# Identity status of transgender youth

*N Lungsithuiliu*
Research scholar

*K. Arockia Maraichelvi*

*N Vasugi*
Avinashilingam Institute for Home Science and
Higher Education for Women,
Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India.
nlungsithuiliu@gmail.com

## Introduction

In India, the transgender community, generally known as "Hijras," is often treated by society as "unnatural" and is generally viewed as objects to ridicule and fear due to superstitious beliefs (Chatterjee, 2018). Despite this, they hold a unique place in Indian traditions, often seen in religious and cultural roles. Legal recognition has evolved significantly, particularly with the 2014 NALSA judgment by the Supreme Court, which granted them the right to self-identify as male, female, or third gender. The Transgender individuals (Protection of Rights) Act of 2019 further aimed to protect their rights, though challenges in social acceptance, healthcare, and employment persist.

The identity development process is a critical aspect of adolescence, a stage during which individuals navigate significant personal, social, and psychological changes related to their gender identity. For transgender youth, this process can be even more complex and challenging as they grapple with their gender identity in a society that may not always affirm their experiences. The identity status of transgender youth involves understanding how these individuals navigate their gender identity, which refers to a person's internal sense of being male, female, a blend of both, or neither, and how this aligns with or differs from the sex they were assigned at birth. This concept, rooted in Erik Erikson's theory of identity development and James Marcia's identity status model, is crucial for understanding the unique experiences of transgender youth (Erikson, 1968; Marcia, 1966).

James Marcia expanded Erikson's framework by identifying four identity statuses based on the presence or absence of exploration and commitment: identity diffusion, identity foreclosure, identity moratorium, and identity achievement. These statuses reflect an individual's process of exploring and committing to their personal identity in various domains, such as career, religion, and gender (Marcia, 1966). In the context of transgender youth, identity development is often centered on their exploration and understanding of gender, a journey that can include both personal and social aspects, such as coming out, changing pronouns, transitioning socially, and negotiating relationships with family, peers, and institutions like schools. Understanding these statuses provides insight into the varied paths youth take in their journey toward a stable and coherent identity.

Identity diffusion involves a lack of both exploration and commitment. Youth in this stage often seem indifferent or disconnected from forming a clear sense of self, showing little interest in exploring options or making long-term decisions. This may stem from environmental factors like instability or trauma, hindering their identity development.

Identity foreclosure occurs when individuals commit to values, beliefs, and roles without exploring alternatives. They often adopt the views of authority figures, such as parents, without questioning them. Although they may appear to have a solid identity, it lacks personal depth and may become fragile when faced with new life challenges.

Identity moratorium is a phase where young people actively explore different roles and beliefs without committing to them. This period, marked by questioning and experimentation, is crucial for identity development but can lead to anxiety and indecision if it continues too long without resolution.

Identity achievement is the successful outcome of exploring different options and making personal commitments, leading to a stable and well-defined sense of self. Those who achieve this status have greater purpose, self-confidence, and resilience, helping them face life's challenges. While it is the goal of identity development, not everyone reaches this stage in every aspect of life.

Kuper et al. (2018) studied the gender identity development among transgender and gender nonconforming emerging adults through an intersectional approach by analyzing 20 diverse trans genders and gender non-conforming people who were between 19-22 years old. They used a semi-structured qualitative interview and analysed the data using an inductive process of constructivist grounded theory. The results revealed that there were variations in gender-related experiences, including how participants described their internal sense of self, expressed and communicated this sense of self, and related to others of similar and different genders.

Transgender youth often encounter significant social, psychological, and institutional barriers in their identity formation. These can include family rejection, peer bullying, and lack of access to affirming healthcare or education. However, research suggests that youth who are supported in their gender identity, through affirming environments and access to appropriate care, are more likely to experience positive mental health outcomes and achieve a stable identity status (Russell, Pollitt, & Li, 2018). Understanding these dynamics is critical for fostering supportive environments that promote the well-being and resilience of transgender youth.

According to Ghorbanian et al. (2022), the depiction and representation of transgender individuals in society, or the lack thereof, significantly influences how they construct their gender identity. Insufficient representation can lead to anxiety and confusion. Many studies on transgender people fail to recognize and validate less visible identities within the group. By acknowledging these identities, researchers and the public can better understand and represent them.

