

1 Development and validation of the Japanese version of the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and
2 Transgender Development of Clinical Skills Scale

3

4

5 Yusuke Kanakubo^{1,2,3*}, Yoshifumi Sugiyama^{1,4}, Eriko Yoshida^{1,3,5}, Takuya Aoki¹,
6 Rieko Mutai⁶, Masato Matsushima¹, Tadao Okada²

7

8 ¹ Division of Clinical Epidemiology, Research Center for Medical Sciences, The Jikei
9 University School of Medicine, Minato-ku, Tokyo, Japan

10 ² Kameda Family Clinic Tateyama, Tateyama, Chiba, Japan

11 ³ Nijiuro Doctors, Minato-ku, Tokyo, Japan

12 ⁴ Division of Community Health and Primary Care, Center for Medical Education, The
13 Jikei University School of Medicine, Minato-ku, Tokyo, Japan

14 ⁵ Department of General Internal Medicine, Kawasaki Kyodo Hospital, Kawasaki
15 Health Cooperative Association, Kawasaki, Kanagawa, Japan

16 ⁶ Department of Adult Nursing, The Jikei University School of Nursing, Chofu, Tokyo,
17 Japan

18

19

20 *Corresponding author

21 E-mail: kanakubo.research@gmail.com (YK)

22

23 **Abstract**

24 **Introduction**

25 The Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Development of Clinical Skills Scale
26 (LGBT-DOCSS) is a validated self-assessment tool for health and mental health
27 professionals who provide care for sexual and gender minority patients. This study
28 aimed to develop and validate a Japanese version of LGBT-DOCSS
29 (LGBT-DOCSS-JP) and examine its psychometric properties.

30 **Methods**

31 LGBT-DOCSS was translated into Japanese and cross-culturally validated using
32 cognitive debriefing. We then evaluated the structural validity, convergent and
33 discriminant validity, internal consistency, and test–retest reliability of
34 LGBT-DOCSS-JP using an online survey.

35 **Results**

36 Data were analyzed for 381 health and mental health professionals aged 20 years or
37 older from three suburban medical institutions. The confirmatory factor analysis
38 indicated that the original three-factor model did not fit well with LGBT-DOCSS-JP.
39 Exploratory factor analysis revealed four new factors: Attitudinal Awareness, Basic
40 Knowledge, Clinical Preparedness, and Clinical Training. Convergent and discriminant
41 validity were supported using four established scales that measured attitudes toward
42 lesbians and gay men, genderism and transphobia, authoritarianism and
43 conventionalism, and social desirability. The internal consistency of LGBT-DOCSS-JP
44 was supported by the Cronbach’s alpha values for the overall scale (0.84), as well for
45 each of its subscales (Attitudinal Awareness and Basic Knowledge both 0.87, Clinical
46 Preparedness 0.78, and Clinical Training 0.97). The test–retest reliability for the overall
47 LGBT-DOCSS-JP was supported by an intraclass correlation coefficient score of 0.86.

48 **Conclusions**

49 LGBT-DOCSS-JP has the potential to serve as a valuable tool in the development and
50 assessment of effective curricula for LGBT care education, as well as a means to
51 promote self-reflection among trainees and professionals.

52

53 **Introduction**

54 Sexual and gender minorities including lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender
55 (LGBT) people have been reported to experience health and healthcare disparities [1].
56 *Healthy People 2020*, the USA government objectives for improving health over the
57 next decade, committed to eliminating LGBT health disparities [2]. It also emphasized
58 the importance of enhancing efforts to improve LGBT health including providing
59 medical students with training to increase the provision of culturally competent care [2].
60 Appropriate education and competency assessment are key to improving care for LGBT
61 people. A systematic review has shown that education improves the knowledge and
62 attitudes of medical staff and students toward LGBT patients [3].

63
64 The Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Development of Clinical Skills Scale
65 (LGBT-DOCSS), developed by Bidell in 2017, is an important instrument for
66 enhancing healthcare provided to sexual and gender minorities. This scale assesses the
67 knowledge, attitudes, and skills of healthcare and mental healthcare professionals
68 towards caring for LGBT patients [4]. The scale was created to develop competent
69 clinical services for LGBT people, and improve on the shortcomings of the previous
70 scales [4]. LGBT-DOCSS has been used in recent studies to show that sufficient
71 education and experience improves medical students' clinical skills [5] and to develop
72 guidelines and recommendations for the care of sexual and gender minorities [6].

73
74 In Japan, however, the provision of education on the care of sexual and gender
75 minorities is inadequate. The 2016 revision of the model core curriculum for medical
76 education emphasized for the first time the importance of explaining sexual orientation
77 and gender identity as a core competency [7]. However, a recent survey showed that
78 Japanese medical schools allocated only a limited amount of time to educate students
79 about LGBT care [8]. There are also no guidelines on how to teach this content in
80 medical education. One major obstacle is the lack of a suitable competence evaluation
81 scale. To improve the capacity of medical students and staff and overcome the health
82 disparities among sexual and gender minorities in Japan, it is essential to develop a
83 Japanese tool for evaluating the clinical skills required to provide LGBT care.

84
85 We therefore aimed to develop a Japanese version of LGBT-DOCSS
86 (LGBT-DOCSS-JP) and examine the scale's reliability and validity among healthcare
87 and mental healthcare professionals in Japan.

88

89 **Methods**

90 This study took place in two phases. The first was translation of LGBT-DOCSS into
91 Japanese, with cross-cultural adaptation in line with guidelines from the International
92 Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research Task Force for Translation
93 (ISPOR) [9]. The second was evaluation of reliability and validity of LGBT-DOCSS-JP
94 using an online survey. We recruited healthcare and mental healthcare professionals
95 from Kameda General Hospital (tertiary teaching hospital), Kameda Clinic
96 (multispecialty outpatient clinic), and Kameda Family Clinic Tateyama (family
97 medicine clinic) as research participants. All these locations are in suburban areas
98 within a 10 km radius of Chiba, Japan. Ethical approval was obtained from the Ethics
99 Committees of both The Jikei University School of Medicine (approval numbers:
100 33-364(10988) and 34-134(11285)) and Kameda Medical Center (approval numbers:
101 21-012 and 22-019).

