HHS Public Access

Author manuscript

Psychol Sex Orientat Gend Divers. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2022 August 05.

Published in final edited form as:

Psychol Sex Orientat Gend Divers. 2021 March ; 8(1): 94–105. doi:10.1037/sgd0000411.

How, When, and Why do Bisexual+ Individuals Attempt to Make Their Identity Visible?

Joanne Davila[1], **Brian A. Feinstein**[2], **Christina Dyar**[2], **Jeremy Jabbour**[3]

[1]Department of Psychology, Stony Brook University

[2]Institute for Sexual and Gender Minority Health and Wellbeing, Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine

[3]Department of Psychology, Northwestern University

Abstract

There is ample evidence of and concern about the invisibility of bisexual+ individuals, which results from the tendency to deny or ignore their identities. Recent research has begun to examine whether and how bisexual+ individuals (an umbrella term that includes all individuals who are attracted to more than one gender, regardless of the specific identity label they use) attempt to make their identity visible to others. This study builds on prior research by exploring novel questions regarding how, when, and why bisexual+ individuals attempt to make their identity visible, using data from an internet survey of 715 individuals who reported attractions to more than one gender. Results indicated that participants were most likely to use bi+ visibility attempt strategies involving indirect forms of communication (e.g., sharing things related to their identity on social media) and direct forms of communication (e.g., telling others in person), though they perceived indirect communication as less successful at communicating their identity to others than direct communication. They were most likely to make bi+ visibility attempts in situations with other bisexual+ individuals or in LGBT contexts, as well as with partners or when single, and they did so for reasons related to a sense of activism or pride. Future directions for research and barriers to bi+ visibility are discussed.

Keywords

bisexual; visibility; identity; disclosure

Bi+ invisibility results from the tendency to deny or ignore bisexual+ identities. Note that we use the term bisexual+ throughout this article as an umbrella term that includes all individuals who report attractions to more than one gender, regardless of the specific sexual identity label they use (e.g., bisexual, pansexual, omnisexual, polysexual, queer). However, when we refer to specific research studies, we use the term bisexual, when appropriate, to

Address correspondence to Joanne Davila, Department of Psychology, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY 11794-2500; (p) 631-632-7826; (f) 631-632-7876; joanne.davila@stonybrook.edu.

We have no known conflict of interest to disclose.

reflect their actual sample. In addition, for simplicity, we use the term bi+ throughout the rest of the paper.

Bi+ invisibility stems from myths about bisexuality and the binary view of sexual orientation, which perpetuate the idea that bisexual+ identities are not legitimate (Brewster & Moradi, 2010; Eliason, 1997; Flanders & Hatfield, 2014; Israel & Mohr, 2004; Mohr & Rochlen, 1999: Spalding & Peplau, 1997; Zivony & Lobel, 2014). Not only is this invisibility a unique form of discrimination faced by bi+ individuals, bi+ individuals also tend to face greater discrimination than their lesbian/gay counterparts, and they face discrimination from both heterosexual and lesbian/gay individuals (for a review, see Feinstein & Dyar, 2017). Bi+ individuals also consistently have worse health outcomes compared to both heterosexual and lesbian/gay individuals, which may, in part, be a consequence of their unique experiences of discrimination (Feinstein & Dyar, 2017; Ross et al., 2018; Salway et al., 2019).

There is ample evidence of and concern about bi+ invisibility. This is reflected in qualitative reports of bi+ individuals' experiences (e.g., Daly, King, & Yeadon-Lee, 2018; Hequembourg & Brailler, 2009; Gonzalez, Ramirez, & Galupo, 2017; Ross, Dobinson, & Eady, 2010), it has been noted by legal scholars (Marcus, 2018), and it has formed the basis for social media campaigns (e.g., the #StillBisexual campaign) designed to promote the recognition and legitimacy of bi+ identities. Indeed, although not all bi+ individuals want their identity to be visible, research suggests that a sizable proportion do (Davila, Jabbour, Dyar, & Feinstein, 2019). In the present paper, we build on prior work (Davila et al., 2019) by exploring how, when, and why bi+ individuals attempt to make their identity visible. Scholars have suggested that disclosure of a concealable stigmatized identity can increase the visibility of the identity and educate others (Chaudoir & Fisher, 2010). As such, examining bi+ individuals' attempts to make their identities visible can inform potential strategies to increase bi+ visibility at the societal level and to reduce the stigma that bi+ people face. That said, despite the potential advantages of visibility, disclosure of a concealable stigmatized identity can have both positive and negative consequences (Chaudoir & Fisher, 2010; Pachankis, 2007), and multiple studies have demonstrated that being more open about one's sexual orientation is associated with negative health outcomes among bisexual people (Feinstein, Dyar, & London, 2017; Feinstein, Dyar, Li, Whitton, Newcomb, & Mustanski, 2019). As such, the stakes may be particularly high for bi+ individuals attempting to be visible, making it all the more important to better understand bi+ visibility.

While relatively few studies have specifically examined bi+ visibility, research on identity disclosure more broadly provides a useful framework for thinking about the potential positive and negative consequences of making one's sexual identity visible. For example, Chaudoir and Fisher (2010) proposed the Disclosure Processes Model (DPM) to understand disclosure decision making and outcomes among people living with a concealable stigmatized identity. The DPM specifically focuses on when and why disclosure can be beneficial or not, emphasizing people's motivations for disclosure (approach versus avoidance) and how disclosure decisions can result in positive or negative outcomes depending on how the disclosure event is experienced. Whereas Chaudoir and Fisher (2010)

specifically conceptualized disclosure as “verbal, interpersonal expressions of self-relevant information” (p. 239), one of the goals of the current study was to explore the variety of ways that bi+ individuals attempt to reveal their concealable stigmatized identity. Research on sexual identity management, particularly the social cognitive model (Lidderdale et al., 2007; Rummel & Tokar, 2016; Tatum, 2018; Tatum, Formica, & Brown, 2017), recognizes that sexual minority individuals use a variety of strategies to make their identities visible in their day-to-day lives (for a review, see Croteau, Anderson, & VanderWal, 2008). These strategies include direct verbal disclosure, but they also include a variety of less direct strategies as well (e.g., speaking out against discrimination without disclosing one’s identity; Anderson, Croteau, Chung, & DiStefano, 2001; Croteau et al., 2008). Of note, this model has largely been applied to experiences in the workplace, limiting our understanding of the strategies people use to make their identities visible across contexts.

In addition, Pachankis (2007) noted that people with a concealable stigma must face and make disclosure decisions regularly, which can be very challenging. In particular, being visible as a bi+ individual is challenging, even compared to lesbian and gay individuals. People tend to make assumptions about a person’s sexual orientation based on the gender of their partner (e.g., a man in a relationship with a man is assumed to be gay), but partner gender is not an accurate indicator of sexual orientation for bi+ individuals. Further, there are no specific bisexual appearance norms like there are for other sexual minority groups, such as lesbians (e.g., “butch;” for a review and discussion, see Hayfield et al., 2013; Huxley et al., 2013). Nonetheless, many bi+ individuals do attempt to make their identity visible. A number of small, qualitative studies of bi+ women have shown that they attempt to make their sexual identity visible through visual cues (e.g., androgynous attire, pride-based attire or paraphernalia, a mix of feminine and masculine displays) and attitudes (e.g., independence, confidence), as well as speaking out about their identity (Hartman, 2013; Hartman-Linck, 2014; see also Hayfield et al., 2013; Huxley et al., 2013 for work on appearance norms). In addition, bi+ women may use visual cues differently depending on partner gender (Daly et al., 2018). For example, they may shift their appearance to be more feminine when with a woman and more masculine when with a man in an attempt to convey their bi+ identity (Daly et al., 2018).