Hence, the study aimed to evaluate the identity status of transgender youth, as understanding their identity development could provide insights into the factors shaping their experiences and help reduce stigma, prejudice, and discrimination. Additionally, examining the socio-demographic factors influencing transgender identity status contributes to advancing the fifth Sustainable Development Goal: achieving gender equality and ending all forms of gender discrimination (UNDP, 2015).

## Objectives of the Study

• To explore the identity status of the selected transgenders Youth.

• To assess the influence of age, gender, education, occupation, family support, and area of residence on the selected transgenders Youth identity status.

## Methodology

The methodology was designed to achieve the objectives of the study titled "Identity Status of Transgender Youth" and to examine the influence of certain independent variables, with specific inclusion and exclusion criteria. The study was conducted after obtaining permission and consent from the relevant authorities and participants. A simple random sampling method was chosen for the study were 200 transgenders (95 transmen and 105 transwomen) within the age ambit of 18 to 24 years was identified from the state of Manipur. A set of 2 tools were used to secure adequate information required for the study. A self - formulated tool to elicit the general profile of the selected transgender Youth was used. Standardized Objective Measure of Ego-Identity Status (OM-EIS), devised by Bennion, L.D., and Adams, G.R., (1986). The inventory comprised of 64 close ended items equally distributed within two dimensions namely Ideological Identity and Interpersonal Identity and each of the dimensions had items for the four paths of the Identity Status - Achievement, Foreclosure, Moratorium and Diffusion. Altogether, the scale has eight items in each path and in each dimension. The scale was on a five-point rating scale with 1 - 5 allotted for strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree and strongly agree. The minimum score for each state was 16 and the maximum score 80. By adding the scores of the 8 items in each path of the dimensions, the path with the highest score determines the identity status of the selected transgender youth. Moreover, based on the three classification rules of OME-IS namely Pure Identity Status Rule, Low-Profile Status Rule, and Transition Status Rule, 16 classifications for each identity status dimensions were made - 4 pure types of namely Pure Achievement, Pure Foreclosure, Pure Moratorium and Pure Diffusion. 11 transitional types, and 1 undifferentiated or Low-Profile (LPM) category. As part of the instrument's scoring process, the 11 transitional status groups are collapsed within its relevant pure statuses and LPM with pure moratorium. Hence only 4 statuses under each dimension are accounted for final analysis. After scoring and classifying the selected sample based on the inventory's specified rules, the identity status of the transgender youth was analyzed statistically using percentile and multinomial logistic regression.

## Results and Discussion

Identity formation is one of the most important developmental tasks in life span development (Cakir, 2014). Marcia (1966) developed a broad view of Erikson's (1968) stage-related concept of identity versus role confusion, which is the 5th stage of psychosocial theory, associated with adolescence. Marcia described four identity statuses that represent the development of identity during adolescence, namely, identity achievement, moratorium, foreclosure, and diffusion. Marcia's approached the concept of identity with the idea that individuals will portray different patterns of identity development in fields such as occupation, religion, politics, lifestyle, and sex roles. The identity status of the transgenders was assessed in two domains of identity namely ideological and interpersonal.

## Ideological Status Classification

The ideological identity status can be otherwise considered as personal identity, which includes the individual's opinions, beliefs, values, attitudes, etc. on occupation, religion, politics, and philosophy of life.

*Table I Identity Status classification in Ideological Domain*

| Category | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Pure Diffusion | 59 | 29.5 |
| Pure Foreclosure | 35 | 17.5 |
| Pure Moratorium | 106 | 53.0 |
| Pure achievement | 0 | 0 |
| **TOTAL** | **200** | **100.0** |

The above table shows that 200 transgenders youth selected for the study, that were pure identity status classifications of the ideological domain after the application of the collapsing transitional status rule which states that individuals who belonged to the 11 transition types and 1 low profile status can be collapsed into the 4 pure identity status- namely pure diffusion, pure foreclosure, pure moratorium, and pure achievement. Most of the transgenders 53% were in a pure moratorium as they are still exploring various commitments of their life and yet not has resolved the identity crisis. However, 29.5% of the respondents were found to be diffusion status, the person in this stage does not have a sense of having choices, has not made a commitment and still confused about their life and followed by 17.5% who were in the foreclosure status as they are still dependent on others to guide them and never had faced the identity crises. The table also clearly depicts that none of transgender Youth are reaching identity achievement. Hence, it is strongly recommended that a well-planned intervention must be formulated to facilitate them to change their path in Identity for better.

