HHS Public Access

Author manuscript

Arch Sex Behav. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2021 July 01.

Published in final edited form as:

Arch Sex Behav. 2020 July ; 49(5): 1783–1798. doi:10.1007/s10508-020-01712-z.

Bisexual Men's Experiences with Discrimination, Internalized Binegativity, and Identity Affirmation: Differences by Partner Gender

Elissa L. Sarno[1,2], **Michael E. Newcomb**[1,2], **Brian A. Feinstein**[1,2], **Brian Mustanski**[1,2]

[1]Department of Medical Social Sciences, Feinberg School of Medicine, Northwestern University, 625 N Michigan Ave., Suite 1400, Chicago, IL 60611, USA

[2]Institute for Sexual and Gender Minority Health and Wellbeing, Northwestern University, Chicago, IL, USA

Abstract

Bisexual individuals experience unique forms of discrimination related to their sexual orientation (e.g., anti-bisexual prejudice), which occurs from both heterosexual and gay/lesbian individuals. Bisexual individuals may experience stigma differently depending on the gender of their relationship or sexual partners, because they may be perceived as heterosexual if they have a partner of a different gender and as gay/lesbian if they have a partner of the same gender. The present longitudinal study investigated within-persons differences in anti-bisexual experiences, internalized binegativity, and bisexual identity affirmation based on the gender of participants' serious relationship partners and gender of sex partners in a sample of 180 young bisexual men. Results indicated that young bisexual men experienced more interpersonal hostility from both heterosexual and gay/lesbian individuals when their serious relationship partner was female. No significant differences were found in other types of anti-bisexual prejudice, internalized binegativity, or bisexual identity affirmation by serious partner gender. For sexual partner gender, men who had only male sex partners experienced more sexual orientation instability attitudes from heterosexual and lesbian/gay individuals; men with only female sex partners experienced more sexual irresponsibility attitudes from heterosexuals, but not from lesbian/gay individuals; and, like those with female serious relationship partners, men with only female sex partners had more frequent experiences of interpersonal hostility from heterosexual and lesbian/gay individuals. Results indicate that bisexual men experience unique forms of prejudice based on the gender of

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dr. Elissa L. Sarno, 625 N. Michigan Ave., Suite 1400, Chicago, IL 60611. Telephone: (312) 503-6533. Fax: (312) 503-6700. elissa.sarno@northwestern.edu.

Ethical approval: All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

Informed consent: Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants in the study.

Conflict of interest: All the authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

their relationship and sexual partners. Implications for the mental health of bisexual men are discussed.

Keywords

Sexual orientation; Bisexuality; Discrimination; Identity

INTRODUCTION

In addition to minority stressors experienced by all sexual minorities (Meyer, 2003), bisexual individuals experience unique forms of discrimination (e.g., anti-bisexual prejudice; Brewster & Moradi, 2010; Feinstein & Dyar, 2017; Roberts, Horne, & Hoyt, 2015). Bisexual individuals experience anti-bisexual prejudice from both heterosexuals and lesbians and gay men (Brewster & Moradi, 2010; Roberts et al., 2015), which can diminish their ability to access supportive communities (Balsam & Mohr, 2007; Cox, Vanden Berghe, Dewaele, & Vincke, 2010). Bisexual individuals' experiences of stigma and acceptance are diverse, and many bisexual individuals have positive experiences, particularly those who have greater community connectedness and social support (Cooke & Melchert, 2019; Dyar & London, 2018a; Price, Gesselman, & Garcia, 2019), which may be more common in large, metropolitan areas (Rosenberger, Schick, Schnarrs, Novak, & Reece, 2014). Although a qualitative study found a cohort effect, such that younger bisexual men reported more rewarding experiences coming out and more affirmation in their bisexual identities than older bisexual men, suggesting a cultural shift toward decreased biphobia (Anderson & McCormack, 2016), extant research continues to identify links between experiences of stigma and negative impacts on many dimensions of health for bisexual individuals (Arnett, Frantell, Miles, & Fry, 2019; Dyar et al., 2020; Dyar & London, 2018b; Friedman et al., 2019).

Bisexual individuals' experiences of prejudice involve negative attitudes and stereotypes that render bisexual identity as invisible, illegitimate, or stigmatized. Anderson and McCormack (2016) identified 11 distinct kinds of what they refer to as "bisexual burden" documented in the literature: bisexuals are stigmatized as (1) neurotic, (2) unable to love, (3) sex crazed, (4) less capable of monogamy than those attracted to a single sex, (5) suffering from negative stereotypes about their identities from other sexual minorities, (6) confused about their sexual orientation, (7) seen as being within a transitional phase, (8) attention-seeking, (9) not being brave enough to fully come out, (10) accused of holding on to heterosexual privilege; yet, when they are in a relationship with the same sex, (11) perceived as gay. Additional research has shown that negative attitudes toward bisexual individuals are comprised of perceptions that they are strange or abnormal, immoral, "trying to be trendy with sexuality," have sexual expertise, and are more appealing to date for heterosexual women (Beach et al., 2019; Friedman et al., 2014).

Of the many types of anti-bisexual prejudice identified in previous research, for the purposes of the present study, these attitudes will be captured by three broad themes, with the knowledge that they may not capture all aspects of stigma that bisexual individuals

experience: sexual orientation instability, sexual irresponsibility, and interpersonal hostility (Beach et al., 2019; Brewster & Moradi, 2010; Dodge et al., 2016; Mohr & Rochlen, 1999). Sexual orientation instability refers to perceptions that bisexual people are confused or in denial about their sexual orientation, that bisexuality is a "just a phase," and that bisexual individuals are afraid to "come out" as lesbian or gay (Alarie & Gaudet, 2013; Beach et al., 2019; Dodge et al., 2016; Dyar, Lytle, London, & Levy, 2017b; Mulick & Wright, 2002; Roberts et al., 2015). Sexual irresponsibility refers to perceptions that bisexual people are untrustworthy, promiscuous, incapable of monogamy, or more likely to have HIV or another STI (Alarie & Gaudet, 2013; Beach et al., 2019; Doan Van, Mereish, Woulfe, & Katz-Wise, 2018; Dodge et al., 2016; Lannutti & Denes, 2012). These attitudes contribute to experiences of hostility from heterosexuals and lesbians and gay men, including increased negative affect toward bisexual individuals (Herek, 2002) and less willingness to engage in romantic or sexual activities with bisexual people (Feinstein, Dyar, Bhatia, Latack, & Davila, 2014). In addition, some bisexual men and women report perceived exclusion from gay and lesbian communities, ranging from subtle implications of not belonging to overt verbal harassment (Ault, 1996; Burleson, 2005; Hemmings, 2002). These experiences contribute to poorer mental health outcomes, including increased depression, anxiety, and substance use, compared to heterosexual and gay/lesbian individuals (Feinstein & Dyar, 2017).

Experiences of anti-bisexual prejudice have also been associated with greater internalized binegativity, or internalized negative attitudes towards one's own bisexual identity (Dyar, Feinstein, & Davila, 2019; Dyar, Feinstein, Schick, & Davila, 2017a). Bisexual individuals have also been shown to experience more negative attitudes toward their own sexual orientation than lesbians and gay men (Balsam & Mohr, 2007; Cox et al., 2010). Anti-bisexual experiences have been linked to higher psychological distress, directly and indirectly, via internalized binegativity (Brewster, Moradi, DeBlaere, & Velez, 2013; Flanders, 2015; MacLeod, Bauer, Robinson, MacKay, & Ross, 2015).

Bisexual stigma can also have an impact on identity affirmation (i.e., feelings of comfort and pride in one's identity; Paul, Smith, Mohr, & Ross, 2014). In one study, bisexual women who experienced positive events related to their bisexual identities had increases in bisexual identity affirmation over time (Dyar & London, 2018a). Positive sexual identity has also been shown to uniquely predict well-being (Riggle, Mohr, Rostosky, Fingerhut, & Balsam, 2014), making it an important contributing factor to bisexual individuals' mental health.

Less is known about bisexual individuals' experiences of stigma when they are in relationships. Bisexual individuals may experience stigma differently depending on the gender of their relationship partner, in part because sexual orientation may be a concealable identity (i.e., not readily inferred from external characteristics; Pachankis, 2007). Others may assume that bisexual individuals are heterosexual or gay/lesbian depending on the gender of their current romantic partner (Dyar, Feinstein, & London, 2014; Hequembourg & Brallier, 2009; Ross, Dobinson, & Eady, 2010), erasing their bisexual identities, which in itself is stigmatizing. Anderson and McCormack (2016) highlight that a component of heterosexism is the "heterosexual presumption," meaning that people are assumed to be heterosexual unless they publicly identify otherwise. Thus, bisexual individuals with a

partner of a different gender may be assumed to be heterosexual and therefore may experience less prejudice from heterosexuals, while simultaneously experiencing exclusion from lesbian/gay communities (Hequembourg & Brallier, 2009; Ross et al., 2010). In contrast, bisexual individuals with same-gender partners may be assumed to be lesbian or gay because of the "one-time rule of homosexuality" (Anderson & McCormack, 2016), meaning that one same-sex experience is socially perceived as indicative of being "entirely" gay, erasing bisexuality as a possible identity, and potentially increasing the likelihood of discrimination from heterosexuals (Hequembourg & Brallier, 2009; Ross et al., 2010).