Davila et al. (2019) built on this qualitative work by conducting a survey of 389 adults attracted to more than one gender, collecting both quantitative and qualitative data on whether and how bi+ individuals attempted to make their sexual identity visible. Of the respondents in their study, 58% reported that they try to make their sexual identity visible. Qualitative analyses of responses to an open-ended question about what they do to make their identity visible yielded five categories of “visibility attempts” (presented in order of most to least used), which were generally consistent with prior qualitative work (Daly et al., 2018; Hartman, 2013; Hartman-Linck, 2014): (1) Direct communication (e.g., telling others either in person or on social media); (2) Visual displays (e.g., wearing bi/pride clothing, jewelry, tattoos); (3) Indirect communication (e.g., sharing things related to their identity on social media, engaging in discussions relevant to LGBT [lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender] issues); (4) Engagement in LGBT-related activities (e.g., events, clubs, bars; advocacy; work/volunteer at LGBT organizations); and (5) Public behavioral displays (e.g., flirting with people of more than one gender). This diversity of strategies is consistent with

social cognitive models of sexual identity management (e.g., Anderson et al., 2001; Croteau et al., 2008).

Supporting the merit of understanding bi+ visibility attempts, Davila et al. (2019) also found differences between participants who attempted to make their identity visible and those who did not. For example, compared to people who did not attempt to make their bi+ identity visible, those who did were more likely to feel connected with the LGBT community, more likely to be affirming of their identity, and less likely to view bi+ identities as illegitimate. They also viewed bi+ identities as more central to their identity and were more uncomfortable with being perceived as heterosexual.

Although the findings of Davila et al. (2019) add to our understanding of who makes bi+ visibility attempts and how they do so, the study was limited with regard to the measurement of bi+ visibility attempts and the questions it addressed. In this study, we addressed these limitations and built on prior work in the following ways. First, we attempted to refine the measurement of bi+ visibility attempts. Specifically, we attempted to validate, in a quantitative manner, the qualitative categories of visibility attempts found in the Davila et al. (2019) study. In addition, although Davila et al. (2019) provided evidence that bi+ people use at least five strategies to make their identity visible, it remains unknown how often bi+ people actually use each strategy. Davila et al. (2019) used an open-ended question to assess what types of bi+ visibility attempts people used but did not gather data on the frequency with which each participant used each strategy. In the present study, we asked participants how frequently they used each strategy identified by Davila et al. (2019) to better estimate the use of different types of attempts. We created items based on the strategies identified by Davila et al. (2019) and then used exploratory factor analysis to test the factor structure of the items.

Next, we addressed a series of key conceptual questions not addressed by Davila et al. (2019). One such question is the extent to which bi+ visibility attempts may be contextually driven. The importance of context in visibility attempts is in line with the models of identity disclosure and management discussed earlier, which suggest that decisions about making oneself visible depend, in part, on the circumstances under which doing so would occur (e.g., features of the environment and the people involved; Chaudoir & Fisher, 2010; Croteau et al., 2008). The importance of context is also consistent with research showing that bi+ individuals are selective in when and with whom they make their identity known. For example, bi+ individuals may present their identity differently based on the gender of their partner or they may not make their identity known if they do not find doing so to be relevant to the situation they are in (e.g., Maliepaard, 2017; Mohr, Jackson, & Sheets, 2017). As such, we examined the contexts in which bi+ visibility attempts may occur, and the frequency with which attempts are made in the various contexts.

Another question regards reasons for bi+ visibility attempts. To date, there has been no direct quantitative examination of the reasons people make such attempts. In line with the DPM (Chaudoir & Fisher, 2010), existing quantitative research focuses mainly on motivations related to coming out or public disclosure of a bi+ identity (the latter of which is consistent with only one type of visibility attempt). Further, research tends to emphasize the

reasons people choose to conceal their identity rather than the reason they choose to make it visible. This research indicates that some bi+ individuals are concerned about stigma and may conceal their identity or present as a different orientation in order to avoid such stigma (e.g., Choi, Nylund-Gibson, Israel, & Mendez, 2019; Mohr et al., 2017). Qualitative research also points to concerns about stigma, fears of negative reactions, and discrimination (e.g., Schrimshaw, Downing, & Cohn, 2018), as well as a sense of not finding disclosure (at least in some situations) relevant to their lives (Maliepaard, 2017). In the present study, we focus specifically on reasons bi+ individuals attempt to make their identity visible.

We also examined whether bi+ individuals perceive different visibility attempt strategies to be successful (i.e., as increasing the chances that people will know that someone is bi+). Even the most direct form of bi+ visibility attempt—explicitly telling others one is bi+—can be unsuccessful. Indeed, some bi+ individuals report that following disclosure of their bi+ identity, others continue to assume that they are heterosexual or lesbian/gay (Dyar, Feinstein, & London, 2014; Hequembourg & Brallier, 2009; Ross, Dobinson, & Eady, 2010). As such, it is important to know whether, or the extent to which, bi+ visibility strategies are perceived as successful in promoting bi+ visibility. Failed attempts could potentially increase stress and feelings of distress by virtue of being discouraging.

Finally, we examined gender/sex, sexual identity, age, and race/ethnicity differences in the use of bi+ visibility attempts (in general and across different contexts), reasons for bi+ visibility attempts, and perceived success of bi+ visibility attempts to shed light on whether and how bi+ visibility attempts may differ across groups. It is important to not assume that all bi+ individuals have similar experiences. Indeed, research indicates that bi+ cisgender men may be less likely to make bi+ visibility attempts compared with bi+ cisgender women and bi+ gender minorities (Davila et al., 2019). This is consistent with research suggesting that, compared to other bi+ individuals, bi+ cisgender men may be more likely to be concerned about negative reactions from others and to endorse more negative attitudes about bisexuality (Choi et al., 2019). Choi et al. (2019) also found that people of color were over-represented among bi+ individuals who endorsed negative attitudes about bisexuality, though Davila et al. (2019) did not find racial/ethnic differences in bi+ visibility attempts. Given the limited theory and research to guide specific predictions, we considered these analyses exploratory.

Method

Participants and Procedure

Data were collected as part of the Bi+ Visibility Project, an internet-based survey of bi+ identity, minority stress, and health among individuals attracted to more than one gender or attracted to people regardless of gender. The current study's focus has not been addressed in other publications from this project, and there are no other data that pertain to the specific research questions addressed here that are being withheld for subsequent publication.

Participants were recruited using paid advertisements on Facebook and Instagram, and the study was described as a study of if and how bi+ individuals make their sexual orientation visible to others. Paid advertisements on these sites are beneficial in that you do not have to

target specific groups, which allows for reaching a wider audience. Prior to being allowed to complete the survey, potential participants were asked to complete an eligibility survey. The eligibility criteria included: (1) at least 18 years old; (2) live in the United States; and (3) attracted to people of more than one gender or regardless of gender. Specifically, participants were asked, “Which of the following best describes your attractions?” Response options included: I am only attracted to people of a single gender; I am attracted to people of more than one gender; and I am attracted to people regardless of gender (e.g., gender doesn’t influence my attractions). Individuals who chose “I am attracted to only one gender” were ineligible for the study. Those who met the eligibility criteria were automatically directed to the consent form and then, if they consented to participate, they were automatically directed to the survey. The survey took approximately 45–60 minutes to complete. All participants received a $10 Amazon gift card as compensation.

A total of 777 individuals met the eligibility criteria and completed the survey. Of those, 62 individuals were excluded from the analytic sample for the following reasons: (1) they had duplicate IP addresses, suggesting that the same individual may have completed the survey twice ($n = 14$); (2) they failed more than one attention check throughout the survey ($n = 25$); or (3) they did not report a bi+ identity despite reporting that they were attracted to people of more than one gender or regardless of gender ($n = 23$). Therefore, the analytic sample included 715 individuals. In response to a question about sexual identity (described below), approximately 50% of participants identified as bisexual (49.8%), followed by pansexual (24.6%), and queer (19.2%). Approximately 6% reported another sexual identity (see demographics section below for all identity options). Approximately one-third identified as cisgender women (women assigned female at birth; 31.6%), 41.4% identified as transgender and non-binary individuals and 27.0% identified as cisgender men. The sample was largely white (83.1%) and college educated (84.1%). Additional demographic information is reported in Table 1.

