# A Critical Review of Sexual Fluidity Literature and the Potential Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Sexual Orientation Identity

Sydney Hainsworth (University of Arizona) & Russell B. Toomey (University of Arizona)

# Background

Adolescence and young adulthood are important times for identity development in many domains, including sexual orientation identity (SOI; Arnett, 2000; Arnold, 2017; Sokol, 2009).

This review serves as a critique of the SOI developmental theories that imply that SOI development follows stages or milestones that are similar for everyone, ending once an individual has decided on a sexual orientation identity (Cass, 1979; McCarn & Fassinger, 1996; Yarhouse, 2001).

Life course theory acknowledges that development continues throughout an individual's life and can be impacted by external factors (Elder,1998; Elder et al., 2003).

This critical review used a life course theory lens (Elder, 1998; Elder et al., 2003) to argue that the cultural and social changes that occurred with the COVID-19 pandemic could have had an impact on the SOI of some individuals and that this proposal merits further study.

#### Methods and Sample

Literature for this review was gathered from peer-reviewed journals in December 2022 and January 2023 from Google Scholar.

#### Keyword search terms:

- "sexual orientation": "stability", "change", "fluidity", "transition shift", and "mobility"
- "COVID-19": "identity fluidity", "identity development", "identity distress", and "generation identity development"

31 studies of SOI were included in this review, see Tables 1 and 2 for more descriptive information.

10 studies of the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on identity were also included in this review.

# Examination of the Sexual Fluidity Literature

Table 1									
Data sources used in SOI fluidity publications included in this review									
Data Source	Abbreviation	Publications							
National Longitudinal									
Study of National		Everett (2015); Fricke & Sironi							
Longitudinal Study of		Everett (2015); Liu et al. (2019);							
Adolescent to Adult		Sabia (2015); Savin-Williams et al.							
Health	Add Health	(2012); Silva (2018)							
		Katz-Wise et al. (2014; 2017a); Ott							
<b>Growing Up Today Study</b>	GUTS	et al. (2011; 2013)							
Study with 80 sexual-									
minority women	Diamond Study	Diamond (2000; 2003; 2005; 2008)							

Rate and Direction of SOI Fluidity
Overall rate of fluidity: 1.4% to 78%

The most common identity shift was heterosexual to sexual minority (n = 11).

Least stable: Primarily same/other-sex oriented (n = 3)

Most stable: Heterosexual and gay/lesbian (n = 4)

Within studies, bisexual was a stable SOI for some, and fluid for others.

# **Predictors of SOI Fluidity**

Non-significant: Age, SES, race/ethnicity, SOI milestones

Significant positive associations with fluidity: Identifying as a sexual minority, lower initial level of same/other-sex attraction, past year sexual behavior, religiosity

Gender: 6 studies found women to have more fluid SOI, 6 studies found men and women to have equally fluid SOI, 1 study found men to have more fluid SOI

Table 2	
Descriptive summary of fluidity studies (demographics at	baseline if applicable)

		Country		Age	Sexual					
Data Source /Author	Sample Size	(State)	Gender	(Mean)	Minority (%)	White (%)	Method	Method	Method	Identity Measure
Add Health	11,727 - 258	US	F & M	16	10%	65%	Quant	Longitudinal	Survey	Kinsey Style
Berona et al., 2018	2,450	US (PA)	F	14	27%	41%	Qual	Longitudinal	Interview	Kinsey Style
Callahan & McGuire, 2022	90	US	TGF, TGM, & Enby	21	78%	Majority	Qual	Cross-Sectional	Interview	Free Response
Campbell et al., 2021	11,543	Australia	F	18-23	38%		Quant	Longitudinal	Survey	Kinsey Style
Diamond et al., 2017	294	US (UT)	F & M	24	66%	87%	Quant	Longitudinal	Survey & Daily Diary	Not Reported
Diamond Study	80	US (NY)	F	22	100%	85%	Qual	Longitudinal	Interview	Lesbian, bisexual, unlabeled, heterosexual
Dickson et al., 2013	1,037	New Zeland	F & M	21	5%		Quant	Longitudinal	Survey	Heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual, other
Feinstein et al., 2019	1,057	US	F	21	100%	78%	Quant	Longitudinal	Survey	Lesbian or bisexual
GUTS	13,952 - 1,461	US	F & M	23	19%	93%	Quant	Longitudinal	Survey	Kinsey Style
Katz-Wise et al., 2017b	140	US	F, M, & TGM	24	41%	Majority	Quant	Longitudinal	Survey	Kinsey Style
Katz-Wise, 2015	199	US (WI)	F & M	21	100%	84%	Quant	Cross-Sec	Survey	Kinsey Style
Mereish et al., 2017	489	US	F	28	100%	82%	Quant	Cross-Sec	Survey	Bisexual or queer
Morgan et al., 2018	15	US (NE)	M	17	100%	100% Black	Qual	Longitudinal	Interview	Free Response and Kinsey Style
Rosario et al., 2006	156	US (NY)	F & M	18	100%	22%	Quant	Longitudinal	Survey	Lesbian/gay, bisexual, straight, other
Stewart et al., 2019	744	US (SE)	F & M	15	13%	48%	MM	Longitudinal	Survey	Heterosexual, gay/lesbian, bisexual, unsure, unlabled, other
Xu et al., 2021	6,037	England	F & M	16	5%	96%	Quant	Longitudinal	Survey	Kinsey Style

Note: F = cisgender female; M = cisgender male; TGF = transgender female; TGM = transgender male; Enby = nonbinary

## Examination of the COVID-19 Identity Literature

Several studies have shown how the COVID-19 pandemic has changed the way individuals think about many different aspects of their identity such as:

- Overall identity (Booker et al., 2022; Pasupathi et al., 2022; Sequeira & Dacey, 2020)
- Professional identity (Brown et al., 2022; Cullum et al., 2020; Findyartini et al., 2020;
   Sequeira & Dacey, 2020)
- Racial/ethnic identity (Gao & Sai, 2021; Wagaman et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2021)

Social distancing orders have been associated with lower levels of hope for the future, identification with the LGBTQ+ community, sense of pride in that they belonged to the LGBTQ+ community, perceptions of minority stress, and significantly higher levels of alcohol use (Scroggs et al., 2021).

## Conclusion

It is not uncommon for an individual to identify with different SOI labels across their lifetime. There are many internal and external factors that may encourage someone to adopt a different SOI label.

Many people re-examined parts of their identity over the lock-down period of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The COVID-19 pandemic disrupted social structures and relationships which have been shown to be correlated with SOI fluidity. For researchers to have a more well-rounded view of sexual development and fluidity, it is vital that we examine the impact of this world-wide, society changing event of the COVID-19 pandemic.