Quantitative research on differences in anti-bisexual prejudice based on gender of relationship partners is limited. Dyar, Feinstein, and London (2014) examined differences in sexual identity, minority stress, and depressive symptoms among bisexual women in different types of relationships (i.e., same-sex, different-sex, and single). Compared to bisexual women in different-sex relationships, those in same-sex relationships reported significantly higher identity uncertainty (e.g., feeling uncertain if one is bisexual or homosexual), which was mediated by higher frequency of assumed lesbian identity. Bisexual women in different-sex relationships reported higher levels of depression, mediated by more frequent experiences of rejection and exclusion by lesbians/gay men. However, bisexual women in same-sex and different sex-relationships did not differ in anti-bisexual experiences with heterosexuals.

Molina et al. (2015) explored the association between gender of intimate relationship partners, depression, and alcohol use, mediated by experienced and internalized binegativity, among bisexual women. Women with a male partner reported greater alcohol use compared to women with a female partner, and this difference was mediated by experienced binegativity. It appears that stigma experiences of bisexual women differ based on the gender of their relationship partner, which have important implications for their well-being. It is unclear, however, how these results might translate to the experiences of bisexual men.

The current study aimed to fill this gap by using novel longitudinal data to examine differences in discrimination experienced by bisexual men when in relationships with men, with women, and not in relationships, and at times when their sexual partners were men only, women only, men and women, or they had no sexual partners. To understand fully whether partner gender is associated with stigma experiences among bisexual individuals, it is necessary to examine stigma experiences within-persons, over time. Our design improves upon prior cross-sectional studies by enabling us to use each individual as their own control when examining within-persons change in discrimination experiences across serious relationship and sexual partners. This reduces the possibility that other differences (e.g., sociodemographic factors) could account for observed differences in stigma experiences.

Experiences of discrimination are likely to differ for bisexual men and bisexual women. The focus on bisexual men can will make a contribution to a body of literature that, to date, has mostly emphasized their role as "viral bridges" or facilitators of HIV transmission to their female partners (Cunningham, Olthoff, Burnett, Rompalo, & Ellen, 2006; O'Leary & Jones, 2006). The "bisexual bridge" concept contributes to stereotypes about bisexual men as untrustworthy, promiscuous, or more likely to have HIV or another STI, and little evidence

has been found to support substantial viral bridging behavior among behaviorally bisexual men (Friedman et al., 2017). Research on the experiences of bisexual men is needed, given that bisexual men are perceived more negatively than bisexual women, possibly based on beliefs that bisexual women are "heterosexuals in disguise," but that bisexual men are gay and avoid "coming out" to protect themselves from antigay stigma (Alarie & Gaudet, 2013; Armstrong & Reissing, 2014; Dodge et al., 2016; Matsick & Rubin, 2018; Yost & Thomas, 2012).

The present study investigated within-persons differences in anti-bisexual experiences, or unique forms of discrimination perpetrated by heterosexual and lesbian and gay individuals toward bisexual individuals (i.e., sexual orientation instability, sexual irresponsibility, and interpersonal hostility with heterosexuals and lesbian/gay men, respectively), and bisexual identity (i.e., internalized binegativity and identity affirmation) based on: (1) the gender of the current or most recent serious relationship partner (i.e., male partner, female partner, or no partner); and (2) the gender of their sexual partners in the past six months at a given wave of data collection (male only, female only, male and female, or no partners) in a sample of young cisgender bisexual men. It was hypothesized that bisexual men would have the most frequent anti-bisexual experiences with heterosexuals when they had serious relationships with men or only male sex partners. Further, we anticipated that bisexual men would have the most frequent anti-bisexual experiences with lesbian and gay individuals when they had relationships with women or only female sex partners. Bisexual men were hypothesized to have the fewest anti-bisexual experiences when they were not in relationships or had no sex partners. Because of the lack of previous research on differences in internalized binegativity and identity affirmation based on partner gender, no hypotheses were made and these were posed as exploratory research questions.

METHOD

Participants and Procedure

Participants were 180 self-identified bisexual cisgender men (i.e., assigned male at birth and identify their current gender identity as a man). Participant demographics are described in Table 1.

Data for this study were collected as a part of RADAR, an ongoing longitudinal cohort study of HIV, substance use, and romantic/sexual relationships among young men who have sex with men (MSM) and transgender women in the Chicago area (current $N = 1,110$). Eligibility criteria were: 16–29 years old, assigned male at birth, English-speaking, and had sex with a man in the past year or identified with a sexual minority label. All available data from all waves were used in these analyses, which were collected every six months between August 2015 and August 2018, for a total of seven waves. Participants reported their sexual orientation at every visit. However, the Brief Anti-Bisexual Experiences Scale was only administered to participants at visits at which they self-identified as bisexual; thus, only data from visits in which participants self-identified as bisexual were included in these analyses (analytic $N = 180$). More information about the recruitment process for the RADAR cohort study can be found in (Mustanski et al., 2018).

Measures

Demographics—Participants reported their age, sex assigned at birth, current gender identity, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, highest level of education completed, status as a current student, and employment status.

Sexual orientation disclosure—Sexual orientation disclosure was measured at each visit with a single item, “How out are you to the people around you?” Response options ranged from 0 (“Not out to anyone”) to 3 (“Out to everyone”).

Gender of current or most recent serious relationship partner—At each visit, participants were asked to name their current serious relationship partner, if they had one. They were also asked to name up to four of their most recent sexual partners, in order from most recent to most distant, in the last six months. For each of their four most recent sexual partners, up to four, participants were asked, “What was your relationship with [partner name]?” for which one response option was: “Serious relationship (boyfriend/girlfriend), someone you dated for a while and feel very close to.” Gender of current serious relationship partner was used for participants who had one. For those who had no current serious relationship partner, gender of their most recent sex partner for whom they reported that their relationship was serious was used for analyses. Participants who reported having no serious relationship partners in the last six months were coded as having no partner. We chose to use gender of most recent serious relationship partner (in the last six months) for participants who did not report currently having a serious relationship partner, rather than coding these visits as ones in which participants had no partner. We chose to code our data this way in order to capture the romantic relationship that was most salient for each participant at each visit, as well as to optimize power for our analyses.

Gender of current or most recent serious relationship partner was identified by asking participants, “How does [partner name] currently identify their gender?” Response options were: “Male,” “Female,” “Male assigned at birth with a different gender identity (such as Male-to-Female Transgender (MTF), transwoman, genderqueer),” and “Female assigned at birth with a different gender identity (such as Female-to-Male Transgender (FTM), transman, genderqueer).” Because there were too few visits in which participants responded that they had partners who were male assigned at birth with a different gender identity (N = 9) or female assigned at birth with a different gender identity (N = 2) to examine group differences, only data from visits in which participants reported that their partners were cisgender “Male” or “Female” were used.

Gender of sexual partners—As described above, at each visit, participants were asked to name their four most recent sexual partners, in order from most recent to most distant, in the last six months. They were also asked to report the gender of each of these four sexual partners using the same question and answer responses described above. Similar to serious relationship partners, there were few visits in which participants reported having at least one partner who was assigned male or female at birth with a different gender identity (N = 24). Thus, only cisgender male and cisgender female partners were included in these analyses.

Visits in which participants only reported having had sexual partners assigned male or female at birth and with a different gender identity ($N = 3$) were removed from analyses.