102

103 **First phase: development of LGBT-DOCSS-JP**

104 We developed LGBT-DOCSS-JP in line with ISPOR guidelines [9]. With the
105 original author's permission, three authors (YK, EY, YS), all of whom were native
106 Japanese speakers and two of whom were familiar with sexual and gender minorities
107 issues, translated the original LGBT-DOCSS into Japanese. All the authors discussed
108 cross-cultural adaptation and made a provisional version. Next, an English-Japanese
109 bilingual physician, who had sufficient experience in back-translation and was not
110 familiar with LGBT-DOCSS, back-translated the provisional version into English. The
111 original author reviewed the back-translated version and checked the discrepancies.
112 After completing a prototype version, we recruited participants via personal connections
113 by purposive sampling to conduct a cognitive debriefing. In recruiting participants, we
114 considered age, sexual orientation, gender identity, occupation, and years of
115 professional experience to ensure maximum variation. Five to eight participants were
116 required [9]. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants. The primary
117 investigator (YK) asked the participants to fill out the prototype version questionnaire
118 and conducted face-to-face interviews individually using an interview guide to check
119 interpretation, understandability, cultural adaptation, and alternative wording to make
120 the scale better. All interviews were recorded and transcribed. Interviews were
121 conducted between January 28th and March 9th, 2022. All the authors discussed the

122 results, and revised the prototype version before it was reviewed again by the original
123 author, and a final version of LGBT-DOCSS-JP developed. Content validity and
124 cross-cultural validity were verified through these processes.

125

126 **Second phase: evaluation of reliability and validity of**

127 **LGBT-DOCSS-JP**

128 **Study design and data collection**

129 We conducted an online survey among health and mental health professionals aged
130 20 years or older including physicians (including dentists), nurses, pharmacists, and
131 psychologists affiliated with the study facilities. Two types of mass emails containing a
132 link to self-administered questionnaires were sent separately to all participants. The
133 second set were used to examine the test–retest reliability. We asked participants to
134 complete the two questionnaires voluntarily at intervals of two to four weeks. Before
135 participation, participants were provided with study information and required to indicate
136 their willingness to participate by opting in. The first survey was administered on July
137 11th, 2022. Participants were asked to provide demographic information, and complete
138 LGBT-DOCSS-JP and four additional scales (see “Measures” section) to examine
139 structural validity, hypothesis testing, and internal consistency. We also included a
140 Directed Question Scale (“Check option 6 here”), which is commonly used to detect
141 “satisficing” or answering behaviors in which participants do not devote appropriate
142 attentional resources to the survey [10]. The second survey was administered on July
143 28th, 2022, and aimed to evaluate the test–retest reliability of LGBT-DOCSS-JP. Both
144 surveys were anonymous, but participants were asked to set a password at the first
145 survey and enter the same password at the second survey to enable us to connect their
146 responses. Those who responded incorrectly to the Directed Question Scale in the first
147 survey or entered invalid passwords in the second survey were excluded from the
148 analysis. Respondents got no reward. Reminder emails were sent twice per survey to
149 mitigate selection bias. The questionnaires were designed using the required-response
150 function to ensure no item response omissions except items related to participants’
151 sexuality such as sex assigned at birth, gender identity, and sexual orientation. The data
152 were collected between July 11th and August 31st, 2022.

153

154 **Measures**

155 **Participants' characteristics**

156 The demographic questionnaire asked about age groups, sex assigned at birth, gender
157 identity, sexual orientation, and professional healthcare specialization. It also asked
158 whether respondents were aware of any coworkers who identified as homosexual or
159 transgender/transsexual, in both their present and previous workplaces (referred to as
160 “homosexual coworker” or “trans coworker”), and whether they had close friends,
161 relatives, or family members who identified as homosexual or transgender/transsexual
162 (referred to as “homosexual friends/family” or “trans friends/family”) using a four-point
163 Likert-type scale (*yes, probably, probably not, or no*) [11]. There is a lack of consensus
164 about the appropriate method for inquiring about sexual orientation and gender identity
165 in Japan, so we used a validated approach from a previous population-based study [12].
166

167 **LGBT-DOCSS-JP**

168 The original LGBT-DOCSS consists of 18 items across three factors: “Basic
169 Knowledge” (four items: 1, 2, 6, and 8), “Attitudinal Awareness” (seven items: 3, 5, 7,
170 9, 12, 17, and 18), and “Clinical Preparedness” (seven items: 4, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, and
171 16). Each item was rated on a seven-point Likert-type scale using the anchors *strongly*
172 *disagree* to *strongly agree* (1 = *strongly disagree*, 4 = *somewhat agree/disagree*, 7 =
173 *strongly agree*). Eight of the 18 were inverted items: 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 12, 17, and 18. A
174 reverse-scoring Likert-type scale was used for the inverted items (i.e., seven points were
175 given for choice 1). The total mean score was determined by adding all test items and
176 dividing the result by 18. The mean subscale scores were calculated by summing the
177 scores of the corresponding questions and dividing the sum by the number of questions
178 in each subscale. The total mean score and the mean subscale scores are therefore
179 standardized on a scale of 1 to 7 points, with a higher score meaning greater care
180 competency.
181

182 **The Japanese 6-item revised version of the Attitudes Toward Lesbians** 183 **and Gay Men Scale (ATLG-J6R)**

184 ATLG-J6R is a six-item instrument designed to evaluate the degree of condemnation
185 or tolerance held by heterosexual laypeople toward lesbian and gay populations [13].
186 ATLG-J6R uses a seven-point Likert-type scale and has two subscales: “Attitudes
187 toward Lesbians” and “Attitudes toward Gay Men”. It has adequate reliability and

188 validity among cisgender-heterosexual college students in Japan [13]. We used all six
189 items of ATLG-J6R. A higher score indicates a worse attitude.

190

191 **The Japanese Version of the Genderism and Transphobia** 192 **Scale-Revised Short Form (J-GTS-R-SF)**

193 The Japanese version of the Genderism and Transphobia Scale-Revised (J-GTS-R) is
194 a 22-item instrument to measure the prejudicial attitudes of laypeople toward
195 transgender individuals [14]. Adequate reliability and structural validity have been
196 demonstrated among college students in Japan [14]. J-GTS-R-SF is the abbreviated
197 version of J-GTS-R and contains 13 items. It uses a seven-point Likert-type scale [14].
198 Both scales have the same two factors: “Genderism and Transphobia”, and “Gender
199 Bashing”. We used all seven items of the “Genderism and Transphobia” subscale of
200 J-GTS-R-SF. A higher score shows a higher level of genderism and transphobia.

