WEBVTT

NOTE duration:"00:46:37" NOTE recognizability:0.785

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:00:00.000 \longrightarrow 00:00:03.420$ For the for the invitation to be here today,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00{:}00{:}03.420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}07.218$ to just speak to you all in the Department

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:00:07.218 \longrightarrow 00:00:11.030$ of Psychiatry about this increasingly

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:00:11.030 \longrightarrow 00:00:14.318$ important and increasingly visible.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:00:14.320 \longrightarrow 00:00:17.953$ Topic and that is how to go about

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:00:17.953 \longrightarrow 00:00:20.900$ providing care to our LGBTQ clients and

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

00:00:20.983 --> 00:00:24.879 patients and how we can do that and

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:00:24.879 \longrightarrow 00:00:26.901$ scientifically informed evidence based

NOTE Confidence: 0.9201791244444445

00:00:26.901 --> 00:00:30.160 ways and the mental health that you

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

00:00:30.160 --> 00:00:32.680 can say crisis affecting LGBTQ people

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00{:}00{:}32.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}35.498$ and populations is one of the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:00:35.498 \longrightarrow 00:00:37.533$ most pressing concerns of the LGBTQ

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:00:37.533 \longrightarrow 00:00:40.293$ community in the US and around the world.

 $00:00:40.300 \longrightarrow 00:00:42.660$ So it's really an honor and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00{:}00{:}42.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}44.959$ and often feels like an imperative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:00:44.960 \longrightarrow 00:00:48.490$ To to do this work to figure out how we

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:00:48.589 \dashrightarrow 00:00:52.300$ can do do best by our LGBTQ clientele.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:00:52.300 \longrightarrow 00:00:57.090$ The the challenge the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

00:00:57.090 --> 00:00:59.130 Unity is quite simply defined,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:00:59.130 \longrightarrow 00:01:01.354$ and it's that LGBTQ people represent one of

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:01:01.354 \longrightarrow 00:01:03.489$ the highest risk groups of any population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

00:01:03.490 --> 00:01:05.338 Risk groups for depression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

00:01:05.338 --> 00:01:07.102 anxiety, substance use problems,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00{:}01{:}07.102 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}07.970$ and suicidality.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

00:01:07.970 --> 00:01:10.728 And now that we have high quality,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:01:10.730 \longrightarrow 00:01:11.837$ nationally representative datasets

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:01:11.837 \longrightarrow 00:01:13.682$ that actually assess sex orientation

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

00:01:13.682 --> 00:01:14.880 and gender identity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

00:01:14.880 --> 00:01:16.218 diverse gender identities,

00:01:16.218 --> 00:01:18.448 something we didn't have until

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

00:01:18.448 --> 00:01:19.930 until surprisingly recently,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:01:19.930 \longrightarrow 00:01:21.520$ we know that study after study

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

00:01:21.520 --> 00:01:23.000 has shown that LGBTQ people,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00{:}01{:}23.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}25.177$ or at least twice greater risk of

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

00:01:25.177 --> 00:01:27.190 of these mental health outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

00:01:27.190 --> 00:01:28.818 And heterosexual cisgender populations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00{:}01{:}28.818 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}31.260$ We also know that this disparity

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:01:31.325 \longrightarrow 00:01:33.587$ largely persists across the life course.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:01:33.590 \longrightarrow 00:01:35.018$ This is true in nearly eight every

NOTE Confidence: 0.9201791244444445

 $00:01:35.018 \longrightarrow 00:01:36.442$ data set in every country in

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:01:36.442 \longrightarrow 00:01:37.717$ which this has been examined,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00{:}01{:}37.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}39.742$ although most of these datasets are

NOTE Confidence: 0.9201791244444445

 $00:01:39.742 \longrightarrow 00:01:42.480$ are are in more Westernized context.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:01:42.480 \longrightarrow 00:01:43.878$ I want to address this challenge

 $00:01:43.878 \longrightarrow 00:01:45.140$ today in two broad parts.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445 00:01:45.140 --> 00:01:45.714 The first, NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:01:45.714 \longrightarrow 00:01:47.436$ we'll focus on the theoretical causes

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:01:47.436 \longrightarrow 00:01:49.479$ of this disparity and the second we'll

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

00:01:49.479 --> 00:01:51.295 focus on on potential solutions

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

00:01:51.295 --> 00:01:53.040 to this disparity largely through

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:01:53.040 \longrightarrow 00:01:54.903$ research taking place at Yale.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:01:54.903 \longrightarrow 00:01:57.218$ It's involving clinical trials and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00{:}01{:}57.220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}00.676$ Imitation science of of LGBTQ

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

00:02:00.676 --> 00:02:02.980 affirmative cognitive behavioral therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00{:}02{:}02{:}02{:}980 \longrightarrow 00{:}02{:}05{:}374$ Which is the first evidence based

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:02:05.374 \longrightarrow 00:02:07.471$ treatments developed by and for

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

00:02:07.471 --> 00:02:09.199 LGBTQ people's mental health.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9201791244444445

 $00:02:09.200 \longrightarrow 00:02:10.866$ So we know that the most plausible

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:02:10.866 \longrightarrow 00:02:12.338$ cause of the mental health

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00{:}02{:}12.338 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}13.738$ disparities affecting LGBTQ people

 $00:02:13.738 \longrightarrow 00:02:15.600$ is not biological or genetic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:02:15.600 \longrightarrow 00:02:17.840$ Is is is some people have argued,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

00:02:17.840 --> 00:02:20.138 but rather probably stigma or simply

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:02:20.138 \longrightarrow 00:02:22.052$ the societal conditions that lead

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00{:}02{:}22.052 \longrightarrow 00{:}02{:}23.960$ some people to be actively devalued

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:02:23.960 \longrightarrow 00:02:26.040$ and have less power than others.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:02:26.040 \longrightarrow 00:02:28.546$ 2 prominent types of stigma that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:02:28.546 \longrightarrow 00:02:30.906$ can consider are the discriminatory

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:02:30.906 \longrightarrow 00:02:33.338$ societal structures that surround.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00{:}02{:}33.340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}35.600$ Many minoritized groups called

NOTE Confidence: 0.9201791244444445

 $00:02:35.600 \longrightarrow 00:02:36.730$ structural stigma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00{:}02{:}36.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}39.558$ And also the stressful kind of more

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00{:}02{:}39.558 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}42.034$ daily encounters with stigma that that

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00{:}02{:}42.034 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}43.944$ happened in our interactions with

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

00:02:43.944 --> 00:02:45.470 other people, including strangers,

 $00:02:45.470 \longrightarrow 00:02:46.230$ peers, coworkers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:02:46.230 \longrightarrow 00:02:48.510$ and even prominently in the in

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:02:48.571 \longrightarrow 00:02:49.946$ the case of LGBTQ people,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:02:49.950 \longrightarrow 00:02:51.140$ even from their own families.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:02:51.140 \longrightarrow 00:02:53.150$ We'll call this interpersonal stigma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:02:53.150 \longrightarrow 00:02:54.650$ but we'll start with structural stigma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:02:54.650 \longrightarrow 00:02:56.690$ which is defined as unjust laws,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445 00:02:56.690 --> 00:02:57.053 policies, NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:02:57.053 \longrightarrow 00:02:58.868$ and community attitudes that deny

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:02:58.868 \longrightarrow 00:03:01.434$ or fail to protect the equal rights

NOTE Confidence: 0.9201791244444445

 $00:03:01.434 \longrightarrow 00:03:02.487$ of the stigmatized.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

00:03:02.490 --> 00:03:03.240 Until recently,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445 00:03:03.240 --> 00:03:03.615 though, NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:03:03.615 \longrightarrow 00:03:05.490$ structural stigma has been difficult

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:03:05.490 \longrightarrow 00:03:08.036$ to measure because it requires a few things.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:03:08.040 \longrightarrow 00:03:09.650$ One is that you have large samples

 $00:03:09.650 \longrightarrow 00:03:10.930$ of the LGBTQ population,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:03:10.930 \longrightarrow 00:03:13.072$ which as I said earlier have

NOTE Confidence: 0.920179124444445

 $00:03:13.072 \longrightarrow 00:03:14.500$ been have been relatively

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:03:14.571 \longrightarrow 00:03:15.627$ hard to come by.

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00{:}03{:}15.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}18.668$ We also need the LGBTQ sample to

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:03:18.668 \longrightarrow 00:03:22.090$ have been recruited from from

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

00:03:22.090 --> 00:03:24.806 geographically diverse structural context.

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00{:}03{:}24.810 \longrightarrow 00{:}03{:}27.001$ You know most of our our studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:03:27.001 \longrightarrow 00:03:28.314$ especially with minoritized populations

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00{:}03{:}28.314 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}30.505$ come from like 1 context like one

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00{:}03{:}30.505 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}32.462$ community like New Haven or one college

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00{:}03{:}32.462 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}34.338$ like Yale without much structural

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00{:}03{:}34.338 \to 00{:}03{:}37.530$ diversity and in the in the surroundings.

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:03:37.530 \longrightarrow 00:03:39.504$ And so we need to study the

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:03:39.504 \longrightarrow 00:03:40.350$ influence structural stigma,

 $00:03:40.350 \longrightarrow 00:03:42.474$ we need context with diverse structures

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:03:42.474 \longrightarrow 00:03:45.385$ and we also need an approach to

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

00:03:45.385 --> 00:03:46.810 quantifying structural stigma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:03:46.810 \longrightarrow 00:03:48.820$ those laws and policies that

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:03:48.820 \longrightarrow 00:03:50.026$ surround TQ people.

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

00:03:50.030 --> 00:03:52.094 Such a quantitative index might look

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00{:}03{:}52.094 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}54.701$ like this where you can sum each

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:03:54.701 \longrightarrow 00:03:56.249$ country's present each country.

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

00:03:56.250 --> 00:03:58.266 I said, because I'll talk about

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:03:58.266 \longrightarrow 00:03:59.610$ doing this internationally first.

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:03:59.610 \longrightarrow 00:04:02.154$ You can send each country's presence

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:04:02.154 \longrightarrow 00:04:03.850$ or absence of discriminatory

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:04:03.921 \longrightarrow 00:04:05.745$ criminalizing laws and policies

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:04:05.745 \longrightarrow 00:04:07.370$ and also the those countries.

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:04:07.370 \longrightarrow 00:04:10.448$ Protective laws and policies and this

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:04:10.448 \longrightarrow 00:04:13.044$ objective approach to measuring stigma

 $00:04:13.044 \longrightarrow 00:04:15.316$ and also overcomes the limitations

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:04:15.316 \longrightarrow 00:04:17.506$ are more commonly used subjective

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:04:17.506 \longrightarrow 00:04:19.745$ measurements of stigma which we know

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:04:19.745 \longrightarrow 00:04:22.030$ are subject to the same source or to

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:04:22.030 \longrightarrow 00:04:23.990$ self report bias in which two people

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

00:04:23.990 --> 00:04:25.928 can have very different experiences

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:04:25.928 \longrightarrow 00:04:28.118$ of the same discriminatory event.

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:04:28.120 \longrightarrow 00:04:30.205$ Using an objective measure of

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:04:30.205 \longrightarrow 00:04:31.873$ structural stigma also overcomes

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:04:31.873 \longrightarrow 00:04:33.707$ limitations of same source reporting

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:04:33.707 \longrightarrow 00:04:35.397$ bias whereby the predictor and

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00{:}04{:}35.397 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}37.379$ this case stigma and the outcome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00{:}04{:}37.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}39.030$ Were measured using the same approach

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:04:39.030 \longrightarrow 00:04:40.735$ by asking people the perceptions of

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:04:40.735 \longrightarrow 00:04:42.688$ stigma and in their own mental health,

00:04:42.690 --> 00:04:44.030 which can produce artificially

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:04:44.030 \longrightarrow 00:04:45.705$ inflated estimates of the associations

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:04:45.705 \longrightarrow 00:04:46.650$ between those things.

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

00:04:46.650 --> 00:04:48.186 But using a quantitative,

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:04:48.186 \longrightarrow 00:04:49.722$ objective assessment of structural

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:04:49.722 \longrightarrow 00:04:51.605$ stigma like this overcomes at

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:04:51.605 \longrightarrow 00:04:53.009$ least those two limitations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00{:}04{:}53.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}55.730$ So such an index can then be applied

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00{:}04{:}55.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}57.840$ to suitable data opportunities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:04:57.840 \longrightarrow 00:05:00.856$ The EU LGBT survey and and also the

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00{:}05{:}00.856 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>}\ 00{:}05{:}03.856$ European men who have sex with men

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:05:03.856 \longrightarrow 00:05:06.016$ Internet survey represent the two

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00{:}05{:}06.102 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}08.616$ largest in terms of sample size.

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:05:08.620 \longrightarrow 00:05:12.790$ Datasets ever collected the LGBTQ

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:05:12.790 \longrightarrow 00:05:15.162$ population these datasets allow

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

00:05:15.162 --> 00:05:18.127 because they span such diverse

00:05:18.130 --> 00:05:19.890 context from countries like like

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:05:19.890 \longrightarrow 00:05:22.370$ Sweden and where I am right now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

00:05:22.370 --> 00:05:25.210 having about the lowest stigma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:05:25.210 \longrightarrow 00:05:26.818$ structural stigma towards LGBTQ

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00{:}05{:}26.818 {\:\raisebox{--}{--}}{\:\raisebox{--}{--}}{\:\raisebox{--}{--}}{\:\raisebox{--}{--}}00{:}05{:}29.230$ people possible being at the vanguard

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

00:05:29.294 --> 00:05:31.373 of LGBT rights kind of right next

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

00:05:31.373 --> 00:05:33.785 door to countries like like like

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00{:}05{:}33.785 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}36.310$ Romania or Hungary or Poland,

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:05:36.310 \longrightarrow 00:05:38.260$ which are some of the most

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:05:38.260 \longrightarrow 00:05:38.910$ stigmatizing countries.

