and 2 in a particular group, regardless of direction. The correlation between Time 1 and Time 2 percentages of day-to-day same-sex attractions in the total sample was .71 (compared with .99 in the test–retest sample), $p < .001$. This correlation was .23 among lesbians ($p = .19$) and .60 among bisexual–unlabeled women ($p < .001$).

An analysis of covariance was used to test for associations among changes in attractions, age, and sexual identity; absolute change in attractions was the dependent variable, sexual identity (lesbian vs. bisexual–unlabeled) was the between-subjects variable, and age (at Time 1) was a covariate. There was a significant effect of sexual identity, $F(1, 75) = 5.7$, $p < .02$, confirming the prediction that bisexual–unlabeled women would report significantly larger absolute changes in sexual attractions than lesbians (see Table 2). There was no significant effect of age, $F(1, 75) = 2.1$, disconfirming the prediction that younger women would report larger absolute changes in attractions. This analysis was repeated by using raw change in attractions as the dependent variable. Again, there was a significant effect of sexual identity, $F(1, 75) = 7.8$, $p < .007$, representing the fact that bisexual–unlabeled women tended to report increases in attractions, whereas lesbians reported small decreases that were not significantly different from zero (evidenced by the confidence interval in Table 2). There was no effect of age, $F(1, 75) = 1.0$. Removing the data of the unlabeled women did not change the results of either analysis.

Sexual Behavior

The number of participants' same-sex and other-sex sexual partners between Times 1 and 2, stratified by sexual identity

Table 2
Means, Standard Deviations, and 95% Confidence Intervals (CI) for Percentage of Same-Sex Sexual Attractions at Time 1 (T1) and Time 2 (T2), Change in Attractions, and Percentage of Same-Sex Sexual Partners Between Times 1 and 2

	Lesbian			Bisexual/unlabeled			Total		
Attribute of sexuality	*M*	*SD*	CI	*M*	*SD*	CI	*M*	*SD*	CI
Same-sex attractions (%)									
T1	92	8	89–95	50	19	44–56	68	26	62–74
T2	90	16	84–95	61	26	53–69	73	26	67–79
Change in attractions									
Raw change: T2 − T1	−2	16	−8–3	10	21	3–16	4	20	0–9
Absolute change: |T2 − T1|	9	13	5–14	17	15	12–22	14	14	11–17
Same-sex sexual partners between T1 and T2 (%)	93	14	88–98	49	29	41–58	68	32	60–75

category, is presented in Table 3. Means, standard deviations, and 95% confidence intervals for the percentage of same-sex sexual partners between Times 1 and 2 are presented in the bottom row of Table 2 (to facilitate comparisons with percentages of same-sex attractions). One lesbian reported no sexual contact between Times 1 and 2, and her data were deleted from these analyses. There was a significant correlation between predominance of same-sex attractions at Time 1 and percentage of same-sex partners between Times 1 and 2 ($r = .68$, $p < .001$), even when computed among the bisexual–unlabeled women only ($r = .30$, $p < .05$). In all, 24% of Time 1 lesbians ($n = 8$) had engaged in sexual contact with one or more men between the two interviews. A Mann-Whitney U test determined that these women reported a significantly smaller percentage of same-sex attractions at Time 1 than did lesbians who had no sexual contact with men between the two interviews ($U = 42$, $p = .01$), but they were not disproportionately represented among the 10 lesbians who each listed a man among her strongest attractions at Time 1, $\chi^2(1, N = 34) = 1.44$ (*ns*).

A chi-square test was used to investigate whether lesbians who had other-sex sexual contact between the two interviews were more likely to change identity labels than were lesbians who did not have other-sex sexual contact. The results indicated a trend-level association, $\chi^2(1, N = 34) = 2.84$, $p = .09$. Among the 26 lesbians who had only same-sex sexual contact between the two interviews, 3 (12%) changed their identity label. Among the 8 lesbians who had other-sex sexual contact, 3 (38%) changed their identity labels. Of the 10 lesbians who listed a man among their strongest prior attractions at Time 1, 30% changed identity labels between Times 1 and 2 compared with 13% of the remaining 24 lesbians. This difference was not significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 34) = 1.50$.

