

THE RELATIONSHIPS AMONG GENDER,
BIPOSITIVE EVENTS AND PSYCHOLOGICAL OUTCOMES

A Thesis Submitted to the
College of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of Master of Arts
In the Department of Psychology and Health Studies
University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon

By

Ana Carolina de Barros

© Copyright Ana Carolina de Barros, June 2022. All rights reserved.
Unless otherwise noted, copyright of the material in this thesis belongs to the author

PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis/dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Postgraduate degree from the University of Saskatchewan, I agree that the Libraries of this University may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying of this thesis/dissertation in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor or professors who supervised my thesis work or, in their absence, by the Head of the Department or the Dean of the College in which my thesis work was done. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this thesis or parts thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of Saskatchewan in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my thesis.

Requests for permission to copy or to make other uses of materials in this thesis/dissertation in whole or part should be addressed to:

Head of the Department of Psychology and Health Studies
9 Campus Drive
University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7N 5A5 Canada

OR

Dean
College of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
University of Saskatchewan
116 Thorvaldson Building, 110 Science Place
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7N 5C9 Canada

Abstract

Researchers have paid little attention to the possibility that interpersonal bipoisitive experiences, also known as bisexual *microaffirmations*, may have positive effects on psychological outcomes. In addition, no study to date has examined whether these experiences vary by gender. Thus, the aim of this study was to explore connections between different types of bipoisitive events, positive identity, proximal stressors, and mental health outcomes, with special attention paid to the role of gender as a moderating variable. Two-hundred forty-two participants completed a series of surveys over four weeks, examining experiences of bipoisitive events, internalized binegativity, sexual identity uncertainty, preoccupation with others' thoughts, bisexual identity affirmation, identity certainty and centrality, anxiety, and depression. Data were analyzed using ANOVAs, multilevel modeling, and mediation analyses. Results emphasize that, while *frequency* of bipoisitive events may not differ by gender, the effect these bipoisitive events have on different internalized variables does. Bipoisitive events seem to have the most effects for bisexual women but can cause increased preoccupation and anxiety for men and non-binary people. Thus, more research is needed on the interactions between gender, bipoisitive events, proximal stressors, and positive identity. This study lends to the growing literature on the importance of considering bipoisitive events as a potential target of interventions aimed at bettering mental health in bisexual populations.

Acknowledgements

I am deeply grateful for the support provided to me throughout this process by Dr. Todd Morrison, my thesis supervisor. His guidance and encouragement have been invaluable in ensuring that I was able to succeed in this program, despite not being on campus for 95% of it.

I would also like to thank the members of my committee, Dr. Melanie Morrison and Dr. Jan Gelech. Their advice and recommendations for how my project could be improved were vital, and their mentorship as instructors has helped me grow both as a researcher and a teacher.

Thank you to all of the organizations which graciously helped me share my calls for participants, including: Saskatoon Sexual Health, Pride at Work, ACAS Queer Asian Youth, OUT Saskatoon, Re:Searching for 2SLGBTQ+ Health, PFLAG Sackville, PFLAG Saint John, PFLAG Barrie Simcoe County, PFLAG Surrey, OUT Jasper, QCentre UCalgary, Queer McGill, SHORE Centre, Klinik Community Health, Calgary Pride, HiM Clinic, Guelph Resource Center for Gender Empowerment & Diversity, Pride & Ally Centre at CBU, SAIT SA LGBTQ+ Club, Toronto Bi+ Network, PEERS Alliance, LGBT Support at UPEI, The 203 Student Group at UNB, Surrey Pride, Vancouver Men's Chorus, Rainbow Resource Centre, Rainbow Health Ontario, Victoria Pride Society, The Enchanté Network, Spectrum Waterloo, Centre for Sexuality, and the Canadian Centre for Gender and Sexual Diversity. The work all of you do for our communities is priceless, and I am deeply grateful to have been lucky enough to partner with you in this endeavor.

Many thanks to my parents, for being interested in my work even when they didn't quite understand it; to my brother, who offered to send me everything in his savings to fund this degree; and to my friends, who endured my constant bemoaning of statistics and cheered me on when I feared I wouldn't make it through.

My deepest appreciation to Drumlin Crape and Ian Costinak, my roommates, best friends, and partners in crime, for all the times they talked through this work with me and helped me unwind from the stress of graduate school with movie nights and escape rooms.

Finally, the best for last: thank you to my three cats, Jem, Merle, and Mindy, as well as my fish Winston, who in a fair world would have all been co-authors on this project. Your office snuggles and aquarium bubbles got me through the completion of an entire degree over Zoom.

Dedicated to the bisexual community, especially those of you who were so excited and willing to share your experiences with me. I hope this work will make you as proud as I am of our resiliency.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PERMISSION TO USE	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
DEDICATION	v
The Relationships Among Gender, Bipositive Events and Psychological Outcomes	1
Literature Review	2
Binegativity	2
Positive Bisexual Research	4
Bipositive Events.....	6
Gender, Bisexuality, and Affirmation	10
Current Study	12
Method	14
Participants	14
Procedure.....	16
Measures	16
<i>Baseline Measures</i>	17
<i>Weekly Surveys</i>	20
Data Analysis	21
Results	23
Initial Analyses.....	23
Frequency of Bipositive Events	27
Mediation Models.....	28
<i>Proximal Stressors & Bisexual Identity Variables</i>	28
<i>Anxiety and Depression</i>	33
<i>Mediation</i>	34
Discussion	34
Experiencing Bipositive Events	35
Bipositive Events, Proximal Stressors, and Identity Variables	36
Event Types.....	39
Bipositive Events and Mental Health Outcomes.....	42
Gender and Bipositive Events.....	43
Limitations & Future Directions	46
Endnotes	48
References	49
Appendix A: Qualitative Responses and Subsequent Categorizations	82
Appendix B: Consent Form for Baseline Measures (T0)	89
Appendix C: Consent Form for Weekly Studies (T1-T3)	91
Appendix D: Debriefing Form for Baseline Measures	93
Appendix E: Debriefing Form for Follow-Ups 1 and 2	94
Appendix F: Debriefing Form for Follow-Up 3	95
Appendix G: Demographics Measure	96
Appendix H: Measures	97
Appendix I: Recruitment Material	101

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Measures Used	58
Table 2. Baseline Correlations	61
Table 3. Week One Correlations	62
Table 4. Week Two Correlations.....	64
Table 5. Week Three Correlations.....	66
Table 6. Overall Correlations	68
Table 7. Baseline to Week One Change Correlations	70
Table 8. Week One to Week Two Change Correlations	72
Table 9. Week Two to Week Three Change Correlations.....	74
Table 10. Hypothesis 2 Findings: Scores	76
Table 11. Hypothesis 2 Findings: Changes	79

The Relationships Among Gender, Bipositive Events and Psychological Outcomes

Research on the health outcomes of LGB (lesbian, gay, and bisexual) people has found consistently that bisexual individuals are at increased risk for outcomes such as anxiety and mood disorders, suicidal ideation, and alcohol and drug use, relative to both lesbian/gay individuals and heterosexual individuals (Feinstein & Dyar, 2017; Ross et al., 2018; Salway et al., 2019; Shokoohi et al., 2020). These outcomes are typically linked to experiences of binegativity (i.e., negative beliefs and stereotypes about bisexual people; Brewster & Moradi, 2010), which bisexual people experience from both gay/lesbian and heterosexual communities (Dyar & London, 2018b; Friedman et al., 2014; Ross et al., 2010). Additionally, binegativity can be internalized as a proximal stressor increasing sexual identity uncertainty as well as symptoms of anxiety and depression (Dyar et al., 2017; Dyar & London, 2018b).

Although binegative experiences have been found to lead to negative outcomes, recent studies have begun to shift the focus to the impacts of *bipositive* experiences (i.e., experiences that affirm an individual's bisexual identity; Dyar & London, 2018a). These experiences can be intrapersonal (e.g., noting internal attraction to people of different genders), interpersonal (e.g., experiencing community belonging with the bisexual or queer community), or institutional (e.g., celebrating events such as Celebrate Bisexuality Day; Flanders et al., 2017). Flanders et al. (2019a) additionally classified interpersonal bipositive events (termed *microaffirmations*¹) as Acceptance events (related to accepting bisexuality as legitimate), Social Support events (communicating support to bisexual individuals and relationships), Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events (recognizing bisexuality as an identity and resisting biphobia), and Emotional Support events (providing emotional support to bisexual individuals). Experiencing bipositive events is associated with decreases in daily stress and anxiety, internalized

binegativity, sexual identity uncertainty, and rejection sensitivity, as well as increases in positive bisexual identity and in strength of identification as bisexual (Dyar & London, 2018a; Flanders et al., 2017; Salim et al., 2019). However, studies have yet to examine if gender moderates these relationships, particularly given other research highlighting key differences between bisexual men and women (Yost & Thomas, 2012; Davila et al., 2020; Choi et al., 2019).

Given current gaps in knowledge, I conducted a diary study, which examined whether the connections between 1) experiencing interpersonal bipoisitive events, 2) experiencing proximal stressors and positive identity changes, and 3) experiencing positive psychological outcomes from these events varies as a function of gender. This study mirrors previous research on the impacts of bipoisitive events on bisexual outcomes; namely, Flanders (2015), Dyar and London (2018a), and Salim et al. (2019). However, two key incremental advances provided by my study are its inclusion of gender as a moderating variable and its examination of subtypes of interpersonal bipoisitive events.

Literature Review

Binegativity

Binegativity refers to negative stereotypes and beliefs about bisexual people (Brewster & Moradi, 2010). These beliefs are endorsed by between 20% to 43% of the United States population and are evident in both the gay/lesbian and heterosexual communities (Dodge et al., 2016). In general, these beliefs tend to fall into three categories: sexual orientation instability (i.e., perceiving bisexuality as a transition between orientations rather than as a stable orientation itself); sexual irresponsibility (i.e., viewing bisexual individuals as more likely to have a sexually transmitted infection); and interpersonal hostility (i.e., excluding individuals that identify as bisexual; Brewster & Moradi, 2010).

Binegative experiences have been connected to several negative psychological outcomes, including identity confusion and concealment. Balsam and Mohr (2007) hypothesized that the reason bisexual people experience higher levels of identity confusion (i.e., uncertainty about one's sexual orientation; Troiden, 1993) than lesbian and gay individuals is attributable to the stigma associated with identifying as bisexual; this stigma may lead bisexual individuals to change the label they use for their identity based on their current partner's gender. In their longitudinal study of 180 bisexual women, Dyar and London (2018b) further expanded on the connections between binegative experiences and identity confusion. They found that internalized binegativity and identity confusion, in the form of uncertainty about one's sexual identity label, mediate the relationship between binegative experiences and identity confusion; in other words, binegative experiences increase internalized binegativity and identity confusion, which in turn lead to greater identity concealment.

Identity concealment, referring to strategies used to hide one's sexual orientation from others, is also common in bisexual people (e.g., Hequembourg & Brallier, 2009). As noted above, identity concealment is often linked to experiences of binegativity; engaging in identity concealment is often conceptualized as a strategy to avoid experiences of stigma or discrimination (Dewaele et al., 2013). As a visibility management strategy, identity concealment has been linked to both positive and negative outcomes; those who do not conceal their identities may experience lower *internalized* binegativity (i.e., internalized negative beliefs about bisexual individuals; Davila et al., 2019), but may also encounter more *external* binegativity (Davila et al., 2020).