**Interpersonal Classification**

The interpersonal identity status is otherwise known as the social identity, which includes interaction, relationship building, and importantly making choices based on mutual respect and understanding. The areas included here are friendship, dating, sex roles, and recreational activities.

*Table II*

*Identity Status classification in Interpersonal Domain*

| Category | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Pure Diffusion | 59 | 29.5 |
| Pure Foreclosure | 20 | 10.0 |
| Pure Moratorium | 121 | 60.5 |
| Pure Achievement | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 200 | 100.0 |

From the above table clearly show that 200 transgenders youth selected for the study, that were pure identity status classifications of the interpersonal domain after the application of the collapsing transitional status rule which states that individuals who belonged to the 11 transition type and 1 low profile status can be collapsed in to the 4 pure identity status- namely pure diffusion, pure foreclosure, pure moratorium, and pure achievement. The majority of the transgender youth 60.5% were in the pure moratorium status, followed by 29.5 % of transgenders who were in the pure diffusion, 10.0% were in the pure foreclosure. It was noted that even in this domain none of the transgenders were found to be in the identity achievement. Thus, indicating that the transgenders are still paving a way for themselves by participating in high exploration in the interpersonal domain. A supportive study by Verschueren et al., (2017) found that Women were overrepresented in the moratorium status (characterized by high exploration) similar to the present study where a majority of the male to female transgender were representatives of the moratorium status, which shows high levels of exploration, as they are still looking for what really is appropriate for them, in terms of friendship, dating, sex roles and recreation.

**Influence of Socio demographic predictors on Interpersonal identity status of transgender**

The outcome variable of interest was the identity status: identity achievement, identity diffusion, and identity foreclosure and identity moratorium. As already indicated none of the selected sample was found to be in the path of pure achievement, only the other three statuses were accounted for the Multinomial logistic regression analysis. The test was employed to investigate the relationship between Socio-demographic variables of interest namely Age, Gender, Education, Occupation, Age of Realization, Family support and Area of residence and the identity statuses of the chosen transgender.

Prior to Conducting the multinomial logistic regression analysis, scores on each of the predictor variable (Socio demographic variables) were standardized to mean 0 and SD 1. The Statistical output of the analysis was explained in three parts

Model fitting information and Goodness of fit

Predictors unique contributions

Parameter estimates contrasting the pure Moratorium status verses each of the other identity statuses

**Model fitting information and Goodness of fit**

The model fitting information table contains a Likelihood Ratio chi-square tests, comparing the full model i.e., containing all the predictors under analysis - the socio demographic variables against a null model (or intercept only model; i.e., no predictors).

*Table III Model Fitting Information and Goodness Of Fit*

| Model | Model Fitting Criteria | Likelihood Ratio Tests | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **-2 Log Likelihood** | **Chi-Square** | **df** | **Sig.** |
| Intercept Only | 351.411 | | | |
| Final | 321.295 | 30.115 | 14 | **.007** |

The statistical significance ($\chi2$ (14) =321.295, p=.007) indicates that the full model represents a significant improvement in fit over the null model.

The table II contains the Deviance and Pearson Chi-Square tests, which are useful for determining whether a model exhibits good fit to the data. The thumb rule was that the non-significant test results are indicators that the model fits the data well.

*Table Iv*

**GOODNESS -OF-FIT**

| | **Chi-Square** | **df** | **Sig.** | **Pseudo R-Square** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | **Nagelkerke** |
| Pearson | 388.789 | 360 | .142 | .168 |
| Deviance | 315.515 | 360 | .956 | |

Both Pearson's chi-square test and Deviance chi-square indicates good fit [χ2 (360) =388.789, p=.142 and χ2 (360) = 315.515, p= .956 respectively) and that indicates the model is a good fit. The Pseudo R- Squared value that are treated as rough analysis to the R- Square value in multinomial logistic regression was also computed ($R^2$=.168, p<.001)