Table 3
Same-Sex and Other-Sex Sexual Partners Between Times 1 and 2

	Lesbian		Bisexual		Unlabeled		Total	
Partner	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Other sex								
0	26	76	2	8	3	15	31	39
1	6	18	5	19	6	30	17	21
2–3	2	6	13	50	5	25	20	25
4 or more	0	0	6	23	6	30	12	15
Same sex								
0	1	3	6	23	4	20	11	14
1	7	21	2	8	5	25	14	18
2–3	15	44	11	42	5	25	31	39
4 or more	11	32	7	27	6	30	24	30
Total	34	100	26	100	20	100	80	100

Discussion

The model of sexual orientation underlying most social scientific research on gay male, lesbian, and bisexual individuals posits that they possess an early developing, traitlike predisposition to experience sexual attractions for the same sex or for both sexes (Bell et al., 1981; Green, 1988; Money, 1988). The process of acknowledging and accepting these attractions is presumed to culminate in the adoption of a sexual identity label—gay or lesbian for those with exclusive same-sex attractions and bisexual for those with nonexclusive attractions—that concords with one's attractions and remains stable over time (Cass, 1984; Cohen & Savin-Williams, 1996; Troiden, 1989). Once an individual adopts a label, it is assumed that he or she will engage in sexual behavior consistent with the label (i.e., exclusive same-sex behavior among lesbians vs. same-sex and other-sex behavior among bisexuals; Blumstein & Schwartz, 1990; Rust, 1992). The findings of the present short-term longitudinal study complicate this view.

This research finds that contemporary young sexual-minority women show general stability in their sexual attractions and consistency between attractions and behavior over a 2-year period. Yet half of these women reported multiple changes in sexual identity, and nearly one fourth of lesbians pursued sexual contact with men. The findings converge with research on adult women from previous cohorts (Golden, 1987, 1996; Kitzinger, 1987; Kitzinger & Wilkinson, 1995; Pattatucci & Hamer, 1995; Rust, 1992, 1993; Sophie, 1986; Weinberg et al., 1994) to suggest that although sexual attractions appear fairly stable, sexual identities and behaviors are more fluid. This fluidity may be an inevitable consequence of the fact that most young women in this sample, like the sexual-minority women in Laumann et al.'s (1994) nationally representative sample, experience attractions for both sexes. This

nonexclusivity leaves open the possibility for multiple identities and behaviors over time, even when attractions remain stable.

The current research focused exclusively on young sexual-minority women because basic information on the sexual development of this understudied population is sorely lacking. Yet comparisons with heterosexual women, heterosexual men, and sexual-minority men are clearly the next step to be taken in research on this topic. For example, Savin-Williams's (1998) recent retrospective study documented considerable variability in the developmental trajectories of young sexual-minority men and argued that traditional models of identity development overstate the linearity of this process among male as well as female sexual minorities. A prospective study comparing these two groups is needed to examine this possibility. Longitudinal study of heterosexual youths is also critical. Most researchers assume that these youths do not experience same-sex attractions, but this may not be the case. Simply assessing the relative frequency of heterosexual youths' same-sex and other-sex attractions over the course of sexual development would make a critical contribution to understanding differences between the nature and development of heterosexual and nonheterosexual orientations.

Sexual Identity

Half of the young women in this sample relinquished the first sexual-minority identity they adopted. Thus, traditional coming-out models positing the adoption of a lesbian, gay male, or bisexual identity as the endpoint of sexual identity development underestimate the duration and variability of this process, as others have argued (Blumstein & Schwartz, 1990; Kitzinger & Wilkinson, 1995; Rust, 1993; Sophie, 1986). It was expected that recent increases in the acceptance and visibility of same-sex sexuality, particularly bisexuality, would result in more stable patterns of sexual-minority identification in the current sample than among previous cohorts. This expectation was confirmed only for bisexuals. Whereas three fourths of Rust's (1993) bisexual respondents had previously identified themselves as lesbian, only one fourth of bisexual women in the current study had done so. Thus, they appear better able than previous cohorts to link their dual attractions to the concept of bisexuality early on in the coming-out process.