In addition, binegativity has been connected to negative mental health outcomes, such as anxiety and depression. Ross et al. (2010) conducted a qualitative study with 55 bisexual

participants and found that they perceived binegativity to be a contributor to their mental health problems. Similarly, in a literature review of minority stress and mental health in bisexual individuals, Feinstein and Dyar (2017) found that stress related to stigma and discrimination (i.e., binegative experiences) can explain, in part, the disparities between mental health and substance use problems in bisexual individuals and in lesbian/gay individuals. Finally, Feinstein et al. (2017) reported that increased LGBTQ community involvement predicted increased alcohol abuse in bisexual women. This relationship was not found for lesbian women. Perceived binegative discrimination functioned as a mediator in this relationship; in other words, bisexual women who were more involved in the LGBTQ community reported greater binegative discrimination, which, in turn, was associated with increased alcohol abuse.

Positive Bisexual Research

In contrast to the myriad of studies examining negative outcomes of discrimination in bisexual persons (Kaestle & Ivory, 2012), there has been a recent move towards research examining positive sexuality and strengths in the LGBTQ community (Asakura & Craig, 2014; Meyer, 2014; Vaughan & Rodriguez, 2014). These studies recognize that affirmative and negative identities are separate constructs, rather than opposites on a continuum (Mayfield, 2001; Mohr & Kendra, 2011). Adopting an affirmative identity is an important method of adapting to stigma (Balsam & Mohr, 2007), and as such, affirmative identities have been connected to several positive outcomes, including decreased depression, anxiety, guilt, fear, sadness, and hostility, and increased self-esteem, self-assurance, and satisfaction with life (Ghavami et al., 2011; Mohr & Kendra, 2011). Such findings ultimately led the American Psychological Association (2012) to release guidelines on LGB-affirming therapy, in recognition of the protective role that affirming identities play in the lives of LGB people.

Given that the experiences of bisexual people cannot be adequately captured in their entirety by research that examines the wider LGBTQ+ community, some studies have focused specifically on affirming identities in bisexual persons. Positive bisexual identity is defined as “feeling good about oneself in the context of identifying as [bisexual]” (Riggle et al., 2014, p. 398). Claiming a bisexual identity has been connected to increased self-reliance, increased tolerance of others’ identities, and personal enrichment (Bradford, 2004). Positive bisexual identity has been envisioned as a multidimensional construct, with interpersonal, intrapersonal, and societal dimensions (Rostosky et al., 2010). Many of these aspects are consistent with claiming a positive gay/lesbian identity (Riggle et al., 2008). However, in a qualitative study by Rostosky et al. (2010), bisexual participants often contrasted their experiences with those of their gay and lesbian peers. For example, when describing the experience of freedom from identity labels and gender roles, participants spoke of feeling “free from fear that a sexual attraction to ‘the wrong gender’ would precipitate an identity crisis” (Rostosky et al., 2010, p. 135) – unlike lesbian and gay individuals. This implies that, although aspects of positive LGB identities may be the same, the construction of these identities may differ based on sexual orientation.

Other factors influence the construction of a positive bisexual identity. Choi et al.’s (2019) latent profile analysis² of bisexual identity found that about 60% of individuals fit an “Affirmative” profile (positive and self-accepting, with high scores on identity affirmation and low scores on internalized binegativity). Women and people who identified with the term “bisexual” were overrepresented in this profile, whereas men and people of color were more likely to fall into the “Ambivalent” (low-to-moderate scores on identity affirmation and internalized binegativity) or “Vigilant” (high scores on anticipated binegativity) profile. In other words, demographic factors such as gender and race may have important associations with

positive bisexual identity. The potential impacts of race were further examined by Galupo et al. (2019), who qualitatively explored positive identities in people who are both bisexual and biracial. These participants described how the overlap of their identities gave them well-rounded views of the world and unique perspectives. While some impacts of gender have been explored (i.e., women being more likely to be “Affirmative”; Choi et al., 2019), the actual processes by which positive identities are developed in regard to gender have yet to be outlined.

Bipositive Events

In recent years, social scientists have accorded greater attention to a construct entitled bipositive events. These events, in contrast to binegative events, involve subjective positivity, affirmation, and/or validation of one’s bisexual identity (Flanders et al., 2017). Flanders et al. (2017) used a social ecological model to group these qualitative descriptions of experiences into intrapersonal, interpersonal, and institutional levels. Intrapersonal experiences involved internal attraction (i.e., simply recognizing romantic, sexual, or emotional attraction to more than one gender in the same day, without attempting to censor or ignore this attraction). Positive interpersonal experiences involve facets such as dating, romantic, or sexual behaviour (e.g., dating someone of one gender while experiencing attraction towards someone of another gender without feeling judged for it); social support (e.g., having friends, family members, and partners who acknowledge and/or support one’s bisexual identity); and community belonging (e.g., having others come out as bisexual to them). Also falling under the interpersonal rubric are positive experiences of coming out; peer normalization of bisexuality (e.g., making bisexual jokes with friends); discussing bisexuality (e.g., talking to others about their bisexual identities); and social media interactions (e.g., reading articles online about bisexuality). Positive institutional experiences included institutional support (e.g., participating in Celebrate

Bisexuality Day); institutional normalization of bisexuality (e.g., having an instructor treat bisexuality as a normal variant of sexuality in a classroom setting); activism (e.g., talking to people about social justice issues); and media representation (e.g., seeing positive representations of bisexual characters in media)³.

Extending research on interpersonal bipoisitive events, which also may be termed *microaffirmations*, Flanders et al. (2019a) developed a scale of bisexual microaffirmations with bisexual women, using data from focus groups who identified as bisexual+ women. The final scale is comprised of four subscales: Acceptance (accepting bisexuality as a legitimate sexual identity), Social Support (general support of bisexual individuals and relationships), Emotional Support (providing emotional support to bisexual individuals), and Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia (recognizing bisexuality and resisting biphobia. Only three of the subscales correlated with identity affirmation; the fourth (Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia) did not. This implies that different forms of interpersonal bipoisitive events may have differing effects on bisexual individuals.

Interestingly, several studies, including Flanders et al. (2017), have found that neutral events (such as simply recognizing attraction to more than one gender) are sometimes viewed as positive by bisexual people. For example, in their qualitative exploration of receiving support from significant others, Fuller and Hovland (2020) found that participants often described neutral responses from their partners about their identities as instances of acceptance. These responses included partners not attempting to change their sexual orientation, as well as partners who provided ambivalent or indifferent responses. These narratives were present in 65% of Fuller and Hovland's (2020) sample; only 35% of participants described overtly positive responses.

Flanders et al.'s (2017) research was further extended by Dyar and London (2018a), who used the qualitative descriptions of bipoisitive events outlined above to longitudinally examine connections between experiencing these events and proximal stressors, positive bisexual identity, and internalizing symptoms. Using a four-week weekly diary study, they discovered that bipoisitive experiences decreased proximal stressors (i.e., internalized binegativity, sexual identity uncertainty, and rejection sensitivity), increased positive bisexual identity, and decreased internalizing symptoms (i.e., anxiety and depression). In particular, decreases in proximal stressors and increases in positive bisexual identity explained the associations between the frequency of bipoisitive events and decreases in internalizing symptoms. These results mirror those of Flanders (2015), whose 30-day daily diary study also found that experiencing bipoisitive events was associated with decreases in daily stress and anxiety.

Dyar and London (2018a) also observed that individuals experiencing more interpersonal bipoisitive events also reported experiencing more intrapersonal bipoisitive events. The authors hypothesized that these individuals may have more access to supportive social contexts. This explanation is supported by Flanders et al. (2019b), who, in their survey of 178 bisexual people of color, found that both general social support and connection to the LGBTQ+ community were associated with greater identity affirmation. Additionally, it is possible that experiencing more interpersonal bipoisitive events increases the salience of positive bisexual identity, which may then lead to increased intrapersonal bipoisitive events.

It is worth noting that not all studies have found clear connections between bipoisitive events and positive psychological outcomes. In their 5-day online daily diary study of the effects of microaggressions and microaffirmations on bisexual women, Salim et al. (2019) did not find microaffirmations to be a significant predictor of variations in depression, suicidality, or

happiness. However, Salim et al. (2019) emphasized the potential impact of neutral versus positive events on these findings. Several measures (e.g., the Bisexual Microaffirmation Scale [Flanders et al., 2019a] and the Bisexual Identity Inventory [Paul et al., 2014]) have items that reflect neutral and positive beliefs or events about bisexuality. While the content of these items reflects qualitative studies where bisexual individuals occasionally report the absence of negative reactions as positive events (e.g., Flanders et al., 2017), it is possible that neutral events do not influence psychological outcomes in the same way as affirmative events. Additionally, this study simultaneously measured microaggressions; thus, it is possible that microaffirmations are simply not powerful enough to negate the influence of negative experiences. This may be related to the *negativity bias* (Norris, 2021); in other words, asking participants to recall both affirmations and aggressions led to participant answers being mostly affected by their memories of microaggressions. This possibility is strengthened by the lengths of the scales used in this study; the Bisexual Microaggression Scale is more than double the length of the Bisexual Microaffirmation Scale (Flanders et al., 2019a), and so it is likely that participants were primed to think more about their weekly experiences with microaggressions than microaffirmations.

Finally, in a qualitative study, Wang and Feinstein (2020) explored bipositive events from the perspective of bisexual+ (i.e., bisexual, pansexual, and queer) young men. These participants described six different contexts for positive experiences: experiences with LGBT+ people, experiences with other bi+ people, experiences in LGBT+ environments, experiences disclosing bi+ identities, romantic and sexual experiences, and experiences with allies. Many of these contexts mirror findings from Flanders et al. (2017); themes such as coming out, romantic and sexual experiences, social support, and community belonging are common to both studies. Participants in Wang and Feinstein's (2020) study described eight different factors that made

their experiences positive: feeling a sense of belonging in community; normalization, acceptance, and visibility of one's identity or community; providing or receiving support; discussing shared experiences; authenticity; celebrating identity or community; experiencing personal growth; and not feeling limited by the gender of potential romantic or sexual partners. Again, several of these factors mirror those reported in Flanders et al. (2017): community belonging, normalization of bisexuality, and discussing shared experiences are themes described in both studies. It appears that, in general, bisexual+ people of all genders conceptualize bipoisitive events similarly.

Gender, Bisexuality, and Affirmation

Few studies have considered gender differences in terms of bisexual identity affirmation. Some studies have focused specifically on one gender or another. For example, Dyar and London (2018) examined only cisgender bisexual women, while Wang and Feinstein (2020) examined only bisexual men. Interestingly, while Wang and Feinstein (2020) highlighted the importance of gender in creating different experiences for bi+ people, they did not interpret their results in a gendered context. Moreover, researchers that have examined people of all genders have samples that are predominantly women (e.g., 54% of the sample in Flanders et al. [2017], 67% of the sample in Galupo et al. [2019]). Additionally, gender is not always considered when interpreting results, sometimes due to insufficient participant numbers (e.g., Flanders, 2015).

There are several reasons to believe that the effects of bipoisitive experiences may be moderated by gender. First, *binegative* beliefs vary as a function of whether the target is a bisexual man or a bisexual woman. Yost and Thomas (2012), examining binegative beliefs among 253 heterosexual students, found that bisexual women were typically described as sexy, attention seeking, and “really heterosexual” whereas bisexual men were described as gender non-

conforming and “really gay.” Additionally, the sexual orientation of bisexual men was more likely to be questioned than the sexual orientation of bisexual women. Finally, a greater number of positive characteristics were attributed to bisexual women (e.g., “sexy,” “liberal,” “open to new experiences”), and a greater number of negative characteristics were attributed to bisexual men (e.g., “wrong,” “immoral,” “disgusting”). These results may be due to societal expectations of hegemonic masculinities, where bisexuality is seen as more of a gender role violation for men than for women (Flanders et al., 2018). Participants (particularly male participants) perceived bisexual women more positively than they did bisexual men. This difference was partially explained by the eroticization of lesbian sexuality by heterosexual men – i.e., bisexual women, like lesbian women, are “sexy.” As the prevalence of different types of binegative beliefs – and thus, of interpersonal binegative events - varies based on the target’s gender, it is possible that the prevalence of different types of *bipositive* events also varies.