Measures

All instructions (general and measure-specific) and questions/items included the term “bi+” to be inclusive of individuals endorsing various identities, and the term was defined at the beginning of the study.

Demographics.—As shown in Table 1, demographic data were collected on age, sexual identity, gender identity, sex assigned at birth, race, ethnicity, education, and income.

Bi+ visibility measures.—Because there were no existing measures of our variables of interest, we created a set of measures based on our collective knowledge of the literature, our prior work, and our lived experiences. We then conducted a pilot study with a sample of 27 individuals recruited online, all of whom reported being attracted to people of more than one gender or regardless of gender. Pilot participants were presented with the items that were generated to measure each of our constructs and then they were asked to provide their feedback on the items and the response scales (e.g., if any of the questions or response scales were unclear or written in a way that unintentionally offended them). They were also asked to provide suggestions for additional questions/items that could be included. Most

participants reported that they were satisfied with the items and did not make suggestions for revisions or additional items. Changes made to each set of items based on feedback from the pilot study are described below.

Bi+ visibility attempt strategies.: All participants were asked to respond to a series of questions regarding the frequency with which they engaged in different types of bi+ visibility attempt strategies. The questions were developed based on the categories and their exemplars reported by Davila et al. (2019). A list of 20 items was generated. Minor wording changes were made and one additional item was added in response to pilot feedback. This resulted in a final set of 21 items (see Table 2). Participants (pilot and current) were instructed as follows: "The next set of questions asks about things that you might do to try to make your bi+ identity visible to others. How often do you do each of the following to try to make your bi+ identity visible to others?" Items were rated on a scale of 1 (never) to 5 (very often). As will be described in the results, this measure has five subscales: direct communication (e.g., "Directly tell people that you're bi+"; 6 items; $\alpha = .77$); indirect communication (e.g., "Share topics pertaining to general LGBT issues on social media"; 4 items; $\alpha = .82$); community engagement (e.g., "Attend social events or meetings specifically for bi+ people, or advocate specifically for bi+ causes"; 5 items; $\alpha = .73$); gender-based visual displays (e.g., "Dress in a way that people will think you're bi+ [e.g., more masculine, more feminine, more androgynous]"; 4 items; $\alpha = .79$); and public behavioral displays (e.g., "Show affection to others in a way [e.g., with people of more than one sex/gender] so that people will think you are bi+"; 2 items; $\alpha = .82$).

Context of bi+ visibility attempts.: To examine the situations in which people might make bi+ visibility attempts, we generated a list of 14 contexts based on typical situations in which people might want or not want to be visible. Minor wording changes were made and one additional item was added in response to pilot feedback. This resulted in 15 contexts (listed in Supplemental Tables 3 and 4). Participants (pilot and current) were instructed as follows: "To what extent do you try to make your bi+ identity visible to others in the following contexts/situations?" Items were rated on a scale of 1 (never) to 5 (very often) with N/A as an option for people for whom a particular context did not apply (e.g., school). We did not calculate Cronbach's alpha for this measure because each item represented a unique context rather than an underlying latent construct (Sijtsma, 2009).

Reasons for bi+ visibility attempts.: To examine the reasons people might make bi+ visibility attempts, we generated a list of nine reasons that were in line with concerns about bi+ invisibility, the myths that lead to it, and results from Davila et al. (2019). As noted in the introduction, people are concerned about bi+ invisibility and there are efforts to increase visibility underway (e.g., via social media), particularly through combatting stereotypes. As such, we included "activism" items in our measure. In addition, Davila et al. (2019) found that people who make visibility attempts (compared to those who do not) were characterized by a sense of identity affirmation and connection to their community, and that their bi+ identity was important to them. As such, we included "pride" items in our measure. Of note, activism and pride both reflect the type of approach motivations described in the DPM, which are theorized to lead to more positive disclosure outcomes (Chaudoir & Fisher, 2010).

Minor wording changes were made and two additional items were added in response to pilot feedback. This resulted in 11 items (see Table 3). Participants (pilot and current) were instructed as follows: “Thinking about the different ways that you might try to make your bi+ identity visible to others, please rate the extent to which you do these things for the following reasons.” Items were rated on a scale of 1 (never) to 5 (very much). The two subscales of this measure represent making one’s bi+ identity visible for activism reasons (e.g., “to challenge myths about being bi+”; 5 items; $\alpha = .91$) and for pride reasons (e.g., “because I’m proud to be bi+”; 5 items; $\alpha = .86$).

Perceived success of bi+ visibility attempts.: To assess perceived success, pilot participants were presented with the same items used to assess bi+ visibility strategies. We made the same wording changes and item addition to make the scales compatible in the current study. Participants (pilot and current) were instructed as follows: “Thinking about the different ways that people might attempt to make their bi+ identity visible to others, please rate the extent to which you think each is likely to be successful. By successful, we mean that it increases the chances that people will know someone is bi+. Please base your ratings on how successful you think each strategy is for people in general (not you in particular).” Each item was rated on a scale of 1 (not at all successful) to 5 (completely successful). Consistent with the bi+ visibility strategies measure, this measure also had five subscales: direct communication (6 items; $\alpha = .80$); indirect communication (4 items; $\alpha = .87$); community engagement (5 items; $\alpha = .70$); gender-based visual displays (4 items; $\alpha = .71$); and public behavioral displays (2 items; $\alpha = .84$).

Results

Overall, approximately 3.1% of data were missing. Given this small amount of missing data, we used pairwise deletion to handle missingness. A Little’s MCAR test ($\chi 2[8528] = 9312.35$, $p < .001$) indicated that data were not missing completely at random. Follow-up analyses indicated that participants who reported less frequent bi-visibility attempts were more likely to drop out of the study and thus have missing data on bi-visibility success, contexts, and reasons. While utilizing pairwise deletion with data that is missing at random can be problematic, sensitivity analyses in which full information maximum likelihood (which can handle data that is missing at random) was utilized provided the same pattern of results as analyses using pairwise deletion. This suggests that our current approach to missing data is acceptable. Skew and kurtosis values for most continuous variables were between −1 and 1, and all were between −2 and 2, indicating acceptably normal distributions. Cooks distance and leverage values were examined for each analysis and did not indicate any outliers.

The “how” of bi+ visibility attempts: Refining the measurement of attempt strategies

Exploratory factor analysis.—To determine the factor structure of the bi+ visibility attempt strategies measure, we conducted an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with geomin rotation. A preliminary Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test of sampling adequacy (KMO = .86) indicated that the correlation matrix of items included enough overlap in item variance for an EFA to be appropriate (Tabachnik, Fidell, & Ullman, 2007). We used parallel analyses,

factor loadings, and interpretability to determine the number of factors that comprised the measure. The first five eigenvalues were: 6.83, 1.76, 1.48, 1.40, and 1.22. A parallel analysis was conducted in which an EFA was performed using random data (see Ruscio & Roche, 2012; Zwick & Velicer, 1986), which produced 95th percentile eigenvalues of 1.36, 1.30, 1.25, 1.21, and 1.18. As the first five eigenvalues from our dataset were larger than the first five eigenvalues generated from a random dataset, the parallel analysis suggested that five factors be extracted. As shown in Table 2, the five factors were: direct communication (6 items); indirect communication (4 items); community engagement (5 items); gender-based visual displays (4 items); and public behavioral displays (2 items). Consistent with Brown's (2015) guidelines, we treated .40 as the lowest acceptable factor loading. With the exception of two items, all items had moderate to strong factor loadings on a single factor (≥ .40). Item 3 had non-trivial loadings on gender-based visual displays and community engagement. Additionally, item 15 had non-trivial loadings on both direct communication and indirect communication. Although these two factor loadings were slightly below our .40 cutoff, we made exceptions because of their strong conceptual fit with the subscales. Items were averaged to create subscale scores.

Correlations among subscales were moderate in size (see Table 4). The largest correlations were among direct communication, indirect communication, and community engagement.