**Predictor's unique contributions**

*Table V*

*Predictor's Unique Contributions in The Multinomial Logistic Regression*

| Effect | Model Fitting Criteria | Likelihood Ratio Tests N=200 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | -2 Log Likelihood of Reduced Model | Chi-Square | df | Sig. |
| Intercept | 321.390 | .094 | 2 | .954 |
| Age | 324.172 | 2.877 | 2 | .237 |
| Gender | 323.695 | 2.399 | 2 | .301 |
| **Education** | **331.637** | **10.342** | **2** | **.006** |
| Occupation | 321.590 | .294 | 2 | .863 |
| Age of Realization | 323.036 | 1.740 | 2 | .419 |
| Family support | 322.527 | 1.231 | 2 | .540 |
| **Area of residence** | **329.919** | **8.623** | **2** | **.013** |

*The chi-square statistic is the difference in -2 log-likelihoods between the final model and a reduced model. The reduced model is formed by omitting an effect from the final model. The null hypothesis is that all parameters of that effect are 0.*

*(Note: if a variable is added in as factors, the result for that variable is treated as an omnibus test of that factor).*

*($x^2$ = amount by which − 2 log likelihood increases when predictor is removed from the full model).*

*p< 0.5, **p< 0.1

The table III contains likelihood ratio tests of the overall contribution of each independent variable to the model. Using the conventional .05 criterion of statistical significant, we see that Education with χ2 10.342 (2), p=.006 and Area of residence with x=8.623(2), p=.013 were the two significant predictors in the model.

**Parameter estimates contrasting the Pure Moratorium status versus each of the other identity statuses**

The reference group was those transgender with pure moratorium status. Accordingly each predictor has two parameter, one for predicting the identity status in the pure foreclosure status rather than the pure moratorium status, and one for predicting the identity status in pure diffusion status. To facilitate the interpretation of differences between predictors, each of the predictor variables had been standardized to mean 0, and SD 1. The parameter estimates were shown in table.

*Table VI*

| Predictor | Pure moratorium status VS | B | Std. Error | Wald | df | OR Exp(B) | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| Age | Pure Diffusion | .061 | .088 | .481 | 1 | 1.063 | .488 | .895 | 1.262 |
| | Pure Foreclosure | -.177 | .135 | 1.706 | 1 | .838 | .192 | .643 | 1.092 |
| Gender | Pure Diffusion | .228 | .332 | .472 | 1 | 1.256 | .492 | .656 | 2.407 |
| | Pure Foreclosure | .835 | .567 | 2.171 | 1 | 2.305 | .141 | .759 | 6.997 |
| Education | Pure Diffusion | -.313 | .200 | 2.447 | 1 | .731 | .118 | .494 | 1.082 |
| | Pure Foreclosure | -1.029 | .360 | 8.195 | 1 | .357 | .004 | .177 | **.723** |
| Occupation | Pure Diffusion | -.166 | .322 | .264 | 1 | .847 | .607 | .451 | 1.593 |
| | Pure Foreclosure | .038 | .574 | .004 | 1 | 1.039 | .947 | .337 | 3.199 |
| Age of Realization | Pure Diffusion | -.048 | .083 | .340 | 1 | .953 | .560 | .810 | 1.121 |
| | Pure Foreclosure | .126 | .125 | 1.005 | 1 | 1.134 | .316 | .887 | 1.450 |

Shri Dharmasthala Manjunatheshwara Institute for Management Development, Mysuru, India

**9th International Conference on**
**Economic Growth and Sustainable Development- Emerging Trends– November 21-22, 2024**

| Family support | Pure Diffusion | -.439 | .425 | 1.067 | 1 | .644 | .302 | .280 | 1.483 |
| | Pure Foreclosure | -.459 | .681 | .453 | 1 | .632 | .501 | .166 | **N=200** |
| Area of residence | Pure Diffusion | .277 | .209 | 1.769 | 1 | 1.320 | .184 | .877 | 1.986 |
| | Pure Foreclosure | 1.020 | .396 | 6.623 | 1 | 2.774 | .010 | 1.275 | **6.033** |

**Parameter Estimates Contrasting The Pure Moratorium Status Versus Each Of The Other Identity Statuses**

a. The reference category is: Pure Moratorium, OR (Exp B)- odds ratio associated with the effect of a one SD increase in the predictor