Gender differences also have been identified in terms of identity disclosure. In their examination of single bisexual men and women’s perceptions of community acceptance, Price et al. (2020) found that bisexual women did not feel as strongly as did bisexual men about hiding their sexual orientation from their friends or in their neighborhood. This may be connected to another finding in their study; namely, bisexual men perceived themselves to be significantly less accepted by the LGBTQ community than did bisexual women. Thus, a lack of LGBTQ community acceptance may prevent bisexual men, but not bisexual women, from disclosing their identities throughout their lives, particularly in contexts which would otherwise encourage bipositive encounters. Similarly, in Davila et al. (2020), cisgender bisexual men were the least likely to use strategies to make their sexual orientations visible, compared to women, non-binary people, and transgender men, implying that they were the least likely to *want* their sexual

orientations to be visible. The issue of visibility is important given that visibility efforts are associated with higher identity affirmation and lowered depression and anxiety (Dyar et al., 2021). The bisexual men interviewed by Schrimshaw et al. (2018) about identity disclosure described several reasons for not telling their friends, family, or female partners about their sexual orientation. These reasons included anticipating negative emotional reactions and negative changes in relationships, believing that others held negative attitudes towards queerness, and having previously witnessed or experienced negative reactions to disclosure. In other words, expected or experienced binegativity seems to prevent bisexual men from disclosing their sexual orientation, and thus from accessing many interpersonal and institutional forms of bipositive experiences.

Finally, gender differences have been observed in the types of identities of bisexual people (i.e., Affirmative, Ambivalent, or Vigilant, as noted in the previous section). Choi et al. (2019), in their profile analysis of bisexual+ identities, found that bisexual+ men were more likely than bisexual+ women to fit an “Ambivalent” or “Vigilant” profile. The former describes people with some concerns about others’ reactions to their bisexuality while the latter refers to people having significant concerns about others’ possible reactions to their bisexuality. In contrast, women were more likely than were men to fit an “Affirmative” profile, which describes people who have a positive and self-accepting orientation towards their bisexuality. Thus, based on this study, it appears that bisexual men have more difficulties cultivating positive bisexual identities.

Current Study

To address gaps in the literature, I examined the potential moderating effects of gender on the ways interpersonal bipositive events are associated with changes in proximal stressors

(i.e., internalized binegativity, sexual identity uncertainty, and preoccupation with other's thoughts), changes in identity variables (i.e., identity affirmation, identity centrality, and identity certainty), and internalizing symptoms (i.e., depression and anxiety). Throughout this study, the terms "bipositive events" and "microaffirmations" will be used interchangeably, as the only bipositive events examined in this study are interpersonal. The design of this study was based on Dyar and London (2018a), with hypotheses derived from findings reported by Dyar and London (2018a), Flanders (2015), and Salim et al. (2019). In this study, I investigated the frequency of different types of interpersonal bipositive events and the possible emergence of gender differences. I also explored whether these types of events predict decreases over time in internalizing symptoms and whether these decreases differ by gender. In addition, I determined whether these types of events predict changes over time in proximal stressors (listed above) and bisexual identity (i.e., identity affirmation, certainty, and centrality). The possibility that these association differ by gender also was examined. Importantly, proximal stressors and bisexual identity were conceptualized as fluid concepts that may be affected by environmental factors; namely, type and frequency of bipositive events (e.g., Dyar & London, 2018a; Salim et al., 2019).

A weekly diary method was chosen for a few reasons. First, the diary method is consistent with several previous studies in this area (Dyar & London, 2018a; Flanders, 2015; Salim et al., 2019). This method allowed me to collect longitudinal data and thus explore both within- and between-person effects. In other words, I was able to examine not only how interpersonal bipositive events affected different people, but also how differing levels of bipositive events affected specific individuals. Second, a weekly method was chosen, rather than

a daily one, as this method decreases participant burden by asking them to report on events experienced in a week rather than every day.

Several hypotheses were tested. First, I hypothesized that, on average, women would experience more bipositive events than would men (*H1*). Second, I hypothesized that experiencing more bipositive events in a week would be associated with decreases over time in proximal stressors (*H2a*), increases in identity affirmation (*H2b*), and decreases in internalizing symptoms (*H2c*). These associations would be evident both within and between participants. In other words, not only would an individual's scores vary from week to week based on how many events they had experienced, but also participants who experienced more bipositive events on average would evidence higher average scores than participants who experienced fewer bipositive events on average. Finally, I hypothesized that the associations between bipositive events and decreases in internalizing symptoms would be mediated by proximal stressors and identity affirmation (*H3*). Specifically, the greater the number of bipositive events, the lower the perceived proximal stressors and the greater the identity affirmation, both of which would be related to decreases in internalizing symptoms. These associations would be evident both within and between participants. Given limited research, no specific gender predictions were made for hypotheses 2 and 3.

Method

Participants

Participants for this study were bisexual men, women, and non-binary persons. Although Dyar and London (2018a) focused on cisgender participants, the reason behind this recruitment choice is unclear, as other studies have included transgender participants (e.g., Salim et al., 2019). Thus, both cisgender and transgender participants were eligible to participate in this

study. The following inclusion criteria were used: participants had to be between 18 and 35 years old, have access to the Internet and e-mail, live in Canada, and self-identify as bisexual or feel that the label of bisexual was applicable to their sexuality. Participants were limited to this age bracket to avoid potential cohort influences, especially given substantial changes in identity discourses and experiences for 2SLGBTQ+ individuals over the past 50 years (American Psychological Association, 2012). Participants were recruited through social media, postings on the University of Saskatchewan's PAWS channel, and organizations across Canada that work with 2SLGBTQ+ individuals. In recognition of their participation, respondents could enter up to five draws for an Amazon gift certificate (50 dollars each).

Procedure

Interested participants were provided with a link to an initial survey where they were asked to provide basic demographic information. If they met the criteria for the study, they were asked for informed consent, contact information, and a day of the week and time during which they would like to complete the surveys. They then completed the baseline survey. Participants who completed the baseline survey were contacted and assigned an ID number. They then received a weekly e-mail with the relevant survey link for the following three weeks.

Measures

The measures used in this study are described below. Importantly, all measures, except for the Generalized Anxiety Disorder 7, the Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale, and the Bisexual Microaffirmation Scale, used feeling thermometers rather than Likert scales.

Participants rated their agreement or disagreement to each item using a sliding scale with 101 points, ranging from 0 (*strongly disagree or never*) to 100 (*strongly agree or always*), where 50 was labelled "neutral". The choice to use feeling thermometers rather than Likert scales was

based on previous research showing that questions with greater numbers of response categories are more reliable and valid, and are inherently more precise measures (Alwin, 1997; Krosnick et al., 2018). Additionally, feeling thermometers may be more sensitive to smaller changes in the constructs of interest (Krosnick et al., 2018).

Baseline Measures

Anxiety. The Generalized Anxiety Disorder 7 (GAD; Spitzer et al., 2006) was used to assess anxiety. Participants rate the extent to which they have experienced each symptom in the past two weeks, on a scale from 0 (*not at all*) to 3 (*nearly every day*). Sample items include “Feeling nervous, anxious, or on edge” and “Becoming easily annoyed or irritable”. Total scores on the GAD-7 range from 0 to 21, with higher scores indicating greater levels of anxiety. In support of the measure’s convergent validity, researchers have found that scores on the GAD-7 correlate positively with internalized binegativity, sexual identity uncertainty, depression, and rejection sensitivity, and correlate negatively with strength of identification as bisexual (Dyar & London, 2018a). Scale score reliability coefficients on this scale range from .81 to .92 (Dyar & London, 2018a; Kaysen et al., 2014).

Bisexual identity affirmation. This construct was measured using the 6-item Identity Affirmation subscale of the Bisexual Identity Inventory (BII-A; Paul et al., 2014). Participants rate the extent to which they agree with each statement on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Items on this subscale include “I am proud to be bisexual” and “Being bisexual is rewarding to me.” Total scores range from 5 to 42, with higher scores indicating greater bisexual identity affirmation. Demonstrating convergent validity, scores on this subscale have been negatively correlated with internalized binegativity and depression

(Dyar & London, 2018a; Paul et al., 2014). Scale score reliability coefficients have ranged from .69 to .93 (Dyar & London, 2018a; Paul et al., 2014).

Depression. This variable was measured using the 7-item Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale – Short Form (CESD; Levine, 2013), which is a modified version of the 20-item CESD. Participants rate the extent to which they have experienced each symptom in the past two weeks, on a scale from 0 (*rarely or none of the time*) to 3 (*most or all of the time*). Sample items include “Sad” and “Trouble keeping mind on tasks.” Total scores on the scale range from 0 to 21, with higher scores indicating greater levels of depressive symptomatology. Scores on this scale have been found to correlate positively with internalized binegativity, sexual identity uncertainty, anxiety, and rejection sensitivity and to correlate negatively with strength of identification as bisexual (Dyar & London, 2018a; Kaysen et al., 2014). Scale score reliability coefficients on this scale range from .80 to .94 (Dyar & London, 2018a; Kaysen et al., 2014).

Identity certainty and centrality. These variables were measured using the 18-item Bisexual Identity Certainty and Centrality (BICC-CERT and BICC-CENT) scale developed by Flanders (2015). Illustrative items include “Being bisexual is an important reflection of who I am” (centrality) and “My level of comfort with my bisexual identity is not dependent upon my past or present sexual behaviour” (certainty). Higher scores indicate greater identity centrality and certainty. This measure’s convergent validity is evidenced by its negative correlation with anxiety. Scale score reliability coefficients on this scale range from .79 to .87 (Flanders, 2015).

Internalized binegativity. Internalized binegativity was measured using the 5-item Internalized Binegativity subscale of the Bisexual Identity Inventory (BII-IB; Paul et al., 2014). Sample items on this subscale include “My life would be better off if I were not bisexual” and “Being bisexual prevents me from having meaningful intimate relationships.” Higher scores

indicate higher levels of internalized binegativity. In support of the measure's convergent validity, scores on this subscale have correlated positively with anticipated binegativity and depression and correlated negatively with bisexual identity affirmation (Paul et al., 2014). Scale score reliability coefficients have ranged from .72 to .87 (Dyar & London, 2018a; Paul et al., 2014; Salim et al., 2019).

Preoccupation with others' thoughts. Preoccupation was measured using the 3-item Preoccupation subscale of the Sexual Orientation Reflection and Rumination Scale (SORRS-P, Galupo & Bauerband, 2015). A sample item on this subscale is "I try to figure out what others think about my sexual orientation." Higher scores indicate greater preoccupation. In support of the measure's convergent validity, researchers have found that scores on this subscale correlate positively with identity salience, perceived stigma, distal minority stress, anxiety, and depression (Galupo & Bauerband, 2015; Gonzalez et al., 2018). Scale score reliability coefficients have ranged from .69 to .83 (Galupo & Bauerband, 2015; Gonzalez et al., 2018).