201

202 **Japanese versions of the Right-Wing Authoritarianism scale (J-RWA)**

203 J-RWA is a 30-item instrument with two factors (“Authoritarianism” and
204 “Conventionalism”) and a method factor [15]. It has adequate reliability and validity
205 among survey panel members in Japan [15]. We selected five items focusing on sexual
206 morality, homosexuality, sexual preference, gays and lesbians, and premarital sexual
207 intercourse, in line with a previous study [4]. J-RWA uses a nine-point Likert-type scale,
208 ranging from -4 = very strongly disagree to 4 = very strongly agree, but we used the
209 seven-point Likert-type scale from the LGBT-DOCSS-JP (1 = strongly disagree to 7 =
210 strongly agree) to minimize participants’ fatigue with multiple scale changes. A higher
211 score indicates a higher level of authoritarianism and conventionalism.

212

213 **The Japanese version of Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding** 214 **(J-BIDR).**

215 J-BIDR is a 24-item instrument that quantifies social desirability, and contains two
216 distinct factors: “Self-Deceptive Enhancement” and “Impression Management” [16]. Its
217 reliability and validity have been rigorously examined among a sample of college
218 students in Japan, using a seven-point Likert-type scale [16]. The “Self-Deceptive
219 Enhancement” factor assesses the extent to which respondents truthfully depict
220 themselves as socially desirable, and the “Impression Management” factor evaluates the
221 degree to which respondents misrepresent themselves to manipulate their
222 self-presentation. Certain items within the LGBT-DOCSS-JP contain socially
223 undesirable or negative expressions towards LGBT individuals, which may result in a

224 bias toward positive responses. To investigate the correlation between the
225 LGBT-DOCSS-JP and social desirability, all 24 items of the J-BIDR were included in
226 the study. A higher score shows a greater inclination toward socially desirable
227 responding.

228

229 **Sample size**

230 The COnsensus-based Standards for the selection of health Measurement
231 INstruments (COSMIN) guidelines suggest that studies on the development of
232 patient-reported outcome measures should include a minimum of 100 participants [17].
233 The optimal subjects-to-variables ratio for exploratory factor analysis ranges from 3:1 to
234 20:1 [18]. LGBT-DOCSS contains 18 items, and it was therefore decided to include a
235 minimum of 360 participants to ensure robust results.

236

237 **Statistical analysis**

238 Descriptive statistics of participants' characteristics were generated for the study
239 population. We also examined the psychometric properties of the questionnaires against
240 the COSMIN guideline [17].

241

242 **Structural validity**

243 We carried out a confirmatory factor analysis with maximum likelihood estimation to
244 assess the structural validity of the original three-factor model (Attitudinal Awareness,
245 Basic Knowledge, and Clinical Preparedness) [4]. We used several criteria to evaluate
246 the fit of the model, including the comparative fit index (CFI), Tucker–Lewis index
247 (TLI), root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), and standardized root mean
248 square residual (SRMR). Generally, values close to 0.95 or higher for CFI and TLI, less
249 than 0.06 for RMSEA, and less than 0.08 for SRMR are considered to indicate a good
250 model fit [19]. The model fit was inadequate, and we therefore carried out an
251 exploratory factor analysis using promax rotation with maximum likelihood estimation
252 to ascertain the structure of LGBT-DOCSS-JP. The determination of the number of
253 factors to retain was based on Cattell's scree test [20]. Only items with a factor loading
254 exceeding 0.30 were incorporated.

255

256 **Hypothesis testing**

257 We compared LGBT-DOCSS-JP with the other outcome measurement instruments to
258 evaluate convergent and discriminant validity. Convergent validity was assessed by
259 examining Spearman’s rank correlation coefficients between the scores on
260 LGBT-DOCSS-JP, including its overall score and subscales, and the scores on
261 ATLG-J6R, J-GTS-R-SF, and J-RWA. Previous studies suggested that the
262 LGBT-DOCSS-JP Attitudinal Awareness subscale would have the strongest correlation
263 with ATLG-J6R, J-GTS-R-SF, and J-RWA. Conversely, to support discriminant
264 validity, we hypothesized that the scores on LGBT-DOCSS-JP would demonstrate
265 minimal correlation with J-BIDR. Certain overarching principles may be used when
266 interpreting correlation coefficients of varying magnitude. For example, a coefficient of
267 0.10 is deemed small, a coefficient of 0.30 is considered medium, and a coefficient of
268 0.50 is deemed large [21]. Convergent validity is often considered adequate when the
269 correlation with a measure evaluating the same construct exceeds 0.50 [22].

270

271 We also compared the scores of LGBT-DOCSS-JP among subgroups. Several studies
272 have reported a correlation between being relatively young and affirmative attitudes
273 toward LGBT individuals [11, 23]. We hypothesized that scores on the
274 LGBT-DOCSS-JP scale would be higher among younger than older adults. To test this
275 hypothesis, we used Jonckheere–Terpstra tests to compare scores among the five age
276 groups.

277

278 Previous studies have shown that participants identifying as LGBT show significantly
279 higher scores on the LGBT-DOCSS scale [4]. We hypothesized that scores would be
280 higher among individuals classified as sexual and gender minorities compared to
281 cisgender-heterosexual participants. To test this hypothesis, we used a Wilcoxon rank
282 sum test to compare scores between cisgender-heterosexual participants and individuals
283 classified as “sexual and gender minorities (LGBTQA)”, which includes lesbian, gay,
284 bisexual, transgender, queer/questioning (including those who have not decided their
285 sexualities), and asexual. Data from individuals who were missing responses to the
286 questions on sexuality or who did not understand the question were excluded from this
287 analysis.

288

289 Some studies of intergroup contact theory have reported that contact with members of
290 stigmatized groups can reduce prejudice and improve attitudes towards those groups. In
291 particular, heterosexual individuals who report personal acquaintance with gay men or
292 lesbians show significantly more favorable attitudes toward the gay community than

293 those who do not have this contact [24, 25]. We therefore also hypothesized that
294 participants who know more about sexual and gender minorities would have higher
295 scores than those who are less aware. To test these hypotheses among
296 cisgender-heterosexual participants, we used Jonckheere–Terpstra tests to compare
297 scores among the four levels of awareness of individuals who identify as homosexual or
298 transgender/transsexual in current and previous workplaces and among close friends,
299 relatives, or family members.

300

301 **Internal consistency**

302 Cronbach’s α was calculated to assess internal consistency of total and subscale
303 scores. A score of 0.70–0.95 is considered an acceptable range [26].

304

305 **Test–retest reliability**

306 The temporal stability of the measure was evaluated by assessing its two-to-four
307 week test–retest reliability using the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC (2,1)).
308 Values less than 0.5, between 0.5 and 0.75, between 0.75 and 0.9, and greater than 0.90
309 are indicative of poor, moderate, good, and excellent reliability [27]. Responses were
310 determined to be from the same respondent when the passwords matched.

