Supplemental Table.

Hierarchical Regression of Gay Community Stress on Body Dissatisfaction in Study 1 with Sampling Weights[a] (N = 424)

Predictor	Step 1			Step 2			Step 3		
	b (SE)	95 % CI	β	*b (SE)*	95 % CI	β	*b (SE)*	95 % CI	β
Step 1									
Sexual orientation	-0.001 (0.11)	-0.23, 0.22	0.00	0.03 (0.12)	-0.21, 0.27	0.01	0.04 (0.12)	-0.20, 0.28	0.02
Age	-0.02 (0.003)	-0.02, -0.01	-0.22***	-0.02 (0.003)	-0.02, -0.01	-0.23***	-0.02 (0.003)	-0.02, -0.01	-0.22***
Race/ethnicity	0.03 (0.04)	-0.04, 0.11	0.05	0.04 (0.04)	-0.03, 0.11	0.05	0.04 (0.04)	-0.03, 0.11	0.06
Income	0.03 (0.01)	0.01, 0.10	0.17**	0.04 (0.01)	0.01, 0.06	0.19**	0.04 (0.01)	0.02, 0.06	0.21**
Education	-0.27 (0.07)	-0.40, -0.14	-0.25***	-0.25 (0.06)	-0.38, -0.13	-0.23***	-0.27 (0.07)	-0.40, -0.14	-0.24***
Relationship status	-0.19 (0.10)	-0.39, 0.01	-0.09	-0.14 (0.10)	-0.34, 0.06	-0.07	-0.15 (0.10)	-0.34, 0.06	-0.07
Step 2									
Rejection sensitivity				0.03 (0.01)	0.02, 0.04	0.21***	0.03 (0.01)	0.02, 0.04	0.21***
Internalized stigma				0.09 (0.05)	-0.01, 0.18	0.09	0.08 (0.05)	-0.01, 0.18	0.09
Identity concealment				-0.02 (0.06)	-0.15, 0.10	-0.02	-0.03 (0.06)	-0.15, 0.01	-0.03
Discrimination				0.01 (0.01)	-0.002, 0.02	0.08	0.01 (0.01)	-0.004, 0.02	0.07
Step 3									
Gay community stress							0.08 (0.07)	-0.06, 0.23	0.06
Full Model									
R²		.09***			.16***			.16***	
ΔR²		--			.07***			.002	

[a] These results differed from the unweighted analyses with respect to statistical significance; however, the effect estimates, although attenuated, were similar in magnitude. We discuss the rationale for interpreting the unweighted results in the full manuscript.

*p < .05, **p <.01, ***p <.001