Sexual identity uncertainty. This construct was measured using the 4-item Identity Uncertainty subscale of the Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Identity Scale – Revised (LGBIS-IU; Mohr & Kendra, 2011). Items on this subscale include "I'm not totally sure what my sexual orientation is" and "I keep changing my mind about my sexual orientation." Higher scores indicate greater uncertainty about one's sexual identity. The measure's convergent validity is evidenced by positive correlations between scores on this subscale and acceptance concerns, identity concealment, rejection sensitivity, depression, and internalized stigma, and negative correlations with identity affirmation and identity centrality (Dyar & London, 2018a; Mohr & Kendra, 2011). Scale score reliability coefficients have ranged from .88 to .93 (Mohr & Kendra, 2011).

Weekly Surveys

Anxiety. The Generalized Anxiety Disorder 7 (GAD; Spitzer et al., 2006) was used to assess this variable. See the Baseline Measures section for the description of the GAD.

Bipositive events (BE). Frequency and type of bipositive events were measured using all four subscales (Acceptance [BMS-A], Social Support [BMS-SS], Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia [BMS-R], and Emotional Support [BMS-ES]) of a modified version of the 16-item Bisexual Microaffirmation Scale for Women (BMS; Flanders et al., 2019a). Instructions and responses were modified to reflect the number of times each situation was experienced in the past week, rather than the original 6 months. Participants rate the number of times they have experienced each situation in the past week, on a scale from 0 (*never*) to 3 (*multiple times a day*). Example items include “Someone respected my opinions about bisexuality” and “Someone supported my relationships.” Total scores on the scale range from 0 to 80, with higher scores indicating more frequent occurrence of microaffirmation events. The BMS’ convergent validity is evident in the positive correlations that have been observed between scores on this scale and scores on measures of identity affirmation and outness (DeLucia & Smith, 2021; Flanders et al., 2019a). Scale score reliability coefficients on this scale range from .89 to .92 (DeLucia & Smith, 2021; Flanders et al., 2019a). Importantly, while the scale was originally developed for women, items on this scale are non-gendered and the scale has been used with bisexual men (DeLucia & Smith, 2021).

In addition to this scale, an “other” option was used to allow participants to list bipositive events that they feel are not represented by the scale. Additional events listed here were analyzed and given an appropriate score based on the event’s frequency (e.g., if a participant indicated a specific event happening once, it was given a score of 1 [*once*]).

Bisexual identity affirmation. This construct was measured using the 6-item Identity Affirmation subscale of the Bisexual Identity Inventory (BII-A; Paul et al., 2014). See the Baseline Measures section for the description of this scale.

Depression. Depression was measured using the 7-item Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale – Short Form (CESD; Levine, 2013). See the Baseline Measures section for the description of this scale.

Identity certainty and centrality. The Bisexual Identity Certainty and Centrality scale (Flanders, 2015) was used to measure these concepts. See the Baseline Measures section for the description of this measure.

Internalized binegativity. Internalized binegativity was measured using the 5-item Internalized Binegativity subscale of the Bisexual Identity Inventory (BII-IB; Paul et al., 2014). See the Baseline Measures section for the description of this scale.

Preoccupation with others' thoughts. Preoccupation was measured using the 3-item Preoccupation subscale of the Sexual Orientation Reflection and Rumination Scale (SORRS-P; Galupo & Bauerband, 2015). See the Baseline Measures section for the description of this scale.

Sexual identity uncertainty. Sexual identity uncertainty was measured using the 4-item Identity Uncertainty subscale of the Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Identity Scale – Revised (LGBIS-IU; Mohr & Kendra, 2011). See the Baseline Measures section for the description of this scale.

Data Analysis

Data for this study were analyzed through several methods. First, to determine whether women report more bipositive events (*HI*), two statistical tests were conducted. To begin, I used a 3 (gender: men, women, non-binary) x 3 (week: 1, 2, 3) mixed ANOVA⁴, with summed

reported bipoisitive events as the dependent variable. To take into consideration the different *types* of bipoisitive events, I also conducted a 3 (gender: men, women, non-binary) x 3 (week: 1, 2, 3) mixed repeated-measures MANOVA, with the four categories of bipoisitive events serving as dependent variables (i.e., Acceptance, Social Support, Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia, and Emotional Support). A MANOVA was conducted to limit the chance of a Type I error, rather than conducting several ANOVAs; in addition, since all of the categories come from the same scale, a MANOVA allowed me to measure and compare multiple facets of the same concept (Finch, 2005).

The second set of hypotheses (i.e., *H2a* through *H2c*), which asserted that experiencing a greater number of bipoisitive events would be associated with decreases in proximal stressors, increases in identity affirmation, and decreases in internalizing symptoms, was tested using multilevel mediation. A similar analysis was used to test Hypothesis 3; namely, that the associations between bipoisitive events and internalizing symptoms would be mediated by proximal stressors and identity affirmation. Multilevel mediation is commonly used to examine mediation in longitudinal data (Zhang et al., 2009), which allowed me to examine how proximal stressors and bisexual identity varied over time within participants in relation to experiencing bipoisitive events, whether gender accounted for any differences in these outcomes between participants, and whether bisexual identity variables and/or proximal stressors mediated any relationships between experiencing bipoisitive events and decreased internalizing symptoms. In addition, multilevel mediation allowed me to examine whether these relationships existed at the within-person level or at the between-person level. In other words, I was interested in whether these effects were significant when comparing each individual's scores to their own scores over

several weeks, and whether these effects were significant when comparing individual's average scores to each other. Data were analyzed in SPSS.

As some of the analyses in this study required change scores, I calculated standardized residuals by predicting variables at time_x using the variable at time_{x-1} (i.e., baseline scores predicted scores at week one, scores at week one predicted scores at week two, etc.). Residual change scores are considered a more reliable method of analyzing change than simple difference scores (Castro-Schilo & Grimm, 2017).

Results

In total, 352 individuals completed the initial survey. Of those 352 individuals, 61 completed one follow-up, 76 completed two follow-ups, and 105 completed three follow-ups. Participants who provided baseline data and at least one follow-up survey point, with a minimum of 3 days between the baseline and follow-up dates, were included in the analyses. Thus, the final sample included 242 participants: 39 men (16%), 144 women (59%), and 43 non-binary individuals (18%). An additional 16 individuals (6.6%) identified their gender as “other”, providing answers such as “genderfluid”, “gender queer”, or a mix of several identities (e.g., “woman and gender-fluid”). Non-binary and individuals who identified their gender as “other” were grouped into one category. Despite this being a very expansive category, covering a wide amount of heterogeneity in gender (Chang & Chung, 2015), there is little to no research done with non-binary bisexual individuals, and this study thus follows the call from Matsuno & Budge (2017) to explicitly include non-binary individuals in empirical research, particularly those that address the intersection of non-binary and other sociopolitical identities. The majority (74.1%, $n = 180$) of individuals identified as White, with smaller proportions identifying as South Asian (2.9%, $n = 7$), Southeast Asian (2.5%, $n = 6$), Black (2.5%, $n = 6$), East Asian (2.1%, $n = 5$), and

Indigenous (1.2%, $n = 3$). An additional proportion (12%, $n = 30$) identified with two or more ethnic categories.

In terms of location, most participants were from Saskatchewan (27.2%, $n = 66$), Ontario (21%, $n = 51$), and British Columbia (17.7%, $n = 43$), with smaller proportions from every other province, as well as the Northwest Territories. No participants were from Yukon or Nunavut. Most participants were from cities with a population of 100,000 to 299,999 residents (32.8%, $n = 79$), cities with a population of 300,000 to one million residents (24.4%, $n = 59$), or cities of over one million residents (20.3%, $n = 49$).

Participants were asked to provide their sexual orientation as a short answer. The majority of participants (92.1%, $n = 223$) used the term “bisexual,” with smaller percentages using “pansexual” (13.6%, $n = 33$), “queer” (10.7%, $n = 26$), “demisexual” or “asexual” (4.6%, $n = 11$), “questioning” (1.6%, $n = 4$), and “lesbian” (1.2%, $n = 3$). In addition, about a quarter of the sample reported multiple sexual orientation labels (23.1%, $n = 56$), e.g., “bisexual and queer”.

Table 1 displays the descriptive statistics for the measures used in this study. Scale score reliability coefficients were satisfactory for all measures.

Initial Analyses

Participants’ mean scores for internalized binegativity and sexual identity uncertainty were below scale midpoints. Thus, overall, participants did not report experiencing high levels of binegativity or uncertainty about their sexual identity. Participants also scored consistently above the midpoint for bisexual identity affirmation and identity certainty. Finally, participants were near the midpoint for depression, anxiety, identity centrality, and preoccupation with others’ thoughts.

In general, participants scored below the midpoint for bisexual events, with means ranging from 14.47 – 16.60 over the course of the study. Means were closest to the midpoint for the *Acceptance* subscale, and furthest from the midpoint for the *Recognition of Bisexuality & Biphobia* subscale. However, all participants indicated experiencing at least one bipoisitive event throughout the course of the study.

Over the three weeks, 180 people provided written answers to the question “If, in the past week, you have experienced any bipoisitive event(s) (events that you felt affirmed your bisexuality) that were not listed above, please describe them below and indicate how often you experienced them.” These answers were classified as *Acceptance*, *Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia*, *Social Support*, or *Emotional Support* events, based on how closely they mirrored the events in each of these categories. In total, 35 events were classified as *Acceptance*, 47 were classified as *Social Support*, 21 were classified as *Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia*, and 17 were classified as *Emotional Support*. Themes noted throughout these events included: finding support, *Acceptance*, or recognition on social media (18 events), accessing support groups (7 events), looking for representation in media (9 events), recognizing internal attraction (5 events), and celebrating bisexuality with other bisexual individuals (24 events). Qualitative responses and their subsequent classifications are presented in Appendix A.

At each week, a correlational analysis was conducted to examine associations between scale scores. Tables 2-9 displays the results of these analyses. First, at baseline (Table 2), predictors were related to each other as expected: that is, all identity affirmation variables (bisexual identity affirmation, identity centrality, and identity certainty) correlated positively with each other, as were all proximal stressor variables (internalized binegativity, identity uncertainty, and preoccupation with others’ thoughts). In addition, all identity affirmation

variables correlated negatively with all proximal stressor variables, except for identity affirmation and preoccupation, which were uncorrelated, and identity centrality and uncertainty, which were uncorrelated. Only two of the affirmation/proximal stressor variables were correlated with internalizing symptoms: 1) identity certainty, which correlated negatively to anxiety and depression, and 2) preoccupation with others' thoughts, which correlated positively to anxiety and depression.

At week 1 (Table 3), the sum of all bipoisitive events was positively correlated with identity centrality, identity certainty, and identity affirmation, as well as negatively correlated with internalized binegativity. Interestingly, this sum was also *positively* correlated with preoccupation with other's thoughts. The sum of each of the four categories of bipoisitive events (i.e., Acceptance, Social Support, Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia, and Emotional Support) correlated positively with identity centrality and identity affirmation. Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events were the only ones not significantly correlated with identity certainty. Emotional Support and Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events correlated positively with preoccupation with other's thoughts, and Acceptance and Emotional Support events correlated negatively with internalized binegativity. Finally, Social Support events were positively correlated with depression.

At week 2 (Table 4), the sum of all bipoisitive events, again, correlated positively with identity centrality, identity certainty, identity affirmation, and preoccupation with others' thoughts, as well as negatively correlated with internalized binegativity. The sum of each of the four categories of bipoisitive events (i.e., Acceptance, Social Support, Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia, and Emotional Support) correlated positively with identity certainty and identity affirmation. Emotional Support events were the only ones not significantly correlated with

identity centrality. Acceptance, Social Support, and Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events correlated positively with preoccupation with others' thoughts, and Acceptance and Emotional Support events correlated negatively with internalized binegativity. No events correlated with anxiety or depression.