As predicted, women whose attractions fluctuated across an implicit boundary separating prototypically lesbian attractions (>75% same sex) from prototypically bisexual attractions (<75% same sex) were disproportionately likely to change identity labels. This indicates that fluidity in sexual identity is not random or arbitrary but reflects women's attempts to fit a wide range of experiences into a comparatively narrow model of sexuality. Numerous researchers have argued that there is extensive overlap between lesbianism and bisexuality (Golden, 1987, 1996; Kitzinger & Wilkinson, 1995; Rust, 1992, 1993), and the findings presented here support this view. They also confirm Weinberg et al.'s (1994) assertion that for individuals whose attractions fall in this overlapping range, "traffic at the border could raise questions about identity" (p. 291).

It also raises questions about sexual orientation. It has been over 50 years since Kinsey et al. (1948) demonstrated the value of modeling sexual orientation as a continuous rather than a categorical variable, and yet categorical models continue to dominate thinking and research on this topic (see McWhirter, Sanders, & Reinisch, 1990, for a variety of perspectives on this issue). This appears to be a greater impediment to the study of female than male sexuality, as categorical models appear better suited to describing the latter than the former. In Laumann et al.'s (1994) nationally representative sample of Americans, the frequency distribution for men's sexual attractions was clearly bimodal: Men tended to report either exclusive same-sex or exclusive other-sex attractions. The frequency distribution for women's sexual attractions, however, peaked over exclusive other-sex attractions and then fell continuously as the scale moved toward exclusive same-sex attractions. In fact, whereas individuals with exclusive same-sex attractions constituted the majority of men with any same-sex attractions, they constituted the minority of women with any same-sex attractions. The women in the current sample follow a similar pattern: Only 5 of the 80 respondents (6%) reported exclusive same-sex attractions at both interviews.

For sexual-minority women, therefore, nonexclusivity in attractions is the norm rather than the exception, and this may be critical for understanding experiences of fluidity. As Weinberg et al. (1994) noted, the potential for intimate experiences with both sexes, even if one is predominantly interested in one sex, may engender a "lack of closure" regarding sexual identity that is manifested in multiple transitions in identity and behavior over the life course. Contrary to conventional views of sexual identity development, these transitions may entail movement both toward and away from sexual-minority identification. In the current study, 6 respondents relinquished their lesbian or bisexual identities for unlabeled identities between the two interviews, and 4 unlabeled women reclaimed heterosexual identifications. These unexpected, "backward" transitions are notable and would have gone entirely unobserved save for the prospective design of the study. Yet they are difficult to interpret at this time. Were these individuals undergoing a temporary phase in their sexual development during the first interview, or are they doing so now? Future longitudinal assessments are necessary to answer this question. Given that individuals making such transitions are least likely to be represented in conventional samples of openly identified lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals, continued observation of their development will fill an important gap in our understanding of the life course of sexual minorities.

Sexual Attractions

Consistent with the findings of Pattatucci and Hamer (1995), changes in the relative frequency of same-sex versus other-sex sexual attractions were fairly small in magnitude but were significantly larger among bisexual–unlabeled women than among lesbians. In explaining the latter phenomenon, Weinberg et al. (1994) suggested that compared with lesbians, gay men, and heterosexuals, bisexuals' capacity to experience attractions for both men and women might render their subjective feelings more susceptible to environmental influences. This is an important point to consider when investigating diversity among the developmental trajectories of sexual-minority youths. For example, what factors distinguish between bisexual–unlabeled women who become more attracted to women over time and those who do not? How do lesbian women respond to such factors? Future research should address these questions.