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714 00:05:38.910 --> 00:05:39.720 In the EU, NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:05:39.720 \longrightarrow 00:05:41.340$ where same sex marriage isn't allowed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00{:}05{:}41.340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}43.296$ where where you can't update your

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

00:05:43.296 --> 00:05:44.600 gender identity on unofficial

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

00:05:44.655 --> 00:05:46.260 documents and things like this,

 $00:05:46.260 \longrightarrow 00:05:48.644$ so you have this patchwork of of a

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:05:48.644 \longrightarrow 00:05:51.018$ very diverse kind of structural context,

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:05:51.020 \longrightarrow 00:05:52.385$ really sitting right next to each other.

NOTE Confidence: 0.873631484285714

 $00:05:52.390 \longrightarrow 00:05:54.610$ And importantly, we have data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

00:05:57.910 --> 00:05:59.680 The populations living in those

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:05:59.680 \longrightarrow 00:06:01.890$ countries and in these datasets we

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:06:01.890 \longrightarrow 00:06:03.775$ see a strong association between

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00{:}06{:}03.775 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}05.283$ country level structural stigma

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00{:}06{:}05.342 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}07.196$ with this countries on the right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

00:06:07.200 --> 00:06:08.750 countries like Lebanon and Belarus,

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00{:}06{:}08.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}10.880$ Ukraine being very high in

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:06:10.880 \longrightarrow 00:06:12.584$ terms of structural stigma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:06:12.590 \longrightarrow 00:06:13.510$ which countries on the left,

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

00:06:13.510 --> 00:06:14.497 countries like Netherlands,

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

00:06:14.497 --> 00:06:15.813 Denmark, Austria being very

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:06:15.813 \longrightarrow 00:06:17.700$ low on the on on that index,

 $00:06:17.700 \longrightarrow 00:06:20.640$ you see across that a strong linear

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:06:20.640 \longrightarrow 00:06:22.924$ association between the prevalence of

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:06:22.924 \longrightarrow 00:06:25.756$ of depression and the LGBTQ population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:06:25.760 \longrightarrow 00:06:26.825$ And structural stigma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:06:26.825 \longrightarrow 00:06:28.955$ Now these estimates are even controlling

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:06:28.955 \longrightarrow 00:06:30.726$ for average country level depression

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:06:30.726 \longrightarrow 00:06:32.760$ where people in in Lebanon have

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00{:}06{:}32.821 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}34.663$ higher higher risk of depression in

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00{:}06{:}34.663 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}36.814$ general than people in the Netherlands.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:06:36.814 \longrightarrow 00:06:39.099$ Even over and above that

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:06:39.099 \longrightarrow 00:06:41.570$ you see that LGBT people.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

00:06:41.570 --> 00:06:43.952 Um, risk of depression is um

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00{:}06{:}43.952 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}46.672$ is is a strong linear function

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

00:06:46.672 --> 00:06:49.786 of of the structural legal

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

00:06:49.790 --> 00:06:53.978 policy climate surrounding them.

 $00:06:53.980 \longrightarrow 00:06:55.756$ This is the same is true of suicidality,

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00{:}06{:}55.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}58.160$ with about 15% of LGBTQ people

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:06:58.160 \longrightarrow 00:06:59.760$ in the Netherlands reporting

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

00:06:59.831 --> 00:07:02.069 past year suicidality on the PHQ,

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:07:02.070 \longrightarrow 00:07:03.972$ where's twice that percent of LGBTQ

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00{:}07{:}03.972 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}06.101$ people report past year suicidality and

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:07:06.101 \longrightarrow 00:07:07.713$ more structurally stigmatizing context

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00{:}07{:}07.713 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}10.240$ like like Belarus or North Macedonia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

00:07:10.240 --> 00:07:13.957 Again, this is over and above the fact that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

00:07:13.960 --> 00:07:15.252 that, that, that, that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00{:}07{:}15.252 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}16.867$ that there's a higher prevalence,

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:07:16.870 \longrightarrow 00:07:17.486$ the depression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:07:17.486 \longrightarrow 00:07:19.950$ and in the general population and some of

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

00:07:20.007 --> 00:07:22.437 those more structurally stigmatizing context.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:07:22.440 \longrightarrow 00:07:23.904$ So now I'll present.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

00:07:23.904 --> 00:07:25.368 Evidence that interpersonal stigma,

 $00:07:25.370 \longrightarrow 00:07:27.198$ including interpersonal interactions with

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00{:}07{:}27.198 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}30.850$ parents and peers due to ones LGBTQ status,

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:07:30.850 \longrightarrow 00:07:34.105$ predict the mental health outcomes known to

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

00:07:34.105 --> 00:07:36.390 just disproportionately affect LGBTQ people.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:07:36.390 \longrightarrow 00:07:38.460$ Now the search for these interpersonal

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:07:38.460 \longrightarrow 00:07:41.139$ forms of stigma has to start early because

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

00:07:41.139 --> 00:07:43.571 we know that many young LGBTQ people

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00{:}07{:}43.571 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}45.619$ experience mental health challenges.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:07:45.620 \longrightarrow 00:07:49.076$ But how young and how much LGBTQ people?

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:07:49.080 \longrightarrow 00:07:50.481$ Young people disproportionately

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:07:50.481 \longrightarrow 00:07:52.816$ experience mental health challenges like

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:07:52.816 \longrightarrow 00:07:54.619$ depression compared to heterosexual,

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

00:07:54.620 --> 00:07:55.862 cisgender young people?

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

00:07:55.862 --> 00:07:57.518 It's still relatively unclear,

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:07:57.520 \longrightarrow 00:07:59.970$ largely because of the challenges of studying

 $00:07:59.970 \longrightarrow 00:08:02.059$ these topics among very young people.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:08:02.060 \dashrightarrow 00:08:04.780$ So my colleague Dan Klein at SUNY Stony

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:08:04.780 \longrightarrow 00:08:06.801$ Brook has been prospectively following

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

00:08:06.801 --> 00:08:10.155 a group of about 600 youth since they

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:08:10.155 \longrightarrow 00:08:12.522$ were aged 3 on Long Island, New York.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:08:12.522 \longrightarrow 00:08:14.370$ The study started when I was in Graduate

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:08:14.417 \longrightarrow 00:08:16.449$ School at Stony Brook and every three years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

00:08:16.450 --> 00:08:17.224 Match that time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

00:08:17.224 --> 00:08:19.030 the the youth and their parents and

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:08:19.083 \longrightarrow 00:08:21.067$ teachers completed numerous assessments,

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00{:}08{:}21.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}22.699$ including interviews including

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

00:08:22.699 --> 00:08:26.260 EG of you know of, of,

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615 00:08:26.260 --> 00:08:27.940 of, of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

00:08:27.940 --> 00:08:29.596 Developmental and temperamental precursors

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:08:29.596 \longrightarrow 00:08:32.080$ to depression and then depression itself.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:08:32.080 \longrightarrow 00:08:34.296$ As the kids aged a few years ago,

 $00:08:34.300 \longrightarrow 00:08:36.302$ we received support from NIH to to

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

00:08:36.302 --> 00:08:38.787 to study the timing and causes of

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:08:38.787 \longrightarrow 00:08:40.737$ the sexual orientation disparity and

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:08:40.737 \longrightarrow 00:08:43.016$ mental health problems in the sample.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

00:08:43.020 --> 00:08:45.244 We started by asking the youth at age

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:08:45.244 \longrightarrow 00:08:47.726$ 15 what gender they were attracted to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:08:47.730 \longrightarrow 00:08:49.938$ This allowed us to assess who

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:08:49.938 \longrightarrow 00:08:52.640$ probably is was being gay or bisexual,

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:08:52.640 \longrightarrow 00:08:54.110$ at least in terms of the gender

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:08:54.110 \longrightarrow 00:08:55.805$ or genders to which they reported

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:08:55.805 \longrightarrow 00:08:56.479$ being attracted,

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:08:56.480 \longrightarrow 00:08:59.160$ and in that sample about 11% of the youth.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00{:}08{:}59.160 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}09{:}00.960$ Did report same gender attractions and

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:09:00.960 \longrightarrow 00:09:02.988$ in their lives they had experienced

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00{:}09{:}02.988 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}04.653$ a steep relative increase in

 $00:09:04.714 \longrightarrow 00:09:06.434$ depression and compared to other

NOTE Confidence: 0.779159325384615

 $00:09:06.434 \longrightarrow 00:09:08.154$ gender attractive youth from a

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

00:09:08.160 --> 00:09:10.650 pretty early age, with that disparity

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00:09:10.650 \longrightarrow 00:09:12.870$ becoming quite pronounced by by

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00:09:12.870 \longrightarrow 00:09:15.780$ by middle school and high school.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00:09:15.780 \longrightarrow 00:09:17.172$ By high school, we also see

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

00:09:17.172 --> 00:09:18.890 that many more of the youth

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00:09:18.890 \longrightarrow 00:09:20.366$ recorded same gender attractions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.788086075555556

 $00:09:20.370 \longrightarrow 00:09:21.585$ reported poor relationships

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00:09:21.585 \longrightarrow 00:09:22.800$ with their parents,

NOTE Confidence: 0.788086075555556

 $00:09:22.800 \longrightarrow 00:09:24.380$ and reported more bullying compared

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

00:09:24.380 --> 00:09:26.289 to youth through reported only being

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00:09:26.289 \longrightarrow 00:09:28.214$ attracted to the other the other gender.

NOTE Confidence: 0.788086075555556

 $00:09:28.220 \longrightarrow 00:09:30.638$ In fact, the association between sexual

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00:09:30.638 \longrightarrow 00:09:33.147$ orientation and age 15 depression was

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00:09:33.147 \longrightarrow 00:09:35.643$ significantly mediated by age 12 exposure

 $00:09:35.643 \longrightarrow 00:09:38.152$ to poor relationships with parents and

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00:09:38.152 \longrightarrow 00:09:41.260$ to exposure to to bullying from their peers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

00:09:41.260 --> 00:09:43.675 So results like this highlight the potential

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00:09:43.675 \longrightarrow 00:09:45.699$ role of interpersonal stigma from.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555555600:09:45.700 --> 00:09:46.096 From,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00:09:46.096 \dashrightarrow 00:09:48.868$ from parents and peers and LGBTQ peoples.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00:09:48.870 \longrightarrow 00:09:51.050$ Disproportionate exposure of depression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00:09:51.050 \longrightarrow 00:09:53.775$ So these findings regarding structural

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

00:09:53.775 --> 00:09:55.980 stigma and interpersonal stigma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00{:}09{:}55.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}59.060$ of which I just presented some some

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

00:09:59.060 --> 00:10:01.224 more recent analysis of of many,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00:10:01.224 \longrightarrow 00:10:03.150$ support the basic tenets of what's

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00{:}10{:}03.211 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}05.076$ known as minority stress theory.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00:10:05.080 \longrightarrow 00:10:07.200$ Minority stress theory suggests that

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00:10:07.200 \longrightarrow 00:10:10.279$ the causes of the sexual and gender

00:10:10.279 --> 00:10:12.615 minority disparity in mental health and

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00:10:12.615 \dashrightarrow 00:10:15.321$ related outcomes is a function of LGBTQ

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00:10:15.321 \longrightarrow 00:10:17.559$ people's greater exposure to to stigma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

00:10:17.560 --> 00:10:19.284 Structural stigma interpersonal stigma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00:10:19.284 \longrightarrow 00:10:22.340$ another key part of minority stress theory.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00:10:22.340 \longrightarrow 00:10:24.363$ Is that these forms of stigma give

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00:10:24.363 \longrightarrow 00:10:26.434$ rise to minority stress reactions that

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00:10:26.434 \longrightarrow 00:10:28.714$ serve as mediators of the association

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00:10:28.714 \longrightarrow 00:10:30.856$ between stigma and poor mental health.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00:10:30.860 \longrightarrow 00:10:32.948$ But what's the minority stress reaction?

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00{:}10{:}32.950 --> 00{:}10{:}33.239 \ Well,$

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00:10:33.239 \longrightarrow 00:10:34.973$ one of the reactions that I've

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

00:10:34.973 --> 00:10:37.460 spent a good deal of time studying

NOTE Confidence: 0.788086075555556

 $00{:}10{:}37.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}38.624$ is identity concealment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00:10:38.630 \longrightarrow 00:10:40.965$ So because they possess a

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00:10:40.965 \longrightarrow 00:10:42.366$ relatively concealable stigma,

00:10:42.370 --> 00:10:44.116 LGBT people face the choice of

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00:10:44.116 \longrightarrow 00:10:45.890$ whether or not to come out.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

00:10:45.890 --> 00:10:48.265 And although models of stigma

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

 $00:10:48.265 \longrightarrow 00:10:50.165$ concealment suggest that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

00:10:50.165 --> 00:10:52.608 environment should ultimately determine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

00:10:52.610 --> 00:10:54.986 An LGBTQ persons person.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78808607555556

00:10:54.986 --> 00:10:55.580 So. NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:10:58.630 \longrightarrow 00:11:01.286$ Or or cost of concealment versus coming out.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

00:11:01.290 --> 00:11:02.745 Very few studies have have

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:11:02.745 \longrightarrow 00:11:03.909$ actually examined the environment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:11:03.910 \longrightarrow 00:11:06.367$ Is A is A is a determinant of concealment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:11:06.370 \longrightarrow 00:11:08.372$ So using the same large cross country

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

00:11:08.372 --> 00:11:10.750 EU data set that I mentioned earlier,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:11:10.750 \longrightarrow 00:11:12.894$ we found that in countries like the UK

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

00:11:12.894 --> 00:11:14.828 that scored low on structural stigma,

 $00:11:14.830 \longrightarrow 00:11:16.630$ the vast majority like 90%

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00{:}11{:}16.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}18.970$ of LGBTQ people are out.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

00:11:18.970 --> 00:11:20.370 In countries like Romania that

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

00:11:20.370 --> 00:11:21.770 scored higher on this index,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

00:11:21.770 --> 00:11:22.935 the majority of section minority

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00{:}11{:}22.935 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}24.420$ people are actually in the closet.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:11:24.420 \longrightarrow 00:11:25.883$ They say that they've told very few

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

00:11:25.883 --> 00:11:27.706 people are or know people in their lives.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00{:}11{:}27.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}29.978$ With their LGBTQ and and again you

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

00:11:29.978 --> 00:11:32.221 see a strong linear association

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00{:}11{:}32.221 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}34.260$ between between really how LGBTQ