Frequency of use: To determine the relative frequency of use for each type of strategy, we conducted a repeated measures ANOVA in which the frequency of use of the five strategies were compared to one another. Degrees of freedom were adjusted via Greenhouse-Geisser correction due to a significant Mauchly's test of sphericity, which indicates that the assumption of sphericity was violated (this was done for all following analyses as appropriate). Different types of strategies were endorsed at different frequencies (F[3.62, 2541.70] = 235.28, $p < .001$) and follow-up pairwise comparisons with a Benjamini-Hochberg correction indicated that all strategies differed significantly from one another ($p < .001$). The bi+ visibility strategies are listed next in order of most to least frequently used: indirect communication, direct communication, public behavioral displays, community engagement, and gender-based visual displays (see Table 4 for subscale means and standard deviations). These differences ranged in size from small to large, with small differences among gender-based visual displays, community engagement, and public behavioral displays, as well as between direct and indirect communication (δ = .13-.24), moderate differences between public behavioral displays and both direct and indirect communication (δ = .47-.58), and large differences for all other comparisons (δ = .75-.93). Of note, there were only two participants who indicated never using any of the bi+ visibility strategies.

Demographic covariates.—We then conducted analyses of covariance (ANCOVAs) to test for demographic differences in the use of different bi+ visibility strategies. Sexual identity, sex/gender, race/ethnicity, and age were entered as simultaneous predictors of each of the types of visibility attempts and pairwise comparisons of marginal means with a Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparisons were conducted. See Supplemental Table 1 for ANCOVAs and follow-up analyses and Supplemental Table 2 for Cohen's δs. The use of two of five types of bi+ visibility attempts significantly

differed by sexual identity: direct and indirect communication (δs = .22-.50). Pansexual participants used direct and indirect communication more often than bisexual participants and those who identified with other sexual identity labels. Queer participants also used direct communication more often than those who identified with other sexual identity labels. Four of the five types of bi+ visibility attempts significantly differed by sex/gender: direct communication, indirect communication, community engagement, and gender-based visual displays (δs = .24-.88). Cisgender women and gender minorities used all of these strategies more often than cisgender men, and gender minorities used direct communication and gender-based visual displays more often than cisgender women. There were no significant differences by race/ethnicity or age.

The "when" of bi+ visibility attempts: Do they occur in different contexts?

To identify which contexts participants were more likely to attempt to make their bi+ identity visible in, we conducted a pairwise *t*-test and three repeated measures ANOVAs to compare similar contexts. Participants were more likely to make visibility attempts when they were in LGBT-specific contexts (t[668] = 30.26, $p < .001$; $M = 3.96$, $SE = .04$) than contexts that were not LGBT-specific ($M = 2.79$, $SE = .04$, δ = .97). Frequency of visibility attempts also differed in the presence of people of different sexual orientations (F[1.68, 1117.54][1] = 429.49, $p < .001$). Participants were more likely to make visibility attempts when they were with other bi+ people ($M = 3.89$, $SE = .04$, δ = .68) than with lesbian/gay people ($M_{diff} = .25$, $p < .001$; $M = 3.64$, $SE = .04$), and they were less likely to make attempts when they were with straight people ($M = 2.89$, $SE = .04$) than with both lesbian/gay people ($M_{diff} = .74$, $p < .001$; δ = .97) or other bi+ people ($M_{diff} = 1.00$, $p < .001$; δ = 1.01). Frequency of visibility attempts also differed in the presence of different types of people (F[2.59, 1474.12] = 381.80, $p < .001$)[2] and all four types of public situations differed significantly from one another ($M_{diff} = .32 – 1.38$, $ps < .001$, δ = .331.37). Participants were most likely to make visibility attempts when in public with their partner ($M = 3.23$, $SE = .05$), followed by in public with a friend ($M = 2.78$, $SE = .04$), and followed by in public alone ($M = 2.17$, $SE = .04$). They were least likely to make visibility attempts when in public with family members ($M = 1.85$, $SE = .04$). These effects were mostly large in size (δ = .93–1.37), with three exceptions (making visibility attempts with friends compared to with partners, making visibility attempts in public alone compared to with friends or family; δ = .33–.60). Participants were also more likely to make visibility attempts when they were single (F[2, 972] = 20.16, $p < .001$; $M = 3.75$, $SE = .05$) than when in same-gender ($M_{diff} = .21$, $p < .001$; $M = 3.54$, $SE = .05$, δ = .21) or different-gender relationships ($M_{diff} = .34$, $p < .001$; $M = 3.41$, $SE = .05$, δ = .34). They were also more likely to make visibility attempts when they were in same-gender relationships than in different-gender relationships ($M_{diff} = .14$, $p = .02$; δ = .13).

We then conducted a series of ANCOVAs in which sexual identity, sex/gender, race/ethnicity, and age were entered as simultaneous predictors of visibility attempts in different contexts. Given the number of analyses conducted, we used the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure to adjust the *p*-values for omnibus ANCOVAs and pairwise comparisons (see Supplemental Table 3). Cohen's δs are reported in Supplemental Table 4. There were significant differences in the likelihood of making visibility attempts in different contexts

based on sex/gender (δs = .24–.71) and age, but not sexual identity or race/ethnicity. Gender minorities were more likely than cisgender men to make visibility attempts at work, at school, in LGBT social settings, and with someone who did not understand or accept their identity. Gender minorities and cisgender women were both more likely than cisgender men to make visibility attempts in social settings that were not LGBT-specific, when with straight people, when in different-gender relationships, and when single. Additionally, gender minorities were more likely than both cisgender men and cisgender women to make visibility attempts when they were with a friend, partner, or family member. Older participants were more likely to make visibility attempts at work, in public alone, with a family member, and with someone who did not understand or accept their bi+ identity. In contrast, older participants were less likely to make visibility attempts at school.

The "why" of bi+ visibility attempts: What are the reasons for making them?

We first conducted an EFA with geomin rotation to determine the number of factors that comprised the measure of reasons for making bi+ visibility attempts. We used the same analytic approach and criteria described above for the EFA of bi+ visibility strategies. A Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test of sampling adequacy (KMO = .93) indicated that the correlation matrix of items included enough overlap in item variance for an EFA to be appropriate. The first three eigenvalues were 5.86, 1.47, and .66. A parallel analysis using random data produced 95th percentile eigenvalues of 1.21, 1.15, and 1.10. As the first two eigenvalues from our sample were larger than those produced from random data and the third eigenvalue was not, we extracted two factors (Table 3). The two factors were in line with our a priori categories. The factors represented activism reasons (5 items) and pride reasons (5 items). We removed one item ("to be a role model for other bi+ people") because it had non-trivial loadings on both factors and it could be conceptualized as a part of either subscale. Items were averaged to create subscale scores.

As shown in Table 4, making visibility attempts for activism and pride reasons were strongly correlated with each other. In addition, they were moderately to strongly correlated with the frequency of use of all five types of visibility strategies . The largest correlations were between activism reasons and direct and indirect communication, as well as between pride reasons and gender-based visual displays and direct communication.

To determine the relative endorsement of activism and pride reasons, we conducted a paired samples *t*-test in which endorsement of activism and pride reasons were compared to each other. Results indicated that activism reasons (M = 3.88, SE = .04; t[677] = 5.29, p < .001; δ = .20) were endorsed more often than pride reasons (M = 3.70, SE = .04).

Next, we conducted ANCOVAs in which sexual identity, sex/gender, race/ethnicity, and age were entered as simultaneous predictors of making visibility attempts for activism and pride reasons (see Supplemental Table 5). Activism reasons did not differ significantly by sexual identity, but pansexual and queer individuals endorsed pride as a reason for making visibility attempts more than bisexual individuals (δ = .20-.23). Bisexual, pansexual, and queer individuals also endorsed pride as a reason for making visibility attempts more than those who identified with other sexual identity labels (δ = .38-.64). In addition, cisgender women and gender minorities endorsed activism and pride reasons for making visibility

attempts more than cisgender men (δ = .32-.50). There were no differences based on race/ethnicity or age.

Perceived success: Are bi+ visibility attempts perceived as successful?