At week 3 (Table 5), the sum of all bipositive events correlated positively with identity centrality and identity affirmation and correlated negatively with internalized binegativity. Unlike before, there was no correlation between identity certainty and bipositive events, nor between preoccupation with other's thoughts and bipositive events. The sum of each of the four categories of bipositive events (i.e., Acceptance, Social Support, Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia, and Emotional Support) correlated positively with identity centrality and identity affirmation. Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events were positively correlated with preoccupation with other's thoughts, and Acceptance and Social Support events correlated negatively with internalized binegativity. None of the four event categories correlated with anxiety or depression.

Data was then transformed into vertical format for comparisons across weeks (Table 6). Overall, bipositive events correlated negatively with internalized binegativity and sexual identity uncertainty, and correlated positively with identity affirmation, preoccupation, identity centrality, and identity certainty. The four categories of bipositive events (i.e., Acceptance, Social Support, Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia, and Emotional Support) correlated positively with identity affirmation, identity centrality, and identity certainty, and correlated negatively with sexual identity uncertainty. Acceptance events, Social Support events, and Emotional Support events correlated negatively with internalized binegativity. Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events were the only type of event that correlated significantly with preoccupation with

others' thoughts. Finally, none of the four bipositive event categories correlated significantly with anxiety or depression.

Additional correlations were run between bipositive events and residual change scores. For week 1 (Table 7), bipositive events, in general, correlated positively with increases in preoccupation with others' thoughts. Social Support was the only type of event that did not correlate with preoccupation. For week 2 (Table 8), bipositive events, in general, correlated positively with increases in identity affirmation; Acceptance events were the only one of the four categories of bipositive events that did not correlate with identity affirmation. As well, Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events correlated positively with preoccupation with others' thoughts, and correlated negatively with sexual identity uncertainty. For week 3 (Table 9), there were no statistically significant correlations between bipositive events in general and any of the other variables of interest; however, number of Social Support events correlated positively with identity centrality.

Several ANOVAS were run to compare whether scores on proximal stressors, identity variables, or mental health outcomes differed by gender. Gender differences were observed for two variables. Specifically, at every week, gender differences were noted for internalized binegativity (baseline: $F(2, 207) = 4.977, p < .008$; week 1: $F(2, 195) = 8.460, p < .001$; week 2: $F(2, 157) = 3.601, p < .05$; week 3: $F(2, 145) = 5.890, p < .01$). Post-hoc tests revealed that men scored higher than both women and non-binary people, except for week two, where men's scores on internalized binegativity differed from non-binary participants only. In addition, at every week, gender differences were observed for bisexual identity affirmation (baseline: $F(2, 234) = 8.671, p < .007$; week one: $F(2, 207) = 9.276, p < .001$; week two: $F(2, 166) = 6.197, p < .01$;

week three: $F(2, 153) = 5.721, p < .01$). Post-hoc tests revealed that men scored significantly lower than both women and non-binary people.

Frequency of Bipositive Events

To compare whether frequency of bipositive events differed by gender, I ran a 3 (gender: man, woman, non-binary) x 3 (week: 1, 2, 3) mixed repeated-measures ANOVA ($N = 91$). There was no significant interaction effect, $F(4, 174) = .245, p = 0.913$. There was a statistically significant main effect of week, $F(1.932, 189.345) = 5.507, p < .01$. Contrasts revealed that participants reported significantly more events in week one than week two, $F(1, 98) = 8.721, p < .005$. There was no significant effect of gender, $F(2, 98) = .048, p = .953$.

Following the ANOVA, a 3 (gender: man, woman, non-binary) x 3 (week: 1, 2, 3) mixed repeated-measures MANOVA was run with the four types of events (Acceptance, recognition, Emotional Support, and Social Support) as the dependent variables ($N = 91$). There was no significant interaction effect, $F(16, 162) = .501, p = .944$. Wilk's Lambda was significant for gender, $F(8, 170) = 2.358, p < .05$, implying that frequencies of events experienced may differ by gender. To decompose this multivariate effect, a discriminant function analysis was conducted. However, no statistically significant findings were observed, $\chi^2(24) = 24.004, p = .461$. Thus, hypothesis 1 was not supported.

Mediation Models

To examine whether changes in mental health outcomes could be explained by changes in proximal stressors and identity variables, multilevel mediation models were run. Note that the N provided for each refers to individual scores, where 1-3 scores could come from the same person. Thus, N s refer to within-person scores, rather than between-person scores.

Proximal Stressors & Bisexual Identity Variables

Bipositive Events. First, I examined whether proximal stressors and identity variables could be predicted by bipositive events ($N = 500$). At the within-person level, bipositive events significantly predicted higher identity affirmation, $b = .966$, $SE = .449$, $p = .031$. At the between-person level, bipositive events significantly predicted lower internalized binegativity, $b = -2.318$, $SE = .955$, $p = .015$; higher preoccupation with others' thoughts, $b = 1.937$, $SE = .689$, $p = .005$; higher identity affirmation, $b = 5.418$, $SE = .923$, $p < .001$; higher identity centrality, $b = 6.085$, $SE = 1.247$, $p < .001$; and higher identity certainty, $b = 5.833$, $SE = 1.496$, $p < .001$.

This model was then rerun three times, using a separate gender group for each. For non-binary people ($N = 120$), there were no significant within-person effects, and the only significant between-person effect was for higher preoccupation with others' thoughts, $b = 3.316$, $SE = .1474$, $p = .024$. For men ($N = 84$), identity affirmation was significantly predicted by bipositive events at the within-person level, $b = 2.403$, $SE = 1.144$, $p = .036$, and at the between-person level, $b = 5.687$, $SE = 1.594$, $p < .001$. Finally, for women ($N = 296$), only identity variables were significantly predicted by bipositive events at the between-person level (affirmation: $b = 7.089$, $SE = 1.306$, $p < .001$; centrality: $b = 9.544$, $SE = 1.709$, $p < .001$; certainty: $b = 9.343$, $SE = 2.147$, $p < .001$).

I then examined whether events in general could predict *changes* in scores. For the combined data ($N = 520$), there were no significant within-person effects. However, at the between-person level, bipositive events predicted *increases* in preoccupation with others' thoughts, $b = .015$, $SE = .006$, $p = .015$, as well as increases in identity centrality, $b = .012$, $SE = .006$, $p = .027$.

Finally, these data were analyzed again with separate gender groups. There were no significant effects for non-binary people ($N = 125$). For men ($N = 89$), bipositive events predicted

decreases in identity certainty at the within-person level, $b = -.121$, $SE = .053$, $p = .023$. There were no between-person effects. Finally, for women ($N = 306$), bipositive events predicted *increases* in identity centrality at the between-person level, $b = .022$, $SE = .009$, $p = .009$.

Event Types. The original model was rerun with separate types of events as the predictor. For the combined data ($N = 525$), Emotional Support events predicted higher identity affirmation at the within-person level, $b = 3.197$, $SE = 1.501$, $p = .033$. At the between-person level, Acceptance events, $b = -7.042$, $SE = 2.768$, $p = .011$, Social Support events, $b = -14.934$, $SE = 4.938$, $p = .002$, and Emotional Support events, $b = -11.602$, $SE = 3.794$, $p = .002$, significantly predicted lower internalized binegativity. Acceptance events, $b = 4.562$, $SE = 2.001$, $p = .023$, and Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events, $b = 6.568$, $SE = 2.247$, $p = .003$, predicted *higher* preoccupation with others' thoughts. Acceptance events, $b = 16.335$, $SE = 2.702$, $p < .001$, Social Support events, $b = 28.080$, $SE = 5.147$, $p < .001$, Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events, $b = 10.749$, $SE = 3.256$, $p = .001$, and Emotional Support events, $b = 19.111$, $SE = 3.704$, $p < .001$, all predicted higher identity affirmation. Acceptance events, $b = 16.854$, $SE = 3.641$, $p < .001$, Social Support events, $b = 29.813$, $SE = 6.475$, $p < .001$, Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events, $b = 17.859$, $SE = 4.188$, $p < .001$, and Social Support events, $b = 16.973$, $SE = 5.052$, $p = .001$, all predicted higher identity centrality. Finally, Acceptance events, $b = 15.894$, $SE = 4.383$, $p < .001$, Social Support events, $b = 33.577$, $SE = 8.458$, $p < .001$, Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events, $b = 14.067$, $SE = 5.237$, $p = .007$, and Emotional Support events, $b = 22.792$, $SE = 5.955$, $p < .001$, all predicted higher identity certainty.

I then examined this model with separate gender groups. For non-binary people ($N = 129$), at the within-person level, Social Support events, $b = 7.403$, $SE = 3.732$, $p = .047$, and

Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events, $b = 6.058$, $SE = 2.812$, $p = .031$, predicted higher identity centrality. In addition, Emotional Support events predicted *higher* internalized binegativity, $b = 7.066$, $SE = 3.163$, $p = .025$. At the between-person level, Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events, $b = 11.593$, $SE = 5.308$, $p = .029$, and Emotional Support events, $b = 16.773$, $SE = 5.550$, $p = .003$, predicted higher preoccupation with others' thoughts. For men ($N = 86$), at the within-person level, Acceptance events significantly predicted higher identity affirmation, $b = 8.057$, $SE = 2.608$, $p = .002$. In addition, Social Support events significantly predicted *lower* identity certainty, $b = -15.115$, $SE = 7.046$, $p = .032$, and Emotional Support events significantly predicted higher identity affirmation, $b = 9.062$, $SE = 3.888$, $p = .020$. At the between-person level, Acceptance events, $b = 19.010$, $SE = 5.016$, $p < .001$, Social Support events, $b = 31.498$, $SE = 9.120$, $p < .001$, and Emotional Support events, $b = 15.320$, $SE = 6.520$, $p = .019$, significantly predicted higher identity affirmation. Social Support events, $b = 31.637$, $SE = 14.717$, $p = .032$, and Emotional Support events, $b = 19.497$, $SE = 9.644$, $p = .043$, also predicted higher identity certainty. Finally, for women ($N = 310$), at the within-persons level, Acceptance events predicted lower internalized binegativity, $b = -3.805$, $SE = 1.743$, $p = .029$. At the between person level, Social Support events, $b = -15.433$, $SE = 6.868$, $p = .025$, and Emotional Support events, $b = -14.130$, $SE = 5.029$, $p = .005$, predicted lower internalized binegativity. Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events, $b = -8.447$, $SE = 4.280$, $p = .048$, and Emotional Support events, $b = -12.691$, $SE = 4.672$, $p = .007$, predicted lower identity uncertainty. Acceptance events, $b = 18.821$, $SE = 3.485$, $p < .001$, Social Support events, $b = 38.721$, $SE = 7.923$, $p < .001$, Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events, $b = 20.178$, $SE = 4.997$, $p < .001$, and Emotional Support events, $b = 30.290$, $SE = 5.260$, $p < .001$, predicted higher identity affirmation. Acceptance events, $b = 22.855$, $SE = 4.759$, $p < .001$, Social Support

events, $b = 52.046$, $SE = 9.395$, $p < .001$, Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events, $b = 31.385$, $SE = 6.400$, $p < .001$, and Emotional Support events, $b = 28.375$, $SE = 7.343$, $p < .001$, predicted higher identity centrality. Lastly, Acceptance events, $b = 21.109$, $SE = 5.752$, $p < .001$, Social Support events, $b = 52.478$, $SE = 13.536$, $p < .001$, Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events, $b = 32.011$, $SE = 8.237$, $p < .001$, and Emotional Support events, $b = 43.124$, $SE = 8.641$, $p < .001$, predicted higher identity certainty.