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:11:34.260 \longrightarrow 00:11:35.700$ people live their lives.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00{:}11{:}35.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}38.248$ I mean this isn't you know this

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:11:38.248 \longrightarrow 00:11:40.560$ isn't abstract this this is you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:11:40.560 \longrightarrow 00:11:42.918$ consuming is something that that

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00{:}11{:}42.918 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}44.967$ that affects the day-to-day decisions

 $00:11:44.967 \longrightarrow 00:11:47.052$ the day-to-day self presentation how

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00{:}11{:}47.052 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}49.588$ what people share what they choose

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:11:49.588 \longrightarrow 00:11:51.826$ to silence within themselves and we

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:11:51.826 \longrightarrow 00:11:54.017$ know that the concealment can not only

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:11:54.017 \longrightarrow 00:11:56.406$ take a mental health toll especially.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

00:11:56.410 --> 00:11:58.546 Didn't see one about a personally

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:11:58.546 \longrightarrow 00:11:59.970$ important aspect of oneself.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

00:11:59.970 --> 00:12:00.726 And again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00{:}12{:}00.726 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}02.994$ you have you have people living

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:12:02.994 \longrightarrow 00:12:05.376$ basically right next door to each other.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

00:12:05.380 --> 00:12:07.288 Um, depending, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00{:}12{:}07.288 \rightarrow 00{:}12{:}09.580$ countries like like countries like

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00{:}12{:}09.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}12.160$ Sweden being right next door to,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675 00:12:12.160 --> 00:12:12.533 to, NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:12:12.533 \longrightarrow 00:12:14.398$ to countries like Russia or

00:12:14.398 --> 00:12:15.517 Ukraine or Belarus,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00{:}12{:}15.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}17.266$ where the lived experience of

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00{:}12{:}17.266 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}19.445$ LGBTQ people in terms of this one

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

00:12:19.445 --> 00:12:20.717 factor concealment looks very,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

00:12:20.720 --> 00:12:22.988 very different with them with with,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

00:12:22.990 --> 00:12:25.800 with actually concomitant impacts on,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:12:25.800 \longrightarrow 00:12:26.691$ on mental health.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

00:12:26.691 --> 00:12:28.770 Because in fact we see that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:12:28.831 \longrightarrow 00:12:30.376$ association between structural

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:12:30.376 \longrightarrow 00:12:32.951$ stigma and outcomes like suicidality

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:12:32.951 \longrightarrow 00:12:34.719$ are significantly mediated by

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:12:34.719 \longrightarrow 00:12:36.404$ by how much people conceal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:12:36.410 \longrightarrow 00:12:39.623$ The same is true for internalized stigma

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:12:39.623 \longrightarrow 00:12:42.727$ or the direction of negative societal

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:12:42.727 \longrightarrow 00:12:46.003$ attitudes towards the towards the South.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00{:}12{:}46.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}48.498$ So this is like responding to to question

00:12:48.498 --> 00:12:50.808 like I wish I could be straight,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:12:50.810 \longrightarrow 00:12:53.074$ if I could take a pill to to

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

00:12:53.074 --> 00:12:54.230 be heterosexual I would.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:12:54.230 \longrightarrow 00:12:56.302$ That's the type of items that that

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:12:56.302 \longrightarrow 00:12:57.530$ indicate internalized stigma and

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:12:57.530 \longrightarrow 00:12:59.252$ again you see a similar association

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

00:12:59.252 --> 00:13:00.419 between country level structural

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:13:00.419 \longrightarrow 00:13:01.967$ stigma and that type in that

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00{:}13{:}01.967 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}04.184$ type of outcome and a similar

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00{:}13{:}04.184 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}05.618$ mediation mediation association.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

00:13:05.620 --> 00:13:07.400 I mean structural stigma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:13:07.400 \longrightarrow 00:13:09.625$ internalized stigma and and outcomes

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00{:}13{:}09.625 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}11.668$ like depression and anxiety.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:13:11.670 \longrightarrow 00:13:15.180$ So the final minority stress reaction

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:13:15.180 \longrightarrow 00:13:17.558$ that that we've examined

 $00{:}13{:}17.558 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}19.346$ is called rejection sensitivity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:13:19.350 \longrightarrow 00:13:21.235$ So rejection sensitivity is the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

00:13:21.235 --> 00:13:22.743 tendency to anxiously expect

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:13:22.743 \longrightarrow 00:13:25.143$ and severely react to rejection

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:13:25.143 \longrightarrow 00:13:26.610$ among stigmatized populations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00{:}13{:}26.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}28.522$ Rejection sensitivity is understood

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00{:}13{:}28.522 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}30.912$ to be an interpersonal schema

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:13:30.912 \longrightarrow 00:13:33.314$ that emerges and upon repeated

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00{:}13{:}33.314 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}35.629$ exposure to stigma based rejection.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00{:}13{:}35.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}37.620$ And we studied sexual orientation

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:13:37.620 \longrightarrow 00:13:38.814$ differences and rejection

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:13:38.814 \longrightarrow 00:13:39.940$ sensitivity in that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:13:39.940 \longrightarrow 00:13:41.440$ in that longitudinal study from

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

00:13:41.440 --> 00:13:43.400 Stony Brook that I mentioned earlier,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:13:43.400 \longrightarrow 00:13:45.913$ the the the 500 or so youth

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:13:45.913 \longrightarrow 00:13:47.938$ on Long Island at age 15,

 $00:13:47.940 \longrightarrow 00:13:49.260$ those youth completed a

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:13:49.260 \longrightarrow 00:13:50.580$ game called Island Getaway.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:13:50.580 \longrightarrow 00:13:53.036$ It's like based on the TV show Survivor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:13:53.040 \longrightarrow 00:13:55.020$ whereby participants are told they're

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

00:13:55.020 --> 00:13:57.000 traveling through the Hawaiian Islands,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:13:57.000 \longrightarrow 00:14:00.780$ they share a little about themselves.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:14:00.780 \longrightarrow 00:14:02.810$ And then are voted on by their

NOTE Confidence: 0.7873545675

 $00:14:02.810 \longrightarrow 00:14:03.680$ peers as they

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:14:03.745 \longrightarrow 00:14:05.917$ themselves vote for the peers that

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00{:}14{:}05.917 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}08.186$ they want to proceed or kick off

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:14:08.186 \longrightarrow 00:14:10.293$ and to to move to the next island.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:14:10.293 \longrightarrow 00:14:12.411$ Unbeknownst to the participant and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00{:}14{:}12.411 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}14.838$ other kids were all computer generated,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:14:14.840 \longrightarrow 00:14:16.408$ but there was a good cover story

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:14:16.408 \longrightarrow 00:14:17.948$ and that the kids would believe

 $00:14:17.948 \longrightarrow 00:14:19.574$ that there were other kids and

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:14:19.580 \longrightarrow 00:14:21.659$ completing the task at the same time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

00:14:21.660 --> 00:14:25.236 So our primary behavioral outcome was,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:14:25.240 \longrightarrow 00:14:25.888$ was ingratiation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:14:25.888 \longrightarrow 00:14:28.156$ namely how many of the peers who

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:14:28.156 \longrightarrow 00:14:30.040$ had rejected the participant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:14:30.040 \longrightarrow 00:14:31.560$ Did the participant nonetheless

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:14:31.560 \longrightarrow 00:14:34.741$ vote to to stay on for the next

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:14:34.741 \longrightarrow 00:14:36.816$ round through the Hawaiian Islands

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:14:36.816 \longrightarrow 00:14:39.049$ and this Island getaway task?

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:14:39.050 \longrightarrow 00:14:41.031$ And what we found was that sexual

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

00:14:41.031 --> 00:14:43.488 minority youth did in fact display more

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:14:43.488 \longrightarrow 00:14:45.423$ ingratiation than their heterosexual peers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:14:45.430 \longrightarrow 00:14:48.094$ And this ingratiation is a behavioral

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

00:14:48.094 --> 00:14:49.870 marker of rejection sensitivity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:14:49.870 \longrightarrow 00:14:52.170$ During the island getaway task,

00:14:52.170 --> 00:14:54.110 EG data were also recorded,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:14:54.110 \longrightarrow 00:14:56.090$ which also allowed us to

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:14:56.090 \longrightarrow 00:14:58.070$ to collect an ERP data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:14:58.070 \longrightarrow 00:14:59.134$ We are particularly interested

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:14:59.134 \longrightarrow 00:15:00.464$ in an ERP that measures.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

00:15:00.470 --> 00:15:02.610 Individual differences in neural

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:15:02.610 \longrightarrow 00:15:05.285$ reactivity to rewarding stimuli as

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:15:05.285 \longrightarrow 00:15:07.914$ opposed to to neutral or punishing

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00{:}15{:}07.914 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}10.288$ stimuli to study sexual orientation

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:15:10.288 \longrightarrow 00:15:12.748$ differences in this reward positivity

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:15:12.748 \longrightarrow 00:15:15.505$ or rupee average ERP's were calculated

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00{:}15{:}15.505 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}17.580$ across both the acceptance and

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00{:}15{:}17.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}19.568$ rejection conditions after about 300

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:15:19.568 \longrightarrow 00:15:21.388$ milliseconds and after after the

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:15:21.388 \longrightarrow 00:15:23.388$ social feedback was given where it

00:15:23.388 --> 00:15:25.200 was maximal in the overall sample.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:15:25.200 \longrightarrow 00:15:27.400$ The top panel shows the mean data from

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:15:27.400 \longrightarrow 00:15:28.860$ the heterosexual participants in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:15:28.860 \longrightarrow 00:15:31.110$ bottom panel shows the mean data from the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

00:15:31.110 --> 00:15:33.054 Sexual minority participants

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:15:33.054 \longrightarrow 00:15:36.942$ and the line in red indicates.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:15:36.950 \longrightarrow 00:15:40.051$ The line and red indicates the responses

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:15:40.051 \longrightarrow 00:15:42.926$ to to neural responses to rejection

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:15:42.926 \longrightarrow 00:15:45.836$ and the line in green indicates

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:15:45.836 \longrightarrow 00:15:48.670$ ERP responses to to acceptance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:15:48.670 \longrightarrow 00:15:50.294$ And what you see is that there was

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:15:50.294 \longrightarrow 00:15:52.174$ a trend towards a small sexual

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:15:52.174 \longrightarrow 00:15:53.590$ orientation difference such that

NOTE Confidence: 0.857031035333333

 $00:15:53.590 \longrightarrow 00:15:55.030$ sexual minorities showed showed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

00:15:57.850 --> 00:15:59.245 Response positive feedback,

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:15:59.245 \longrightarrow 00:16:00.640$ which other research,

00:16:00.640 --> 00:16:02.160 including research using this sample,

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:16:02.160 \longrightarrow 00:16:04.036$ has shown to be predictive of of

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:16:04.036 \longrightarrow 00:16:05.480$ the development of depression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:16:05.480 \longrightarrow 00:16:07.200$ Importantly, this main effect was

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:16:07.200 \longrightarrow 00:16:09.336$ qualified by an interaction with parental

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:16:09.336 \longrightarrow 00:16:11.466$ support such that the sex orientation

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:16:11.466 \longrightarrow 00:16:13.579$ difference and repeat wasn't significant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

00:16:13.580 --> 00:16:16.596 It averaged or high levels of family support,

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:16:16.600 \longrightarrow 00:16:18.080$ but but was only significant

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:16:18.080 \longrightarrow 00:16:19.560$ low levels of family support.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6205573733333333

00:16:19.560 --> 00:16:20.332 Now, unfortunately,

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:16:20.332 \longrightarrow 00:16:21.876$ as I showed earlier,

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00{:}16{:}21.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}24.856$ LGBT youth are much less likely

NOTE Confidence: 0.6205573733333333

 $00:16:24.856 \longrightarrow 00:16:25.848$ and consistently.

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:16:25.850 \longrightarrow 00:16:29.154$ More likely to report and poor parental

00:16:29.154 --> 00:16:32.388 lack of parental support in their lives,

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:16:32.390 \longrightarrow 00:16:34.874$ which which is unfortunate given given

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

00:16:34.874 --> 00:16:37.429 the known importance of parental support

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00{:}16{:}37.429 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}39.913$ as a buffer against against depression

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:16:39.913 \longrightarrow 00:16:42.887$ and an evidence here suggests through

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:16:42.887 \longrightarrow 00:16:45.482$ mechanisms that might drive depression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:16:45.490 \longrightarrow 00:16:46.282$ So overall,

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

00:16:46.282 --> 00:16:49.054 the results that I just reviewed support

NOTE Confidence: 0.6205573733333333

 $00:16:49.054 \longrightarrow 00:16:51.929$ the tenants of minority stress theory.

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:16:51.930 \longrightarrow 00:16:54.390$ You have structural and interpersonal forms

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

00:16:54.390 --> 00:16:57.060 of stigma being strongly associated with.

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

00:16:57.060 --> 00:16:59.223 Or mental health and you have this

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:16:59.223 \longrightarrow 00:17:00.998$ association being mediated by minority

NOTE Confidence: 0.6205573733333333

00:17:00.998 --> 00:17:02.988 stress reactions like identity concealment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:17:02.990 \longrightarrow 00:17:04.110$ internalized stigma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:17:04.110 \longrightarrow 00:17:06.350$ rejection sensitivity that lead

00:17:06.350 --> 00:17:08.590 LGBTQ people to respectively,

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:17:08.590 \longrightarrow 00:17:09.990$ hide their true selves,

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:17:09.990 \longrightarrow 00:17:11.390$ feel ashamed and expect,

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

00:17:11.390 --> 00:17:13.775 and anxiously expect and poorly

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:17:13.775 \longrightarrow 00:17:15.206$ react to rejection.