The table provides information comparing each identity status group against the reference category, the Pure Moratorium status and shows the regression coefficients that indicates which predictors significantly discriminate between the identity statuses of pure foreclosure and pure moratorium. The coefficients that was statistically significant was education (b= -1.029 SE= .360, p< .004) representing the comparison between the education status that is coded as 1 elementary, 2 as primary, 3 as higher secondary, 4 as graduate and post graduate as 5. The individuals scoring higher on this variable are more likely to be in the pure foreclosure status. Based on the codes, the negative sign indicates that for every unit decrease in education vulnerability to be in the pure foreclosure status increase by Exp(B) of .357. Additionally the area of residence was found significant (b= 1.020 SE=.396, p=.010) in the model representing the comparison between the area of transgender coded as 1 rural, 2 as semi-urban and 3 as urban. The positive sign indicates that for every unit increase in area of residence score. The subject has an increase odd of 2.774 in the pure foreclosure against the moratorium status.

| Classification | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Observed** | **Predicted** | | | |
| | **Pure Diffusion** | **Pure Foreclosure** | **Pure Moratorium** | **Percent Correct** |
| Pure Diffusion | 5 | 4 | 50 | 8.5% |
| Pure Foreclosure | 0 | 5 | 15 | 25.0% |
| Pure Moratorium | 5 | 0 | 116 | 95.9% |
| Overall Percentage | 5.0% | 4.5% | 90.5% | 63.0% |

These are classification statistics used to determine which identity status were the best predicted by the model.

Pure diffusion status of identity among the transgender was correctly predicted by the model by 8.5% of the time (as 5 of the 63 people who actually were in the pure moratorium were predicted to be so by the model). Pure foreclosure was correctly predicted by the model 25.0% of the time. A highest percentage of prediction was found in the pure moratorium, as it was correctly predicted by the model with 95.9% of the time.

## Influence of Socio demographic predictors on Ideological Identity status of transgender

The outcome variable of interest was the identity status: identity achievement, identity diffusion, identity foreclosure and identity moratorium. As already indicated none of the selected sample were found to be in the path of pure achievement, only the other three statuses were accounted for the Multinomial logistic regression analysis. The test was employed to investigate the relationship between Socio-demographic variables of interest namely Age, Gender, Education, Occupation, Age of realization, Family support and Area of residence and the identity statuses of the chosen transgender.

Prior to Conducting the multinomial logistic regression analysis, scores on each of the predictor variable (Socio demographic variables) were standardized to mean 0 and SD 1. The Statistical output of the analysis was explained in three parts

Model fitting information and Goodness of fit

Predictors unique contributions

Parameter estimates contrasting the pure Moratorium status verses each of the other identity statuses

## Model fitting information and Goodness of fit

The model fitting information table contains a Likelihood Ratio chi-square tests, comparing the full model i.e., containing all the predictors under analysis - the socio demographic variables against a null model (or intercept only model; i.e., no predictors).

*Table I*

**Model Fitting Information and Goodness of Fit**

| Model | Model Fitting Criteria | Likelihood Ratio Tests | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **-2 Log Likelihood** | **Chi-Square** | **df** | **Sig.** |
| Intercept Only | 390.435 | | | |
| Final | 375.998 | 14.437 | 14 | .418 |

The statistical insignificance ($\chi 2$ (14) =375.998, p=.418) indicates that the full model do not represent a significant improvement over the null model.

Table II contains the Deviance and Pearson Chi-Square tests, which are useful for determining whether a model exhibits good fit to the data. The thumb rule was that the non-significant test results are indicators that the model fits the data well.

*Table II*

**Goodness-Of-Fit**

| | Chi-Square | df | Sig. | Pseudo R- Square |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Chi-Square** | **df** | **Sig.** | **Nagelkerke** |
| Pearson | 377.835 | 360 | .249 | .081 |
| Deviance | 367.445 | 360 | .382 | |

Both Pearson's chi-square test and Deviance chi-square indicates good fit [($\chi 2$ (360) =377.835, p=.249 and ($\chi 2$ (360) = 367.445, p= .382 respectively) and that indicates the model is a good fit. The Pseudo R- Squared Value that are treated as rough analysis to the R- Square value in multinomial logistic regression was also computed ($R^2$=.081, p<.001)

### a. Predictor's unique contributions

*TABLE III*

*Predictor's Unique Contributions in The Multinomial Logistic Regression*

N=200

| Effect | Model Fitting Criteria | Likelihood Ratio Tests | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **-2 Log Likelihood of Reduced Model** | **Chi-Square** | **df** | **Sig.** |
| Intercept | 379.343 | 3.345 | 2 | .188 |
| Age | 379.729 | 3.730 | 2 | .155 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Gender** | **382.607** | **6.609** | **2** | **.037** |
| Education | 376.109 | .110 | 2 | .946 |
| Occupation | 376.114 | .116 | 2 | .944 |
| Age of Realization | 376.221 | .223 | 2 | .894 |
| Family support | 376.653 | .655 | 2 | .721 |
| Area | 378.723 | 2.725 | 2 | .256 |