311

312 **Responsiveness and interpretability**

313 Responsiveness and interpretability of scores were not assessed.

314

315 All statistical analyses used R, version 4.2.1 (the R Foundation). For each analysis,
316 we used a two-tailed significance level of $P < 0.05$. Missing values were limited to three
317 items: sex assigned at birth, gender identity, and sexual orientations. We used listwise
318 deletion for comparative analysis between LGBTQA and cisgender-heterosexual
319 participants, and among cisgender-heterosexual individuals with varying levels of
320 awareness about sexual and gender minorities. Missing values did not affect other
321 analyses in which sexuality was not taken into account.

322

323 **Results**

324 **First phase: development of LGBT-DOCSS-JP**

325 In the first phase, we recruited eight participants, including three physicians (a family
326 physician, a pediatrician, and a urologist), three nurses, a pharmacist, and a psychologist.

327 The participants' ages ranged from 27 to 54 years (median = 39, interquartile range
328 (IQR) = 30.5–47.5) and years of experience ranged from 3 to 32 (median = 9.5, IQR =
329 5–21.5). Four participants were cisgender males, and four were cisgender females
330 including one lesbian. No transgender individuals were included. The median interview
331 time (IQR) was 36 (27–38) minutes.

332 During the translation process, some expressions were adjusted to facilitate cultural
333 adaptation. For example, some terms such as sexual orientation, gender identity, lesbian,
334 gay, bisexual, transgender, cisgender, and the umbrella term LGBT are not widely
335 known in Japan, and annotations were therefore added to provide clarity (S1 Appendix).
336 Some participants mentioned that these annotations were useful.

337 The participants pointed out wording or expressions that required improvement, and
338 we discussed the modifications later. For instance, most of the participants were not
339 familiar with the concept of “institutional barriers”. We therefore adopted the
340 expression “systematic barriers, such as rules and customs” for semantic equivalence.
341 The expression of choices in the original questionnaire (*strongly disagree–strongly*
342 *agree*) was considered inadequate because of the variance in natural Japanese response
343 patterns contingent on the item type. We therefore modified the expression of choices
344 for some items inquiring about knowledge or experience (i.e., *not at all–very well* or
345 *none–very much*) until we had a final version of LGBT-DOCSS-JP (S1 Appendix).
346 Content validity and cross-cultural validity were established through these processes.


347

348 **Second phase: evaluation of reliability and validity of**

349 **LGBT-DOCSS-JP**

350 A total of 414 (22.3%) out of 1855 participants responded to the first questionnaire
351 (Fig 1). However, 33 of these responses were deemed incorrect from the Directed
352 Question Scale [10], resulting in a total of 381 (20.5%) responses available for analysis.
353 We obtained 89 (14.2%) suitable responses from physicians/dentists, 252 (22.6%) from
354 nurses, 34 (31.8%) from pharmacists, and six (100%) from licensed or certified clinical
355 psychologists. In total, 151 (36.5%) of the 414 participants responded to the second
356 questionnaire. However, 51 of these responses were excluded because of incorrect
357 responses to the Directed Question Scale or password mismatch, giving a total of 100
358 responses for analysis.

359



360

361 **Fig 1. Flow diagram of the study**

362

363 Table 1 shows the baseline characteristics of participants. Overall, 47.5% of the
364 sample were in their 20s, 69.6% identified as cisgender females, and 78.2% identified as
365 heterosexual. The majority of participants (66.1%) were nurses. The mean (standard
366 deviation (SD)) LGBT-DOCSS-JP total score was 4.16 (0.74) and the median (IQR)
367 score was 4.11 (3.67–4.72).

368

Table 1. Participants' characteristics

	First survey (n = 381)	Second survey (n = 100)
Age (years), no. (%)		
20–29	181 (47.5)	35 (35.0)
30–39	98 (25.7)	34 (34.0)
40–49	61 (16)	21 (21.0)
50–59	31 (8.1)	7 (7.0)
≥ 60	10 (2.6)	3 (3.0)
Sex assigned at birth, no. (%)		
Male	108 (28.3)	34 (34.0)
Female	270 (70.9)	65 (65.0)
Missing	3 (0.8)	1 (1.0)
Gender identity, no. (%)		
Cisgender male	106 (27.8)	32 (32.0)
Cisgender female	265 (69.6)	63 (63.0)
Transgender	7 (1.8)	4 (4.0)
Missing	3 (0.8)	1 (1.0)
Sexual orientation, no. (%)		
Heterosexual	298 (78.2)	74 (74.0)
Lesbian/gay	4 (1)	2 (2.0)
Bisexual	11 (2.9)	3 (3.0)
Asexual	8 (2.1)	3 (3.0)
Do not want to decide/have not decided	34 (8.9)	11 (11.0)
Do not understand the question	8 (2.1)	1 (1.0)
Other	3 (0.8)	2 (2.0)
Missing	15 (3.9)	4 (4.0)
Professional healthcare specialization, no. (%)		
Physician (including dentist)	89 (23.4)	21 (21.0)
Nurse	252 (66.1)	59 (59.0)
Pharmacist	34 (8.9)	18 (18.0)
Licensed or certified clinical psychologist	6 (1.6)	2 (2.0)

369

370 **Structural validity**

371 A confirmatory factor analysis using the model described in the original paper [4]
372 showed the following indices of model fit: CFI = 0.718, TLI = 0.673, RMSEA = 0.158
373 [90% confidence interval (CI) 0.151–0.166], and SRMR = 0.095. The model fit was
374 therefore deemed insufficient, and we carried out an exploratory factor analysis. The
375 scree test suggested a four- or five-factor model. A five-factor model was rejected
376 because it included items with low factor loading (< 0.30). However, the four-factor
377 model was deemed interpretable, and all factor loadings exceeded 0.30. The factors
378 were named “Attitudinal Awareness” (items 3, 5, 7, 9, 12, 17, and 18), “Basic
379 Knowledge” (items 1, 2, 6, and 8), “Clinical Preparedness” (items 4, 13, 14, 15, and 16),
380 and “Clinical Training” (items 10 and 11). Table 2 shows structure coefficients. The
381 score distributions for the overall scale and each subscale are shown in S1 Fig.