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:17:15.210 \longrightarrow 00:17:17.498$ At the same time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:17:17.498 \longrightarrow 00:17:19.786$ because these reactions all

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

00:17:19.786 --> 00:17:21.341 represent cognitive, affective,

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:17:21.341 \longrightarrow 00:17:23.807$ and behavioral reactions within the person,

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:17:23.810 \longrightarrow 00:17:26.610$ these reactions at least can be affirmatively

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

00:17:26.610 --> 00:17:27.810 addressed through psychotherapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:17:27.810 \longrightarrow 00:17:29.180$ Even if the broad structures,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6205573733333333

 $00:17:29.180 \longrightarrow 00:17:31.260$ or even if if people's

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

00:17:31.260 --> 00:17:32.924 day-to-day interactions can't be,

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:17:32.930 \longrightarrow 00:17:34.510$ can't be easily changed,

 $00:17:34.510 \longrightarrow 00:17:35.695$ get until recently,

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00{:}17{:}35.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}37.795$ no empirically supported mental health

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:17:37.795 \longrightarrow 00:17:40.353$ treatment had been created to address

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:17:40.353 \longrightarrow 00:17:42.723$ these reactions and and examined in

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:17:42.723 \longrightarrow 00:17:45.079$ RCT specifically for LGBTQ individuals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:17:45.080 \longrightarrow 00:17:45.760$ So therefore,

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:17:45.760 \longrightarrow 00:17:47.460$ over the past several years,

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:17:47.460 \longrightarrow 00:17:49.164$ our team here at Yale has been in

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:17:49.164 \longrightarrow 00:17:50.821$ the process of developing and testing

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:17:50.821 \longrightarrow 00:17:52.291$ the efficacy of an intervention

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00{:}17{:}52.291 \mathrel{--}{>} 00{:}17{:}53.705$ that affirmatively responds to

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:17:53.705 \longrightarrow 00:17:55.485$ stigma and addresses minority stress

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:17:55.485 \longrightarrow 00:17:58.360$ reactions to improve mental health.

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:17:58.360 \longrightarrow 00:17:59.800$ So to create such a treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:17:59.800 \longrightarrow 00:18:01.410$ we interviewed numerous mental health

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00{:}18{:}01.410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}02.698$ professionals around the country,

 $00:18:02.700 \longrightarrow 00:18:04.460$ people who spent their entire

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

00:18:04.460 --> 00:18:06.220 careers working with LGBTQ people.

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

00:18:06.220 --> 00:18:09.161 We asked them how we should adapt CBT,

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

00:18:09.161 --> 00:18:11.485 just standard cognitive behavior

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:18:11.485 \longrightarrow 00:18:14.979$ therapy to best support LGBTQ people

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

00:18:14.979 --> 00:18:17.991 and ability to to to adaptively

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:18:17.991 \longrightarrow 00:18:20.200$ respond to minority stress.

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:18:20.200 \longrightarrow 00:18:22.768$ We also interviewed many dozen LGBTQ

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00{:}18{:}22.768 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}25.212$ people who themselves were were

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:18:25.212 \longrightarrow 00:18:27.198$ currently experiencing depression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6205573733333333

00:18:27.200 --> 00:18:30.040 anxiety, suicidality, and substance use.

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:18:30.040 \longrightarrow 00:18:33.288$ And and we packaged all those that

NOTE Confidence: 0.6205573733333333

 $00{:}18{:}33.288 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}37.365$ kind of qualitative and expert input into a.

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:18:37.370 \longrightarrow 00:18:39.778$ Into a CBT treatment manual that that

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:18:39.778 \longrightarrow 00:18:41.848$ provides LGBTQ people with the tools

00:18:41.848 --> 00:18:43.804 to understand and challenge the ways

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:18:43.804 \longrightarrow 00:18:46.129$ that minority stress impacts their lives.

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

00:18:46.129 --> 00:18:48.247 And they're in their mental health.

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:18:48.250 \longrightarrow 00:18:50.015$ So the mental health professionals

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:18:50.015 \longrightarrow 00:18:52.210$ told us about the way they've

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

00:18:52.210 --> 00:18:54.422 seen LGBTQ people grow past the

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:18:54.422 \longrightarrow 00:18:56.654$ painful lessons of stigma by first

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:18:56.654 \longrightarrow 00:18:58.390$ acknowledging the existence of stigma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6205573733333333

 $00{:}18{:}58.390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}00.791$ kind of raising their awareness of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

00:19:00.791 --> 00:19:03.224 fact that stigma is a reality and

NOTE Confidence: 0.6205573733333333

 $00:19:03.224 \longrightarrow 00:19:05.491$ that that that has to be coped

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:19:05.491 \longrightarrow 00:19:07.500$ with in the lives of LGBTQ people.

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:19:07.500 \longrightarrow 00:19:09.165$ Learning skills for standing up

NOTE Confidence: 0.6205573733333333

 $00:19:09.165 \longrightarrow 00:19:11.365$ to stigma is kind of insidious

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:19:11.365 \longrightarrow 00:19:12.760$ and harmful impact.

NOTE Confidence: 0.620557373333333

 $00:19:12.760 \longrightarrow 00:19:14.812$ But within within oneself,

00:19:14.812 --> 00:19:17.890 learning it how stigma can can

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

 $00:19:17.985 \longrightarrow 00:19:21.585$ shape biases like internalized internalized

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

00:19:21.585 --> 00:19:23.942 **** negativity or internalized transphobia,

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

00:19:23.942 --> 00:19:26.390 leading people to believe that they're

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

 $00:19:26.443 \longrightarrow 00:19:28.638$ inferior to heterosexual cisgender people,

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

 $00{:}19{:}28.640 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}19{:}30.992$ leading people to kind of chronically

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

00:19:30.992 --> 00:19:33.252 anxiously expect rejection even, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

 $00{:}19{:}33.252 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}35.328$ in their in their close relationships

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

 $00:19:35.328 \longrightarrow 00:19:37.979$ or even even among other LGBTQ people.

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

00:19:37.980 --> 00:19:39.684 Um, learning new empowered.

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

00:19:39.684 --> 00:19:42.100 Um, ways of of behaving

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

00:19:42.100 --> 00:19:43.761 and finding support, meaning,

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

 $00{:}19{:}43.761 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}46.066$ and purpose, including from within

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

 $00:19:46.066 \dashrightarrow 00:19:48.749$ the LGBTQ community as they do so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

 $00:19:48.750 \longrightarrow 00:19:50.274$ So like I said,

00:19:50.274 --> 00:19:52.179 we packaged that expertise that

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

 $00{:}19{:}52.179 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}54.215$ that qualitative feedback into

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

00:19:54.215 --> 00:19:57.377 into a treatment package and LGBTQ

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

00:19:57.377 --> 00:19:59.229 affirmative CBT quite simply,

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

 $00:19:59.230 \longrightarrow 00:20:01.294$ and then tested the treatment success

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

00:20:01.294 --> 00:20:03.489 and an initial randomized control trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

00:20:03.490 --> 00:20:04.610 And keep in mind,

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

 $00:20:04.610 \longrightarrow 00:20:05.730$ until this research no.

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

00:20:05.730 --> 00:20:07.613 Despite the the fact that LGBT people

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

00:20:07.613 --> 00:20:10.074 are one of the highest risk groups for

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

00:20:10.074 --> 00:20:11.753 for these mental health challenges,

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

 $00:20:11.753 \longrightarrow 00:20:13.768$ no mental health treatment for

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

 $00:20:13.768 \longrightarrow 00:20:15.962$ LGBTQ people had ever been tested

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

 $00:20:15.962 \longrightarrow 00:20:18.310$ in an RCT to see if it worked so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

00:20:18.310 --> 00:20:19.990 Unfortunately don't have time to go

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

 $00:20:19.990 \longrightarrow 00:20:22.153$ into the the exact content of the

 $00:20:22.153 \longrightarrow 00:20:24.055$ treatment but I'll I'll I'll summarize

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

00:20:24.118 --> 00:20:26.379 by saying that it's guided by a

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

 $00:20:26.379 \longrightarrow 00:20:27.989$ personally tailored minority stress

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

 $00:20:27.989 \longrightarrow 00:20:30.545$ case conceptualization that specifies

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

 $00{:}20{:}30.545 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}33.101$ techniques for addressing various

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

 $00:20:33.101 \longrightarrow 00:20:35.496$ minority stressors that that LGBTQ

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

 $00:20:35.496 \longrightarrow 00:20:38.466$ people might be facing and then and

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

 $00:20:38.466 \longrightarrow 00:20:42.114$ and and then provides a set of of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

 $00{:}20{:}42.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}43.616$ The principles and techniques,

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

 $00{:}20{:}43.616 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}46.377$ both based in CBT and the integration

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

00:20:46.377 --> 00:20:49.065 of CBT with minority stress theory,

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

00:20:49.070 --> 00:20:50.900 that help LGBT people raise

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

 $00{:}20{:}50.900 \to 00{:}20{:}53.205$ awareness of the existence of early

NOTE Confidence: 0.73916674375

 $00:20:53.205 \longrightarrow 00:20:55.240$ and ongoing sources of minority.

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

00:20:58.690 --> 00:21:00.870 That help LGBTQ people reduce

 $00:21:00.870 \longrightarrow 00:21:03.050$ characteristic ways of avoiding the

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00{:}21{:}03.127 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}05.947$ emotional consequences of minority stress,

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

00:21:05.950 --> 00:21:08.682 such as drinking alcohol use, self harm

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

00:21:08.682 --> 00:21:11.238 and other forms of emotional numbing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:21:11.240 \longrightarrow 00:21:13.335$ asserting oneself against the emotional

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:21:13.335 \longrightarrow 00:21:15.430$ consequences of minority stress to

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:21:15.488 \longrightarrow 00:21:17.468$ break social withdrawal tendencies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:21:17.470 \longrightarrow 00:21:21.120$ Reworking. Internalized.

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

00:21:21.120 --> 00:21:23.265 Umm, homophobic, biphobic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:21:23.265 \longrightarrow 00:21:26.125$ transphobic, and cultural ideologies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

00:21:26.130 --> 00:21:28.370 Importantly, not challenging the veracity

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:21:28.370 \longrightarrow 00:21:31.070$ of of discrimination in the world,

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:21:31.070 \longrightarrow 00:21:32.880$ but instead challenging the veracity

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:21:32.880 \longrightarrow 00:21:35.012$ of their internalization that one is

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

00:21:35.012 --> 00:21:36.867 rejectable or that one is not lovable,

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:21:36.870 \longrightarrow 00:21:40.209$ or that one is inferior to to others.

 $00:21:40.210 \longrightarrow 00:21:42.075$ And then intentionally building and

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:21:42.075 \longrightarrow 00:21:45.070$ drawing on cues of of social safety and

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:21:45.070 \longrightarrow 00:21:47.541$ and and and and people's worlds,

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

00:21:47.550 --> 00:21:49.345 including from within the LGBT

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00{:}21{:}49.345 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}51.140$ community and the broader community.

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:21:51.140 \longrightarrow 00:21:53.815$ So this this treatment overall

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

00:21:53.815 --> 00:21:55.955 teaches people these cognitive,

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:21:55.960 \longrightarrow 00:21:56.428$ affective,

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

00:21:56.428 --> 00:21:59.236 and behavioral skills to help them

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:21:59.236 \longrightarrow 00:22:01.572$ start overcoming the the patterns

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

00:22:01.572 --> 00:22:04.128 of thinking and behaving that they.

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:22:04.130 \longrightarrow 00:22:06.629$ People often have a root and minority

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:22:06.629 \longrightarrow 00:22:09.029$ stress and often are kind of have

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:22:09.029 \longrightarrow 00:22:10.836$ a deeply planted root that that

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

00:22:10.836 --> 00:22:13.020 characterizes a lot of their a lot of

 $00:22:13.078 \longrightarrow 00:22:15.214$ their behavior and that sets in a lot

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:22:15.214 \longrightarrow 00:22:17.470$ of their reactions to stress that can

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00{:}22{:}17.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}20.070$ set them up for mental health risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00{:}22{:}20.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}21.846$ So in an initial weightless control

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:22:21.846 \longrightarrow 00:22:23.875$ trial with with 60 young game as exual

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

00:22:23.875 --> 00:22:26.122 men in New York City we found initial

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:22:26.122 \longrightarrow 00:22:28.565$ evidence for the promise of this treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:22:28.570 \longrightarrow 00:22:30.858$ So looking at the lines in blue which

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:22:30.858 \longrightarrow 00:22:34.198$ is the effect of the from having.

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:22:34.200 \longrightarrow 00:22:35.826$ Received the treatment compared to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

00:22:35.826 --> 00:22:37.549 lines and Gray which is the effect

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00{:}22{:}37.549 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}39.210$ from from being put on a wait list.

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:22:39.210 \longrightarrow 00:22:41.460$ We found that the treatment helps

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

00:22:41.460 --> 00:22:43.831 these young gay bisexual men feel

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:22:43.831 \longrightarrow 00:22:45.427$ less depressed less anxious,

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

00:22:45.430 --> 00:22:48.349 drink less and and have safer sex

 $00:22:48.350 \longrightarrow 00:22:50.750$ at three months following the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00{:}22{:}50.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}53.469$ the treatment or the the wait list.

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:22:53.470 \longrightarrow 00:22:56.542$ We do very similar study with 60 young

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

00:22:56.542 --> 00:22:58.949 sexual minority women in New York City

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:22:58.950 \longrightarrow 00:23:00.654$ many of whom were were transgender

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:23:00.654 \longrightarrow 00:23:02.371$ or gender non binary similar to

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:23:02.371 \longrightarrow 00:23:04.219$ the pilot study with young gay and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00{:}23{:}04.220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}06.092$ Sexual men we found that compared

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:23:06.092 \longrightarrow 00:23:07.791$ to waitlists the treatment was

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:23:07.791 \longrightarrow 00:23:09.355$ associated with significantly greater

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:23:09.355 \longrightarrow 00:23:11.667$ reductions and and depression and

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:23:11.667 \longrightarrow 00:23:13.497$ anxiety and an unhealthy alcohol use.

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00{:}23{:}13.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}17.358$ All these outcomes that that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:23:17.358 \longrightarrow 00:23:18.644$ particularly disproportionately

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

00:23:18.644 --> 00:23:21.758 likely to affect LGBTQ people.

 $00:23:21.760 \longrightarrow 00:23:23.614$ We then asked whether this treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:23:23.614 \longrightarrow 00:23:25.253$ might be more efficacious than

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:23:25.253 \longrightarrow 00:23:26.998$ existing treatments for LGBTQ people.