I then examined whether the four event types could predict *changes* in scores. For the combined data ($N = 442$), there were no within-person effects. At the between-person level, Acceptance events predicted increases in preoccupation with others' thoughts, $b = .038$, $SE = .019$, $p < .042$, as well as increases in identity centrality, $b = .037$, $SE = .016$, $p = .023$. Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events, $b = .049$, $SE = .021$, $p = .024$, and Emotional Support events, $b = .053$, $SE = .024$, $p = .028$, also predicted increases in preoccupation with others' thoughts. Finally, Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events predicted decreases in internalized binegativity, $b = -.049$, $SE = .024$, $p = .042$.

Finally, this model was examined with separate gender groups. For non-binary people ($N = 100$), at the within-person level, Social Support events predicted increases in identity centrality, $b = .246$, $SE = .075$, $p = .001$. At the between-person level, Social Support events predicted *decreases* in identity centrality, $b = -.080$, $SE = .040$, $p = .048$, while Emotional Support events predicted increases in preoccupation with others' thoughts, $b = .120$, $SE = .054$, $p = .027$. For men, ($N = 77$), at the within-person level, Acceptance events predicted decreases in internalized binegativity, $b = -.230$, $SE = .092$, $p = .013$; in addition, Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events predicted *increases* in identity uncertainty, $b = .0193$, $SE = .064$, $p = .003$, and Emotional Support events predicted *decreases* in identity certainty, $b = -.449$, $SE = .181$, $p =$

.013. At the between-person level, Acceptance events predicted increases in preoccupation with others' thoughts, $b = .065$, $SE = .033$, $p = .049$, as did Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events, $b = .076$, $SE = .032$, $p = .016$. Finally, for women ($N = 253$), at the within-person level, Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events predicted increases in preoccupation with others' thoughts, $b = .091$, $SE = .044$, $p = .038$. At the between-person level, Acceptance events, $b = .053$, $SE = .024$, $p = .024$, Social Support events, $b = .100$, $SE = .043$, $p = .021$, and Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events, $b = .074$, $SE = .031$, $p = .018$, predicted increases in identity centrality.

Summary. Tables 10 (scores) and 11 (change scores) present a summary of the findings. In general, bipositive events were able to predict lower internalized binegativity, but mostly for women. In addition, bipositive events tended to predict *higher* preoccupation scores, as well as *increases* in preoccupation. Bipositive events tended to predict higher identity affirmation scores; interestingly, this finding did not hold for the nonbinary sample. Similarly, bipositive events predicted higher identity centrality scores, but not for men. Finally, while bipositive events tended to predict higher identity certainty scores for women, they often led to *decreases* in identity certainty for men.

Importantly, while bipositive events could often predict scores, they did not reliably predict *changes* in scores; thus, *H2a* and *H2b* are largely unsupported.

Anxiety and Depression

The second step was to examine whether events predicted levels of anxiety and depression. There were no within- or between-person effects for the data as a whole ($N = 500$), nor for separate gender groups (non-binary: $N = 120$; men: $N = 84$; women: $N = 296$).

I also examined the different types of bipositive events. For the combined sample ($N = 525$), Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events significantly predicted *increases* in depression at the between-person level, $b = .043$, $SE = .019$, $p = .022$. This finding was noteworthy for women ($N = 310$), where Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events predicted higher scores on depression at the between-person level, $b = .0432$, $SE = .0202$, $p = .032$, as well as increases in depression at the between-person level, $b = .063$, $SE = .024$, $p = .008$. Social Support events predicted *higher* depression scores for the combined sample at the between-person level, $b = .407$, $SE = .205$, $p = .047$. In contrast, Emotional Support events significantly predicted lower depression scores for men at the between-person level, $b = -.633$, $SE = .315$, $p = .045$. Finally, Social Support events predicted higher scores on anxiety for men ($N = 86$) at the within-person level, $b = .590$, $SE = .285$, $p = .039$. For women ($N = 310$), Social Support events predicted higher anxiety scores, $b = .743$, $SE = .323$, $p = .021$, and higher depression scores, $b = .621$, $SE = .278$, $p = .025$, at the between-person level.

Summary. Tables 10 (scores) and 11 (changes) present a summary of the findings. In general, findings tended to be null or opposite; in particular, certain types of bipositive events predicted higher anxiety and depression scores, as well as increases in depression. Thus, *H3a* is unsupported.

Mediation

The first model examined whether a relationship between bipositive events and anxiety was mediated by preoccupation with others' thoughts. The indirect effect of bipositive events on anxiety scores through preoccupation was statistically significant, $N = 712$, $b = .032$, $SE = .009$, $p < .001$. There was a similar mediation effect between Acceptance events and anxiety, $N = 734$, $b = .070$, $SE = .024$, $p = .003$, as well as with Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events

and anxiety, $N = 719$, $b = .100$, $SE = .026$, $p < .001$. Thus, bipositive events – particularly Acceptance events and Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events – predicted higher preoccupation with others' thoughts, which in turn predicted higher anxiety scores.

The second model examined whether a relationship between bipositive events and anxiety was mediated by preoccupation with others' thoughts for non-binary people in particular. This mediation effect also was statistically significant, $N = 166$, $b = .042$, $SE = .021$, $p = .047$.

Finally, the third model examined whether a relationship between Social Support events and anxiety was mediated by identity certainty. This mediation effect was not statistically significant.

In general, most proximal stressors and identity variables did not mediate relationships, and those that did mediated an opposite effect than hypothesized. Thus, $H3$ is unsupported.

Discussion

Using a weekly diary format, I aimed to explore how often bisexual individuals experience different types of bipositive events, and whether there are any gender differences in these experiences. I also explored whether different types of bipositive events predict decreases in anxiety and depression, and whether these decreases could be explained by changes in proximal stressors – internalized binegativity, sexual identity uncertainty, and preoccupation with others' thoughts - and bisexual identity variables – identity affirmation, identity centrality, and identity certainty.

On average, the frequencies of bipositive events did not differ based on gender. Bipositive events predicted scores and changes on most proximal stressors and identity variables. In addition, interactions arose between types of bipositive events and gender, such that some events predicted higher anxiety and depression scores for certain genders, while others predicted

lower scores. However, preoccupation with others' thoughts was the only significant mediator between bipoisitive events and anxiety and depression, and the relationship between bipoisitive events and anxiety/depression was the opposite of what was expected. Thus, most hypotheses were unsupported.

Experiencing Bipoisitive Events

H1, which stated that women would, on average, experience more bipoisitive events than men, was not supported. However, there was an interesting effect of time, with participants reporting significantly more events in week one than week two. It is possible that, again, this is an artefact of the study design; participants may have been more motivated to look for bipoisitive events in their life during the first follow-up than subsequent follow-ups. The finding that the number of experiences of bipoisitive events does not differ by gender is of note. Due to previous research that men are less likely than are women to have positive orientations towards their bisexuality and to disclose their bisexuality, I originally hypothesized that men would experience *fewer* bipoisitive events than women do, as they may be less likely to be in environments where they would encounter such events. In fact, this finding implies that the actual number of experienced bipoisitive events may be similar regardless of gender. This would, in turn, imply that the issue may not be the *number* of bipoisitive events experienced. Other factors – such as whether the event occurs with known others or with strangers or the actual content of the events themselves – may be more important in affecting well-being.

The average number of events reported per week – between 14 and 16 – was much higher than Flanders (2015), who found that most participants experienced 1-2 positive events a day (7-14 events a week), and Dyar and London (2018), who found that participants experienced an average of 2.94 interpersonal bipoisitive events per week. It is closest to Salim et al. (2019), who

found that the average microaffirmations score was 1.88 per day – totaling around 14 per week. The relatively high average level of experienced events in this sample implies a potential sampling bias, where participants who were already aware of experiencing quite a few bipoisitive events were more likely to participate in the study. In addition, this level was relatively high even though most participants indicated that they believed they were experiencing *fewer* bipoisitive events due to COVID-19 – in particular, these participants expressed that they were experiencing fewer events because they were not participating in in-person social interactions where they might typically experience these events. However, it is worth noting that some participants experienced more events due to the pandemic, as they were able to control the environments they were in to a greater extent than they usually could (e.g., choosing to be in supportive online environments). Thus, future research is needed to determine whether these findings hold across samples of bisexual participants who experience a smaller number of bipoisitive events per week. It is possible that many of the null findings were due to relatively high numbers of bipoisitive events experienced; these events may have greater impact on those who experience them rarely.

Bipoisitive Events, Proximal Stressors, and Identity Variables

Across all weeks, bipoisitive events were positively correlated with identity centrality, identity certainty, and identity affirmation, and negatively correlated with internalized binegativity and sexual identity uncertainty. This implies that, in general, experiencing more bipoisitive events is related to higher levels of identity centrality, identity certainty, and identity affirmation, as well as lower levels of internalized binegativity and sexual identity uncertainty. This association may be because of one’s environment. People who are in environments where they are experiencing more interpersonal bipoisitive events may have built up higher levels of identity certainty, centrality, and affirmation over time; alternatively, people who already have

higher identity certainty, centrality, and affirmation may seek environments that are more affirming of their identities or may be more prone to perceive and remember these events. Either way, this result emphasizes the importance of considering bipositive events as an environmental factor when examining positive bisexual identity.

In addition to the previous relationships, some interesting correlations arose when comparing *changes* in scores. Bipositive events were correlated with increases in preoccupation with others' thoughts in week one, and with increases in identity affirmation in week two. Increases in preoccupation with others' thoughts may have been an effect of mere participation in the study; awareness that they would be asked to report bipositive events may have led participants to pay more attention to how others perceived their bisexuality. This is similar to Flanders et al. (2017), who, in qualitatively exploring bipositive experiences, often reported study participation being experienced as an interpersonal bipositive event. On the other hand, the week two increases in identity affirmation may have been a lagged effect; potentially, it takes a couple of weeks to build up enough bipositive events to cause a change in identity affirmation. This interpretation is supported by Flanders (2015), who suggested that microaffirmations could have lasting buffering effects on well-being. However, it was outside of the scope of this study to fully explore this effect.

Multilevel mediation models examined how bipositive events might impact scores and changes in proximal stressors and identity variables, as well as to explore the role gender could play in this interaction. First, bipositive events predicted decreased internalized binegativity at the between-person level. In other words, participants who reported experiencing more bipositive events also reported decreased scores in internalized binegativity, when compared to other participants. This finding is similar to Dyar and London (2018a), who reported that bipositive

events tended to decrease internalized binegativity. As internalized binegativity is a proximal stressor related to negative health outcomes (Meyer, 2003), this finding emphasizes the role that bipositive events could play in improving the overall health of bisexual individuals.

Secondly, as noted above, bipositive events predicted *increased* preoccupation with others' thoughts. Interestingly, this was only significant at the between-person level. In other words, a participant's preoccupation scores across weeks could not be predicted from their experience of bipositive events, but participants who experienced more bipositive events reported higher preoccupation when compared to other participants. As preoccupation has been correlated with identity confusion and perceived stigma (Galupo & Bauerband, 2016), it was conceptualized as a proximal stressor for the purposes of this study. However, this finding implies that preoccupation may actually be a positive factor when exploring bipositive events, as noting bipositive events requires one to pay attention to what others' think of their sexual orientation. Thus, future studies should examine how preoccupation may be modeled in a positive way to allow sexual minorities to experience positive events while protecting from its negative outcomes.

Finally, bipositive events predicted higher scores in all identity variables, again at the between-person level. Compared to *other* participants, those who reported more bipositive events also reported a stronger positive bisexual identity, as measured by identity affirmation, centrality, and certainty. Interestingly, bipositive events also predicted identity affirmation at the within-person level. In other words, participants who experienced more bipositive events in a particular week also reported higher identity affirmation compared to *their own scores* on different weeks. As the only within-person effect, this finding implies that bipositive events are uniquely able to

predict scores on identity affirmation from week-to-week; identity affirmation also may be a more malleable concept than identity centrality or certainty.