Contrary to prediction, younger respondents did not undergo larger changes in sexual attractions than did older respondents. Thus, adolescents' sexual attractions do not appear to be inherently more variable than those of young adults. However, this issue should be reexamined among even younger adolescents for a more definitive test. Such reexaminations should also include older adults, as their attractions might demonstrate greater stability than those of young adults. Nonetheless, adolescent attractions cannot be considered reliable predictors of adult sexual attractions. Lesbians who reported at the first interview that one of their strongest adolescent attractions had been directed toward a man did not report greater percentages of other-sex attractions at the follow-up interview than did other lesbians; nor were they disproportionately likely to have engaged in other-sex sexual contact between the two interviews. In fact, only one of these women reported such contact. Thus, early and intense other-sex attractions do not necessarily "foreshadow" later other-sex attractions and behavior (at least so far). These findings contrast with conventional views of sexual orientation that presume continuity between adolescent and adult sexual feelings (see Boxer & Cohler, 1989, for a critique of these views). The nature of sexual orientation's influence on sexual attractions experienced at different stages of life clearly remains to be specified.

Sexual Behavior

Young women's sexual behavior between the two interviews was largely consistent with the pattern of attractions they described at the first interview. Those with predominantly same-sex attractions had predominantly same-sex partners; those with predominantly other-sex attractions had predominantly other-sex partners; those with roughly equal percentages of same-sex and other-sex attractions had roughly equal numbers of same-sex and other-sex partners. It is important to remember that the women in the current sample were recruited from gay, lesbian, and bisexual organizations, activities, and social networks, as well as from college courses on gender and sexuality. Thus, their immediate social environments were fairly accepting of same-sex behavior and provided multiple opportunities to engage in same-sex relationships. Sexual-minority women facing fewer opportunities for such relationships might show lower concordance between attractions and behavior.

Nearly one fourth of lesbians in the current sample had sexual contact with men between the two interviews. Thus, prior findings of inconsistencies between identity and behavior among lesbians (see, e.g., Rust, 1992) cannot be solely attributed to the fact that previous cohorts of lesbian women faced greater social pressure to engage in heterosexual relationships and greater stigmatization of same-sex sexuality. Instead, these inconsistencies may be an inevitable consequence of the fact that most lesbians—even those who are primarily attracted to women on a day-to-day basis—continue to experience periodic attractions to men. This interpretation is supported by the fact that lesbians who had other-sex sexual partners between the two interviews had reported more other-sex attractions at Time 1 than those who had only same-sex partners. This suggests that other-sex sexual contact may reflect authentic sexual interest rather than (or in addition to) social pressure. In commenting on nonexclusive attractions and behavior among lesbians, Rust (1992) concluded that "the question is, therefore, not whether self-identified lesbians will ever again find themselves heterosexually involved, but how they will react to heterosexual involvement" (p. 380). Future longitudinal assessments of the current sample will reveal whether this provocative perspective is correct.

Notably, the majority of lesbians who had sexual contact with men between the two interviews retained their lesbian labels. This suggests that women who are predominantly attracted to the same sex do not necessarily consider the capacity for other-sex attractions and behavior sufficient justification for identifying themselves as bisexual. A salient example was provided by a lesbian in the sample who reported having unexpectedly fallen in love with a close male friend since the first interview. When asked how she labeled her current identity, she responded "I don't know—I don't really feel like I'm bisexual. I feel like I'm a lesbian involved with a man. Of course, people just don't accept that. But all of my other attractions are for women, and I feel like this is sort of an exception." Thus, just as sporadic same-sex attractions may not prompt heterosexually identified individuals to identify themselves as bisexual, sporadic other-sex attractions may not prompt lesbian-identified women to do so. Nonetheless, future longitudinal research is necessary to determine the extent to which the age and context of a woman's initial sexual-minority identification influences its long-term development.