Brief Anti-Bisexual Experiences Scale—The Brief Anti-Bisexual Experiences Scale (Brief ABES; Brewster & Moradi, 2010; Dyar et al., 2019) is an 8-item measure that is administered twice: once with reference to anti-bisexual experiences perpetrated by heterosexual individuals and once with reference to those perpetrated by lesbian/gay individuals. The Brief ABES' three subscales reflect three distinct components of anti-bisexual prejudice: Sexual Orientation Instability (three items; e.g., "People have addressed my bisexuality as if it means that I am simply confused about my sexual orientation"), Sexual Irresponsibility (two items; e.g., "People have assumed that I will cheat in a relationship because I am bisexual"), and Interpersonal Hostility (three items; e.g., "Others have treated me negatively because I am bisexual"). See Appendix for the full scale. Participants responded on a scale from 1 (*Never*) to 6 (*Almost all of the time [more than 70% of the time]*). Items were averaged to create six composite scores reflecting sexual orientation instability experiences from heterosexuals ($\alpha = .82$) and from lesbian and gay individuals ($\alpha = .85$), sexual irresponsibility experiences from heterosexuals ($\alpha = .76$) and from gay and lesbian individuals ($\alpha = .82$), and interpersonal hostility experiences from heterosexuals ($\alpha = .84$) and from lesbian and gay individuals ($\alpha = .81$). Higher scores reflect greater frequency of anti-bisexual experiences. The Brief ABES showed a three-factor structure and good psychometric properties in a sample of non-monosexual adults (Dyar et al., 2019).

Bisexual Identity Inventory—Bisexual identity was assessed using two subscales of the Bisexual Identity Inventory (BII; Paul et al., 2014): Internalized Binegativity (five items; e.g., "It's unfair that I am attracted to people of more than one gender") and Identity Affirmation (six items; e.g., "I am grateful for my bisexual identity"). Participants responded on a scale from 1 (*Strongly disagree*) to 7 (*Strongly agree*). Items are averaged into a composite score for each subscale, with higher scores reflecting greater internalized binegativity ($\alpha = .77$) and greater identity affirmation ($\alpha = .90$). The BII showed good psychometric properties in a sample of bisexual participants (Paul et al., 2014).

Analytic Approach

Analyses were conducted using Mplus software with robust maximum likelihood estimation (Version 7.31; Muthén & Muthén, 1998–2015). Level 1 consisted of repeated measures (i.e., current or most recent serious relationship partner, sexual partners, anti-bisexual experiences, internalized binegativity, and identity affirmation), which were nested within individuals (Level 2). Three dichotomous Level 1 predictor variables were created for current or most recent serious relationship partner at each visit: male partner (no [coded 0]; yes [coded 1]), female partner (no [0]; yes [1]), and no partner (no [0]; yes [1]). Two sets of analyses were conducted: one with male partner as the reference group and one with no partner as the reference group, in order to test differences in outcome variables among all three groups. Four dichotomous Level 1 predictor variables were created for gender of sexual partners at each visit: male partners only (no [coded 0]; yes [coded 1]), female partners only (no [0]; yes [1]), male and female partners (no [coded 0]; yes [coded 1]), and

no partners (no [0]; yes [1]). Analyses were conducted using no partners as the reference group. If any significant differences were found, any groups with significant differences from the no partners group were used as the reference group to test for differences in outcome variables among all groups.

To test the hypotheses that, at the within-person level (1) bisexual men would have the most frequent anti-bisexual experiences with heterosexuals when they had serious relationships with men or only male sex partners; (2) bisexual men would have the most frequent anti-bisexual experiences with lesbian and gay individuals when they had relationships with women or only female sex partners; and (3) bisexual men would have the fewest anti-bisexual experiences when they were not in relationships or had no sex partners, analyses were conducted using a multilevel latent covariate model, which treats the repeated measures of within-person variables as indicators of individual level latent variables while adjusting for their nonindependence (Lüdtke et al., 2008). Age and race/ethnicity were included as Level 2 (between-person) covariates in each model. Race/ethnicity was collapsed into four dichotomous Level 2 variables: Non-Hispanic White, Black or African American, Hispanic/Latino, and Other (Asian, Multiracial, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and another race/ethnicity not listed).

RESULTS

Mean number of data collection visits per participant was 2.23 (range, 1–4), with a total of 402 visits. Among participants who completed a study visit, there were no item-level missing data. At 138 visits participants reported that their current or most recent serious relationship partner was male, at 71 visits participants reported that their current or most recent serious relationship partner was female, and at 193 visits participants reported having had no serious relationship partners in the last six months. At 167 visits, gender of current serious relationship partner was used for analyses, and at 42 visits, gender of most recent serious relationship partner was used. Participants reported having had only male sexual partners at 252 visits, only female partners at 55 visits, both male and female partners at 52 visits, and no sexual partners in the last six months at 40 visits. Table 1 shows gender of participants' serious relationship partners and sexual partners across all study visits. Across all study visits, 77 participants reported having only had male relationship partners, 64 participants reporting having had no relationship partners, 37 participants reported having had only female relationship partners, and two participants reported having had both male and female serious relationship partners.

Table 2 includes means, variances, within- and between-persons correlations, and intraclass correlations (ICCs) for all variables. ICCs can be interpreted as the proportion of variance due to differences between people (or, alternatively, consistency within persons). Conversely, (1 – ICC) can be interpreted as the proportion of variance due to differences within a person across visits (plus error). In general, bisexual identity variables had a greater proportion of between-persons variance, whereas anti-bisexual experiences generally had a greater proportion of within-person variance.

Within- and between-persons correlations among study variables are shown in Table 2. At the within-persons level, interpersonal hostility experiences (i.e., being treated negatively or excluded) with heterosexuals ($r(178) = .11$, $p = .03$) and lesbian/gay individuals ($r(178) = .10$, $p = .04$) were significantly positively correlated with internalized binegativity. Only one Brief ABES subscale, Sexual Irresponsibility Experiences (i.e., perceptions that bisexual people are promiscuous or more likely to have HIV/STI) with heterosexual individuals, had a significant positive correlation with identity affirmation ($r(178) = .11$, $p = .02$). Interestingly, although sexual orientation instability with heterosexuals (i.e., perceptions that bisexual people are confused or in denial about their sexual orientation; $r(178) = -.15$, $p < .001$) and sexual irresponsibility experiences with heterosexuals ($r(178) = -.14$, $p = .01$) had significant negative correlations with sexual orientation disclosure at the within-persons level, at the between-persons level, sexual orientation instability experiences with lesbian/gay people and sexual orientation disclosure were positively correlated ($r(178) = .15$, $p = .04$). Also at the between-persons level, sexual orientation instability ($r(178) = .15$, $p = .04$), sexual irresponsibility ($r(178) = .16$, $p = .03$), and interpersonal hostility experiences with heterosexuals ($r(178) = .18$, $p = .02$) were significantly positively correlated with identity affirmation. Sexual orientation disclosure was negatively correlated with internalized binegativity ($r(178) = -.32$, $p < .001$), and positively correlated with identity affirmation ($r(178) = .46$, $p < .001$). As expected, internalized binegativity and identity affirmation were significantly negatively correlated at both the within-persons ($r(178) = -.26$, $p < .001$) and between-persons levels ($r(178) = -.57$, $p < .001$), and positive correlations were found among the six subscales of the Brief ABES (see Table 2).

Paired-samples *t*-tests were conducted to compare the frequency of anti-bisexual experiences, aggregated to the person level. Participants had significantly fewer interpersonal hostility experiences ($M = 1.50$, $SD = 0.58$) than sexual orientation instability experiences ($M = 1.91$, $SD = 0.91$), $t(179) = 8.04$, $p < .001$, or sexual irresponsibility experiences ($M = 1.85$; $SD = 1.05$), $t(179) = 5.73$, $p < .001$. No significant differences were found between frequency of sexual orientation instability experiences and sexual irresponsibility experiences, $t(179) = 1.15$, $p = .250$.

Paired-samples *t*-tests were also conducted to compare the frequency of anti-bisexual experiences with heterosexual and lesbian/gay individuals. On average, participants had significantly more sexual orientation instability experiences with heterosexuals ($M = 2.01$, $SD = 1.01$) than with lesbians/gay individuals ($M = 1.82$, $SD = 0.97$), $t(179) = 3.45$, $p = .001$. They also experienced more interpersonal hostility with heterosexuals ($M = 1.65$, $SD = 0.74$) than with lesbian/gay individuals ($M = 1.36$, $SD = .57$), $t(179) = 5.99$, $p < .001$. No significant differences were found between sexual irresponsibility experiences with heterosexuals ($M = 1.89$, $SD = 1.15$) and lesbian/gay individuals ($M = 1.85$, $SD = 1.09$), $t(179) = 1.52$, $p = .129$.

Results for within-person differences in anti-bisexual experiences, internalized binegativity, and identity affirmation based on gender of serious relationship partners are shown in Table 3. There were no significant differences in sexual orientation instability or sexual irresponsibility experiences from heterosexual or lesbian/gay individuals based on gender of serious relationship partner. Significant differences in anti-bisexual experiences are

interpreted in light of the lack of within-persons variability in gender of serious relationship partners. Specifically, only two participants reported having both male and female serious relationship partners over the study period. This caused what is known as a conflated effect, in which a main effect is neither the between-person nor within-person main effect, but a blend of the two effects (Hoffman, 2015). Thus, when comparing frequency of anti-bisexual experiences for participants with male partners to those who had female partners, results are interpreted as between-persons effects. However, because there were more participants who had a combination of visits in which they reported female partners and those in which they reported no partners over the study period, results for these comparisons are interpreted as within-persons effects.