Table 2. Structure coefficients for LGBT-DOCSS-JP (n = 381)

Item	Factor			
	1	2	3	4
*9 When it comes to transgender individuals, I believe they are morally deviant.	0.829	-0.042	-0.086	0.018
*17 People who dress opposite to their biological sex have a perversion.	0.808	0.083	-0.056	-0.049
*12 The lifestyle of a LGB individual is unnatural or immoral.	0.796	0.010	-0.071	0.032
*18 I would be morally uncomfortable working with a LGBT client/patient.	0.713	-0.001	-0.020	0.035
*3 I think being transgender is a mental disorder.	0.665	-0.039	0.030	0.008
*7 LGB individuals must be discreet about their sexual orientation around children.	0.555	-0.008	-0.002	0.045
*5 A same sex relationship between two men or two women is not as strong and as committed as one between a man and a woman.	0.510	-0.009	0.126	-0.088
1 I am aware of institutional barriers that may inhibit transgender people from using health care services.	-0.023	1.053	-0.131	-0.048
2 I am aware of institutional barriers that may inhibit LGB people from using health services.	-0.014	1.022	-0.112	-0.033

8	I am aware of research indicating that transgender individuals experience disproportionate levels of health and mental health problems compared to cisgender individuals.	0.003	0.540	0.094	0.030
6	I am aware of research indicating that LGB individuals experience disproportionate levels of health and mental health problems compared to heterosexual individuals.	0.008	0.461	0.115	0.015
14	I feel competent to assess a person who is LGB in a therapeutic setting.	0.024	-0.025	1.068	-0.183
15	I feel competent to assess a person who is transgender in a therapeutic setting.	0.061	-0.047	1.044	-0.153
13	I have experience working with LGB clients/patients.	-0.069	0.003	0.358	0.013
16	I have experience working with transgender clients/patients.	-0.027	-0.027	0.346	0.145
*4	I would feel unprepared talking with a LGBT client/patient about issues related to their sexual orientation or gender identity.	0.087	0.066	0.310	0.130
11	I have received adequate clinical training and supervision to work with lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) clients/patients.	0.009	-0.004	-0.043	1.015
10	I have received adequate clinical training and supervision to work with transgender clients/patients.	-0.010	-0.025	-0.020	0.969
Proportion of variance		0.19	0.14	0.13	0.10
Cronbach's α (subscale)		0.87	0.87	0.78	0.97

Note. Extraction method: Maximum likelihood estimation. Rotation method: Promax rotation. *Inverted item. Bold font shows factor loadings greater than 0.3.

384 **Hypothesis testing**

385 The results of hypothesis testing for convergent and discriminant validity are shown in
386 Table 3. They showed adequate convergent and discriminant validity. The total scores
387 for LGBT-DOCSS-JP showed moderate correlations with ATLG-J6R, J-GTS-R-SF,
388 and J-RWA, indicating adequate convergent validity. The Attitudinal Awareness
389 subscale showed the strongest correlation with the J-GTS-R-SF Genderism/Transphobia
390 subscale ($r = -0.70$), followed by the ATLG-J6R ($r = -0.63$). The weak correlation
391 between LGBT-DOCSS-JP and J-BIDR attests to the strong discriminant validity of
392 LGBT-DOCSS-JP.

393

394

Table 3. Convergent and divergent correlation matrix (n = 381)

	Attitudinal Awareness	Basic Knowledge	Clinical Preparedness	Clinical Training	ATLG-J6R	J-GTS-R-SF	J-RWA	J-BIDR
LGBT-DOCSS-JP Total scale scores	0.54	0.74	0.72	0.51	-0.47	-0.50	-0.40	0.18
Attitudinal Awareness		0.13	0.20	0.06	-0.63	-0.70	-0.50	0.14
Basic Knowledge			0.37	0.34	-0.22	-0.24	-0.25	0.13
Clinical Preparedness				0.44	-0.20	-0.22	-0.16	0.12
Clinical Training					-0.11	-0.07	-0.07	0.01
ATLG-J6R						0.68	0.49	-0.09
J-GTS-R-SF							0.52	-0.18
J-RWA								-0.08

Note. Attitudinal Awareness, Basic Knowledge, Clinical Preparedness, and Clinical Training are subscales of LGBT-DOCSS-JP. ATLG-J6R = Japanese 6-item revised version of the Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men Scale; J-GTS-R-SF = items on the Genderism and Transphobia subscale of the Japanese Version of the Genderism and Transphobia Scale-Revised Short Form; J-RWA = items focusing on sexuality from the Japanese version of the Right-Wing Authoritarianism scale; J-BIDR = Japanese version of Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding.

396

397 Table 4 shows the results of the hypothesis testing. The scores for the Attitudinal
398 Awareness subscale were significantly higher among younger age groups. However, the
399 scores for the Clinical Preparedness subscale were higher among older age groups. The
400 overall scores, and the scores for the Basic Knowledge and Clinical Preparedness
401 subscales, did not show significant differences. The cisgender-heterosexual participants
402 had significantly lower scores for the total scale and each subscale compared to
403 LGBTQA participants. S1 Table shows that cisgender-heterosexual participants who
404 were aware of homosexual coworkers, transgender/transsexual coworkers, and
405 transgender/transsexual friends, family, or relatives had significantly higher overall
406 scores and scores for some subscales. Those who were aware of sexual and gender
407 minorities also had significantly higher scores on the Clinical Preparedness subscale in
408 each subgroup analysis.

409

Table 4. Hypothesis testing (n = 381)

	No.	Total (mean (SD))	Attitudinal Awareness (mean (SD))	Basic Knowledge (mean (SD))	Clinical Preparedness (mean (SD))	Clinical Training (mean (SD))
Total sample	381	4.16 (0.74)	6.30 (0.82)	3.85 (1.51)	2.37 (1.14)	1.75 (1.21)
Age (years)						
20–29	181	4.13 (0.68)	6.37 (0.82)	3.85 (1.44)	2.18 (1.04)	1.73 (1.09)
30–39	98	4.23 (0.82)	6.39 (0.75)	3.68 (1.77)	2.60 (1.20)	1.87 (1.52)
40–49	61	4.06 (0.72)	6.14 (0.88)	3.88 (1.37)	2.26 (1.08)	1.58 (1.00)
50–59	31	4.18 (0.76)	5.97 (0.89)	4.05 (1.27)	2.74 (1.36)	1.78 (1.13)
60+	10	4.35 (0.88)	6.10 (0.75)	4.50 (1.30)	2.80 (1.26)	1.80 (1.23)
P value ^{a)}		1	< 0.01	0.50	0.01	0.56
Sexual orientation and gender identity						
Cisgender-heterosexual	293	4.09 (0.70)	6.26 (0.85)	3.70 (1.44)	2.30 (1.14)	1.72 (1.23)
Sexual and gender minorities (LGBTQA)	62	4.49 (0.78)	6.51 (0.63)	4.50 (1.58)	2.72 (1.12)	1.85 (1.17)
P value ^{b)}		< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01

Note. LGBT-DOCSS-JP total scale scores and subscale scores are described. a) Jonckheere–Terpstra test.

b) Wilcoxon rank sum test. Bold font shows significance at $P < 0.05$ in P value line. SD, standard deviation.