Finally, findings about *changes* in proximal stressors and identity variables were mostly null. The first notable finding was that bipositive events predicted *increases* in preoccupation with others' thoughts at the between-person level. As noted above, this finding raises the need to explore how preoccupation can be positively modeled to allow bisexual individuals to experience bipositive events while also protecting from its negative outcomes. The second notable finding was that bipositive events predicted increases in identity centrality at the between-person level, as hypothesized. In other words, people who experienced more bipositive events also experienced greater increases in identity centrality. This is noteworthy given that Flanders (2015) found identity centrality to be a relatively stable concept; however, unlike Flanders (2015), this study used four separate time points. Thus, it is possible that identity centrality is a state, rather than trait, construct; however, it may take several measurements to pick up these changes.

The majority null findings on changes implies that some of these factors may not be as malleable as previously conceptualized. In particular, it is possible that these concepts are *trait* constructs rather than *state* constructs (Geiser et al., 2017). In this case, it is unlikely that bipositive events would be able to change these constructs – which also explains the relatively null findings at the within-person level. Further studies should examine whether these proximal stressors and identity variables are truly as malleable as they have been conceptualized, using frameworks such as latent state-trait (LST) theory (Geiser et al., 2017).

Event Types

In examining correlations with event types, Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events were the only events not negatively correlated with binegativity, and the only events

positively correlated with preoccupation. Four of the six items on the Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia subscale refer to biphobia; thus, although the overall event is positive, the requisite presence of biphobia in experiencing these events may prevent Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events from having an impact on internalized binegativity. Since experiencing biphobia has been associated with increased levels of internalized binegativity (Dyar et al., 2019), the later positive event of having that biphobia recognized as serious may not be enough to actively *decrease* internalized binegativity. Regarding preoccupation with others' thoughts, all items on the Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia scale require an increased salience of one's bisexual identity, as the subscale has to do with *recognition* of one's identity and the challenges that come with it. It is possible that noting these events requires one to already be more preoccupied with other's thoughts; alternatively, experiencing these events may increase one's preoccupation, as a method of seeking out future bipoisitive events. Importantly, the events in this scale are all interpersonal, and thus require individuals to be aware of others' perceptions of them. It is likely that *intrapersonal* events would not have the same effect on preoccupation.

Multilevel modeling revealed other interesting differences in how various types of events predict proximal stressors and positive bisexual identity. In particular, no types of events predicted scores in sexual identity uncertainty. This is notable, especially given that identity certainty *was* significantly related to bipoisitive events. While I measured identity certainty using a bisexual-specific scale (Flanders, 2015), sexual identity uncertainty was measured using a composite scale, meaning it can be used to explore sexual identity uncertainty in all sexual minorities (Morrison et al., 2019). This finding reiterates the importance of instrumentation that explores bisexual identity uniquely, rather than subsuming it under other sexual identity experiences. As bisexual individuals may experience proximal stressors differently than other

sexual minorities (e.g., Balsam & Mohr, 2007; Dyar & London, 2018b), future research with bisexual samples should strive to use scales developed specifically for examining bisexual experiences.

In addition, Acceptance and Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events both predicted higher preoccupation scores. It is possible that this is related to the context in which these events occur. In particular, Acceptance events and Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events may be more likely to be initiated by strangers or less-well-known others, while emotional and Social Support events may be more likely to occur with acquaintances. Thus, preoccupation with others' thoughts – particularly of unknown others - may be a necessary prerequisite for noting Acceptance and Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events, but not emotional and Social Support events. This raises the question of the impact of context on bipositive events. In particular, microaggression research has emphasized that environment plays a role in the types of microaggressions experienced (Vaccaro & Koob, 2019). It is likely that context plays a similar role in the kinds of microaffirmations experienced. Factors such as who initiates the event, what triggers the event, what environment the individual is in (school, work, home), and who else is present at the event may vary based on event type. However, this context is not captured by the BMS, which focuses solely on event frequency. A deeper exploration into this context may reveal factors that are equally important to the impact of an event on proximal stressors and identity; for example, it is possible that the presence of many others during a microaffirmation *increases* preoccupation.

Lastly, all types of events predicted higher scores on identity affirmation, identity centrality, and identity certainty. This mirrors Dyar and London (2018a), and emphasizes the important relationship between positive bisexual identity and bipositive experiences. In

particular, Dyar and London (2018a) hypothesized that interpersonal bipoisitive events may increase the frequency of *intrapersonal* bipoisitive events, leading to increased positive identity. Thus, future research should explore the potential mediating role of intrapersonal bipoisitive events in this relationship.

Bipoisitive Events and Mental Health Outcomes

Results from mediation models exploring whether bipoisitive events were able to predict scores on anxiety and depression scales were largely null. Interestingly, when examining the sample as a whole, Social Support events predicted *higher* scores on depression. It is possible that this reflects the seeking of Social Support events to cope with higher depression scores. In addition, Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events predicted *increases* in depression scores. Again, Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events often require binegative events to occur first; thus, the positive event of combatting that binegativity may not be enough to overcome the depression caused by encountering binegativity. This raises the need to design interventions that not only encourage bipoisitive events, but also decrease the amount of negativity that bisexual people face.

It is worth noting that preoccupation often mediated relationships between bipoisitive events and anxiety. Experiencing bipoisitive events – particularly Acceptance and Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events - often raised preoccupation with others' thoughts, leading to increased anxiety. This finding is notable and emphasizes the need to further examine the role that preoccupation with others' thoughts plays in the mental health of bisexual individuals. Galupo and Bauerband (2016) found that preoccupation was related to identity salience; in other words, participants who had a more salient sexual orientation (conceptualized in this study as identity centrality) also scored higher on preoccupation. This was similarly true in this study. It is

possible, therefore, that bipositive events have a *negative* impact on anxiety by increasing preoccupation, especially for those with higher identity centrality thus leaving the individual vulnerable to noting not only positive but also negative identity events. Again, this emphasizes the need for interventions to focus on decreasing binegative experiences and discrimination.

The relative lack of significant findings in this area closely mirrors Salim et al. (2019), who did not find microaffirmations to be significant predictors of depression, suicidality, or happiness. Salim et al. (2019) posited that this may be due to microaffirmations not being sufficient to impact mental health while individuals also encounter microaggressions. While microaggressions were not measured in this study, the mediating path of preoccupation – which would leave one vulnerable to noticing more *negative* interpersonal events as well – supports Salim et al.'s (2019) hypothesis.

Gender & Bipositive Events

Multilevel mediation models were run for the sample as a whole, but were also run with each gender to determine whether findings were dependent on gender. First, the findings that were significant with the sample as a whole were mostly significant for women as well. In particular, for women, bipositive events and separate event types predicted scores on positive bisexual identity variables. These findings were inconsistent or null for men and non-binary people. This reiterates the importance of considering the impact of gender when looking at bipositive events. It is possible that bipositive events are unable to predict positive identity for non-binary people and men due to other factors. For example, Choi et al. (2019) found that 25% of their bisexual sample were *Vigilant*, meaning they had relatively high levels of stigma sensitivity, and thus may have trouble developing positive identities. Increased relevance of one's identity – even in positive contexts - may increase stigma sensitivity, particularly for

people who fit *Vigilant* profiles of bisexuality, and thus prevent positive events from affecting positive identity factors. This possibility is strengthened by the fact that men have been found to have significantly higher levels of stigma sensitivity than women (Balsam & Mohr, 2007). However, as stigma sensitivity was not measured in this study, I was unable to control for this possibility.

Interestingly, most findings about preoccupation did not hold for women. This implies that the role of preoccupation may be unique to the experiences of men and non-binary people. Schrimshaw et al. (2018) noted that men often did not disclose their identities due to fear of negative reactions; thus, it is likely that *any* event that focuses on these men's sexualities would raise preoccupation. It is possible that women do not have the same reaction to these events, especially given that women are more likely to share their bisexual identities with others (Price et al., 2020). Thus, future research should examine the roles of identity visibility and outness on bipositive events and preoccupation.

In addition, there were some findings that arose specifically with women. Identity centrality tended to increase with Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia events and Social Support events at the between-person level. As well, sexual identity uncertainty was predictably lower when examining Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia and Emotional Support events at the between-person level. These findings were not seen with men or non-binary people. The fact that these findings, which mirror findings in Dyar and London (2018), were only significant with women implies that there is something different about the experiences of men and non-binary people when it comes to identity centrality and uncertainty. While some studies have found that identity centrality is higher for bisexual women than bisexual men, and higher for non-cisgender participants than cisgender men (Hinton et al., 2021), these findings did not arise

in this study. In other words, despite all genders experiencing similar amounts of identity centrality in this sample, only women experienced increases in identity centrality with increased bipositive events.

Most of the significant findings from the combined sample did not hold when examined with only men. Interestingly, those around identity affirmation did often remain statistically significant; in particular, identity affirmation was often predicted both within-participants and between-participants for men. This implies that bipositive events may be particularly well-suited to increase identity affirmation for men.

A noteworthy additional finding that arose with men was that Social Support events tended to predict *lower* identity certainty scores within participants; similarly, bipositive events predicted *decreases* in identity centrality. In addition, Emotional Support events tended to predict *higher* anxiety scores between participants. All these findings are opposite of what was hypothesized and suggest that the impact of bipositive events on men might be more complicated than it is for women. For example, it is possible that bipositive events decrease identity centrality as a method of compensating for increased preoccupation (Galupo & Bauerband, 2016). In other words, men who experience more bipositive events may attempt to decrease their identity salience to prevent preoccupation from rising.

Finally, the relatively large number of non-binary participants in my sample allowed me to examine the impact of bipositive events on non-binary people, an as-yet-unexplored area. Like for men, most findings did not hold for non-binary people. However, some unique findings arose for non-binary people. For example, Social Support scores tended to predict increases in identity centrality at the within-person level but *decreases* at the between-person level. This implies that, while Social Support can increase identity centrality for specific individuals from week to week,

identity centrality overall decreases between participants. This may be due to the connection between identity salience and preoccupation, as posited above for men (Galupo & Bauerband, 2016). These findings emphasize the need to further explore the experiences of non-binary bisexual individuals, whose intersectional minoritized identities are significantly different than are those of men and women (particularly cisgender men and women).

The relative lack of within-person findings in this study implies that, as posited above, the concepts measured in this study may be *trait* concepts rather than *state* concepts. In particular, while bipositive events were unable to measure changes or fluctuations in these concepts between weeks for specific individuals, they could predict general patterns of these concepts *across* individuals.

Limitations & Future Directions

There were several limitations associated with this study. Most importantly, the number of men recruited fell below what was desired. The number of men who completed baseline and at least one additional week of data was 39; only 17 men completed all three weeks of follow-up, compared to 63 women. It is worth noting that multilevel models should typically have a sample size of at least 50 at level 2 (Maas & Hox, 2005); thus, the number of men in this sample may not have been sufficient to find significant effects. Thus, the non-significance of many of the findings for men and non-binary people may reflect insufficient power, rather than a true lack of effects. For example, it is possible that microaffirmations *do* consistently decrease internalized binegativity for men and non-binary people, but that there were insufficient participants in this study to detect this effect. Thus, it is vital that this research be rerun with non-binary people and men.