When participants had female partners they reported significantly more frequent experiences of interpersonal hostility from heterosexuals compared to when they had no partners (B = .43, SE = .17, p = .01). Participants who had female partners also had significantly more frequent interpersonal hostility experiences from heterosexuals than those who reported having male partners (B = .59, SE = .17, p < .001). Results were the same for interpersonal hostility experiences from lesbian and gay individuals, such that when participants had female partners they had more frequent experiences than when they had no partners (B = .34, SE = .16, p = .04), and participants who had female partners had more frequent experiences than those who reported having male partners (B = 39, SE = .17, p = .02). No significant differences were found for sexual orientation instability or sexual irresponsibility from heterosexuals or lesbian/gay individuals based on serious relationship partner. There were no significant differences in internalized binegativity or identity affirmation based on serious relationship partner.

Results for within-person differences in anti-bisexual experiences, internalized binegativity, and identity affirmation based on gender of sexual partners are displayed in Table 4. For sexual orientation instability from heterosexuals, participants experienced this significantly more frequently at visits when they had only male partners in the last six months, compared to having no partners. Participants had significantly more frequent experiences of instability from lesbian/gay individuals when they had male partners only, compared to when they had no partners or female partners only; participants also experienced more instability from lesbian/gay individuals when they had male and female partners, compared to having only female partners or no partners.

For sexual irresponsibility experiences from heterosexuals, participants had significantly more frequent experiences when they had male partners only or female partners only, compared to no partners and compared to when they had male and female partners. For sexual irresponsibility from lesbian/gay individuals, participants had more frequent experiences when they had any partners than when they had no partners, but there were no significant differences based on having male only, female only, or male and female partners.

For interpersonal hostility from heterosexuals, participants had significantly more frequent experiences when they had any partners, compared to having no partners; in addition, participants had more frequent experiences when they had female partners only compared to having male partners only. For interpersonal hostility from lesbian/gay individuals,

participants had significantly more frequent experiences when they had female partners only, or male and female partners, compared to having no partners. There were no significant differences in internalized binegativity or identity affirmation based on gender of sexual partners in the last six months.

Lastly, there were no significant between-persons effects of age and race/ethnicity, with two exceptions. The Other race group (comprised of those who identified as Asian, Multiracial, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and another race/ethnicity not listed) had significantly less frequent experiences of sexual orientation instability from lesbian/gay individuals than the Non-Hispanic White ($B = .64$, $SE = .22$, $p = .003$), Black or African American ($B = .29$, $SE = .14$, $p = .039$), or Hispanic/Latino ($B = .51$, $SE = .17$, $p = .003$) groups. Age was significantly positively associated with interpersonal hostility experiences with lesbian/gay individuals ($B = .04$, $SE = .02$, $p = .005$), meaning that older participants had more frequent experiences of interpersonal hostility with lesbian/gay individuals.

DISCUSSION

The present study is among the first to quantitatively investigate differences in anti-bisexual experiences, internalized binegativity, and identity affirmation based on the gender of bisexual men's serious relationship and sexual partners. This study contributes a novel understanding of stigma experiences for bisexual men because they were examined within-persons over time and across multiple partnerships. In addition, the study focused on stigma experiences of bisexual men, who have been shown to be perceived more negatively than bisexual women (Alarie & Gaudet, 2013; Armstrong & Reissing, 2014; Dodge et al., 2016; Matsick & Rubin, 2018; Yost & Thomas, 2012), and may be particularly vulnerable to negative mental health consequences as a result.

Participants had significantly more sexual orientation instability and interpersonal hostility experiences with heterosexuals than with lesbians/gay individuals. This is consistent with previous research showing that heterosexuals, particularly heterosexual men, have the most negative attitudes toward bisexual men and women, compared to gay/lesbian participants (Dodge et al., 2016; Friedman et al., 2014). Although positive attitudes toward bisexual individuals have increased among heterosexuals in recent years (Anderson & McCormack, 2016; Gallup, 2019), many continue to have negative attitudes, or at the very least are ambivalent toward, bisexual individuals, which may be more of a reflection of a trend toward less expression of explicit prejudice toward marginalized groups, while maintaining implicit biases (Anselmi, Vianello, Voci, & Robusto, 2013).

Anti-Bisexual Experiences based on Gender of Serious Partners

Bisexual men experienced interpersonal hostility from gay/lesbian people most frequently when they had female serious relationship partners, and more frequently when they had female sexual partners only compared to when they had no partners. This appears consistent with Dyar et al. (2014) findings for bisexual women and qualitative research in which bisexual individuals in different-sex relationships experienced more rejection from lesbian and gay communities than those in same-sex relationships (Hequembourg & Brallier, 2009; Ross et al., 2010). For bisexual men, hostility from lesbians and gay men may stem from a

perception that they have not yet transitioned to a strictly same-sex orientation (Alarie & Gaudet, 2013; Brewster & Moradi, 2010). This may take the form of being afforded lower status as "junior members in the gay male fraternity" (Burleson, 2005, p. 94) or feeling "not gay enough" within lesbian and gay spaces (Callis, 2013; McLean, 2008).

Bisexual men also reported the most frequent experiences of interpersonal hostility from heterosexuals when they had female serious relationship partners, and more frequent experiences when they had female sexual partners only compared to having no partners or male partners only. Qualitative studies have shown that bisexual individuals with different-sex partners might be assumed to be heterosexual, which would seemingly protect them from heterosexism (Hequembourg & Brallier, 2009; Ross et al., 2010). Dyar et al. (2014), however, found no significant differences in interpersonal hostility with heterosexuals between bisexual women in same-sex relationships and different-sex relationships. The bisexual men in this sample had relatively high mean levels of sexual orientation disclosure, which is unsurprising, given their participation in a community-based cohort study of young MSM and transgender women. Thus, others may not assume they are heterosexual based on their relationship partners. Heterosexuals might be uncomfortable with the idea of an openly bisexual man in a relationship with a woman, possibly because they assume bisexual men are actually gay or will transmit HIV/STIs to their female partners (Armstrong & Reissing, 2014; Dodge et al., 2016; Matsick & Rubin, 2018). Future research could explore this possibility by testing whether disclosure of one's sexual orientation as bisexual (as opposed to disclosure of another non-heterosexual identity) moderates associations between partner gender and anti-bisexual experiences.

Neither sexual orientation instability nor sexual irresponsibility experiences differed within-persons based on gender of the serious relationship partners. This suggests that bisexual men experience similar levels of these dimensions of anti-bisexual prejudice regardless of the gender of their serious relationship partners. Participants also had significantly more frequent sexual orientation instability and sexual irresponsibility experiences, on average, compared to interpersonal hostility experiences. This may be because the instability and irresponsibility subscales are measures of attitudes, while the hostility subscale is a measure of behavior. In other words, more frequent experiences of instability or irresponsibility would be those in which it was apparent to the participant that others held attitudes that bisexuality is a phase or that bisexual individuals are incapable of monogamy. In contrast, more frequent experiences of hostility are those in which others acted uncomfortable or treated the participant negatively. It is possible that people are more likely to express attitudes than to engage in hostile behaviors, which is consistent with studies showing declines in overt prejudice and a shift toward more subtle forms, such as microaggressions (Blanton & Jaccard, 2008; Dovidio & Gaertner, 2000; Sue et al., 2007). In addition, attitudes may be expressed in the absence of discomfort or negative treatment, although being alienated or treated negatively because of one's bisexuality implies that one possesses negative attitudes.

The relatively infrequent experience of interpersonal hostility may mean that on the occasions when it does occur, it is more impactful, making it easier to perceive differences based on the gender of one's relationship partner. The relative impact of experiences of

interpersonal hostility may also act as an explanation for its positive correlations with internalized binegativity, which was unrelated to any of the other Brief ABES subscales. Bisexual men who have had partners of different genders over time may have become more attuned to others' discomfort when they have female partners, which may lead to more negative attitudes towards their own sexual orientation. In contrast, they may be less sensitive to changes in sexual orientation instability and sexual irresponsibility experiences because they occur, on average, more often.