410

411

412 **Internal consistency**

413 In this group, Cronbach's alpha of LGBT-DOCSS-JP total score was 0.84 [95% CI
414 0.81–0.86]. The Cronbach's alpha for the four factors was 0.87 for both Attitudinal
415 Awareness and Basic Knowledge, 0.78 for Clinical Preparedness, and 0.97 for Clinical
416 Training.

417

418 **Test-retest reliability**

419 ICC(2,1) of LGBT-DOCSS-JP total score was 0.86 [95% CI 0.80–0.91]. The values
420 for the four factors were 0.77 for Attitudinal Awareness, 0.80 for Basic Knowledge,
421 0.71 for Clinical Preparedness, and 0.82 for Clinical Training.

422

423 **Discussion**

424 This paper describes the process of developing LGBT-DOCSS-JP through a
425 cross-cultural validation process following a scale translation guideline and examining
426 its psychometric properties. We confirmed the reliability and validity of
427 LGBT-DOCSS-JP.

428

429 In terms of structural validity, LGBT-DOCSS-JP has a distinct four-factor structure,
430 covering Attitudinal Awareness, Basic Knowledge, Clinical Preparedness, and Clinical
431 Training. The Attitudinal Awareness and Basic Knowledge subscales include the same
432 items as the original LGBT-DOCSS, but we separated the original scale's Clinical
433 Preparedness subscale into two domains: Clinical Preparedness and Clinical Training.
434 One of the main reasons is the difference in educational systems across nations.
435 Education on LGBT issues is lacking within the USA, but the deficiency is even more
436 conspicuous in Japan. A recent study reported that the proportion of medical schools
437 that did not teach LGBT content at all during clinical training was significantly higher
438 in Japan than in the USA and Canada (47.2% vs 33.3%) [8]. Other recent studies have
439 found that over 90% of hospitals in Japan do not provide nursing training with LGBT
440 content, despite the demand for this education [28, 29]. This is much worse than the
441 28% of baccalaureate nursing programs in the USA that did not teach LGBT sexual
442 health at all [30]. These training issues in Japan are mainly due to the unavailability of
443 suitable instructors and lack of school policy about LGBT education [8, 30, 31].
444 However, despite the lack of official practical training, many healthcare professionals
445 are aware of the needs of LGBT patients and provide care for them regularly, increasing
446 their clinical preparedness through trial and error. The discrepancy between the lack of

447 official education and actual clinical practice may account for the separation of the
448 original Clinical Preparedness factor into two factors in our study. This separation was
449 also supported by comparing the scores with the original study [4]. The mean (SD)
450 scores in our study for the Clinical Preparedness and Clinical Training subscales were
451 2.37 (1.14) and 1.75 (1.21), notably lower than the Clinical Preparedness score of 3.51
452 (1.45) reported in the original study [4]. The Basic Knowledge subscale mean (SD)
453 score was also lower in our study than in the original study (3.85 (1.51) vs. 4.95
454 (1.51)). Providing precise knowledge and on-the-job clinical training with LGBT
455 patients may be effective in the current Japanese context. However, the Attitudinal
456 Awareness subscale score was as high in this study as in the original study (6.30 (0.82)
457 vs. 6.52 (0.72)) [4]. These findings align with the social milieu of Japan, where a
458 succession of same-sex partnership schemes have been instituted at the municipal level
459 since 2015, and the proportion of citizens showing favorable views of LGBT
460 individuals is increasing [11]. A higher score for Attitudinal Awareness is therefore
461 reasonable.

462

463 We also conducted some hypothesis testing. As hypothesized, younger people scored
464 better in the Attitudinal Awareness subscale, which is in line with previous research [4,
465 11]. Older participants scored higher on the Clinical Preparedness subscale, probably
466 because of increased clinical expertise acquired over their years of professional
467 healthcare experience. This is inconsistent with a previous study of healthcare providers
468 in the USA, which reported no significant difference in LGBT-DOCSS scores based on
469 age [32]. As expected, LGBTQA participants scored higher on LGBT-DOCSS-JP than
470 cisgender-heterosexual participants. Cisgender-heterosexual individuals who were
471 aware of homosexual coworkers at their workplace or knew there were homosexual or
472 transgender/transsexual individuals among their friends, relatives, or family scored
473 higher than their peers. These findings are in line with previous studies [24, 25].
474 However, awareness of transgender/transsexual coworkers was not significantly
475 associated with higher scores except for the Clinical Preparedness subscale. The
476 literature offers inconsistent conclusions about the effectiveness of contact with
477 transgender people in reducing bias. A critical shortcoming is the limited measurement
478 of intergroup contact with transgender people [33]. Previous studies have used a
479 dichotomous measure of contact, disregarding the importance of both quantity and
480 quality of contact [33]. Our study asked solely about participants' perceptions of the
481 presence or absence of transgender/transsexual individuals. Consequently, our measure
482 may have failed to accurately capture the frequency and quality of intergroup contact,

483 potentially undermining the observed effects of this contact on bias reduction. The
484 restricted number of participants may also explain the lack of statistical power.

485

486 Our analyses showed satisfactory validity. LGBT-DOCSS-JP, especially the
487 Attitudinal Awareness subscale, showed a robust association with established scales
488 assessing attitudes toward lesbian and gay individuals, genderism and transphobia, as
489 well as authoritarianism and conventionalism. It was not correlated with a social
490 desirability scale unrelated to the construct of LGBT-DOCSS-JP. These findings show
491 sufficient convergent and discriminant validity of LGBT-DOCSS-JP.

492

493 The results also suggest that the scale is reliable. The Cronbach’s alpha and ICC(2,1)
494 values of LGBT-DOCSS-JP total score were sufficiently good, and almost the same as
495 those reported in the original study [4]. These findings indicate that LGBT-DOCSS-JP
496 shows robust internal consistency and test–retest reliability.

497

498 This study has numerous strengths. First, LGBT-DOCSS-JP is the first Japanese
499 scale to assess health and mental health professionals’ clinical skills with LGBT
500 patients. However, this scale was not designed to serve as a high-stakes assessment such
501 as a pass–fail comprehensive degree examination, certification test, or licensing
502 examination [4]. Second, the translation is based on a culturally and academically
503 validated process. Third, we had a sufficiently large sample to evaluate psychometric
504 properties, and the results of hypothesis testing were also conceptually acceptable.
505 Fourth, we used an online survey to guarantee anonymity because of the sensitive
506 nature of the topic. Some participants may not have engaged fully with the survey, but
507 we included a question to detect and mitigate this drawback [10]. Fifth, the study
508 demonstrated the applicability of LGBT-DOCSS in non-English-speaking and
509 non-Western countries and cultures, addressing a limitation of the previous study [4].