Limitations of the Study

Like the overwhelming majority of research on sexual minorities, the current study relies on a convenience sample of respondents drawn from gay, lesbian, and bisexual activities and organizations, as well as from college courses on gender and sexuality, and thus cannot be considered representative of sexual-minority women. The sample comprises predominantly White, middle-class, and highly educated women, and a critical priority for future research is longitudinal investigation of larger and more diverse populations of sexual minorities, particularly ethnic minorities, individuals living in rural or isolated environments, and individuals of lower socioeconomic status. Also, all of the women in the current sample began to question their sexuality before reaching the age of 23, whereas some sexual-minority women do not do so until middle or late adulthood (Kitzinger & Wilkinson, 1995). Whether this influences fluidity in attractions, behavior, or identity is unknown. One possibility is that late-identifying women are more likely than early-identifying women to adopt a sexual-minority label in the context of a long-term, monogamous same-sex relationship. This might forestall changes and inconsistencies that are engendered by alternating between same-sex and other-sex relationships within short periods of time.

Also, the method of measuring same-sex sexual attractions used in this study has limitations that must be taken into account when interpreting the results. As noted earlier, one might consider both the relative frequency and the relative intensity of individuals' same-sex and other-sex attractions relevant to sexual orientation, and there is no a priori reason to consider one superior to the other. Yet most of the published research has focused on relative frequency rather than on relative intensity (perhaps because frequency is an easier construct to operationalize), and this study did the same. Unlike measures of intensity, measures of relative frequency force a trade-off between same-sex and other-sex attrac-

tions. Although this capably represents the predominance of one's same-sex versus other-sex attractions, it is not the only way (and perhaps not the best way) to conceptualize the link between sexual orientation and sexual attractions. Finally, the limitations of the relative frequency measure necessarily extend to the measurement of changes in same-sex attractions over time. Given that sexual attractions are complex and multifaceted psychological phenomena, difference scores for Time 1 and Time 2 same-sex attractions provide only a crude estimate of longitudinal changes in sexual attractions. Nonetheless, given that nothing is known about the stability of sexual attractions among women of this age and cohort, the descriptive information provided by this short-term prospective study makes an important contribution to the literature on this topic despite its limitations.

Conclusion

In commenting on the diversity of sexual identities, attractions, and behaviors reported by American men and women, Laumann et al. (1994) asserted that "it makes more sense to ask about specific aspects of same-gender behavior, practice, and feelings during specific periods of an individual's life rather than a single yes-or-no question about whether a person is homosexual" (pp. 285–286). The current research has taken up this challenge, providing a prospective view of the extent to which sexual attractions experienced at different points in time and different stages of life delimit women's future sexual experiences and self-concepts. The findings demonstrate that although young women's sexual attractions do not undergo substantial short-term change, the prevalence of nonexclusivity in their attractions creates the potential for recurrent inconsistencies among identity, attractions, and behavior.

Thus, the manifestations of sexual-minority women's attractions are more fluid than the attractions themselves. The extent to which this is also true of heterosexual women and of sexual-minority men remains to be investigated. In order to appropriately model the development of female and male same-sex sexuality during adolescence and adulthood, and to provide accurate and reassuring information to sexual-minority youths undergoing transitions in sexual development, future longitudinal research must continue to investigate the origins and implications of changes and inconsistencies in sexual identity, attractions, and behavior across the life course.

References

Bell, A. P., & Weinberg, M. S. (1978). *Homosexualities: A study of diversity among men and women.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Bell, A. P., Weinberg, M. S., & Hammersmith, S. K. (1981). *Sexual preference: Its development in men and women.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Blumstein, P., & Schwartz, P. (1990). Intimate relationships and the creation of sexuality. In D. P. McWhirter, S. A. Sanders, & J. M. Reinisch (Eds.), *Homosexuality/heterosexuality: Concepts of sexual orientation* (pp. 307–320). New York: Oxford University Press.

Boxer, A., & Cohler, B. (1989). The life course of gay and lesbian youth: An immodest proposal for the study of lives. *Journal of Homosexuality, 17,* 315–355.