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:23:27.000 \longrightarrow 00:23:30.104$ So in a trial with 254 young gay and

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

00:23:30.104 --> 00:23:32.299 bisexual men in Miami and in New York City,

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:23:32.300 \longrightarrow 00:23:34.385$ we compared this LGBTQ affirmative

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:23:34.385 \longrightarrow 00:23:36.871$ CBT to supportive counseling in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:23:36.871 \longrightarrow 00:23:38.845$ community and to a single session

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00{:}23{:}38.845 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}40.719$ of HIV testing and referral.

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

00:23:40.720 --> 00:23:43.163 That we chose HIV testing and single

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:23:43.163 \longrightarrow 00:23:45.594$ session HIV testing and and referral

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:23:45.594 \longrightarrow 00:23:48.008$ because it's the most common way that

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:23:48.008 \longrightarrow 00:23:50.210$ young gay and bisexual men encounter

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00{:}23{:}50.210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}52.242$ and LGBT specific healthcare services.

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

00:23:52.242 --> 00:23:55.368 I'm in the US testing for HIV,

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:23:55.368 \longrightarrow 00:23:56.220$ that is,

 $00:23:56.220 \longrightarrow 00:23:59.220$ with the with the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

00:23:59.220 --> 00:24:02.208 In a in a in an HIV STI screening

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:24:02.208 \longrightarrow 00:24:03.060$ appointment takes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:24:03.060 \longrightarrow 00:24:04.590$ you know 20-30 minutes and it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

 $00:24:04.590 \longrightarrow 00:24:06.163$ and it's a frequently used service

NOTE Confidence: 0.763773344

00:24:06.163 --> 00:24:07.675 in the lives of LGBTQ people.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00:24:07.680 \longrightarrow 00:24:08.898$ But we thought we'd use that

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00:24:08.898 \longrightarrow 00:24:10.778$ as a sa a quite weak control.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00:24:10.780 \longrightarrow 00:24:12.985$ And what we found was that LGBTQ

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00{:}24{:}12.985 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}14.881$ affirmative CBT was associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

00:24:14.881 --> 00:24:17.087 small to moderately relative benefit

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00:24:17.087 \longrightarrow 00:24:20.076$ compared to to the two other treatments.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00{:}24{:}20.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}22.495$ Effect sizes were the largest for substance

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

00:24:22.495 --> 00:24:24.838 use problems with LGBTQ affirmative CBT,

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00:24:24.840 \longrightarrow 00:24:26.028$ yielding significantly greater

 $00:24:26.028 \longrightarrow 00:24:28.404$ impact on the substance use problems

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00:24:28.404 \longrightarrow 00:24:30.227$ than the other two conditions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00:24:30.230 \longrightarrow 00:24:32.190$ Also consistent with the trans

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

00:24:32.190 --> 00:24:34.150 diagnostic basis of the treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00:24:34.150 \longrightarrow 00:24:36.145$ the targets minority stress reactions

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

00:24:36.145 --> 00:24:38.685 theorized to underlie all of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00:24:38.685 \longrightarrow 00:24:41.075$ multiple Co occurring outcomes that

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00:24:41.075 \longrightarrow 00:24:42.987$ disproportionately affect LGBTQ people.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00:24:42.990 \longrightarrow 00:24:45.204$ We also found that the treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00:24:45.204 \longrightarrow 00:24:46.680$ was associated with significantly

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00{:}24{:}46.738 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}48.686$ stronger efficacy for reducing

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

00:24:48.686 --> 00:24:50.147 comorbidity across depression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00:24:50.150 \longrightarrow 00:24:52.388$ anxiety, substance use, and HIV risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00:24:52.390 \longrightarrow 00:24:56.730$ Then the then the two comparison conditions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00:24:56.730 \longrightarrow 00:24:58.890$ We then performed what's called

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00:24:58.890 \longrightarrow 00:25:00.618$ a treatment effect heterogeneity

 $00:25:00.618 \longrightarrow 00:25:02.507$ analysis to identify the strongest

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

00:25:02.507 --> 00:25:04.601 moderator of set of moderators of

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00:25:04.664 \longrightarrow 00:25:06.342$ LGBTQ affirmative CBT's efficacy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00:25:06.342 \longrightarrow 00:25:09.030$ So we did this by asking the the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00:25:09.030 \longrightarrow 00:25:10.818$ the the therapist over the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00:25:10.818 \longrightarrow 00:25:12.929$ four or five years of this study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00:25:12.930 \longrightarrow 00:25:14.874$ So we surveyed them at the end of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00:25:14.874 \longrightarrow 00:25:16.751$ study to nominate any and all factors

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00:25:16.751 \longrightarrow 00:25:18.853$ that they thought may have led some

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00:25:18.853 \longrightarrow 00:25:20.488$ participants to benefit more from

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00{:}25{:}20.488 \to 00{:}25{:}22.131$ LGBTQ affirmative CBT than others.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00:25:22.131 \longrightarrow 00:25:24.420$ They suggested a list of 20 potential

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00{:}25{:}24.488 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}26.268$ moderators that we then subjected

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00:25:26.268 \longrightarrow 00:25:27.336$ to a machine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

00:25:27.340 --> 00:25:29.160 Learning approach to identify

 $00:25:29.160 \longrightarrow 00:25:30.525$ the top moderators.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00:25:30.530 \longrightarrow 00:25:32.642$ So we pre registered this analysis

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

00:25:32.642 --> 00:25:35.408 and with the primary outcome of our

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

00:25:35.408 --> 00:25:37.721 comorbidity count of depression, anxiety,

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00:25:37.721 \longrightarrow 00:25:41.267$ HIV risk behavior and substance use.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

00:25:41.270 --> 00:25:44.666 Only one moderator emerged as significant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

00:25:44.670 --> 00:25:46.178 namely race and ethnicity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

00:25:46.178 --> 00:25:48.440 such that Black and Latinx participants

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00:25:48.503 \longrightarrow 00:25:51.226$ who compose the majority of the sample

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

00:25:51.226 --> 00:25:53.333 experience significantly more reduction in

NOTE Confidence: 0.821262139230769

 $00{:}25{:}53.333 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}55.538$ comorbid conditions from LGBTQ affirming.

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:25:59.630 \longrightarrow 00:26:01.877$ So we haven't been able to empirically

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:26:01.877 \longrightarrow 00:26:03.989$ identify the reasons for this moderation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:26:03.990 \longrightarrow 00:26:05.340$ But clinically, we noted that

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

00:26:05.340 --> 00:26:06.690 black and white Max participants

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:26:06.736 \longrightarrow 00:26:08.146$ seem more amenable to the minority

 $00:26:08.146 \longrightarrow 00:26:09.570$ stress focus of the treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:26:09.570 \longrightarrow 00:26:10.775$ Perhaps because they were they

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

00:26:10.775 --> 00:26:12.260 were better able to to draw,

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:26:12.260 \longrightarrow 00:26:14.409$ they were able to drop on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

00:26:14.409 --> 00:26:15.330 racial socialization experiences,

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:26:15.330 \longrightarrow 00:26:17.935$ to incorporate the minority stress

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:26:17.935 \longrightarrow 00:26:21.024$ focus of LGBTQ affirmative CPT and

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

00:26:21.024 --> 00:26:23.430 into and into into their lives,

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00{:}26{:}23.430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}25.418$ or perhaps because

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00{:}26{:}25.418 \to 00{:}26{:}26.909$ LGBTQ affirmative CBT.

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

00:26:26.910 --> 00:26:28.760 Addressed not only minority stress,

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:26:28.760 \longrightarrow 00:26:29.921$ sexual minority stress,

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00{:}26{:}29.921 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}32.630$ but all identity related stress in their

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:26:32.694 \longrightarrow 00:26:34.840$ interactions and and in reality it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:26:34.840 \longrightarrow 00:26:36.765$ It would be hard if not impossible

 $00:26:36.765 \longrightarrow 00:26:38.836$ to kind of tease apart how

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00{:}26{:}38.836 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}40.796$ people are are incorporating an

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:26:40.796 \longrightarrow 00:26:42.379$ identity focused lens of CBT.

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:26:42.380 \longrightarrow 00:26:44.372$ And separately depending on the all

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

00:26:44.372 --> 00:26:46.143 the the different social identities

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:26:46.143 \longrightarrow 00:26:48.078$ they might they might identify.

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:26:48.080 \longrightarrow 00:26:49.492$ For example the assertiveness

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:26:49.492 \longrightarrow 00:26:51.610$ practice in the treatment wouldn't be

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00{:}26{:}51.672 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}53.737$ limited only to 1 aspect of someone's

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

00:26:53.737 --> 00:26:55.467 identity who would naturally apply

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:26:55.467 \longrightarrow 00:26:57.427$ even to racially hostile situations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616 00:26:57.430 --> 00:26:59.250 As well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:26:59.250 \longrightarrow 00:27:01.116$ So we're now studying whether this

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

00:27:01.116 --> 00:27:03.128 treatment can can lend itself to to,

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:27:03.130 \longrightarrow 00:27:05.152$ to maybe even more efficient reach

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:27:05.152 \longrightarrow 00:27:07.615$ by using an asynchronous form of the

00:27:07.615 --> 00:27:09.365 treatment whereby LGBTQ young people,

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:27:09.370 \longrightarrow 00:27:11.008$ in this case anywhere in the US,

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:27:11.010 \longrightarrow 00:27:13.392$ can receive 1010 weeks of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

00:27:13.392 --> 00:27:14.980 psychoeducational content about minority

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00{:}27{:}15.045 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}17.432$ stress and CBT and learn skills for

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:27:17.432 \longrightarrow 00:27:18.910$ addressing its emotional impact.

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

00:27:18.910 --> 00:27:20.386 They can read about this online,

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:27:20.390 \longrightarrow 00:27:22.136$ they can share their written reactions

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00{:}27{:}22.136 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}24.453$ and try out the CBT skills through

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

00:27:24.453 --> 00:27:26.643 through homework exercises in their lives,

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:27:26.650 \longrightarrow 00:27:28.870$ and they can receive and and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:27:28.870 \longrightarrow 00:27:30.875$ They do receive weekly feedback

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00{:}27{:}30.875 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}33.140$ from from the therapist this we're

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:27:33.140 \longrightarrow 00:27:35.120$ in the process of comparing this

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00{:}27{:}35.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}37.422$ treatment to to to relatively weak

 $00:27:37.422 \longrightarrow 00:27:39.397$ control condition just simple self

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

00:27:39.397 --> 00:27:41.052 monitoring and mood and minority

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:27:41.052 \longrightarrow 00:27:43.266$ stress and then and then this will

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:27:43.266 \longrightarrow 00:27:46.108$ set us up to eventually compare this

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

00:27:46.108 --> 00:27:48.395 this perhaps more efficient way of

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00{:}27{:}48.395 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}50.699$ delivering the treatment to to to

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

00:27:50.699 --> 00:27:52.484 perhaps the more time intensive

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

00:27:52.484 --> 00:27:54.833 standard you know kind of 50 minute

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:27:54.833 \longrightarrow 00:27:56.964$ session once a week that would and

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:27:56.964 \longrightarrow 00:27:59.740$ that we've that we've used in our other.

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00{:}27{:}59.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}02.156$ This will allow us to to weigh

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:28:02.156 \longrightarrow 00:28:04.165$ the relative benefits of this

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

00:28:04.165 --> 00:28:07.583 delivery modality capable of of

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00{:}28{:}07.583 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}10.106$ potentially wider reach.

NOTE Confidence: 0.849931375384616

 $00:28:10.110 \longrightarrow 00:28:12.120$ So these are initial trials.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

00:28:15.770 --> 00:28:19.690 Oh, wait, sorry. So, so Speaking of REACH

 $00:28:19.690 \longrightarrow 00:28:22.185$ and I now want to highlight our team's

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00{:}28{:}22.185 \to 00{:}28{:}24.525$ efforts to ensure the implementation of

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:28:24.525 \longrightarrow 00:28:26.903$ this effective treatment and our local

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:28:26.903 \longrightarrow 00:28:29.590$ communities and to ensure that our treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:28:29.590 \longrightarrow 00:28:32.250$ response to the needs of those communities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:28:32.250 \longrightarrow 00:28:34.637$ So we know that that LGBTQ identities

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

00:28:34.637 --> 00:28:36.974 don't exist in isolation, but rather

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00{:}28{:}36.974 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}38.726$ they Co occur with other identities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

00:28:38.730 --> 00:28:41.546 We also know that if current rates continue,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:28:41.550 \longrightarrow 00:28:43.142$ a black gay man in the US has

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:28:43.142 \longrightarrow 00:28:45.017$ a one in two chance of becoming

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

00:28:45.017 --> 00:28:47.010 infected with HIV in his lifetime,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

00:28:47.010 --> 00:28:48.138 the average Latinx.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

00:28:48.138 --> 00:28:49.266 Scared bisexual man.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:28:49.270 \longrightarrow 00:28:51.430$ So one in three chance of becoming infected

00:28:51.430 --> 00:28:53.747 with HIV in his lifetime at current rates,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:28:53.750 \longrightarrow 00:28:55.928$ with the source of this disproportionate

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

00:28:55.928 --> 00:28:57.905 risk being solely in intersecting

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:28:57.905 \longrightarrow 00:28:59.761$ sources of structural discrimination

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

00:28:59.761 --> 00:29:02.081 towards LGBTQ people and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:29:02.144 \longrightarrow 00:29:03.989$ racism towards people of color.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:29:03.990 \longrightarrow 00:29:05.670$ We also know that the fastest

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

00:29:05.670 --> 00:29:07.490 increases in new new incident cases

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00{:}29{:}07.490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}09.404$ of HIV are occurring among young

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:29:09.404 \longrightarrow 00:29:11.591$ black gay and bisexual men in small

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00{:}29{:}11.591 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}13.445$ urban areas places like New Haven.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:29:13.445 \longrightarrow 00:29:16.365$ So I was approached by by medical provider

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00{:}29{:}16.365 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}18.766$ what one of the medical directors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

00:29:18.770 --> 00:29:20.948 Working at the Fairhaven Community Health

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

00:29:20.948 --> 00:29:23.218 Center and FQHC here in New Haven,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:29:23.220 \longrightarrow 00:29:25.656$ who was witnessing this epidemic first hand.