Given that the same strategies were asked about in the perceived success measure as in the bi+ visibility strategies measure, we used the same five subscales for both measures. To determine the relative perceived success of each type of strategy, we conducted a repeated measures ANOVA in which the perceived success of the five strategies were compared to one another. Strategies differed in how successful they were perceived to be (F[3.68, 2390.63] = 719.67, $p < .001$) and follow-up pairwise comparisons with a Benjamini-Hochberg correction indicated that all strategies differed significantly from one another (M_{diff} = .20–1.54, $p < .001$). The visibility strategies are listed next in order of those perceived to be most successful to least successful: direct communication, community engagement, public behavioral displays, indirect communication, and gender-based visual displays. Effect sizes for these differences varied from small to large, with a small difference (δ = .21) between the perceive success of indirect communication and gender-based visual cues, moderate differences between public behavioral displays and gender-based visual cues, indirect communication, and community engagement (δ = .43-.68), and large differences for all other comparisons (δ = .86–1.83).

We also examined correlations between the use of visibility strategies and their perceived success. These correlations (see Table 4) indicated that participants tended to use strategies they perceived to be more successful. However, these correlations were small to moderate in size.

Finally, a series of ANCOVAs in which sexual identity, sex/gender, race/ethnicity, and age were entered as simultaneous predictors of perceived success were conducted to identify demographic differences (Supplemental Table 6). Supplemental Table 7 includes Cohen's δ effect size estimates for mean differences. Only one strategy differed significantly in its perceived success by sexual identity: bisexual, pansexual, and queer individuals perceived direct communication as more successful than individuals who identified with other sexual identity labels (δs = .41-.52). In addition, cisgender women perceived community engagement as more successful than cisgender men (δ = .25). Cisgender women also perceived direct communication as more successful than both cisgender men and gender minorities (δs = .22-.31). Finally, younger participants perceived gender-based visual displays and community engagement as more successful than older participants. There were no significant differences based on race/ethnicity.

Discussion

This study was designed to extend prior work on bi+ visibility by exploring how, when, and why bi+ individuals attempt to make their identity visible. Although this has been explored in a few small qualitative studies (e.g., Daly et al., 2014; Hartman, 2013; Hartman-Linck, 2014), this is the first quantitative study to do so. Further, whereas Davila et al. (2019) were limited by only examining how bi+ individuals attempt to make their identity visible, the

current study extends this work by also examining when and why these attempts are made, as well as improving upon examination of the "how." Primary findings are outlined below.

The "how" of bi+ visibility attempts

One of our aims was to refine measurement of the strategies bi+ individuals use to make visibility attempts. Building on prior work (Davila et al., 2019), we developed a scale to measure bi+ visibility strategies that largely replicated the five categories of attempts found in Davila et al.'s (2019) qualitative analysis, resulting in: direct communication, indirect communication, behavioral displays, community engagement, and gender-based visual displays. Prior work on identity management (e.g., Anderson et al., 2001) focuses on explicit and implicit ways of making one's identity visible, which generally correspond to the direct and indirect communication strategies we identified. Our work allows for greater understanding of how bi+ individuals attempt to be visible by also identifying additional, more specific strategies they use that have not been examined in the existing identity management literature.

With regard to frequency of use, participants reported using, from most to least frequent, indirect communication, direct communication, public behavioral displays, community engagement, and gender-based visual displays. Davila et al. (2019) were only able to report the percentage of participants who used each strategy. Our analyses provide information on the relative use of each strategy. That is, it is not that more people use indirect communication, but rather that participants are using indirect communication relatively more than other strategies. This provides new information about strategy choice and becomes particularly relevant in the context of perceived success of strategies discussed below.

It is also informative to note that all but two participants reported engaging in some type of visibility strategy, suggesting that such attempts are relatively common. This is in line with social cognitive models of sexual identity management. As Croteau et al. (2008) note, these models suggest that people translate their intentions to engage in identity management strategies into daily identity management behaviors, such that "any given individual will employ a myriad of identity management behaviors across the breadth of contexts encountered daily" (p. 549).

With regard to demographic differences, participants who identified as pansexual were more likely than others to use both direct and indirect communication. Pansexuality is even less visible than bisexuality and, because of that, pansexual participants might be particularly motivated to make their identity visible. In addition, consistent with Davila et al. (2019), cisgender men were least likely to use any of the strategies, suggesting they may be least likely to want to be visible. This is consistent with research indicating that bi+ men are less likely to be out, that they fear and face greater stigmatization, and that bi+ identities are less acceptable for men (Balsam & Mohr, 2007; Choi et al., 2019; Dodge et al., 2016; Eliason, 1997; Scrimshaw et al. 2018; Yost & Thomas, 2012). Taken together, these findings suggest more work is necessary to reduce stigma and increase acceptance of male bisexuality. We also found that gender minorities reported more frequent use of direct communication and gender-based visual displays. This is consistent with Davila et al. (2019) who found that gender minorities were particularly likely to attempt to make their bi+ identity visible.

Gender minorities may have more experience with, or desire to, make their gender identity visible and this may extend to their sexual identity as well. This is, of course, speculative and a question for future research. Indeed, virtually no research has examined how gender minorities engage in identity management (for an exception, see Brewster, Velez, DeBlaere, & Moradi, 2012).

The "when" of bi+ visibility attempts

We examined the contexts/situations in which bi+ individuals were more or less likely to attempt to make their identity visible. Four key findings emerged. First, participants were more likely to make visibility attempts when they were in LGBT-specific contexts and when they were with other bi+ people. They were least likely to make attempts when they were with straight people. These findings suggest that bi+ individuals may be most apt to and comfortable with making visibility attempts when they are with people who are similar to them, perhaps because they feel safest in those situations, though that is a question for future research. Although understandable, this does present a challenge for bi+ identities becoming more visible and accepted in society. However, the DPM (Chaudoir & Fisher, 2010) suggests that the reaction of the person to whom one is disclosing their identity is important to the outcome of that disclosure and whether it will have positive or negative consequences, including feeding back into further visibility and/or concealment. If the reaction is positive, which is more likely in a safe context, it might increase further visibility attempts, though whether it will do so outside of safe contexts is also a question for future research.

Second, participants were more likely to make their bi+ identity visible when they were in public with a romantic partner, and they were least likely to make visibility attempts when with family members. There may be a variety of reasons for this. For example, perhaps partners are the most likely to know about and support their bi+ identity, so making an attempt when with a partner might reflect doing so in the context of a supportive person. It also might reflect an attempt to be visible in the context of an ambiguous situation because partner gender can convey misleading information about bi+ people's sexual identity. Regarding family, bi+ individuals may not want to put family in a potentially difficult situation by drawing attention to their identity. In addition, family may be least accepting of their identity. Indeed, some data suggest that bi+ individuals rate friends as more supportive than they rate family (Sheets & Mohr, 2009), and data generally show that disclosing to family can be challenging (see Heatherington & Lavner, 2008). All of these speculations provide avenues for future research.

Third, participants were more likely to make bi+ visibility attempts when they were in same-gender relationships. This is consistent with Mohr et al. (2017) who found that, among bisexual individuals, having a different-sex partner was associated with a lower likelihood of presenting themselves publicly as bisexual. Finally, participants were also more likely to make visibility attempts when they were single, perhaps as a way to meet appropriate partners or because they did not have to be concerned with partners' reactions to visibility attempts. Again, these are all speculations in need of additional research, but the findings do point to the potentially complex issues involved in choosing when to make bi+ visibility attempts. In particular, they raise important questions about the complexity of context (e.g.,

where someone is, who someone is with) and how it might interact with other variables, such as motivations and expectations included in the DPM (Chaudoir & Fisher, 2010) and social cognitive models of identity management (Croteau et al., 2008; Lidderdale et al., 2007; Rummel & Tokar, 2016; Tatum, 2018; Tatum, Formica, & Brown, 2017).

There also were a number of demographic differences in the contexts in which people make bi+ visibility attempts, mirroring some of the findings of bi+ visibility strategy used. Gender minority individuals were more likely than cisgender individuals to make their bi+ identity visible across a variety of contexts, and cisgender men were least likely to do so. This latter finding again likely reflects the stigma and lack of acceptance bi+ cisgender men experience.