Cass, V. (1984). Homosexual identity: A concept in need of a definition. *Journal of Homosexuality, 9,* 105–126.

Chapman, B. E., & Brannock, J. C. (1987). Proposed models of lesbian identity development: An empirical examination. *Journal of Homosexuality, 14,* 69–80.

Chung, Y. B., & Katayama, M. (1996). Assessment of sexual orientation in lesbian/gay/bisexual studies. *Journal of Homosexuality, 30,* 49–62.

Cohen, K. M., & Savin-Williams, R. C. (1996). Developmental perspectives on coming out to self and others. In R. C. Savin-Williams & K. M. Cohen (Eds.), *The lives of lesbians, gays, and bisexuals: Children to adults* (pp. 113–151). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.

Diamond, L. M. (1998). Development of sexual orientation among adolescent and young adult women. *Developmental Psychology, 34,* 1085–1095.

Dixon, J. K. (1984). The commencement of bisexual activity in swinging married women over age thirty. *Journal of Sex Research, 20,* 71–90.

Esterberg, K. G. (1994). Being a lesbian and being in love: Constructing identities through relationships. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Social Services, 1,* 57–82.

Fox, R. C. (1995). Bisexual identities. In A. R. D'Augelli & C. Patterson (Eds.), *Lesbian, gay, and bisexual identities over the lifespan* (pp. 48–86). New York: Oxford University Press.

Gagnon, J. (1990). Gender preference in erotic relations: The Kinsey scale and sexual scripts. In D. P. McWhirter, S. A. Sanders, & J. M. Reinisch (Eds.), *Homosexuality/heterosexuality: Concepts of sexual orientation* (pp. 177–207). New York: Oxford University Press.

Golden, C. (1987). Diversity and variability in women's sexual identities. In Boston Lesbian Psychologies Collective (Ed.), *Lesbian psychologies: Explorations and challenges* (pp. 19–34). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Golden, C. (1996). What's in a name? Sexual self-identification among women. In R. C. Savin-Williams & K. M. Cohen (Eds.), *The lives of lesbians, gays, and bisexuals: Children to adults* (pp. 229–249). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.

Gonsiorek, J. C., & Rudolph, J. R. (1991). Homosexual identity: Coming out and other developmental events. In J. C. Gonsiorek & J. D. Weinrich (Eds.), *Homosexuality: Research implications for public policy* (pp. 161–176). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Green, R. (1988). The immutability of homosexual orientation: Behavioral science implications for a constitutional (legal) analysis. *Journal of Psychiatry & Law, 16,* 537.

Herdt, G. (1990). Developmental discontinuities and sexual orientation across cultures. In D. P. McWhirter, S. A. Sanders, & J. M. Reinisch (Eds.), *Homosexuality/heterosexuality: Concepts of sexual orientation* (pp. 208–236). New York: Oxford University Press.

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

Kitzinger, C. (1987). *The social construction of lesbianism.* London: Sage.

Kitzinger, C., & Wilkinson, S. (1995). Transitions from heterosexuality to lesbianism: The discursive production of lesbian identities. *Developmental Psychology, 31,* 95–104.

Laumann, E. O., Gagnon, J. H., Michael, R. T., & Michaels, F. (1994). *The social organization of sexuality: Sexual practices in the United States.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Marmor, J. (1980). *Homosexual behavior: A modern reappraisal.* New York: Basic Books.

McWhirter, D. P., Sanders, S. A., & Reinisch, J. M. (Eds.). (1990). *Homosexuality/heterosexuality: Concepts of sexual orientation.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Money, J. (1988). *Gay, straight, and in-between: The sexology of erotic orientation.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Money, J. (1990). Agenda and credenda of the Kinsey scale. In D. P. McWhirter, S. A. Sanders, & J. M. Reinisch (Eds.), *Homosexuality/heterosexuality: Concepts of sexual orientation* (pp. 41–60). New York: Oxford University Press.