 $00:29:25.660 \longrightarrow 00:29:28.732$ She reached out to me after a particularly

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

00:29:28.732 --> 00:29:31.900 hard month of of diagnosing several of her,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

00:29:31.900 --> 00:29:34.322 her young black and white next gay

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

00:29:34.322 --> 00:29:36.597 patients with with HIV and said that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:29:36.600 \longrightarrow 00:29:38.628$ that that that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:29:38.628 \longrightarrow 00:29:40.656$ that she was,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:29:40.660 \longrightarrow 00:29:42.599$ that she was very motivated to try

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:29:42.599 \longrightarrow 00:29:44.828$ to address the the kind of holistic

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:29:44.828 \longrightarrow 00:29:47.145$ circumstances in their lives that that set

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:29:47.145 \longrightarrow 00:29:49.431$ them up for this risk and she knew about.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:29:49.440 \longrightarrow 00:29:51.305$ This Umm this LGBTQ affirmative

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00{:}29{:}51.305 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}53.883$ CBT treatment that we had done and

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:29:53.883 \longrightarrow 00:29:56.130$ and asked if if we could perhaps

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:29:56.130 \longrightarrow 00:29:57.957$ deliver the treatment at Fair Haven

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:29:57.957 \longrightarrow 00:29:59.942$ do it in a group based setting.

 $00:29:59.942 \longrightarrow 00:30:01.839$ Because she had the the sense that

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:30:01.839 \dashrightarrow 00:30:03.565$ that her patients could be nefit from

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:30:03.565 \longrightarrow 00:30:05.521$ talking to each other to help them

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:30:05.521 \longrightarrow 00:30:07.271$ see that they that they weren't alone

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

00:30:07.271 --> 00:30:09.924 to help them see that they were going

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:30:09.924 \dashrightarrow 00:30:11.524$ through similar struggles to build

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:30:11.524 \longrightarrow 00:30:13.572$ community and so and so we did that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

00:30:13.580 --> 00:30:16.080 And, and doctor Skyler Jackson,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:30:16.080 \longrightarrow 00:30:18.060$ who was at the time of postdoc in my lab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:30:18.060 \longrightarrow 00:30:20.778$ now Sistant professor in our department.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:30:20.780 \longrightarrow 00:30:23.220$ He he he he brought the study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:30:23.220 \longrightarrow 00:30:24.964$ He was also one of the therapist

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:30:24.964 \longrightarrow 00:30:25.760$ on the study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

00:30:25.760 --> 00:30:28.308 And then before we deliver the treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

00:30:28.310 --> 00:30:29.954 we interviewed about a dozen game

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

00:30:29.954 --> 00:30:32.076 bisexual men of color in New Haven to

 $00:30:32.076 \longrightarrow 00:30:33.884$ get a sense of their interlocking forms

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00{:}30{:}33.884 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}35.935$ of stigma and how they influence their

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00{:}30{:}35.935 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}37.517$ mental health, their day-to-day lives,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:30:37.517 \longrightarrow 00:30:39.820$ and their sense of community and connection.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:30:39.820 \longrightarrow 00:30:41.950$ We then packaged the results of

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:30:41.950 \longrightarrow 00:30:43.750$ those interviews into the LGBT.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

00:30:43.750 --> 00:30:46.198 Affirmative CBT treatment to make sure

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:30:46.198 \dashrightarrow 00:30:48.618$ that the therapist can be prepared

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00:30:48.618 \dashrightarrow 00:30:51.117$ and responsive to the to the unique.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

 $00{:}30{:}51.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}53.216$ Challenges and and resiliencies

NOTE Confidence: 0.82507835

00:30:53.216 --> 00:30:55.969 experienced by by, by this community.

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:30:59.290 \longrightarrow 00:31:01.061$ For the treatment and this pilot study

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00{:}31{:}01.061 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}03.253$ to to 21 black and Latino gay and

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

00:31:03.253 --> 00:31:05.060 bisexual men that they are having.

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:31:05.060 \longrightarrow 00:31:06.929$ I should say that Doctor Jackson has

00:31:06.929 --> 00:31:08.677 since received a K award to expand

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:31:08.677 \longrightarrow 00:31:10.670$ this work to to similar communities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:31:10.670 \longrightarrow 00:31:12.925$ It's it's similar similar locales

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

00:31:12.925 --> 00:31:15.508 like in bisexual men living there

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

00:31:15.508 --> 00:31:17.810 in the in the US S so in this small

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:31:17.810 \longrightarrow 00:31:19.599$ pilot that we did a fair haven we

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

00:31:19.599 --> 00:31:21.004 found reductions in the expected

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:31:21.004 \longrightarrow 00:31:22.972$ direction for for almost all of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:31:22.972 \longrightarrow 00:31:24.574$ outcomes and perhaps most relevant for

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:31:24.580 \longrightarrow 00:31:26.710$ this pilot study we found evidence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:31:26.710 \longrightarrow 00:31:29.115$ That this intersectionality adapted group

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:31:29.115 \longrightarrow 00:31:32.019$ based format of LGBTQ affirmative CBT

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:31:32.019 \longrightarrow 00:31:34.159$ could be implemented quite feasibly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

00:31:34.160 --> 00:31:36.134 Most of the participants showed up

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:31:36.134 \longrightarrow 00:31:38.838$ to to to nearly all of the sessions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:31:38.840 \longrightarrow 00:31:40.826$ but perhaps looking at how they

 $00:31:40.826 \longrightarrow 00:31:42.743$ talked about the treatment in their

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:31:42.743 \longrightarrow 00:31:44.605$ own words kind of drives the the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:31:44.610 \longrightarrow 00:31:45.471$ the, the, the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:31:45.471 \longrightarrow 00:31:47.480$ the point and the purpose of this

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

00:31:47.544 --> 00:31:49.280 intervention home quite well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286 00:31:49.280 --> 00:31:51.940 for example.

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:31:51.940 \longrightarrow 00:31:53.291$ One participant said I used to think

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:31:53.291 \longrightarrow 00:31:54.738$ that being gay was a bad thing and

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

00:31:54.738 --> 00:31:55.989 that I should be ashamed of myself,

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:31:55.990 \longrightarrow 00:31:57.264$ that I should try and be straight

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:31:57.264 \longrightarrow 00:31:58.568$ and that I shouldn't hang out

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:31:58.568 \longrightarrow 00:31:59.758$ with like other gay people.

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:31:59.760 \longrightarrow 00:32:01.508$ Now, after the treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:32:01.508 \longrightarrow 00:32:04.180$ it's the exact opposite, another said.

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:32:04.180 \longrightarrow 00:32:04.900$ After the study.

 $00:32:04.900 \longrightarrow 00:32:06.040$ I came out to my mom,

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:32:06.040 \longrightarrow 00:32:07.320$ I came out to a lot more friends.

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

00:32:07.320 --> 00:32:08.044 Now I'm just like,

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

00:32:08.044 --> 00:32:09.130 I'm just living my best life,

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:32:09.130 \longrightarrow 00:32:09.958$ as people say,

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:32:09.958 \longrightarrow 00:32:12.496$ going back to that kind of the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:32:12.496 \longrightarrow 00:32:14.656$ cost of of hiding a part of oneself,

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

00:32:14.660 --> 00:32:16.856 including from from one's own parents,

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:32:16.860 \longrightarrow 00:32:18.617$ and kind of the the challenges,

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:32:18.620 \longrightarrow 00:32:20.748$ but also potential benefits.

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

00:32:20.748 --> 00:32:22.344 Of coming out,

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:32:22.350 \longrightarrow 00:32:23.398$ which this treatment helped

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:32:23.398 \longrightarrow 00:32:24.970$ this this one young man do,

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:32:24.970 \longrightarrow 00:32:25.540$ another participant said.

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:32:25.540 \longrightarrow 00:32:27.360$ It helped me a lot to how do I say it?

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:32:27.360 \longrightarrow 00:32:29.467$ Be happy with myself like except myself.

 $00:32:29.470 \longrightarrow 00:32:30.292$ In the session,

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:32:30.292 \longrightarrow 00:32:31.388$ people actually listened and

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:32:31.388 \longrightarrow 00:32:32.848$ cared about what I had to say,

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:32:32.850 \longrightarrow 00:32:34.094$ so the treatment helps

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:32:34.094 \longrightarrow 00:32:35.027$ strengthen their identities,

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:32:35.030 \longrightarrow 00:32:38.750$ as gained bisexual men most consistently,

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

00:32:38.750 --> 00:32:41.198 most participants noted a simple but

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

00:32:41.198 --> 00:32:43.262 impactful take away illustrated by

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00{:}32{:}43.262 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}45.122$ this this last participants quote

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:32:45.122 \longrightarrow 00:32:47.004$ simply that the treatment made

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:32:47.004 \longrightarrow 00:32:49.008$ them feel like they weren't alone,

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:32:49.010 \longrightarrow 00:32:50.358$ which is something that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00{:}32{:}50.358 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}52.380$ That the providers working at Fairhaven

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00{:}32{:}52.437 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}54.225$ had been seeing in their patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

00:32:54.230 --> 00:32:55.538 They had the sense of isolation,

 $00:32:55.540 \longrightarrow 00:32:56.940$ the sense of loneliness,

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:32:56.940 \longrightarrow 00:32:58.690$ and the treatment was was

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:32:58.690 \longrightarrow 00:33:00.287$ actually a self against that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:33:00.290 \longrightarrow 00:33:02.782$ So with the goal of assessing whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00{:}33{:}02.782 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}04.693$ LGBTQ affirmative CBT can continue

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:33:04.693 \longrightarrow 00:33:07.015$ to be implemented and compete in

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

00:33:07.015 --> 00:33:09.000 community settings across the country,

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00{:}33{:}09.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}10.716$ we identified an ideal network of

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:33:10.716 \longrightarrow 00:33:12.270$ settings where this can happen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:33:12.270 \longrightarrow 00:33:12.769$ So.

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286 00:33:12.769 --> 00:33:13.767 You know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:33:13.767 \longrightarrow 00:33:16.761$ the US doesn't have a universal

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

00:33:16.761 --> 00:33:17.980 healthcare system.

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:33:17.980 \longrightarrow 00:33:18.996$ But but it does.

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

00:33:18.996 --> 00:33:21.345 But it does have kind of this amazing

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:33:21.345 \longrightarrow 00:33:23.991$ resource that was created by the LGBTQ

 $00:33:23.991 \longrightarrow 00:33:26.177$ community in the in the 1950s and 60s.

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286 00:33:26.180 --> 00:33:26.677 Specifically, NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:33:26.677 \longrightarrow 00:33:29.659$ the US has more than 300

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

00:33:29.659 --> 00:33:31.150 LGBTQ community clinics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:33:31.150 \longrightarrow 00:33:32.990$ These are these are grassroots

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:33:32.990 \longrightarrow 00:33:34.462$ clinics established and in

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:33:34.462 \longrightarrow 00:33:36.408$ many cases and during the gay

NOTE Confidence: 0.760032765714286

 $00:33:36.408 \longrightarrow 00:33:37.923$ rights movement of the 60s

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00{:}33{:}37.983 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}40.639$ where LGBTQ people were were were not having

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:33:40.639 \longrightarrow 00:33:42.818$ their their needs their their healthcare,

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

00:33:42.818 --> 00:33:44.703 mental health care needs met.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:33:44.710 \longrightarrow 00:33:46.705$ So they they did it themselves.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00{:}33{:}46.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}48.576$ These centers got even more attention

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00{:}33{:}48.576 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}50.740$ during the the AIDS epidemic in

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:33:50.740 \longrightarrow 00:33:52.756$ the 80s and 90s in particular where

 $00:33:52.820 \longrightarrow 00:33:55.308$ where where they became a kind of an

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:33:55.308 \longrightarrow 00:33:57.135$ indispensable place to to do the

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

00:33:57.135 --> 00:33:58.994 outreach and provide the care that they

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:33:58.994 \longrightarrow 00:34:01.080$ continue to be neglected by more formal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:34:01.080 \longrightarrow 00:34:04.506$ Settings. About 40% of these of

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

00:34:04.506 --> 00:34:06.790 these clinics provide mental

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:34:06.888 \longrightarrow 00:34:10.026$ health services to to a combined.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

00:34:10.030 --> 00:34:12.678 The report is it's a combined 50,000 people,

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:34:12.680 \longrightarrow 00:34:14.108$ LGBT people each year.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

00:34:14.108 --> 00:34:16.843 Because they often provide free or heavily

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00{:}34{:}16.843 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}18.947$ subsidized mental health services,

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:34:18.950 \longrightarrow 00:34:20.624$ they're providing these services to people

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:34:20.624 \longrightarrow 00:34:22.490$ who otherwise wouldn't be able to get care.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:34:22.490 \longrightarrow 00:34:24.090$ I'm including individuals with lower

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

00:34:24.090 --> 00:34:26.050 incomes and LGBT people of color,

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:34:26.050 \longrightarrow 00:34:26.902$ trans women.