The “why” of bi+ visibility attempts

We examined reasons people might make attempts, focusing specifically on activism and pride related reasons. In doing so, we created a scale that reflects these reasons. Though additional validation is necessary, the scale provides a basis to further examine why people make bi+ visibility attempts. Participants endorsed making bi+ visibility attempts more so for reasons of activism than pride (though the magnitude of this difference was small), and both reasons were significantly associated with frequency of use of all of the bi+ visibility strategies, particularly direct communication. This is consistent with Davila et al.’s (2019) finding that people who make visibility attempts were characterized by a sense of identity affirmation and connection to their community, and that their bi+ identity was important to them. It also is consistent with the DPM (Chaudoir & Fisher, 2010), which suggests that people who have approach motivations for disclosure (which are consistent with pride and activism) are more likely to disclose and to have positive outcomes. Prior theory and research has typically focused on reasons people do not disclose their identity, pointing to issues of fear/concern about stigma and negative evaluation (e.g., Choi et al, 2019; Mohr et al., 2017; Pachankis, 2007).

Understanding positive reasons that people choose to make their bi+ identity visible is in line with an affirming, strength-based perspective on sexual identity (e.g., Riggle, Mohr, Rostosky, Fingerhut, & Balsam, 2014). It is also consistent with research showing that experiencing bi-positive events can increase bisexual individuals’ affirmation of their identity and their well-being, at least among women (Dyar & London, 2018). Perhaps making a visibility attempt for activism or pride related reasons can be seen as a bi-positive event, a question that could be examined in future research. Of note, cisgender women and gender minorities endorsed activism and pride as reasons for making visibility attempts more than cisgender men, again consistent with the greater stigma that bi+ cisgender men may experience.

Perceived success of bi+ visibility attempts

Overall, participants reported that direct communication was the most successful, followed by (in order) community engagement, public behavioral displays, indirect communication, and gender-based visual displays. This order does not fully map on to the strategies that participants reported using most. Although correlations between strategy use and perceived success indicated that participants tended to use strategies they perceived to be more

successful, the associations were only small to moderate in size. As such, participants are not consistently using the strategy that they perceived to be most successful (direct communication) as much as they are using ones that they perceived to be relatively ineffective (e.g., indirect communication). This likely reflects the challenges associated with direct communication in regard to stigma and other negative consequences. The less direct strategies may be perceived as a safer way to test the waters to see how people would react (e.g., Jones & King, 2014).

Research on identity management in the workplace that examines explicit (direct) and implicit (indirect) disclosure strategies has not typically examined them separately (e.g., Rummel & Tokar, 2016), though Reed and Leuty (2016) found that greater use of each was associated with perceptions and experiences of a friendlier work environment. Additional examination of why bi+ people choose specific strategies would be a useful next step, particularly with regard to their motivations. For example, although research suggests that both explicit and implicit disclosure strategies are associated with positive expectations (Reed & Leuty, 2016; Rummel & Tokar, 2016), if people's motivations for using different strategies differ, their outcomes are also likely to differ (Chaudoir & Fisher, 2010) and may even be more or less successful in increasing visibility. Importantly, also determining what people on the receiving end of bi+ visibility attempts view as more or less successful will be important to assess.

Strengths and limitations of the current study

Our study had numerous strengths. It is the first to examine these key questions about bi+ visibility attempts. It did so in a large sample of individuals attracted to more than one gender or to people regardless of gender, who were diverse in sexual identity and sex/gender. It provided a more methodologically rigorous measurement of bi+ visibility attempts and strategies, as well as strength-based reasons for making such attempts. In doing so, we created new measures which can be used to assess these constructs in future research. Of course, replication of their psychometric properties is necessary, but they provide a much-needed starting point for the field.

Naturally, the findings must be interpreted with a number of limitations in mind. First, the sample was self-selected and recruited online. As such, we cannot rule out the possibility that our sample may have differed on relevant variables of study compared to bi+ individuals who would not choose, or have access, to participate in this study. This may have biased the sample toward inclusion of bi+ individuals who are more likely to make their identity visible, those who are more privileged (i.e., have access to the internet), and/or those who feel more positively about their identity (and may want to demonstrate that by participating in such a study). As such, our sample may not reflect the full range of bi+ individuals and their experiences with and motivations for visibility. Second, the sample largely included educated, white individuals, all from the United States. Although race/ethnicity was not associated with any of our variables of interest, more diverse samples will be needed to better examine possible racial/ethnic and SES differences in bi+ visibility attempts. Indeed, studying bi+ visibility through an intersectional lens has the potential to provide important information about how systems of privilege and oppression may affect how a bi+ individual

engages in visibility attempts or whether they even do so (see Moradi & Grzanka, 2017 for a discussion of intersectionality in the field of psychology). For instance, our mainly educated, white participants may find it easier to make visibility attempts than would people who are less privileged and more subject to social inequalities. Third, as noted above, the measures used were created for this study. As such, they are in need of additional validation, particularly with regard to content validity (e.g., whether the measures capture the full range of visibility attempts, contexts, and motivations) and construct validity (e.g., whether, for instance, the context and motivation measures are related to other similar measures; how visibility attempts are related to constructs included in disclosure and identity management models such as expectations and reactions; whether reports of visibility attempts are consistent with behavior). In separate analyses from this same sample, more frequent use of bi+ visibility strategies was associated with indicators of positive bi+ identity (e.g., greater centrality and affirmation of one's bi+ identity, lower internalized bi-illegitimacy and binegativity; Feinstein, Dyar, Milstone, Jabbour, & Davila, in press). This is consistent with our findings on pride reasons for engaging in bi+ visibility attempts, and lends some additional support for construct validity.

Conclusions

Despite limitations, our study increases understanding of the how, when, why, and who of bi+ visibility. It suggests that many bisexual+ individuals want to be visible, that they are actively engaging in strategies designed to make their identity visible, and that they are doing so for reasons of both activism and pride. This highlights the strengths of bisexual+ individuals who want to be visible. On the other hand, our findings show that bisexual+ individuals are largely making bi+ visibility attempts in relatively "safe" situations (e.g., with other bisexual+ individuals and in LGBT settings). They are also more regularly using strategies that they themselves perceive to be less successful for making their bisexual+ identity visible. Direct communication was clearly identified as the strategy most likely to be successful, but it was not the most frequently used. This suggests that more work is needed to increase success of bi+ visibility attempts, including understanding what is successful from the point of view of the perceiver, and to foster an environment in which it is safer to be visible. As noted in our introduction, when people make themselves visible it can serve an educational purpose and, consequently, has the potential to contribute to reductions in societal stigma and increases in acceptance. Our findings suggest that fostering bi+ individuals' positive motivations to be visible could be helpful in this regard. In addition, to facilitate success of bi+ visibility, it will also be important to educate all people (including educators, therapists, and the general public) about bi+ identities, what strategies bi+ individuals may use to make their identity visible, and the importance of not making assumptions about identity based on partner gender.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by grants from the American Psychological Foundation and the Sexualities Project at Northwestern. Brian Feinstein's time was supported by a grant the National Institute on Drug Abuse (K08DA045575). Christina Dyar's time was also supported by a grant from the National Institute on Drug Abuse (K01DA046716). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the funding agencies.

References

Anderson MZ, Croteau JM, Chung YB, & DiStefano TM (2001). Developing an assessment of sexual identity management for lesbian and gay workers. Journal of Career Assessment, 9(3), 243–260. 10.1177/106907270100900303

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. 10.1037/0022-0167.54.3.306

Brewster ME, & Moradi B (2010). Perceived experiences of anti-bisexual prejudice: instrument development and evaluation. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 57(4), 451–468. 10.1037/a0021116

Brewster ME, Velez B, DeBlaere C, & Moradi B (2012). Transgender individuals' workplace experiences: The applicability of sexual minority measures and models. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 59, 60–70. 10.1037/a0025206 [PubMed: 21875182]

Brown TA (2015). Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research. Guilford publications.