510

511 However, this study also had some limitations. First, it was conducted exclusively
512 within three suburban medical institutions, imposing constraints on its external validity.
513 Future investigations are needed in diverse clinical settings. Second, there was some
514 self-selection bias. Our respondents included a significantly higher percentage of sexual
515 and gender minorities (LGBTQA) compared to a previous general population study
516 (22.8% vs. 8.2%) [23]. Additionally, approximately four times as many individuals
517 responded “yes” or “*probably*” about their awareness of sexual and gender minorities
518 than in a previous study [11]. Those who had more awareness of sexual and gender

519 minorities may have been more inclined to respond. Furthermore, the overall response
520 rate was limited despite our reminder emails. It is therefore conceivable that our scale
521 scores were overestimated when compared with the general population. Third,
522 interpretability and responsiveness were not evaluated, and these psychometric
523 properties should be confirmed in future studies.

524

525 LGBT-DOCSS-JP has the potential to help with the development and assessment of
526 effective curricula for education and training in providing care for LGBT people. This is
527 urgently needed in Japan, where effective training programs and methods have yet to be
528 established. LGBT-DOCSS-JP may also be a valuable tool to promote self-reflection
529 among trainees and professionals about their LGBT attitudinal awareness, basic
530 knowledge, clinical preparedness, and clinical training. We hope this scale will
531 primarily be used for self-exploration and competency development.

532

533 **Acknowledgments**

534 The authors are grateful to Toshiaki Kameda and Yaeko Watanabe for supporting the
535 data collection. We also thank Daichi Hayashi for the back-translation. We would like
536 to take this opportunity to thank Mamiko Ukai and Ryota Takahashi for their
537 collaboration and advice as Kameda Family Clinic Tateyama primary care research
538 team. We also thank Melissa Leffler, MBA, from Edanz (<https://jp.edanz.com/ac>) for
539 editing a draft of this manuscript.

540

541

542 **References**

- 543 1. Institute of Medicine. The health of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people: Building a
544 foundation for better understanding. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2011.
- 545 2. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender
546 Health 2020 [cited 11 July 2023]. Available from:
547 <https://wayback.archive-it.org/5774/20220413203148/https://www.healthypeople.gov/2020/topics-objectives/topic/lesbian-gay-bisexual-and-transgender-health>.
548
- 549 3. Sekoni AO, Gale NK, Manga-Atangana B, Bhadhuri A, Jolly K. The effects of educational
550 curricula and training on LGBT-specific health issues for healthcare students and professionals: a
551 mixed-method systematic review. *J Int AIDS Soc.* 2017;20(1):21624. doi: 10.7448/IAS.20.1.21624.
552 PubMed PMID: 28782330; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5577719.
- 553 4. Bidell MP. The Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Development of Clinical Skills Scale
554 (LGBT-DOCSS): Establishing a New Interdisciplinary Self-Assessment for Health Providers. *J Homosex.*
555 2017;64(10):1432-60. doi: 10.1080/00918369.2017.1321389. PubMed PMID: 28459378.
- 556 5. Nowaskie DZ, Patel AU. How much is needed? Patient exposure and curricular education on
557 medical students' LGBT cultural competency. *BMC Medical Education.* 2020;20(1). doi:
558 10.1186/s12909-020-02381-1.
- 559 6. Willging C, Kano M, Green AE, Sturm R, Sklar M, Davies S, et al. Enhancing primary care
560 services for diverse sexual and gender minority populations: a developmental study protocol. *BMJ Open.*
561 2020;10(2):e032787. Epub 20200225. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-032787. PubMed PMID: 32102808;
562 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7045086.
- 563 7. Medical Education Model Core Curriculum Coordination Committee; Medical Education
564 Model Core Curriculum Expert Research Committee. Model Core Curriculum for Medical Education in
565 Japan, AY 2016 Revision 2017 [cited 11 July 2023]. Available from:

- 566 https://www.mext.go.jp/component/a_menu/education/detail/_icsFiles/afieldfile/2018/06/18/1325989_3
567 [0.pdf](#).
- 568 8. Yoshida E, Matsushima M, Okazaki F. Cross-sectional survey of education on LGBT content
569 in medical schools in Japan. *BMJ Open*. 2022;12(5):e057573. Epub 20220518. doi:
570 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-057573. PubMed PMID: 35584939; PubMed Central PMCID:
571 PMC9119159.
- 572 9. Wild D, Grove A, Martin M, Eremenco S, McElroy S, Verjee-Lorenz A, et al. Principles of
573 Good Practice for the Translation and Cultural Adaptation Process for Patient-Reported Outcomes (PRO)
574 Measures: report of the ISPOR Task Force for Translation and Cultural Adaptation. *Value Health*.
575 2005;8(2):94-104. doi: 10.1111/j.1524-4733.2005.04054.x. PubMed PMID: 15804318.
- 576 10. Maniaci MR, Rogge RD. Caring about carelessness: Participant inattention and its effects on
577 research. *Journal of Research in Personality*. 2014;48:61-83. doi: 10.1016/j.jrp.2013.09.008.
- 578 11. Kamano S, Ishida H, Kazama T, Hiramori D, Yoshinaka T, Kawaguchi K. Attitudes toward
579 sexual and gender minorities: handout for the 2019 (2nd) national survey report meeting. (“Seiteki
580 minority ni tsuite no ishiki: 2019 nen (dai 2 kai) zenkokuchosakai haifushiryō”) 2020 [cited 11 July 2023].
581 Available from: <http://alpha.shudo-u.ac.jp/~kawaguch/2019chousa.pdf>.
- 582 12. Hiramori D, Kamano S. Asking about Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity in Social
583 Surveys in Japan: Findings from the Osaka City Residents’ Survey and Related Preparatory Studies.
584 *Journal of Population Problems*. 2020;76(4):443-66. doi: 10.31235/osf.io/w9mjn.
- 585 13. Horikawa Y, Oka T. Development and validation of the Japanese 20-item version of the
586 Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men Scale (ATLG-J20). *Research in social psychology*.
587 2018;34(2):85-93. doi: 10.14966/jssp.1728.
- 588 14. Mori Y, Yanagawa H, Ishimaru K. Should Transgender Education Be Provided by
589 Transgenders?: Development of the Japanese Version of the Genderism and Transphobia Scale-Revised
590 and a Randomized Trial at Women’s Universities. *Bulletin of Centre of Clinical Psychology &*
591 *Counseling at Ochanomizu University*. 2021;22:13-23.
- 592 15. Takano R, Taka F, Michio. N. Development of Japanese versions of the Right-Wing
593 Authoritarianism (RWA) scale. *The Japanese Journal of Psychology*. 2021;91(6):398-408. doi:
594 10.4992/jjpsy.91.19225.
- 595 16. Tani I. Development of Japanese Version of Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding
596 (BIDR-J). *The Japanese Journal of Personality*. 2008;17(1):18-28. doi: 10.2132/personality.17.18.
- 597 17. Mokkink LB, Prinsen CA, Patrick DL, Alonso J, Bouter LM, de Vet HC, et al. COSMIN Study
598 Design checklist for Patient-reported outcome measurement instruments 2019 [cited 11 July 2023].
599 Available from:
600 https://www.cosmin.nl/wp-content/uploads/COSMIN-study-designing-checklist_final.pdf.