Anti-Bisexual Experiences based on Sexual Partners

In contrast to the results found for serious relationship partners, more significant differences in frequency of anti-bisexual experiences were found based on gender of sex partners. Bisexual men in this study had sexual orientation instability experiences with heterosexuals most frequently when they had only male sexual partners, and with lesbian and gay individuals when they had only male, or male and female, sexual partners. There may have been significant differences in sexual orientation instability based on gender of sex partners, rather than gender of serious relationship partners, because sex partners may be perceived to be more temporary, which is consistent with the stereotype that bisexuality is itself temporary or "a phase" (Alarie & Gaudet, 2013; Beach et al., 2019; Dodge et al., 2016; Dyar et al., 2017b; Mulick & Wright, 2002; Roberts et al., 2015). Serious relationship partners, in contrast, may not influence these types of anti-bisexual experiences because they may be longer lasting relationships that do not invoke the idea of bisexuality as a transient or illegitimate identity. That bisexual men had the most frequent sexual orientation instability experiences with both heterosexuals and gay/lesbian people when they had only male sexual partners may be related to the perception that bisexual individuals are afraid to come out as gay (Alarie & Gaudet, 2013; Beach et al., 2019; Dodge et al., 2016; Dyar et al., 2017b; Mulick & Wright, 2002; Roberts et al., 2015), and a feeling that this stereotype is reinforced by having had only male sexual partners.

Bisexual men had the most frequent experiences of sexual irresponsibility with heterosexuals when they had male only or female only sex partners, compared to when they had no partners or both male and female sex partners, and with lesbian/gay individuals when they had sex partners of any gender, compared to having no sex partners. It seems that the experience of this type of prejudice from lesbian/gay individuals is not related to having sex partners of a particular gender, but rather to having any sex partners at all, as opposed to having no partners, because this stereotype has to do with perceptions of bisexual individuals as untrustworthy, promiscuous, or incapable of monogamy (Alarie & Gaudet, 2013; Beach et al., 2019; Doan Van et al., 2018; Dodge et al., 2016; Lannutti & Denes, 2012). For bisexual men, having any sex appears to be associated with perceptions of promiscuity and of being "sex-crazed" (Anderson & McCormack, 2016).

Internalized Binegativity, Identity Affirmation, and Sexual Orientation Disclosure

Bisexual men did not experience differences in internalized binegativity based on the gender of their serious relationship partners or sex partners, consistent with Molina et al.'s (2015) results for bisexual women. Mean levels of internalized binegativity were generally low, meaning that the men in this sample are generally comfortable and accepting of their

bisexual identities. Relatedly, participants also had high mean levels of identity affirmation, which did not differ based on gender of partners. This could also be attributed to their greater connection to LGBTQ communities as a function of their participation in this community-based study of young MSM and transgender women. Future research should continue to explore these relations, perhaps in samples of bisexual men who are less out, as they may experience more internalized binegativity and be more vulnerable to negative mental health outcomes.

Significant positive between- and within-persons correlations were found between identity affirmation and anti-bisexual experiences from heterosexuals (see Table 2). In other words, bisexual men who had more comfort and pride in their bisexual identity also had more frequent experiences of anti-bisexual prejudice with heterosexual people. Higher bisexual identity affirmation has been associated with being more out as bisexual (Paul et al., 2014), which was also supported by a significant positive within- and between-person correlations between identity affirmation and sexual orientation disclosure in the present study (see Table 2), and this increased visibility could mean exposure to more anti-bisexual prejudice (Roberts et al., 2015).

Significant correlations were also found between anti-bisexual experiences and sexual orientation disclosure. When bisexual men were more out about their sexual orientation, they had more frequent experiences of anti-bisexual prejudice with lesbian/gay people, but less frequent experiences with heterosexual people. This could be related to a limitation of this study: the lack of specificity of the sexual orientation measure, which does not distinguish between disclosing one's sexual orientation as nonheterosexual or specifically bisexual. Measuring diverse forms of sexual orientation disclosure is important for bisexual individuals, given that they are more likely than their lesbian and gay counterparts to present themselves as heterosexual or as another sexual minority (i.e., lesbian or gay; Mohr, Jackson, & Sheets, 2017). It is possible that the bisexual men in this study disclosed their sexual orientation as bisexual in some contexts, but as nonheterosexual in others, resulting in different patterns of experiences of stigma with heterosexual and lesbian/gay people. Future research is needed to investigate not only how much bisexual men disclose their sexual orientation, but also what sexual orientation bisexual men disclose to different people (i.e., heterosexuals and lesbian/gay individuals) when they have partners of different genders.

Limitations and Future Directions

Results of this study should be interpreted in light of several limitations. Sexual orientation identity commonly changes over time, particularly during adolescence and young adulthood (Kaestle, 2019; Moreira, Halkitis, & Kapadia, 2015), which was evidenced in the present study by the fact that 58.3% of participants did not identify as bisexual at at least one of the seven waves of data collection (see Table 1). Because the Brief ABES was only administered to participants at visits at which they self-identified as bisexual, we were not able to assess how associations between gender of partners and experiences of prejudice may have been different for participants as their sexual orientation changed over time. Additionally, participants may have self-identified as other nonmonosexual identities (i.e., queer) at study visits that were not included in these analyses, and could have had partners of different

genders and experienced prejudice that is similar to or different from those who identified as bisexual. Exploring developmental changes in sexual orientation identity over time and how these relate to both gender of relationship partners and experiences of prejudice is an important direction for future research.

Second, the sample was comprised of self-identified bisexual cisgender men who are likely to be more out and at least somewhat connected to the LGBTQ community, which has implications for the generalizability of the results. For example, research conducted with bisexual men who were less connected to LGBTQ communities could yield different results in regards to anti-bisexual experiences from gay/lesbian individuals, because less community connection could mean less exposure to this population, and fewer opportunities to experience stigma. In contrast, decreased community affiliation could be a choice on the part of bisexual men as a result of experiences of anti-bisexual stigma from gay/lesbian individuals; thus, the opposite result could occur. In addition, more connectedness to LGBTQ community is likely correlated to increased outness about one's sexual orientation. Bisexual men who have not disclosed their sexual orientation, for example, could have more female relationship partners, and experience less frequent anti-bisexual experiences because they are most often assumed to be heterosexual. In addition, data for this study were collected in Chicago, a large urban area in the United States. Regional differences in anti-bisexual experiences may limit the generalizability of these results to bisexual men living in areas that are more suburban or rural, or in other countries.

It is important to recognize the role that experiences of intersectional stigma play for bisexual men in different types of relationships, which likely differ by race/ethnicity and other sociocultural identities that we were not able to explore in this study. For example, research has shown that LGBTQ people of color experience racism in relationships and dating, including exclusion/rejection and sexual objectification (Balsam, Molina, Beadnell, Simoni, & Walters, 2011), which could contribute to increased experiences of sexual irresponsibility beliefs and interpersonal hostility for bisexual men of color. Black bisexual men, for example, may experience heightened cultural expectations of heteronormativity within Black communities, which create emotional conflict around sexual attraction to other men and increase the likelihood of having female partners and of sexuality nondisclosure (Bowleg, 2013; Wilson, 2008). Research conducted with bisexual Latino men has also revealed that adhering to masculine expressions of gender to manage the risk of being perceived as nonheterosexual plays a significant role in their sexual experiences with men and women (Muñoz-Laboy, Severson, Garcia, Parker, & Wilson, 2018). Although our sample was fairly diverse in terms of race/ethnicity, we did not have enough participants of each race/ethnicity to test these associations in each group. Future research is needed to further explore the experiences of diverse bisexual men in relationships.

Although the longitudinal design of the study was able to capture differences at the within-person level, there were a limited number of visits at which data were collected, particularly those in which participants had partners who were assigned male or female at birth and had a different gender identity (e.g., transwoman, transman, genderqueer). A level 2 sample size of at least 100 has been recommended when using multilevel modeling (Preacher, Zyphur, & Zhang, 2010), meaning that the present study's sample of 180 participants is likely

sufficient. In addition, there was relatively little within-persons variability in gender of serious relationship partners over time, with only two participants reporting both male and female serious relationship partners across all visits. However, future longitudinal studies that are longer in duration and with greater numbers of visits in which bisexual men report partners of diverse gender identities could have more power to detect differences in anti-bisexual experiences and bisexual identity, and more within-persons variability in partner gender. As this longitudinal cohort study is ongoing, these analyses may become feasible as more data are collected.

Lastly, our operationalization of gender of serious relationship partners included current relationship partners for some visits, and most recent serious relationship partner (in the last six months) for others (about 20% of visits). Although we found that significant effects did not change when we excluded visits with data from most recent serious relationship partners, future research is needed to assess the impact of current versus previous partnerships on experiences of discrimination, internalized binegativity, and identity affirmation among bisexual men.