*The chi-square statistic is the difference in -2 log-likelihoods between the final model and a reduced model. The reduced model is formed by omitting an effect from the final model. The null hypothesis is that all parameters of that effect are 0.*
*(Note: if a variable is added in as factors, the result for that variable is treated as an omnibus test of that factor).*

*($x^2$ = amount by which $-2$ log likelihood increases when predictor is removed from the full model).* \*p< 0.5.

The table III contains likelihood ratio tests of the overall contribution of each independent variable to the model. Using the conventional .05 criterion of statistical significant, we see that gender was the only significant predictor in the model with χ2 6.609 (2), p=.037).

**Parameter estimates contrasting the Pure Moratorium status versus each of the other identity statuses**

The reference group was that transgender with pure moratorium status. Accordingly, each predictor has two parameters, one for predicting the identity status in the pure diffusion status rather than the pure moratorium status, and one for predicting the identity status in pure foreclosure status. To facilitate the interpretation of differences between predictors, each of the predictor variables had been standardized to mean 0, and SD 1. The parameter estimates were shown in table.

*Table IV*

| Predictor | Pure moratorium VS | B | Std. Error | Wald | df | OR Exp(B) | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| Age | Pure Diffusion | -.164 | .088 | 3.436 | 1 | .849 | .064 | .714 | 1.009 |
| | Pure Foreclosure | -.008 | .109 | .005 | 1 | .992 | .941 | .801 | 1.228 |
| **Gender** | Pure Diffusion | -.776 | .345 | 5.055 | 1 | .460 | .025 | .234 | .905 |
| | Pure Foreclosure | -.743 | .414 | 3.224 | 1 | .476 | .073 | .211 | 1.070 |
| Education | Pure Diffusion | .001 | .206 | .000 | 1 | 1.001 | .998 | .669 | 1.497 |
| | Pure Foreclosure | -.076 | .241 | .099 | 1 | .927 | .753 | .578 | 1.486 |
| Occupation | Pure Diffusion | .065 | .327 | .040 | 1 | 1.068 | .841 | .562 | 2.027 |
| | Pure Foreclosure | -.079 | .395 | .040 | 1 | .924 | .842 | .426 | 2.006 |
| Age of Realization | Pure Diffusion | -.039 | .082 | .221 | 1 | .962 | .638 | .819 | 1.130 |
| | Pure Foreclosure | -.011 | .102 | .012 | 1 | .989 | .914 | .810 | 1.207 |
| Family support | Pure Diffusion | -.314 | .442 | .505 | 1 | .730 | .477 | .307 | 1.737 |
| | Pure Foreclosure | -.305 | .509 | .359 | 1 | .737 | .549 | .272 | 2.001 |
| Area of residence | Pure Diffusion | .204 | .215 | .907 | 1 | 1.227 | .341 | .806 | 1.868 |
| | Pure Foreclosure | -.248 | .249 | .992 | 1 | .781 | .319 | .479 | 1.271 |

---

## Parameter Estimates Contrasting the Pure Moratorium

## Status Versus Each of The Other

### Identity Statuses

The reference category is: Pure Moratorium, OR (Exp B)- odds ratio associated with the effect of a one SD increase in the predictor

The results provide information comparing each identity status group against the reference category, the Pure Moratorium status. Specifically, the first part of the table shows the regression coefficient that indicates which predictors significantly discriminate between the identity statuses of pure diffusion and pure moratorium. The coefficients that is statistically significant was gender (b=-.776 SE= .345, p< .025) representing the comparison between the Trans men coded as 1 and Trans women coded as 2). In other words, the individuals scoring higher on this variable are less likely to be in the pure diffusion status. Based on the codes, the negative sign indicates that a trans men's vulnerability to be in the pure diffusion status increase by Exp(B) of 0.460 in comparison to a trans woman. Additionally. The age factor was found to be near to be significant (b= -.164, s.e. = .088, p= .064) in the model. The negative sign indicates that for every unit increase in the individual has an increased odd of 0.849 to be in the pure moratorium status.