- 601 18. MacCallum RC, Widaman KF, Zhang S, Hong S. Sample size in factor analysis. *Psychological*
602 *Methods*. 1999;4(1):84-99. doi: 10.1037/1082-989X.4.1.84.
- 603 19. Hu L, Bentler PM. Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional
604 criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*.
605 1999;6(1):1-55. doi: 10.1080/10705519909540118.
- 606 20. Cattell RB. The Scree Test For The Number Of Factors. *Multivariate Behav Res*.
607 1966;1(2):245-76. doi: 10.1207/s15327906mbr0102_10. PubMed PMID: 26828106.
- 608 21. Cohen J. A power primer. *Psychol Bull*. 1992;112(1):155-9. doi:
609 10.1037//0033-2909.112.1.155. PubMed PMID: 19565683.
- 610 22. Abma IL, Rovers M, van der Wees PJ. Appraising convergent validity of patient-reported
611 outcome measures in systematic reviews: constructing hypotheses and interpreting outcomes. *BMC Res*
612 *Notes*. 2016;9:226. Epub 20160419. doi: 10.1186/s13104-016-2034-2. PubMed PMID: 27094345;
613 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4837507.
- 614 23. Kamano S, Ishida H, Iwamoto T, Koyama Y, Chitose Y, Hiramori D, et al. "Survey on
615 Diversity of Work and Life, and Coexistence among the Residents of Osaka City": Report Based on
616 Percent Frequency Tables 2019 [cited 11 July 2023]. Available from:
617 https://osaka-chosa.jp/files/20191108osakachosa_report.pdf.
- 618 24. Pettigrew TF, Tropp LR. A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *J Pers Soc Psychol*.
619 2006;90(5):751-83. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751. PubMed PMID: 16737372.
- 620 25. Herek GM, Capitanio JP. "Some of My Best Friends" Intergroup Contact, Concealable Stigma,
621 and Heterosexuals' Attitudes Toward Gay Men and Lesbians. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*.
622 2016;22(4):412-24. doi: 10.1177/0146167296224007.
- 623 26. Bland JM, Altman DG. Statistics notes: Cronbach's alpha. *BMJ*. 1997;314(7080):572-. doi:
624 10.1136/bmj.314.7080.572.
- 625 27. Koo TK, Li MY. A Guideline of Selecting and Reporting Intraclass Correlation Coefficients
626 for Reliability Research. *J Chiropr Med*. 2016;15(2):155-63. Epub 20160331. doi:
627 10.1016/j.jcm.2016.02.012. PubMed PMID: 27330520; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4913118.
- 628 28. Kanda K, Nakashoji I, Yamazaki A, Okada Y, Kano K, Goto M, et al. A Survey of Nurses'
629 Consciousness Concerning Sexual Minorities. *Journal of Japan Society of Nursing Research*.
630 2022;45(1):93-104. doi: 10.15065/jjsnr.20210908146.
- 631 29. Sambe M. Report on "Questionnaire for nursing directors on LGBT patient care." ("LGBT no
632 kanja taiou ni tsuite no kangobucho ankeeto' houkokusho") 2019 [cited 11 July 2023]. Available from:
633 [https://researchmap.jp/multidatabases/multidatabase_contents/download/259573/22c639ed26cf64e8c59d](https://researchmap.jp/multidatabases/multidatabase_contents/download/259573/22c639ed26cf64e8c59db15983d58854/20506?col_no=2&frame_id=498252)
634 [b15983d58854/20506?col_no=2&frame_id=498252](https://researchmap.jp/multidatabases/multidatabase_contents/download/259573/22c639ed26cf64e8c59db15983d58854/20506?col_no=2&frame_id=498252).
- 635 30. Aaberg V. The state of sexuality education in baccalaureate nursing programs. *Nurse Educ*
636 *Today*. 2016;44:14-9. Epub 20160521. doi: 10.1016/j.nedt.2016.05.009. PubMed PMID: 27429324.

- 637 31. Yamazaki Y, Aoki A, Otaki J. Prevalence and curriculum of sexual and gender minority
638 education in Japanese medical school and future direction. *Med Educ Online*. 2020;25(1):1710895. doi:
639 10.1080/10872981.2019.1710895. PubMed PMID: 31931679; PubMed Central PMCID:
640 PMC7006669.
- 641 32. Nowaskie DZ, Sewell DD. Assessing the LGBT cultural competency of dementia care
642 providers. *Alzheimer's & Dementia: Translational Research & Clinical Interventions*. 2021;7(1).
643 doi: 10.1002/trc2.12137.
- 644 33. Hoffarth MR, Hodson G. When intergroup contact is uncommon and bias is strong: the case of
645 anti-transgender bias. *Psychology & Sexuality*. 2018;9(3):237-50. doi: 10.1080/19419899.2018.1470107.
646
647

648 **Supporting information**

- 649 **S1 Appendix (LGBT-DOCSS-JP). The Japanese version of the Lesbian, Gay,**
650 **Bisexual, and Transgender Development of Clinical Skills Scale**
651 **(LGBT-DOCSS-JP) (PDF) (Any information presented in a language other than**
652 **English is not published on medRxiv. S1 Appendix is in Japanese, and thus, it is not**
653 **available here. If you need this file, please contact the corresponding author.)**
- 654 **S1 Fig. The score distributions for the overall scale and each subscale (PDF)**
- 655 **S1 Table. Hypothesis testing among cisgender-heterosexual participants (PDF)**