This study is among the first to quantitatively investigate differences in experiences of anti-bisexual prejudice and positive and negative aspects of bisexual identity by gender of serious relationship partners and sexual partners among bisexual men. Having relationship or sex partners who are male or female may make bisexual men vulnerable to different types of prejudice, relative to having no partners. Although previous research has indicated that romantic relationships may be protective against the impact of stigma on mental health for sexual minority individuals (Wienke & Hill, 2009), these results indicate that being in different types of relationships may have more complex implications for the mental health of bisexual men. Although mental health variables were not included in this study, the results have important implications for the psychological wellbeing of bisexual men, as previous research has found that bisexual women in different-sex relationships who experienced more anti-bisexual stigma also experienced greater depression (Dyar et al., 2014) and binge drinking (Molina et al., 2015). Future research should continue to investigate links between partner gender, anti-bisexual prejudice, bisexual identity, and mental health, to further elucidate the experiences of this population.

Funding:

This research was supported by a grant from the National Institute on Drug Abuse (U01DA036939; PI: Mustanski). Elissa Sarno's time was supported by a grant from the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (F32AA028194; PI: Sarno). Brian Feinstein's time was supported by a grant from the National Institute on Drug Abuse (K08DA045575; PI: Feinstein). We acknowledge the research infrastructure provided by the NIH-funded Third Coast Center for AIDS Research (CFAR) (P30 AI117943) and the NIH-funded Northwestern University Clinical and Translational Sciences Institute (UL1TR001422). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the funding agencies.

Appendix

Brief Anti-Bisexual Experiences Scale

	Never	Once in a while (less than 10% of the time)	Sometimes (10%−25% of the time)	A lot (26% −49% of the time)	Most of the time (50% −70% of the time)	Almost all of the time (more than 70% of the time)
1. People have acted as if my bisexuality is only a sexual curiosity, not a stable sexual orientation.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. People have not taken my sexual orientation seriously, because I am bisexual.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. People have addressed my bisexuality as if it means that I am simply confused about my sexual orientation	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. People have assumed that I will cheat in a relationship because I am bisexual.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. People have treated me as if I am obsessed with sex because I am bisexual.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Others have acted uncomfortable around me because of my bisexuality.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. I have been alienated because I am bisexual.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Others have treated me negatively because I am bisexual	1	2	3	4	5	6

Note. Each question is followed by “had this experience with lesbian or gay people” and “had this experience with heterosexual people,” followed by response options. Subscale composition is as follows: Sexual Orientation Instability (1, 2, 3), Sexual Irresponsibility (4, 5), and Interpersonal Hostility (6, 7, 8).

REFERENCES

Alarie M, & Gaudet S (2013). ‘I don’t know if she is bisexual or if she just wants to get attention’: Analyzing the various mechanisms through which emerging adults invisibilize bisexuality. Journal of Bisexuality, 13, 191–214. doi:10.1080/15299716.2013.780004

Anderson E, & McCormack M (2016). The changing dynamics of bisexual men’s lives: Social research perspectives. Switzerland: Springer.

Anselmi P, Vianello M, Voci A, & Robusto E (2013). Implicit sexual attitude of heterosexual, gay and bisexual individuals: Disentangling the contribution of specific associations to the overall measure. PLoS One, 8, e78990. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0078990 [PubMed: 24260142]

Armstrong HL, & Reissing ED (2014). Attitudes toward casual sex, dating, and committed relationships with bisexual partners. Journal of Bisexuality, 14, 236–264. doi:10.1080/15299716.2014.902784

Arnett JE III, Frantell KA, Miles JR, & Fry KM (2019). Anti-bisexual discrimination as insidious trauma and impacts on mental and physical health. Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity, 6, 475–485. doi:10.1037/sgd0000344

Ault A (1996). Ambiguous identity in an unambiguous sex/gender structure: The case of bisexual women. Sociological Quarterly, 37, 449–463. doi:10.1111/j.1533-8525.1996.tb00748.x

Balsam KF, & Mohr JJ (2007). Adaptation to sexual orientation stigma: A comparison of bisexual and lesbian/gay adults. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54, 306–319. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.54.3.306

Balsam KF, Molina Y, Beadnell B, Simoni J, & Walters K (2011). Measuring multiple minority stress: The LGBT People of Color Microaggressions Scale. Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 17, 163–174. doi:10.1037/a0023244 [PubMed: 21604840]

Beach L, Bartelt E, Dodge B, Bostwick W, Schick V, Fu T-CJ, … Herbenick D (2019). Meta-perceptions of others' attitudes toward bisexual men and women among a nationally representative probability sample. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 48, 191–197. doi:10.1007/s10508-018-1347-8 [PubMed: 30446861]

Blanton H, & Jaccard J (2008). Unconscious racism: A concept in pursuit of a measure. Annual Review of Sociology, 34, 277–297. doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.33.040406.131632

Bowleg L (2013). 'Once you've blended the cake, you can't take the parts back to the main ingredients': Black gay and bisexual men's descriptions and experiences of intersectionality. Sex Roles, 68, 754–767. doi:10.1007/s11199-012-0152-4

Brewster ME, & Moradi B (2010). Perceived experiences of anti-bisexual prejudice: Instrument development and evaluation. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 57, 451–468. doi:10.1037/a0021116

Brewster ME, Moradi B, DeBlaere C, & Velez BL (2013). Navigating the borderlands: The roles of minority stressors, bicultural self-efficacy, and cognitive flexibility in the mental health of bisexual individuals. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 60, 543–556. doi:10.1037/a0033224 [PubMed: 23815628]

Burleson WE (2005). Bi America: Myths, truths, and struggles of an invisible community. Binghamton, NY: Harrington Park Press/The Haworth Press.

Callis AS (2013). The black sheep of the pink flock: Labels, stigma, and bisexual identity. Journal of Bisexuality, 13, 82–105. doi:10.1080/15299716.2013.755730

Cooke PJ, & Melchert TP (2019). Bisexual well-being: Assessing a model of predictors of psychosocial well-being for bisexual men. Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity, 6, 242–255. doi:10.1037/sgd0000324

Cox N, Vanden Berghe W, Dewaele A, & Vincke J (2010). Acculturation strategies and mental health in gay, lesbian, and bisexual youth. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 39, 1199–1210. doi:10.1007/s10964-009-9435-7 [PubMed: 20689983]

Cunningham SD, Olthoff G, Burnett P, Rompalo AM, & Ellen JM (2006). Evidence of heterosexual bridging among syphilis-positive men who have sex with men. Sexually Transmitted Infections, 82, 444–445. doi:10.1136/sti.2005.019513 [PubMed: 17151030]

Doan Van EE, Mereish EH, Woulfe JM, & Katz-Wise SL (2018). Perceived discrimination, coping mechanisms, and effects on health in bisexual and other nonmonosexual adults. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 48, 159–714. doi:10.1007/s10508-018-1254-z [PubMed: 30105618]

Dodge B, Herbenick D, Friedman MR, Schick V, Fu TJ, Bostwick W, … Sandfort TG (2016). Attitudes toward bisexual men and women among a nationally representative probability sample of adults in the United States. PLoS One, 11, e0164430. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0164430 [PubMed: 27783644]

Dovidio JF, & Gaertner SL (2000). Aversive racism and selection decisions: 1989 and 1999. Psychological Science, 11, 315–319. doi:10.1111/1467-9280.00262 [PubMed: 11273391]

Dyar C, Feinstein BA, & Davila J (2019). Development and validation of a brief version of the Anti-Bisexual Experiences Scale. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 48, 175–189. doi:10.1007/s10508-018-1157-z [PubMed: 29611021]

Dyar C, Feinstein BA, & London B (2014). Dimensions of sexual identity and minority stress among bisexual women: The role of partner gender. Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity, 1, 441–451. doi:10.1037/sgd0000063

Dyar C, Feinstein BA, Schick V, & Davila J (2017a). Minority stress, sexual identity uncertainty, and partner gender decision making among nonmonosexual individuals. Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity, 4, 87–104. doi:10.1037/sgd0000213

Dyar C, Feinstein BA, Stephens J, Zimmerman AR, Newcomb ME, & Whitton SW (2020). Nonmonosexual stress and dimensions of health: Within-group variation by sexual, gender, and racial/ethnic identities. Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity, 7, 12–25. doi:10.1037/sgd0000348 [PubMed: 32346545]

Dyar C, & London B (2018a). Bipositive events: Associations with proximal stressors, bisexual identity, and mental health among bisexual cisgender women. Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity, 5, 204–219. doi:10.1037/sgd0000281

Dyar C, & London B (2018b). Longitudinal examination of a bisexual-specific minority stress process among bisexual cisgender women. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 42, 342–360. doi:10.1177/0361684318768233

Dyar C, Lytle A, London B, & Levy SR (2017b). An experimental investigation of the application of binegative stereotypes. Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity, 4, 314–327. doi:10.1037/sgd0000234