Chaudoir SR, & Fisher JD (2010). The disclosure processes model: Understanding disclosure decision making and postdisclosure outcomes among people living with a concealable stigmatized identity. Psychological Bulletin, 136(2), 236–256. 10.1037/a0018193 [PubMed: 20192562]

Choi A, Nylund-Gibson K, Israel T, & Mendez S (2019). A latent profile analysis of bisexual identity: Evidence of within-group diversity. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 48(1), 113–130. 10.1007/s10508-018-1325-1 [PubMed: 30443835]

Croteau JM, Anderson MZ, & VanderWal BL (2008). Models of workplace sexual identity disclosure and management: Reviewing and extending concepts. Group & Organization Management, 33(5), 532–565. 10.1177/1059601108321828

Daly SJ, King N, & Yeadon-Lee T (2018). 'Femme it up or dress it down': Appearance and bisexual women in monogamous relationships. Journal of Bisexuality, 18(3), 257–277. 10.1080/15299716.2018.1485071

Davila J., Jabbour J., Dyar C., & Feinstein B. (2019). Bi visibility: Characteristics of those who attempt to make their bisexual identity visible and the strategies they use. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 48(1), 199–211. 10.1007/s10508-018-1284-6 [PubMed: 30413988]

Dodge B, Herbenick D, Friedman MR, Schick V, Fu T, Bostwick W, & ... Sandfort TM (2016). Attitudes toward bisexual men and women among a nationally representative probability sample of adults in the United States. Plos ONE, 11(10), 1–18. 10.1371/journal.pone.0164430

Dyar C, Feinstein BA, & London B (2014). Dimensions of sexual identity and minority stress among bisexual women: The role of partner gender. Psychology of Orientation and Gender Diversity, 1(4), 441–451. 10.1037/sgd0000063

Dyar C, & London B (2018). Bipositive events: associations with proximal stressors, bisexual identity, and mental health among bisexual cisgender women. Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity, 5(2), 204–219. 10.1037/sgd0000281

Eliason MJ (1997). The prevalence and nature of biphobia in heterosexual undergraduate students. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 26(3), 317–326. 10.1023/A:1024527032040 [PubMed: 9146816]

Feinstein BA, & Dyar C (2017). Bisexuality, minority stress, and health. Current sexual Health Reports, 9(1), 42–49. 10.1007/s11930-017-0096-3 [PubMed: 28943815]

Feinstein BA, Dyar C, Milstone JS, Jabbour J, & Davila J (in press). Use of different strategies to make one's bisexual+ identity visible: Associations with dimensions of identity, minority stress, and health. Stigma and Health.

Flanders CE, & Hatfield E (2014). Social perception of bisexuality. Psychology & Sexuality, 5(3), 232–246. 10.1080/19419899.2012.749505

Gonzalez K, Ramirez A, & Galupo J (2017). "I was and still am": Narratives of bisexual marking in the #StillBisexual campaign. Sexuality & Culture, 21(2), 493–515. 10.1007/s12119-016-9401-y

Hartman JE (2013). Creating a bisexual display: making bisexuality visible. Journal of Bisexuality, 13(1), 39–62. 10.1080/15299716.2013.755727

Hartman-Linck JE (2014). Keeping bisexuality alive: Maintaining bisexual visibility in monogamous relationships. Journal of Bisexuality, 14(2), 177–193. 10.1080/15299716.2014.903220

Hayfield N, Clarke V, Halliwell E, & Malson H (2013). Visible lesbians and invisible bisexuals: Appearance and visual identities among bisexual women. Women's Studies International Forum, 40, 172–182. 10.1016/j.wsif.2013.07.015

Heatherington L, & Lavner JA (2008). Coming to terms with coming out: Review and recommendations for family systems-focused research. Journal of Family Psychology, 22(3), 329–343. 10.1037/0893-3200.22.3.329 [PubMed: 18540762]

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. 10.1080/00918360902728517 [PubMed: 19319738]

Huxley C, Clarke V, & Halliwell E (2013). Resisting and conforming to the "Lesbian Look": The importance of appearance norms for lesbian and bisexual women. Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 24, 205–219.10.1002/casp.2161

Israel T, & Mohr JJ (2004). Attitudes toward bisexual women and men: Current research, future directions. Journal of Bisexuality, 4(1–2), 117–134. 10.1300/J159v04n01_09

Jones KP, & King EB (2014). Managing concealable stigmas at work: A review and multilevel model. Journal of Management, 40, 1466–1494. 10.1177/0149206313515518

Lidderdale MA, Croteau JM, Anderson MZ, Tovar-Murray D, & Davis JM (2007). Building LGB vocational psychology: A theoretical model of workplace sexual identity management. In Bieschke K, Perez R, & DeBord K (Eds.), Handbook of counseling and psychotherapy with lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients (2nd ed., pp. 245–270). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Maliepaard E (2017). Bisexuality in the Netherlands: Connecting bisexual passing, communities, and identities. Journal of Bisexuality, 17(3), 1–24. 10.1080/15299716.2017.1342214

Mohr JJ, Jackson SD, & Sheets RL (2017). Sexual orientation self-presentation among bisexual-identified women and men: Patterns and predictors. Archives of Sexual Behavior. Advance online publication. 10.1007/s10508-016-0808-1

Mohr JJ, Markell HM, King EB, Jones KP, Peddie CI, & Kendra MS (2019). Affective antecedents and consequences of revealing and concealing a lesbian, gay, or bisexual identity. Journal of Applied Psychology, 104(10), 1266–1282. 10.1037/apl0000399.supp [PubMed: 30985158]

Mohr JJ, & Rochlen AB (1999). Measuring attitudes regarding bisexuality in lesbian, gay male, and heterosexual populations. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 46(3), 353–369. 10.1037/0022-0167.46.3.353

Moradi B, & Grzanka PR (2017). Using intersectionality responsibly: Toward critical epistemology, structural analysis, and social justice activism. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 64(5), 500–513. 10.1037/cou0000203 [PubMed: 29048196]

Pachankis JE (2007). The psychological implications of concealing a stigma: A cognitive-affective-behavioral model. Psychological Bulletin, 133(2), 328–345. 10.1037/0033-2909.133.2.328 [PubMed: 17338603]

Reed L, & Leuty M (2016). The role of individual differences and situational variables in the use of workplace sexual identity management strategies. Journal of Homosexuality, 63, 985–1017. 10.1080/00918369.2015.1117900 [PubMed: 26563765]

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. 10.1037/sgd0000057

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. 10.2105/AJPH.2008.156307 [PubMed: 20075326]

Ross LE, Salway T, Tarasoff LA, Mackay JM, Hawkins BW, & Fehr CP (2018). Prevalence of depression and anxiety among bisexual people compared to gay, lesbian, and heterosexual individuals: A systematic review and meta-analysis. The Journal of Sex Research, 55, 435–456. 10.1080/00224499.2017.1387755 [PubMed: 29099625]

Rummell CM, & Tokar DM (2016). Testing an empirical model of workplace sexual identity management. Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity, 3, 49–62. 10.1037/sgd0000144

Ruscio J, & Roche B (2012). Determining the number of factors to retain in an exploratory factor analysis using comparison data of known factorial structure. Psychological assessment, 24(2), 282. 10.1037/a0025697 [PubMed: 21966933]

Salway T, Ross LE, Fehr CP, Burley J, Asadi S, Hawkins B, &Tarasoff LA (2019). A systematic review and meta-analysis of disparities in the prevalence of suicide ideation and attempt among bisexual populations. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 48, 89–111. 10.1007/s10508-018-1150-6 [PubMed: 29492768]

Schrimshaw E, Downing M, & Cohn D (2018). Reasons for non-disclosure of sexual orientation among behaviorally bisexual men: Non-disclosure as stigma management. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 47(1), 219–233. 10.1007/s10508-016-0762-y [PubMed: 27278965]

Sheets RL, & Mohr JJ (2009). Perceived social support from friends and family and psychosocial functioning in bisexual young adult college students. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 56, 152–163. 10.1037/0022-0167.56.1.152

Sijtsma K “On the use, the misuse, and the very limited usefulness of Cronbach’s alpha.” Psychometrika 74, no. 1 (2009): 107. [PubMed: 20037639]

Spalding LR, & Peplau LA (1997). The unfaithful lover: heterosexuals’ perceptions of bisexuals and their relationships. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21(4), 611–626. 10.1111//j.1471-6402.1997.tb00134.x

Tabachnick Barbara G., Fidell Linda S., and Ullman Jodie B. Using multivariate statistics. Vol. 5. Boston, MA: Pearson, 2007.