 $00:34:26.902 \longrightarrow 00:34:29.458$ So we specifically partnered with Centrelink,

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:34:29.460 \longrightarrow 00:34:31.404$ which is the coordinating hub of

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:34:31.404 \longrightarrow 00:34:33.950$ the US's 300 plus LGBTQ centers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:34:33.950 \longrightarrow 00:34:36.026$ to survey the directors and CEO's

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:34:36.026 \longrightarrow 00:34:37.678$ of these centers to get a sense

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:34:37.678 \longrightarrow 00:34:39.329$ of their capacity and interest

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:34:39.329 \longrightarrow 00:34:40.825$ and willingness to implement.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00{:}34{:}40.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}42.718$ Our LGBTQ affirmative CBT

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:34:42.718 \longrightarrow 00:34:45.550$ intervention and as you can see.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333 00:34:45.550 --> 00:34:46.160 Most.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00{:}34{:}46.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}49.820$ Of the CEO's and directors reported

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:34:49.820 \longrightarrow 00:34:51.808$ that they saw room to improve their

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00{:}34{:}51.808 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}53.580$ their current mental health offerings.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00{:}34{:}53.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}55.953$ Most also reported that their staff can

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:34:55.953 \longrightarrow 00:34:58.600$ benefit and being trained in an evidence

 $00:34:58.600 \longrightarrow 00:35:00.952$ based treatment like LGBTQ affirmative CBT.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00{:}35{:}00.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}02.928$ And 100% of them said that they'd be

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00{:}35{:}02.928 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}04.558$ willing to provide the administrative

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:35:04.558 \longrightarrow 00:35:06.363$ support and staff time necessary

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:35:06.363 \longrightarrow 00:35:08.657$ for their mental health staff to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:35:08.657 \dashrightarrow 00:35:10.644$ trained and an LGBTQ affirmative CBT.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:35:10.644 \longrightarrow 00:35:12.500$ So we train them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

00:35:12.500 --> 00:35:13.668 but not only that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:35:13.668 \longrightarrow 00:35:15.420$ we use implementation science to determine

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:35:15.468 \longrightarrow 00:35:17.238$ whether the training was efficacious.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:35:17.240 \longrightarrow 00:35:19.484$ Namely we used a weightless control

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:35:19.484 \longrightarrow 00:35:21.855$ trial over 11 week training and

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:35:21.855 \longrightarrow 00:35:24.249$ LGBTQ affirmative CBT to to about

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:35:24.250 \longrightarrow 00:35:26.356$ 130 providers in this initial pilot

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:35:26.356 \longrightarrow 00:35:28.262$ test working in LGBTQ community

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:35:28.262 --> 00:35:29.990 \ {\rm centers \ across \ 21 \ states}.$

 $00:35:29.990 \longrightarrow 00:35:30.935$ This was this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:35:30.935 \longrightarrow 00:35:32.825$ this took place during the pandemic

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:35:32.825 \longrightarrow 00:35:34.883$ when we were all everyone in my lab

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:35:34.883 \longrightarrow 00:35:36.762$ was kind of sitting at home with

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:35:36.762 \longrightarrow 00:35:38.386$ kind of wondering what to do and

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:35:38.386 \longrightarrow 00:35:40.272$ how to do it and and this was

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:35:40.272 \longrightarrow 00:35:42.158$ kind of an ideal opportunity to take

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00{:}35{:}42.158 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!\!>}\ 00{:}35{:}44.024$ advantage of the ability to train

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:35:44.030 \longrightarrow 00:35:45.801$ people remotely to do work that they

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00{:}35{:}45.801 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}47.458$ that they were continuing to do.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:35:47.460 \longrightarrow 00:35:50.403$ And and and we're kind of in in

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:35:50.410 \longrightarrow 00:35:52.230$ in great need of support for doing

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00{:}35{:}52.230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}53.849$ it given the increasing demands

NOTE Confidence: 0.813160972333333

 $00:35:53.849 \longrightarrow 00:35:56.177$ including among LGBT people for from.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

00:35:59.860 --> 00:36:03.996 So we we we organized like a lunchtime

 $00:36:04.000 \longrightarrow 00:36:05.992$ webinar, training live every week for

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:36:05.992 \longrightarrow 00:36:08.240$ 11 weeks and randomly assigned half of

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:36:08.240 \longrightarrow 00:36:10.682$ the providers to the to to receive the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:36:10.682 \longrightarrow 00:36:12.557$ training immediately the other half.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:36:12.560 \longrightarrow 00:36:14.102$ So wait list where they received

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:36:14.102 \longrightarrow 00:36:15.500$ the training after four months.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:36:15.500 \longrightarrow 00:36:17.440$ And what we see looking at the lines in blue,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:36:17.440 \longrightarrow 00:36:18.924$ which is the effect of receiving the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

00:36:18.924 --> 00:36:20.237 training compared to the lines in red,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:36:20.240 \longrightarrow 00:36:21.596$ which is the effect of receiving

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:36:21.596 \longrightarrow 00:36:22.274$ the wait list.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:36:22.280 \longrightarrow 00:36:24.440$ Our analysis showed that the training

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:36:24.440 \longrightarrow 00:36:25.880$ was associated with significantly

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00{:}36{:}25.932 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}27.907$ greater increases in LGBTQ affirmative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

00:36:27.910 --> 00:36:28.986 Cultural competence,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

00:36:28.986 --> 00:36:31.138 minority knowledge of minority,

 $00:36:31.140 \longrightarrow 00:36:32.784$ stress theory and how it can

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:36:32.784 \longrightarrow 00:36:33.880$ be applied in practice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:36:33.880 \longrightarrow 00:36:36.480$ CBT knowledge and familiarity with

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:36:36.480 \longrightarrow 00:36:39.080$ the LGBTQ affirmative CBT skills.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:36:39.080 \longrightarrow 00:36:41.960$ And then we took this cool thing where

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

00:36:41.960 --> 00:36:44.791 we hired young LGBTQ actors in in

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

00:36:44.791 --> 00:36:47.899 Hollywood to role play being LGBTQ client.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:36:47.900 \longrightarrow 00:36:49.428$ We gave them kind of a script of

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:36:49.428 \longrightarrow 00:36:51.569$ how to role play being kind of a

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00{:}36{:}51.569 {\:{\circ}{-}{>}\:} 00{:}36{:}52.705$ characteristic young LGBT person

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:36:52.763 \longrightarrow 00:36:54.038$ going through a hard time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00{:}36{:}54.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}56.021$ We then showed that video to each

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00{:}36{:}56.021 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}57.310$ of the providers individually

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:36:57.310 \longrightarrow 00:36:59.200$ and then had the providers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

00:36:59.200 --> 00:37:00.958 Describe how, what,

 $00:37:00.958 \longrightarrow 00:37:02.130$ what tools,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00{:}37{:}02.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}03.445$ what skills and approaches they

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:37:03.445 \longrightarrow 00:37:05.085$ would use just in free form

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:37:05.085 \longrightarrow 00:37:06.425$ writing to help that person.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:37:06.430 \longrightarrow 00:37:08.430$ And then we had research

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:37:08.430 \longrightarrow 00:37:10.430$ assistants code the writing for

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00{:}37{:}10.507 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}12.542$ the presence of LGBTQ affirmative

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:37:12.542 \longrightarrow 00:37:15.369$ CBT content and and this last.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:37:15.370 \longrightarrow 00:37:18.090$ Kind of box of skills used shows that

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:37:18.090 \longrightarrow 00:37:20.617$ that the providers are much more

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00{:}37{:}20.617 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}22.552$ likely to describe applying LGBTQ

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:37:22.552 \longrightarrow 00:37:24.659$ affirmative CBT to the to the to

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:37:24.659 \longrightarrow 00:37:26.827$ the role played client from before

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

00:37:26.827 --> 00:37:29.014 the training compared to after the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

00:37:29.014 --> 00:37:30.928 training and the coders were masked

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00{:}37{:}30.928 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}32.955$ to whether the description came

 $00:37:32.955 \longrightarrow 00:37:35.085$ from the control group the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:37:35.085 \longrightarrow 00:37:37.073$ active training condition or whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:37:37.073 \longrightarrow 00:37:39.033$ they were submitted at baseline

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:37:39.033 \longrightarrow 00:37:41.079$ or or following the training.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

00:37:41.080 --> 00:37:41.740 So finally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:37:41.740 \longrightarrow 00:37:44.050$ we wanted to know whether this we

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:37:44.050 \longrightarrow 00:37:46.283$ wouldn't know whether the streaming can

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:37:46.283 \longrightarrow 00:37:48.490$ be disseminated to other high need,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:37:48.490 \longrightarrow 00:37:51.088$ high stigma locales.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

00:37:51.090 --> 00:37:51.764 So first,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00{:}37{:}51.764 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}53.449$ we're working with our colleagues

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:37:53.449 \longrightarrow 00:37:54.123$ in Changsha,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00{:}37{:}54.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}56.506$ China and Hunan province to adapt

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:37:56.506 \dashrightarrow 00:37:58.971$ LGBTQ affirmative and CBT to respond

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

00:37:58.971 --> 00:38:00.986 to the intersections of Chinese

 $00:38:00.986 \dashrightarrow 00:38:03.409$ culture and LGBTQ identities there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00{:}38{:}03.410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}05.881$ Given that the the experience of of

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

00:38:05.881 --> 00:38:08.233 LGBTQ people can look quite different

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

00:38:08.233 --> 00:38:11.082 than than LGBT people in settings.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:38:11.090 \longrightarrow 00:38:14.068$ Like the US with them with with

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

00:38:14.068 --> 00:38:16.438 kind of marriages of convenience

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

00:38:16.438 --> 00:38:18.901 being highly highly common something

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

00:38:18.901 --> 00:38:20.916 like 70\% of young LGBT people

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:38:20.916 \longrightarrow 00:38:23.226$ report being and I'm and I'm in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:38:23.226 \longrightarrow 00:38:24.562$ heterosexual marriage where both

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00{:}38{:}24.562 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}38{:}26.206$ partners know we're both parties

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:38:26.206 \longrightarrow 00:38:28.190$ know that I'm that that one or both

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:38:28.190 \longrightarrow 00:38:30.315$ of the others or themselves LGBT

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

00:38:30.315 --> 00:38:33.380 and and this is done you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:38:33.380 \longrightarrow 00:38:35.956$ to uphold a kind of Chinese family

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:38:36.034 \longrightarrow 00:38:38.876$ values and and and and other

 $00:38:38.876 \longrightarrow 00:38:41.424$ pressures that young LGBT people in China.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:38:41.424 \longrightarrow 00:38:43.410$ Will report related to their to

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:38:43.475 \longrightarrow 00:38:44.849$ their sexual identity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:38:44.850 \longrightarrow 00:38:45.730$ And so we used,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00{:}38{:}45.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}47.616$ I should say they used the team

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

00:38:47.616 --> 00:38:49.408 in China has really done a fantastic

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

00:38:49.408 --> 00:38:51.770 job carefully adapting the treatment model,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:38:51.770 \longrightarrow 00:38:53.834$ working with the LGBTQ community to

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:38:53.834 \longrightarrow 00:38:55.667$ ensure that the resulting treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.7379580375

 $00:38:55.667 \longrightarrow 00:38:58.037$ was appropriate and resonant with them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00:38:58.040 \dashrightarrow 00:39:01.424$ the young LGBT people that they work with.

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00:39:01.430 \longrightarrow 00:39:04.050$ This included meeting with experts

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00{:}39{:}04.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}05.622$ community demonstrations training

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00:39:05.622 \longrightarrow 00:39:08.095$ the therapist and doing a initially

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00:39:08.095 \longrightarrow 00:39:10.129$ a small open trial which showed

00:39:10.194 --> 00:39:12.294 you know early promise of the of

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00:39:12.294 \longrightarrow 00:39:14.720$ of the ability of the session to

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

00:39:14.720 --> 00:39:16.620 impact depression and anxiety.

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00:39:16.620 \longrightarrow 00:39:19.212$ We're not testing this adaptive treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

00:39:19.212 --> 00:39:20.940 using our asynchronous delivery

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00{:}39{:}21.005 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}22.817$ platform that I showed earlier and

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00:39:22.817 \longrightarrow 00:39:25.374$ in RCT with them with with with 120

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

00:39:25.374 --> 00:39:28.390 young gay and bisexual men and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00{:}39{:}28.471 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}31.435$ working with colleagues in China has.

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00:39:31.440 \longrightarrow 00:39:33.680$ Has been rewarding because of

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00{:}39{:}33.680 \to 00{:}39{:}36.832$ connections to like the China CDC and

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00:39:36.832 \longrightarrow 00:39:39.751$ the the interest in in government

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00:39:39.751 \dashrightarrow 00:39:42.374$ officials and and and and and kind of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00:39:42.380 \longrightarrow 00:39:44.642$ And in addressing the the spread

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

00:39:44.642 --> 00:39:47.120 of HIV among getting bisexual men

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00:39:47.120 \longrightarrow 00:39:49.355$ and doing that through through.

 $00:39:49.360 \longrightarrow 00:39:51.820$ They're delivering tailored healthcare so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00:39:51.820 \longrightarrow 00:39:54.030$ So we have buy in of of of not only

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00{:}39{:}54.099 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>}\ 00{:}39{:}56.259$ community partners but also on government

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00:39:56.259 \longrightarrow 00:39:58.415$ and and and healthcare officials

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00:39:58.415 \longrightarrow 00:40:01.349$ who who can who can work to to uptake

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00:40:01.349 \longrightarrow 00:40:03.443$ and and implement this intervention if

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

00:40:03.443 --> 00:40:05.760 it continues to show to show promise.

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00:40:05.760 \longrightarrow 00:40:07.936$ Another side of our work is Romania and

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00{:}40{:}07.936 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}10.190$ which is one of the most normatively

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00:40:10.190 \longrightarrow 00:40:12.240$ anti LGBTQ countries in Europe where

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00:40:12.240 \longrightarrow 00:40:13.945$ identity concealment is the norm

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00{:}40{:}13.945 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}15.689$ where and where LGBTQ affirmative

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00{:}40{:}15.689 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}17.963$ mental health services are are are

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00{:}40{:}17.963 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}19.790$ pretty much whacking completely.

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

00:40:19.790 --> 00:40:21.200 So in addition, you know,

 $00:40:21.200 \longrightarrow 00:40:24.021$ we had received funding to do these RCT's

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00:40:24.021 \longrightarrow 00:40:26.367$ of mostly of HIV prevention interventions

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00:40:26.367 \longrightarrow 00:40:29.118$ with young gay bisexual men in Romania.

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00:40:29.120 \longrightarrow 00:40:30.884$ But at the same time we

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00:40:30.884 \longrightarrow 00:40:32.060$ were hearing all these,

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

00:40:32.060 --> 00:40:32.900 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00:40:32.900 \longrightarrow 00:40:35.000$ very moving and compelling stories

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00{:}40{:}35.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}37.790$ about how these men existed in in

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00{:}40{:}37.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}39.974$ in a situation where they couldn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00:40:40.047 \longrightarrow 00:40:42.567$ receive any other mental or sexual

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00{:}40{:}42.567 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}44.862$ health support outside of our study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

00:40:44.862 --> 00:40:45.780 So, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

00:40:45.780 --> 00:40:48.492 it raises this kind of quandary

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00{:}40{:}48.492 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}50.300$ of here delivering individually.