Feinstein BA, & Dyar C (2017). Bisexuality, minority stress, and health. Current Sexual Health Reports, 9, 42–49. doi:10.1007/s11930-017-0096-3 [PubMed: 28943815]

Feinstein BA, Dyar C, Bhatia V, Latack JA, & Davila J (2014). Willingness to engage in romantic and sexual activities with bisexual partners: Gender and sexual orientation differences. Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity, 1, 255–262. doi:10.1037/sgd0000047

Flanders CE (2015). Bisexual health: A daily diary analysis of stress and anxiety. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 37, 319–335. doi:10.1080/01973533.2015.1079202

Friedman MR, Bukowski L, Eaton LA, Matthews DD, Dyer TV, Siconolfi D, & Stall R (2019). Psychosocial health disparities among black bisexual men in the US: Effects of sexuality nondisclosure and gay community support. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 48, 213–224. doi:10.1007/s10508-018-1162-2 [PubMed: 29623533]

Friedman MR, Dodge B, Schick V, Herbenick D, Hubach RD, Bowling J, … Reece M (2014). From bias to bisexual health disparities: Attitudes toward bisexual men and women in the United States. LGBT Health, 1, 309–318. doi:10.1089/lgbt.2014.0005 [PubMed: 25568885]

Friedman MR, Stall R, Plankey M, Shoptaw S, Herrick AL, Surkan PJ, … Silvestre AJ (2017). Stability of Bisexual Behavior and Extent of Viral Bridging Behavior Among Men Who Have Sex with Men and Women. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 46, 903–912. doi:10.1007/s10508-016-0863-7 [PubMed: 27873033]

Gallup. (2019). Gay and lesbian rights. Retrieved from https://news.gallup.com/poll/1651/gay-lesbian-rights.aspx

Hemmings C (2002). Bisexual spaces: A geography of sexuality and gender. London, UK: Routledge.

Hequembourg AL, & Brallier SA (2009). An exploration of sexual minority stress across the lines of gender and sexual identity. Journal of Homosexuality, 56, 273–298. doi:10.1080/00918360902728517 [PubMed: 19319738]

Herek GM (2002). Heterosexuals attitudes toward bisexual men and women in the United States. Journal of Sex Research, 39, 264–274. [PubMed: 12545409]

Hoffman L (2015). Longitudinal Analysis: Modeling Within-Person Fluctuation and Change. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.

Kaestle CE (2019). Sexual orientation trajectories based on sexual attractions, partners, and identity: A longitudinal investigation from adolescence through young adulthood using a US representative sample. Journal of Sex Research, 56, 811–826. doi:10.1080/00224499.2019.1577351 [PubMed: 31030560]

Lannutti PJ, & Denes A (2012). A kiss is just a kiss?: Comparing perceptions related to female–female and female–male kissing in a college social situation. Journal of Bisexuality, 12, 49–62. doi:10.1080/15299716.2012.645716

Lüdtke O, Marsh HW, Robitzsch A, Trautwein U, Asparouhov T, & Muthén B (2008). The multilevel latent covariate model: A new, more reliable approach to group-level effects in contextual studies. Psychological Methods, 13, 203–229. doi:10.1037/a0012869 [PubMed: 18778152]

MacLeod MA, Bauer GR, Robinson M, MacKay J, & Ross LE (2015). Biphobia and anxiety among bisexuals in Ontario, Canada. Journal of Gay & Lesbian Mental Health, 19, 217–243. doi:10.1080/19359705.2014.1003121

Matsick JL, & Rubin JD (2018). Bisexual prejudice among lesbian and gay people: Examining the roles of gender and perceived sexual orientation. Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity, 5, 143–155. doi:10.1037/sgd0000283

McLean K (2008). Inside, outside, nowhere: Bisexual men and women in the gay and lesbian community. Journal of Bisexuality, 8, 63–80. doi:10.1080/15299710802143174

Meyer IH (2003). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: Conceptual issues and research evidence. Psychological Bulletin, 129, 674–697. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.129.5.674 [PubMed: 12956539]

Mohr JJ, Jackson SD, & Sheets RL (2017). Sexual orientation self-presentation among bisexual-identified women and men: Patterns and predictors. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 46, 1465–1479. doi:10.1007/s10508-016-0808-1 [PubMed: 27502348]

Mohr JJ, & Rochlen AB (1999). Measuring attitudes regarding bisexuality in lesbian, gay male, and heterosexual populations. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 46, 353–369. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.46.3.353

Molina Y, Marquez JH, Logan DE, Leeson CJ, Balsam KF, & Kaysen DL (2015). Current intimate relationship status, depression, and alcohol use among bisexual women: The mediating roles of bisexual-specific minority stressors. Sex Roles, 73, 43–57. doi:10.1007/s11199-015-0483-z [PubMed: 26456995]

Moreira AD, Halkitis PN, & Kapadia F (2015). Sexual identity development of a new generation of emerging adult men: The P18 Cohort Study. Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity, 2, 159–167. doi:10.1037/sgd0000099

Mulick PS, & Wright LW (2002). Examining the existence of biphobia in the heterosexual and homosexual populations. Journal of Bisexuality, 2, 45–64. doi:10.1300/J159v02n04_03

Muñoz-Laboy M, Severson N, Garcia J, Parker RG, & Wilson P (2018). 'I kick it to both, but not in the street': Behaviorally bisexual Latino men, gender, and the sexual geography of New York City metropolitan area. Men and Masculinities, 21, 131–149. doi:10.1177/1097184X17695036

Mustanski B, Ryan DT, Hayford C, Phillips G 2nd, Newcomb ME, & Smith JD (2018). Geographic and individual associations with PrEP stigma: Results from the RADAR cohort of diverse young men who have sex with men and transgender women. AIDS and Behavior, 22, 3044–3056. doi:10.1007/s10461-018-2159-5 [PubMed: 29789985]

Muthén LK, & Muthén BO (1998–2015). Mplus user's guide (Seventh Ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén.

O'Leary A, & Jones KT (2006). Bisexual men and heterosexual women: How big is the bridge? How can we know? Sexually Transmitted Diseases, 33, 594–595. doi:10.1097/01.olq.0000225280.44538.f6 [PubMed: 16837828]

Pachankis JE (2007). The psychological implications of concealing a stigma: A cognitive-affective-behavioral model. Psychological Bulletin, 133, 328–345. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.133.2.328 [PubMed: 17338603]

Paul R, Smith NG, Mohr JJ, & Ross LE (2014). Measuring dimensions of bisexual identity: Initial development of the Bisexual Identity Inventory. Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity, 1, 452–460. doi:10.1037/sgd0000069

Preacher KJ, Zyphur MJ, & Zhang Z (2010). A general multilevel SEM framework for assessing multilevel mediation. Psychological Methods, 15, 209–233. doi:10.1037/a0020141 [PubMed: 20822249]

Price DM, Gesselman AN, & Garcia JR (2019). Single bisexual men's and women's perceptions of acceptance in the LGBTQ community. Journal of Homosexuality, 1–25. doi:10.1080/00918369.2019.1618645

Riggle EDB, Mohr JJ, Rostosky SS, Fingerhut AW, & Balsam KF (2014). A multifactor Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Positive Identity Measure (LGB-PIM). Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity, 1, 398–411. doi:10.1037/sgd0000057

Roberts TS, Horne SG, & Hoyt WT (2015). Between a gay and a straight place: Bisexual individuals' experiences with monosexism. Journal of Bisexuality, 15, 554–569. doi:10.1080/15299716.2015.1111183

Rosenberger JG, Schick V, Schnarrs P, Novak DS, & Reece M (2014). Sexual behaviors, sexual health practices, and community engagement among gay and bisexually identified men living in rural areas of the United States. Journal of Homosexuality, 61, 1192–1207. doi:10.1080/00918369.2019.1618645 [PubMed: 24344718]

Ross LE, Dobinson C, & Eady A (2010). Perceived determinants of mental health for bisexual people: A qualitative examination. American Journal of Public Health, 100, 496–502. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2008.156307 [PubMed: 20075326]

Sue DW, Capodilupo CM, Torino GC, Bucceri JM, Holder AMB, Nadal KL, & Esquilin M (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical practice. American Psychologist, 62, 271–286. [PubMed: 17516773]

Wienke C, & Hill GJ (2009). Does the "marriage benefit" extend to partners in gay and lesbian relationships? Evidence from a random sample of sexually active adults. Journal of Family Issues, 30, 259–289. doi:10.1177/0192513X08324382

Wilson PA (2008). A dynamic-ecological model of identity formation and conflict among bisexually-behaving African-American men. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 37, 794–809. doi:10.1007/s10508-008-9362-9 [PubMed: 18546068]