The second set of coefficients represents comparison between the pure moratorium and pure foreclosure, and it was observed that there was no statistical significance among any of the chosen variables. In other words, none of the variables under study predict the identity status of transgenders within the pure foreclosure and pure moratorium status.

| Classification | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Observed** | **Predicted** | | | |
| | **Pure Diffusion** | **Pure Foreclosure** | **Pure Moratorium** | **Percent Correct** |
| Pure Diffusion | 14 | 0 | 46 | 23.3% |
| Pure Foreclosure | 5 | 0 | 29 | 0.0% |
| Pure Moratorium | 9 | 0 | 97 | 91.5% |
| Overall Percentage | 14.0% | 0.0% | 86.0% | 55.5% |

These are classification statistics used to determine which identity status were the best predicted by the model.

Pure diffusion status of identity among the trangenders were correctly predicted by the model by 23.3% (as 14 of the 60 people who actually were in the pure moratorium were predicted to be so by the model). A highest percentage of prediction was found in the Pure moratorium, as it was correctly predicted by the model with 91.5% of the time. However, the Pure foreclosure status predicted value was zero.

Shri Dharmasthala Manjunatheshwara Institute for Management Development, Mysuru, India

**9th International Conference on**
**Economic Growth and Sustainable Development- Emerging Trends– November 21-22, 2024**

## Conclusion

The present study concludes that every individual possesses a unique identity, which can be classified into one of four distinct statuses. The formation of an individual's identity occurs over a wide range of influences, including age, gender, education, occupation, family support, and area of residence. These factors play a crucial role in the development of one's identity and significantly impact the identity status of transgenders youth, as highlighted in this research. Identity development is a lifelong process characterized by fluctuations based on various situations and experiences encountered throughout a person's life. In today's modern society, navigating identity can resemble the challenge of engaging with a community of unfamiliar faces. Individuals often feel compelled to gain societal approval by creating favorable impressions and exhibiting appropriate behaviors. Furthermore, the study noted that transgender individuals are engaged in deep exploration of both ideological and interpersonal dimensions, indicating their journey toward identity achievement. This emphasizes the importance of balancing social and personal life, as both are crucial for the holistic development of identity among transgender individuals. The study's insights underscore the need for further integration of these domains for comprehensive identity development in the transgender community.

## Recommendation

The intervention TA with the transgenders would help them to improve their positive identity status.

A few days training program with transgender would help them to sustain in the identity status and to develop the ability for personal change as well as growth.

Examine the knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions of non-transgender people towards the transgender community, to help in understanding how transphobia manifests in people.

## Reference

Chatterjee, S. (2018, January). Problems Faced by Transgender Community in India: Some Recommendations. Retrieved April 6, 2023, from https://ijcrt.org/papers/IJCRT1705102.pdf.

Kuper, L. E., Wright, L., & Mustanski, B. (2018). Gender identity development among transgender and gender nonconforming emerging adults: An intersectional approach. International Journal of Transgenderism, 19(4), 436–455. https://doi.org/10.1080/15532739.2018.1443869.

Ghorbanian, A., Aiello, B., & Staples, J. (2022). Under-representation of transgender identities in research: The limitations of traditional quantitative survey data. Transgender Health, 7(3), 261–269. https://doi.org/10.1089/trgh.2020.0107.

Cakir, S. G. (2014). Ego identity status and psychological well-being among Turkish emerging adults. Identity, 14(3), 230–239. https://doi.org/10.1080/15283488.2014.921169.

Verschueren, M., Rassart, J., Claes, L., Moons, P., & Luyckx, K. (2017). Identity statuses throughout adolescence and emerging adulthood: A large-scale study into gender, age, and contextual differences. Psychologica Belgica, 57(1), 32–42. https://doi.org/10.5334/pb.348

Russell, Stephen & Pollitt, Amanda & Li, Gu & Grossman, Arnold. (2018). Chosen Name Use Is Linked to Reduced Depressive Symptoms, Suicidal Ideation, and Suicidal Behavior Among Transgender Youth. Journal of Adolescent Health. 63. 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2018.02.003.

Erik H. Erikson (1968). Identity, youth and crisis. New York: W. W. Norton Company

Marcia, J. E. (1966). Development and validation of ego-identity status. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3(5), 551–558. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0023281.