Pattatucci, A. M. L., & Hamer, D. H. (1995). Development and familiality of sexual orientation in females. *Behavior Genetics, 25,* 407–420.

Pillard, R. C. (1990). The Kinsey Scale: Is it familial? In D. P. McWhirter, S. A. Sanders, & J. M. Reinisch (Eds.), *Homosexuality/heterosexuality: Concepts of sexual orientation* (pp. 88–100). New York: Oxford University Press.

Remafedi, G. (1990). Fundamental issues in the care of homosexual youth. *Medical Clinics of North America, 74,* 1169–1179.

Rust, P. (1992). The politics of sexual identity: Sexual attraction and behavior among lesbian and bisexual women. *Social Problems, 39,* 366–386.

Rust, P. (1993). Coming out in the age of social constructionism: Sexual identity formation among lesbians and bisexual women. *Gender and Society, 7,* 50–77.

Savin-Williams, R. C. (1996). Memories of childhood and early adolescent sexual feelings among gay and bisexual boys: A narrative approach. In R. C. Savin-Williams & K. M. Cohen (Eds.), *The lives of lesbians, gays, and bisexuals: Children to adults* (pp. 94–109). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.

Savin-Williams, R. C. (1998). *". . . And then I became gay": Young men's stories.* New York: Routledge.

Sell, R. L. (1996). The Sell Assessment of Sexual Orientation: Background and scoring. *Journal of Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Identity, 1,* 295–310.

Shively, M. G., & DeCecco, J. P. (1977). Components of sexual identity. *Journal of Homosexuality, 3,* 41–48.

Shuster, R. (1987). Sexuality as a continuum: The bisexual identity. In Boston Lesbian Psychologies Collective (Ed.), *Lesbian psychologies* (pp. 56–71). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Sophie, J. (1986). A critical examination of stage theories of lesbian identity development. *Journal of Homosexuality, 12,* 39–51.

Stokes, J. P., Damon, W., & McKirnan, D. J. (1997). Predictors of movement toward homosexuality: A longitudinal study of bisexual men. *Journal of Sex Research, 34,* 304–312.

Stokes, J. P., McKirnan, D., & Burzette, R. (1993). Sexual behavior, condom use, disclosure of sexuality, and stability of sexual orientation in bisexual men. *Journal of Sex Research, 30,* 203–213.

Troiden, R. R. (1989). The formation of homosexual identities. *Journal of Homosexuality, 17,* 43–73.

Weinberg, M. S., Williams, C. J., & Pryor, D. W. (1994). *Dual attraction: Understanding bisexuality.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Whisman, V. (1996). *Queer by choice: Lesbians, gay men, and the politics of identity.* New York: Routledge.

Received November 3, 1998
Revision received October 12, 1999
Accepted October 13, 1999 ■

ORDER FORM

Send me a Free Sample Issue ❑

Start my 2000 subscription to *Developmental Psychology!* ISSN:0012-1649

___ $87.00, APA Member/Affiliate _____
___ $174.00, Individual Nonmember _____
___ $370.00, Institution _____
In DC add 5.75% sales tax _____
TOTAL AMOUNT ENCLOSED $ _____

❑ Check Enclosed (make payable to APA)

Charge my: ❑ VISA ❑ MasterCard ❑ American Express
Cardholder Name _____
Card No. _____ Exp. date _____
_____
Signature (Required for Charge)
Credit Card _____
Billing Address _____
City _____ State _____ Zip _____
Daytime Phone _____

Subscription orders must be prepaid. (Subscriptions are on a calendar basis only.) Allow 4-6 weeks for delivery of the first issue. Call for international subscription rates.

SEND THIS ORDER FORM TO:
American Psychological Association
Subscriptions
750 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20002-4242

Or call (800) 374-2721, fax (202) 336-5568.
TDD/TTY (202)336-6123. Email: subscriptions@apa.org

AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

SHIP TO:
Name _____
Address _____
City _____ State _____ Zip _____
APA Customer # _____

GAD00

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE – A PHOTOCOPY MAY BE USED