Tatum AK (2018). Workplace climate and satisfaction in sexual minority populations: An application of social cognitive career theory. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 65, 618–628. 10.1037/cou0000292 [PubMed: 29952582]

Tatum AK, Formica LJ, & Brown SD (2017). Testing a social cognitive model of workplace sexual identity management. Journal of Career Assessment, 25(1), 107–120. 10.1177/1069072716659712

Yost M, & Thomas G (2012). Gender and binegativity: Men’s and women’s attitudes toward male and female bisexuals. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 41(3), 691–702. 10.1007/s10508-011-9767-8 [PubMed: 21597943]

Zivony A, & Lobel T (2014). The invisible stereotypes of bisexual men. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 43(6), 1165–1176. 10.1007/s10508-014-0263-9 [PubMed: 24558124]

Zwick WR, & Velicer WF (1986). Comparison of five rules for determining the number of components to retain. Psychological bulletin, 99(3), 432. 10.1037/0033-2909.99.3.432

Public Significance Statement:

This study suggests that many bisexual+ individuals want to be visible and are actively engaging in strategies to make their identity visible to others. However, they are doing so in relatively "safe" situations, suggesting that more work is needed to foster an environment in which it is safer for bisexual+ individuals to be visible.

Table 1

Sample Demographics (*N* = 715)

	n	%
Sex/Gender		
Cisgender women	226	31.6%
Cisgender men	193	27.0%
Transgender men	28	3.9%
Transgender women	62	8.7%
Non–binary	206	28.8%
Sexual Identity		
Bisexual	356	49.8%
Pansexual	176	24.6%
Queer	137	19.2%
Another Identity	46	6.4%
Ethnicity		
Latinx	85	11.9%
Non-Latinx	630	88.1%
Race		
White	594	83.1%
Black	26	3.6%
Asian	20	2.8%
Native American	12	1.7%
Multi-Racial	61	8.5%
Another Identity	2	0.3%
Current College Student	263	36.8%
Highest Education		
High School or Less	114	15.9%
Some College	305	42.7%
Associate's Degree	57	8.0%
Bachelor's Degree	134	18.7%
Graduate School	105	14.7%
Current Household Annual Income		
Under $12,000	135	18.9%
$12,000–$23,999	134	18.7%
$24,000–$44,999	156	21.8%
$45,000–$74,999	140	19.6%
$75,000–$119,999	89	12.4%
$120,000 or more	55	7.7%

Table 2

Bi+ Visibility Strategies: Factor loadings

Item	Gender Based Displays	Community Engagement	Direct Communication	Indirect Communication	Behavioral Displays
1. Dress in a way that people will think you're bi+ (e.g., more masculine, more feminine, more androgynous)	**.83**	.02	−.004	−.002	−.01
2. Wear bi+ pride clothing or accessories	.06	**.58**	.14	−.02	−.03
3. Wear jewelry, piercings, or makeup so that people will think you are bi+	**.40**	.35	.03	−.06	.04
4. Style your hair in a way that people will think you're bi+	**.69**	.07	.02	.01	−.001
5. Display something in your home (e.g., signs, decorations) so that people will think you're bi+	.15	**.44**	.14	.06	.03
6. Attend social events or meetings specifically for bi+ people, or advocate specifically for bi+ causes	−.03	**.61**	.01	.11	.06
7. Attend social events or meetings for the general LGBT community or advocate for general LGBT causes	−.002	**.56**	−.04	.18	.04
8. Go to LGBT bars or clubs	−.08	**.41**	−.04	.001	.16
9. Directly tell people that you're bi+	.02	.02	**.66**	−.04	.04
10. Talk about your experiences as a bi+ individual	−.02	.05	**.64**	.05	.04
11. Mention the sex or gender of your past or current partners, so that people will know you're bi+	−.03	.02	**.43**	−.03	.27
12. Designate yourself as bi+ or interested in more than one sex/gender on social media profiles	.05	.06	**.56**	.02	.01
13. Correct somebody if they assume you're straight	.05	−.04	**.70**	−.01	−.02
14. Correct somebody if they assume you're gay or lesbian	−.03	−.21	**.55**	.06	.07
15. Share topics specifically pertaining to bi+ issues on social media	.001	.26	.33	**.36**	−.06
16. Share topics pertaining to general LGBT issues on social media	.06	.18	.23	**.50**	−.07
17. Discuss issues/politics specifically about the bi+ community with people who may not know your sexual identity (without explicitly identifying yourself as bi+)	−.001	.02	.03	**.72**	.11
18. Discuss issues/politics about the general LGBT community with people who may not know your sexual identity (without explicitly identifying yourself as bi+)	−.01	−.05	−.04	**.83**	.05
19. Act in a certain way (e.g., more masculine, more feminine) so that people will think you are bi+	**.61**	−.06	−.02	.03	.36
20. Show affection to others in a way (e.g., with people of more than one sex/gender) so that people will think you are bi+	.14	.01	.05	.02	**.75**
21. Flirt with others in a way (e.g., with people of more than one sex/gender) so that people will think you are bi+	−.002	.06	.01	−.01	**.83**

Table 3

Reasons for Bi+ Visibility Attempts: Factor Loadings

Item	Activism	Pride
To challenge myths about being bi+	**.88**	−.04
To combat bias that bi+ people experience	**.90**	−.004
To stand up for the rights of bi+ individuals	**.71**	.15
To educate people about being bi+	**.68**	.20
To combat invisibility that bi+ people experience	**.60**	.29
To be a role model to other bi+ people	.38	.27
Because it makes me feel good to do so	−.05	**.83**
Because it is liberating	−.01	**.79**
Because I’m proud to be bi+	.14	**.68**
Because being bi+ is central to my identity	.07	**.65**
Because I want others to know the real me	.15	**.60**

Psychol Sex Orientat Gend Divers. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2022 August 05.

Table 4

Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. BV : Gender Based Displays	-											
2. BV: Community Engagement	.43**	-										
3. BV : Direct Disclosure	.40**	.48**	-									
4. BV: Indirect Communication	.36**	.55**	.50**	-								
5. BV : Behavioral Displays	.39**	.36**	.38**	.33**	-							
6. Reasons: Activism	.36**	.44**	.51**	.56**	.29**	-						
7. Reasons: Pride	.48**	.46**	.57**	.44**	.35**	.59**	-					
8. PS: Gender Based Displays	.39**	.22**	.11*	.17**	.21**	.17**	.24**	-				
9. PS: Community Engagement	.18**	.27**	.23**	.23**	.15**	.26**	.30**	.48**	-			
10. PS: Direct Communication	.06	.10*	.19**	.14**	.04	.19**	.23**	.25**	.50**	-		
11. PS: Indirect Communication	.21**	.26**	.23**	.29**	.20**	.26**	.22**	.35**	.43**	.28**	-	
12. PS: Behavioral Displays	.20**	.17**	.21**	.17**	.27**	.21**	.22**	.44**	.42**	.33**	.40**	-
M	2.39	2.52	3.16	3.35	2.66	3.88	3.70	2.61	3.60	4.15	2.81	3.20
SD	.97	.85	.80	1.00	1.06	1.03	.99	.74	.66	.65	.82	.88
α	.79	.73	.77	.82	.82	.91	.86	.71	.70	.80	.87	.84

*p < .05

**p < .001.

BV = bi+ visibility strategy; PS = perceived success