Yost MR, & Thomas GD (2012). Gender and binegativity: Men's and women's attitudes toward male and female bisexuals. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 41, 691–702. doi:10.1007/s10508-011-9767-8 [PubMed: 21597943]

Table 1

Participant Demographics

	M	SD
Age at baseline (in years)	22.32	2.85
	N	%
Race/ethnicity		
Black or African American	64	35.6
Hispanic/Latino	56	31.1
Non-Hispanic White	34	18.9
Multiracial	19	10.6
Asian	4	2.2
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	0.6
Another race/ethnicity not listed	2	1.1
Sexual orientation across all study visits		
Self-identified as bisexual at all study visits	75	41.7
Self-identified as bisexual at at least three consecutive study visits	135	75.0
Highest level of education completed		
Less than high school diploma	22	12.2
High school diploma/GED	140	77.8
Undergraduate degree	16	8.9
Graduate degree	2	1.1
Current student	80	44.4
Currently employed		
Full-time	74	41.1
Part-time	63	35.0
Not currently employed	43	23.9
Gender of serious relationship partners across study visits (self-identified as bisexual)		
Male partners only	77	42.8
No partners	64	35.6
Female partners only	37	20.6
Female and male partners	2	1.1
Gender of sexual partners across study visits (self-identified as bisexual)		
Male partners only	117	65
Male and female partners	37	20.6
Female partners only	17	9.4
No partners	9	5.0

Note. Participants reported their sexual orientation at all study visits, and only data from visits in which participants self-identified as bisexual were included in analyses. “Sexual orientation across all study visits” refers to participants’ self-identified sexual orientation across all seven study visits from which data were available; “Gender of [serious relationship/sexual partners] across study visits (self-identified as bisexual)” refers only to study visits at which participants self-identified as bisexual, which constituted the analytic sample.

Table 2

Univariate and Bivariate Descriptive Statistics for Outcome Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Internalized binegativity[a]	.64	−.26***	.08	.00	.03	−.02	.11*	.10*	−.06
2. Identity affirmation[b]	−.57***	.70	−.01	−.01	.11*	.08	−.01	−.02	.25*
3. Sexual orientation instability-H[a]	.12	.15*	.47	.63***	.52***	.34***	.58***	.41***	−.15***
4. Sexual orientation instability-LG[a]	.12	.11	.69***	.55	.24***	.33***	.21***	.21***	−.07
5. Sexual irresponsibility-H[a]	.09	.16*	.68***	.48***	.51	.74***	.41***	.28***	−.14**
6. Sexual irresponsibility- LG[a]	.15	.13	.61***	.69***	.81***	.45	.27***	.38***	−.04
7. Interpersonal hostility-H[a]	.03	.18*	.67***	.48***	.62***	.52***	.37	.60***	−.07
8. Interpersonal hostility-LG[a]	.09	.09	.47***	.75***	.40***	.62***	.55***	.38	.00
9. Sexual orientation disclosure[c]	−.32***	.46***	.11	.15*	.03	.04	−.01	.03	.68
Mean	2.18	5.65	2.01	1.82	1.89	1.85	1.65	1.36	1.94
Within variance	.53	.57	.69	.55	.78	.90	.52	.34	.23
Between variance	.94	1.31	.61	.68	.84	.74	.30	.20	.50

Note. Within-person correlations are above the diagonal; between-persons correlations are below the diagonal. Intraclass correlations are on the diagonal. H = experiences with heterosexuals; LG = experiences with lesbian or gay people.

[a]Absolute range = 1–6;

[b]Absolute range = 1–7;

[c]Absolute range = 0–3.

*$p < .05$.

**$p < .01$.

***$p < .001$.

Table 3

Within-Person Differences in Outcome Variables by Gender of Serious Relationship Partners

Outcome	Predictor	*B*	*SE*	*P*
Sexual orientation instability-H	Male partner	Ref.	-	-
	Female partner	.11	.18	.57
	No partner	−.03	.13	.81
	No partner	Ref.	-	-
	Female partner	.14	.16	.39
Sexual orientation instability-LG	Male partner	Ref.	-	-
	Female partner	.13	.17	.44
	No partner	−.01	.11	.90
	No partner	Ref.	-	-
	Female partner	.13	.14	.37
Sexual irresponsibility-H	Male partner	Ref.	-	-
	Female partner	.31	.15	.18
	No partner	.20	.15	.18
	No partner	Ref.	-	-
	Female partner	.11	.17	.52
Sexual irresponsibility-LG	Male partner	Ref.	-	-
	Female partner	.40	.20	.05
	No partner	.18	.14	.19
	No partner	Ref.	-	-
	Female partner	.22	.18	.22
Interpersonal hostility-H	Male partner	Ref.	-	-
	Female partner	.60	.17	.00**
	No partner	.16	.09	.07
	No partner	Ref.	-	-
	Female partner	.44	.17	.01*
Interpersonal hostility-LG	Male partner	Ref.	-	-
	Female partner	.41	.16	.01*
	No partner	.08	.06	.19
	No partner	Ref.	-	-
	Female partner	.33	.16	.04*
Internalized binegativity	Male partner	Ref.	-	-
	Female partner	−.03	.17	.84
	No partner	.08	.14	.58
	No partner	Ref.	-	-
	Female partner	−.11	.14	.42
Identity affirmation	Male partner	Ref.	-	-
	Female partner	−.15	.22	.48
	No partner	−.09	.13	.47

Outcome	Predictor	*B*	*SE*	*P*
	No partner	Ref.	-	-
	Female partner	−.06	.21	.76

Note. H = experiences with heterosexuals; LG = experiences with lesbian or gay people; Ref. = predictor was used as the reference group. Age and race/ethnicity were included as covariates at the between-person level for all analyses.

* $p < .05$.

** $p < .01$.

Table 4

Within-Person Differences in Outcome Variables by Gender of Sex Partners

Outcome	Predictor	*B*	*SE*	*P*
Sexual orientation instability-H	No partners	Ref.	-	-
	Male only	.46	.19	.02*
	Female only	.43	.22	.05
	Male and female	.39	.21	.07
	Male only	Ref.	-	-
	Female only	−.03	.19	.88
	Male and female	−.07	.15	.62
Sexual orientation instability-LG	No partners	Ref.	-	-
	Male only	.50	.16	.00**
	Female only	.24	.15	.10
	Male and female	.54	.20	.01**
	Male only	Ref.	-	-
	Female only	−.26	.13	.04*
	Male and female	.04	.16	.81
	Male and female	Ref.	-	
	Female only	−.30	.15	.04*
Sexual irresponsibility-H	No partners	Ref.	-	-
	Male only	.50	.15	.00**
	Female only	.80	.21	.00**
	Male and female	.14	.17	.42
	Male only	Ref.	-	-
	Female only	.30	.21	.16
	Male and female	−.36	.15	.01*
	Female only	Ref.	-	-
	Male and female	−.66	.22	.00**
Sexual irresponsibility-LG	No partners	Ref.	-	-
	Male only	.59	.15	.00**
	Female only	.81	.21	.00**
	Male and female	.50	.20	.01*
	Male only	Ref.	-	-
	Female only	.23	.20	.25
	Male and female	−.09	.16	.59
	Female partners	Ref.	-	-
	Male and female	−.32	.22	.16
Interpersonal hostility-H	No partners	Ref.	-	-
	Male only	.23	.11	.03*
	Female only	.61	.17	.00**

Outcome	Predictor	*B*	*SE*	*P*
	Male and female	.47	.16	.00**
	Male only	Ref.	-	-
	Female only	.38	.18	.03*
	Male and female	.24	.15	.12
	Female only	Ref.	-	-
	Male and female	−.14	.18	.44
Interpersonal hostility-LG	No partners	Ref.	-	-
	Male only	16	.12	.17
	Female only	.37	.15	.01*
	Male and female	.36	.14	.01*
	Female only	Ref.	-	-
	Male only	−.21	.14	.13
	Male and female	−.01	.12	.91
	Male and female	Ref.	-	-
	Male only	−.20	.11	.06
Internalized binegativity	No partners	Ref.	-	-
	Male only	.36	.29	.20
	Female only	.11	.37	.75
	Male and female	.31	.39	.44
Identity affirmation	No partners	Ref.	-	-
	Male only	.04	.19	.85
	Female only	−.11	.28	.71
	Male and female	−.45	.24	.06

Note. H = experiences with heterosexuals; LG = experiences with lesbian or gay people; Ref. = predictor was used as the reference group. Age and race/ethnicity were included as covariates at the between-person level for all analyses.

* $p < .05$.

** $p < .01$.