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00:40:50.300 \longrightarrow 00:40:53.324$ Focus things like CBT to to

NOTE Confidence: 0.74786926

 $00:40:53.324 \longrightarrow 00:40:55.870$ population what you're sending them.

 $00:40:55.870 \longrightarrow 00:40:56.700$ You know, but you know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00{:}41{:}00.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}02.154$ Doctors that that can't that can't

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:41:02.154 \longrightarrow 00:41:03.928$ be supportive outside of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:41:03.928 \longrightarrow 00:41:05.680$ context of that of that study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:41:05.680 \longrightarrow 00:41:08.128$ So what we do is we started building a

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:41:08.128 \longrightarrow 00:41:10.605$ cadre of of mental health professionals

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

00:41:10.605 --> 00:41:13.228 who could who could work to to kind

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:41:13.228 \longrightarrow 00:41:15.625$ of change the attitudes of the mental

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

00:41:15.625 --> 00:41:17.380 health professionals in Romania to

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00{:}41{:}17.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}19.837$ to to be more LGBTQ affirmative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:41:19.840 \longrightarrow 00:41:22.056$ So one of the things we did for

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:41:22.056 \longrightarrow 00:41:24.451$ example was invite a kind of a network

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00{:}41{:}24.451 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}26.132$ of of mental health professionals

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

00:41:26.132 --> 00:41:28.277 in remaining to to attend.

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:41:28.280 \longrightarrow 00:41:30.914$ The training that we did of

 $00:41:30.914 \longrightarrow 00:41:34.210$ LGBTQ affirmative therapy and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:41:34.210 \longrightarrow 00:41:35.806$ 200 people showed up and then we

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:41:35.806 \longrightarrow 00:41:37.277$ randomized them to either received the

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:41:37.277 \longrightarrow 00:41:39.450$ training in person or to receive it remotely.

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:41:39.450 \longrightarrow 00:41:41.990$ And this is an important.

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

00:41:41.990 --> 00:41:44.875 Implication from kind of global

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

00:41:44.875 --> 00:41:48.250 implementation perspective and that you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

00:41:48.250 --> 00:41:49.839 it's hard and challenging to to

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00{:}41{:}49.839 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}51.646$ show up in person to every country

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:41:51.646 \longrightarrow 00:41:53.650$ where such a training might be needed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:41:53.650 \longrightarrow 00:41:56.122$ But if we can show that remote online

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

00:41:56.122 --> 00:41:57.929 training works works just as well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:41:57.930 \longrightarrow 00:41:59.916$ it really has implications for feasibility

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:41:59.916 \longrightarrow 00:42:01.620$ and cost and time effectiveness

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:42:01.620 \longrightarrow 00:42:03.888$ and in fact that's what we found.

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00{:}42{:}03.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}05.930$ So the lines here whether people

 $00:42:05.930 \longrightarrow 00:42:07.703$ were the providers were either

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:42:07.703 \longrightarrow 00:42:09.433$ randomized to receive the training

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00{:}42{:}09.433 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}11.980$ in person or to receive it online.

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

00:42:11.980 --> 00:42:13.100 Regardless of whether providers

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:42:13.100 \longrightarrow 00:42:14.780$ received it in person or online,

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:42:14.780 \longrightarrow 00:42:17.384$ we found that we found significant

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:42:17.384 \longrightarrow 00:42:19.988$ reductions in explicit bias and even

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00{:}42{:}19.988 \rightarrow 00{:}42{:}22.382$ 15 months after the treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:42:22.382 \longrightarrow 00:42:24.734$ and reductions in in implicit bias

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00{:}42{:}24.734 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}26.589$ towards LGBT people and uptake

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

00:42:26.589 --> 00:42:28.400 in LGBTQ affirmative practice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:42:28.400 \longrightarrow 00:42:29.360$ Skills, beliefs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00{:}42{:}29.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}32.202$ behaviors and the effect sizes here are

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

00:42:32.202 --> 00:42:35.039 very small because they're comparing the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:42:35.040 \longrightarrow 00:42:36.460$ the, the, the, the,

 $00:42:36.460 \longrightarrow 00:42:39.053$ the impact of delivering of delivering the

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

00:42:39.053 --> 00:42:41.417 treatment in person versus versus online,

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647 00:42:41.420 --> 00:42:42.060 so, so. NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:42:42.060 \longrightarrow 00:42:43.980$ Some kind of important test of

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:42:43.980 \longrightarrow 00:42:45.964$ preparing for future implementation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

00:42:45.964 --> 00:42:49.112 So, so future research directions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647 00:42:49.112 --> 00:42:50.438 I think, NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

00:42:50.440 --> 00:42:52.420 involve continuing to be curious and

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:42:52.420 \longrightarrow 00:42:54.718$ open about whether and how we need

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:42:54.718 \longrightarrow 00:42:56.560$ to adapt existing treatments for for

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00{:}42{:}56.560 {\: --> \:} 00{:}42{:}58.718$ sexual and gender minority populations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:42:58.720 \longrightarrow 00:43:01.712$ While at the same time I may be

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

00:43:01.712 --> 00:43:03.356 moving beyond RCT's to speed up

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:43:03.356 \longrightarrow 00:43:04.252$ the dissemination of treatments

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:43:04.252 \longrightarrow 00:43:05.259$ that we already have,

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00{:}43{:}05.260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}08.158$ including so we have we we have

00:43:08.160 --> 00:43:11.180 many evidence based psychotherapies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:43:11.180 \longrightarrow 00:43:14.530$ For example, for for the general population,

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

 $00:43:14.530 \longrightarrow 00:43:16.816$ those therapies can be adapted right

NOTE Confidence: 0.727077086617647

00:43:16.816 --> 00:43:19.620 now using using kind of evidence based.

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:43:21.730 \longrightarrow 00:43:23.554$ LGBTQ tailored case conceptualizations

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:43:23.554 \longrightarrow 00:43:26.697$ and so like we've derived this type

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

00:43:26.697 --> 00:43:29.056 of guidance and published it of how

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00{:}43{:}29.056 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}31.227$ people who were delivering whether it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

00:43:31.227 --> 00:43:33.883 IP T or or more expensive experiential

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:43:33.883 \longrightarrow 00:43:36.961$ or emotion focused the rapies or more

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:43:36.961 \longrightarrow 00:43:38.924$ more interpersonally focused therapies

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:43:38.924 \longrightarrow 00:43:41.716$ can can all borrow from the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:43:41.716 \longrightarrow 00:43:43.817$ general quite general LGBTQ affirmative

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00{:}43{:}43.817 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}46.696$ principles that that that we use to

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:43:46.696 \longrightarrow 00:43:49.464$ adapt and CBT to to think creatively and

00:43:49.464 --> 00:43:51.648 carefully about how to make existing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:43:51.650 \longrightarrow 00:43:53.790$ Evidence based practice more responsive

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:43:53.790 \longrightarrow 00:43:56.362$ to to the LGBTQ population without

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:43:56.362 \longrightarrow 00:43:58.784$ going through the you know 1015 years

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:43:58.784 \longrightarrow 00:44:00.828$ of of effort needed to develop the

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:44:00.828 \longrightarrow 00:44:02.451$ treatments from scratch to adapt them

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00{:}44{:}02.451 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}04.470$ test them in RCT's and then I'm and

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

00:44:04.470 --> 00:44:05.900 then ultimately hope that they'll be,

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:44:05.900 \longrightarrow 00:44:07.924$ that they'll be implemented.

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

00:44:07.924 --> 00:44:09.948 I'm Speaking of implementation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:44:09.950 \longrightarrow 00:44:11.630$ What our what our lab is currently

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

00:44:11.630 --> 00:44:13.812 working on is using the tools of

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:44:13.812 \longrightarrow 00:44:15.216$ implementation science including from

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

00:44:15.216 --> 00:44:16.903 global mental health context where

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

00:44:16.903 --> 00:44:18.769 where you know evidence based practice

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00{:}44{:}18.769 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}20.922$ is being scaled up using tech and

00:44:20.922 --> 00:44:22.926 task shifting to ensure that providers

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:44:22.926 \longrightarrow 00:44:25.074$ are trained in treatments that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:44:25.074 \longrightarrow 00:44:27.417$ responsive to the needs of of local

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

00:44:27.417 --> 00:44:29.355 communities especially in in high need

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

00:44:29.355 --> 00:44:31.849 settings across the US and and globally.

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:44:31.850 \longrightarrow 00:44:34.328$ So a lot of excitement about about

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

00:44:34.328 --> 00:44:36.421 about moving this work forward to

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:44:36.421 \longrightarrow 00:44:38.661$ to to reach those who who could

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:44:38.732 \longrightarrow 00:44:40.637$ continue to benefit from it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:44:40.640 \longrightarrow 00:44:41.564$ So in conclusion,

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:44:41.564 \longrightarrow 00:44:44.203$ you know from the beginning of the LGBTQ

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:44:44.203 \longrightarrow 00:44:46.278$ rights movement and affirmative stance

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00{:}44{:}46.278 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}48.539$ towards mental health was you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:44:48.540 \longrightarrow 00:44:50.916$ one of the few basic demands

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

00:44:50.916 --> 00:44:52.500 of the LGBTQ community.

00:44:52.500 --> 00:44:54.039 We have to keep in mind that you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:44:54.040 \longrightarrow 00:44:55.708$ the, the, the, the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

00:44:55.708 --> 00:44:57.376 the mental health profession,

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667 00:44:57.380 --> 00:44:58.066 you know, NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:44:58.066 \longrightarrow 00:45:00.124$ it's historic role in the mental

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

00:45:00.124 --> 00:45:02.658 health of LGBTQ people was to use

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:45:02.658 \longrightarrow 00:45:05.118$ its power to pathologize LGBTQ people

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

00:45:05.118 --> 00:45:06.948 through through pathologizing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667 00:45:06.950 --> 00:45:07.398 diagnosis, NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

00:45:07.398 --> 00:45:09.190 abusive conversion therapies and

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

00:45:09.190 --> 00:45:10.982 things that justified the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:45:10.990 \longrightarrow 00:45:13.540$ The criminalization and kind of and

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:45:13.540 \longrightarrow 00:45:16.944$ kind of you know spending ones life you

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:45:16.944 \longrightarrow 00:45:20.480$ know as a as a persecuted population

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:45:20.480 \longrightarrow 00:45:23.756$ you know spent in solitude and sickness.

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:45:23.760 \longrightarrow 00:45:25.146$ But the fields come a long way

 $00:45:25.146 \longrightarrow 00:45:26.120$ and I think we can,

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:45:26.120 \longrightarrow 00:45:26.358$ we,

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:45:26.358 \longrightarrow 00:45:28.500$ we can and should be proud of that and

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:45:28.558 \longrightarrow 00:45:30.850$ we now have scientific evidence that

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00{:}45{:}30.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}32.856$ LGBTQ affirmative CBT's are efficacious.

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:45:32.856 \longrightarrow 00:45:34.504$ They're capable of community

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:45:34.504 \longrightarrow 00:45:36.159$ implementation and they're capable

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00{:}45{:}36.159 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}37.595$ of relatively efficient dissemination

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:45:37.595 \longrightarrow 00:45:39.810$ to high to high stigma settings

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:45:39.810 \longrightarrow 00:45:41.246$ worldwide and where that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:45:41.250 \longrightarrow 00:45:43.656$ Without legacy and and all too

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:45:43.656 \longrightarrow 00:45:45.729$ often unfortunately persist in our

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00{:}45{:}45.729 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}47.309$ continued application of research

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:45:47.309 \longrightarrow 00:45:50.154$ to the to this express need of

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:45:50.154 \longrightarrow 00:45:52.560$ the LGBTQ population and will only

 $00:45:52.560 \longrightarrow 00:45:54.486$ hopefully continue to ensure its

NOTE Confidence: 0.728604094666667

 $00:45:54.486 \longrightarrow 00:45:56.718$ continued and equity and and thriving.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832963248333333

 $00:46:00.670 \longrightarrow 00:46:01.810$ All of you for showing up.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832963248333333

00:46:01.810 --> 00:46:04.057 Thank you to the Department of Psychiatry

NOTE Confidence: 0.832963248333333

 $00:46:04.057 \longrightarrow 00:46:06.722$ for being one of my professional one of

NOTE Confidence: 0.832963248333333

00:46:06.722 --> 00:46:08.890 my two professional homes here at Yale.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832963248333333

00:46:08.890 --> 00:46:10.514 Thank you for the support of of

NOTE Confidence: 0.832963248333333

00:46:10.514 --> 00:46:12.556 this topic and through the LGBTQ and

NOTE Confidence: 0.832963248333333

 $00:46:12.556 \longrightarrow 00:46:14.171$ advocacy and practice and research

NOTE Confidence: 0.832963248333333

00:46:14.171 --> 00:46:15.859 efforts and Department of Psychiatry

NOTE Confidence: 0.832963248333333

 $00{:}46{:}15.859 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}17.827$ the research presented here today is

NOTE Confidence: 0.832963248333333

 $00:46:17.830 \longrightarrow 00:46:19.662$ there is the result of the hard work

NOTE Confidence: 0.832963248333333

00:46:19.662 --> 00:46:21.352 of of the committed caring people

NOTE Confidence: 0.832963248333333

 $00:46:21.352 \longrightarrow 00:46:23.756$ shown here and and and and several

NOTE Confidence: 0.832963248333333

 $00:46:23.756 \longrightarrow 00:46:25.490$ others who who've who've been part

NOTE Confidence: 0.832963248333333

 $00:46:25.490 \longrightarrow 00:46:28.080$ of our initiative and in the past.

 $00:46:28.080 \longrightarrow 00:46:30.915$ Most of whom are listed here as long as,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832963248333333

 $00{:}46{:}30.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}32.240$ as well as the funding sources

NOTE Confidence: 0.832963248333333

 $00:46:32.240 \longrightarrow 00:46:32.900$ and our collaborators.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832963248333333

 $00{:}46{:}32.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}35.180$ So thank you all and I eagerly

NOTE Confidence: 0.832963248333333

 $00{:}46{:}35.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}36.880$ look forward to your questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832963248333333 00:46:36.880 --> 00:46:37.000 Thank you.