Secondly, many of the participants in this study were recruited from Canadian 2SLGBTQ+ community organizations and university Pride centers. This may have led to an overrepresentation of relatively affirmative individuals in this sample; this potential is supported by the sample's high average score on identity affirmation and high number of experienced interpersonal bipoisitive events. Thus, future research should draw from a wider array of bisexual populations, who are less involved with queer organizations and who may experience fewer affirmations of their identities in day-to-day life.

Finally, relying on self-reporting for interpersonal events ignores the potential effects of bipoisitive events that were *not* reported. It is possible that some interpersonal events were not regarded as important for participants, but affected their identities and proximal stressors; this may be particularly true for a sample where the number of bipoisitive events was relatively high. In other words, participants may have not mentioned particular bipoisitive events because they did not deem them as important as other ones that they remembered. The weekly diary format, which was chosen to minimize participant burden, may have encouraged this issue. Thus, future research may consider using daily diary approaches, as used by Salim et al. (2019) and Flanders (2015), to more fully capture the number of bipoisitive events experienced.

Despite its limitations, this study does point towards several interesting future avenues of research and applications. First, it emphasizes the importance of exploring different *types* of bipoisitive events, rather than conceptualizing bipoisitive events as one-dimensional. The different patterns that arose throughout these analyses imply that different types of events have different effects on individuals, potentially due to the people they are experienced with and the amount of attention to one's identity that is required for the event.

Secondly, the relationship between microaffirmations and *increased* anxiety and depression emphasizes the need for interventions that take into consideration the multiple effects of identity centrality and preoccupation with others' thoughts. In other words, interventions that focus solely on increasing interpersonal bipoisitive events without considering how identity salience and preoccupation may lead one to be more vulnerable to the impacts of microaggressions may be inappropriate and lead to negative, rather than positive, mental health impacts. Thus, interventions should aim to dually increase microaffirmations *and* decrease microaggressions; alternatively, interventions aimed at increasing microaffirmations should consider how preoccupation can be modelled in a protective manner that prevents vulnerability to negative mental health impacts. While bipoisitive events can positively affect bisexual people's experiences, attention must be paid to the ways gender and identity centrality play specific roles in their impacts.

¹The term *microaffirmations* is defined as “apparently small acts...that are public and private, often unconscious but very effective, which occur wherever people wish to help others to succeed” (Rowe, 2008, p. 46). To stay consistent with existing literature, this term is used throughout; however, It is worth noting that the scale of the microaffirmations examined in this study varies, and may not necessarily be *micro* (e.g., showing explicit support of bisexuality may not be considered *micro*).

²A statistical method used to explore individual differences and create ‘classifications’ of groups of individuals

³Two aspects of bipoisitive experiences in Flanders et al. (2017) were related to participation in the study itself (at the intrapersonal and interpersonal levels).

⁴Week was included in the analysis to identify whether potential gender differences were occurring consistently or only at a certain point in the study.

References

- Alwin, D. F. (1997). Feeling thermometers versus 7-point scales: Which are better? *Sociological Methods & Research*, 25(3), 318-340. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124197025003003>
- American Psychological Association. (2012). Guidelines for psychological practice with lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients. *American Psychologist*, 67(1), 10–42. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024659>
- Asakura, K., & Craig, S. L. (2014). “It gets better” ... but how? Exploring resilience development in the accounts of LGBTQ adults. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 24(3), 253–266. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2013.808971>
- Balsam, K. F., & Mohr, J. J. (2007). Adaptation to sexual orientation stigma: A comparison of bisexual and lesbian/gay adults. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 54(3), 306–319. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.54.3.306>
- Bradford, M. (2004). The bisexual experience: Living in a dichotomous culture. *Journal of Bisexuality*, 4(1–2), 7–23. https://doi.org/10.1300/J159v04n01_02
- Brewster, M. E., & Moradi, B. (2010). Perceived experiences of anti-bisexual prejudice: Instrument development and evaluation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 57(4), 451–468. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021116>
- Castro-Schilo, L., & Grimm, K. J. (2017). Using residualized change versus difference scores for longitudinal research. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 35(1), 32-58. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407517718387>
- Chang, T. K., & Chung, Y. B. (2015). Transgender microaggressions: Complexity of the heterogeneity of transgender identities. *Journal of LGBT Issues in Counseling*, 9(3), 217-234. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15538605.2015.1068146>

- Choi, A. Y., Nylund-Gibson, K., Israel, T., & Mendez, S. E. A. (2019). A latent profile analysis of bisexual identity: Evidence of within-group diversity. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 48(1), 113–130. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-018-1325-1>
- Davila, J., Feinstein, B. A., Dyar, C., & Jabbour, J. (2020). How, when, and why do bisexual+ individuals attempt to make their identity visible? *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000411>
- Davila, J., Jabbour, J., Dyar, C., & Feinstein, B. A. (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. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-018-1284-6>
- DeLucia, R., & Smith, N. G. (2021). The impact of provider biphobia and microaffirmations on bisexual individuals' treatment-seeking intentions. *Journal of Bisexuality*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15299716.2021.1900020>
- Dewaele, A., Van Houtte, M., Cox, N., & Vincke, J. (2013). From coming out to visibility management: A new perspective on coping with minority stressors in LGB youth in Flanders. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 60(5), 685–710. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2013.773818>
- Dodge, B., Herbenick, D., Friedman, M. R., Schick, V., Fu, T.-C. (Jane), Bostwick, W., Bartelt, E., Muñoz-Laboy, M., Pletta, D., Reece, M., & Sandfort, T. G. M. (2016). Attitudes toward bisexual men and women among a nationally representative probability sample of adults in the United States. *PLOS ONE*, 11(10), e0164430. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0164430>

- Dyar, C., Feinstein, B. A., & Davila, J. (2019). Development and validation of a brief version of the Anti-Bisexual Experiences Scale. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 48*, 175-189.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-018-1157-z>
- Dyar, C., Feinstein, B. A., Bettin, E., & Davila, J. (2021). Bisexual+ visibility attempts: Associations with minority stress, affect, and substance use in a daily diary study. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000469>
- Dyar, C., Feinstein, B. A., Schick, V., & Davila, J. (2017). Minority stress, sexual identity uncertainty, and partner gender decision making among nonmonosexual individuals. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity, 4*(1), 87–104.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000213>
- 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*(2), 204–219.
<https://doi.org/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*(3), 342–360. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684318768233>
- Feinstein, B. A., & Dyar, C. (2017). Bisexuality, minority stress, and health. *Current Sexual Health Reports, 9*(1), 42–49. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11930-017-0096-3>
- Feinstein, B. A., Dyar, C., & London, B. (2017). Are outness and community involvement risk or protective factors for alcohol and drug abuse among sexual minority women? *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 46*(5), 1411–1423. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-016-0790-7>

- Finch, H. (2005). Comparison of the performance of nonparametric and parametric MANOVA test statistics when assumptions are violated. *Methodology*, 1(1), 27-38. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1614-1881.1.1.27>
- Flanders, C. E. (2015). Bisexual health: A daily diary analysis of stress and anxiety. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 37(6), 319–335.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01973533.2015.1079202>
- Flanders, C. E. (2018). The male bisexual experience. In D. J. Swan & S. Habibi (Eds.), *Bisexuality* (pp. 127–143). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-71535-3_8
- Flanders, C. E., LeBreton, M., & Robinson, M. (2019a). Bisexual women’s experience of microaggressions and microaffirmations: A community-based, mixed-methods scale development project. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 48(1), 143–158.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-017-1135-x>
- Flanders, C. E., Shuler, S. A., Desnoyers, S. A., & VanKim, N. A. (2019b). Relationships between social support, identity, anxiety, and depression among young bisexual people of color. *Journal of Bisexuality*, 19(2), 253–275.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15299716.2019.1617543>
- Flanders, C. E., Tarasoff, L. A., Legge, M. M., Robinson, M., & Gos, G. (2017). Positive identity experiences of young bisexual and other nonmonosexual people: A qualitative inquiry. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 64(8), 1014–1032.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2016.1236592>
- Friedman, M. R., Dodge, B., Schick, V., Herbenick, D., Hubach, R. D., Bowling, J., Goncalves, G., Krier, S., & Reece, M. (2014). From bias to bisexual health disparities: Attitudes

- toward bisexual men and women in the United States. *LGBT Health*, 1(4), 309–318.
<https://doi.org/10.1089/lgbt.2014.0005>
- Fuller, K. A., & Hovland, C. A. (2020). Bipositivity: Bisexual persons' narratives of acceptance and support from significant others. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 1–13.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2020.1815429>
- Galupo, M. P., & Bauerband, L. A. (2016). Sexual Orientation Reflection and Rumination Scale: Development and psychometric evaluation. *Stigma and Health*, 1(1), 44–58.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/sah0000017>
- Galupo, M. P., Taylor, S. M., & Cole, D. (2019). “I am double the bi”: Positive aspects of being both bisexual and biracial. *Journal of Bisexuality*, 19(2), 152–168.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15299716.2019.1619066>
- Geiser, C., Götz, T., Preckel, F., & Freund, P. A. (2017). States and traits: Theories, models, and assessment. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 33(4), 219–223.
<https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000413>
- Ghavami, N., Fingerhut, A., Peplau, L. A., Grant, S. K., & Wittig, M. A. (2011). Testing a model of minority identity achievement, identity affirmation, and psychological well-being among ethnic minority and sexual minority individuals. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 17(1), 79–88. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022532>
- Gonzalez, K. A., Ramirez, J. L., & Galupo, M. P. (2018). Increase in GLBTQ Minority Stress Following the 2016 US Presidential Election. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*, 14(1–2), 130–151. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1550428X.2017.1420849>

- Hequembourg, A. L., & Brallier, S. A. (2009). An exploration of sexual minority stress across the lines of gender and sexual identity. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 56(3), 273–298. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918360902728517>
- Hinton, J. D. X., de la Piedad Garcia, X., Kaufmann, L. M., Koc, Y., & Anderson, J. R. (2021). A systematic and meta-analytic review of identity centrality among LGBTQ groups: An assessment of psychosocial correlates. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2021.1967849>
- Kaestle, C. E., & Ivory, A. H. (2012). A forgotten sexuality: Content analysis of bisexuality in the medical literature over two decades. *Journal of Bisexuality*, 12(1), 35–48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15299716.2012.645701>
- Kaysen, D. L., Kulesza, M., Balsam, K. F., Rhew, I. C., Blayney, J. A., Lehavot, K., & Hughes, T. L. (2014). Coping as a mediator of internalized homophobia and psychological distress among young adult sexual minority women. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, 1(3), 225–233. <https://doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000045>
- Krosnick, J. A., Judd, C. M., & Wittenbrink, B. (2018). The measurement of attitudes. In *The handbook of attitudes* (pp. 45-105). Routledge.
- Levine, S. Z. (2013). Evaluating the seven-item Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale Short-Form: A longitudinal US community study. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 48(9), 1519–1526. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-012-0650-2>
- Maas, C. J. M., & Hox, J. J. (2005). Sufficient sample sizes for multilevel modeling. *Methodology*, 1(3), 86-92. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1614-2241.1.3.86>

- Matsuno, E., & Budge, S. L. (2017). Non-binary/genderqueer identities: A critical review of the literature. *Current Sexual Health Reports*, 9, 116-120. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11930-017-0111-8>
- Mayfield, W. (2001). The development of an internalized homonegativity inventory for gay men. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 41(2), 53–76. https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v41n02_04
- Meyer, I. H. (2003). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: Conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(5), 674–697. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.129.5.674>
- Meyer, I. H. (2014). Minority stress and positive psychology: Convergences and divergences to understanding LGBT health. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, 1(4), 348–349. <https://doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000070>
- Mohr, J. J., & Kendra, M. S. (2011). Revision and extension of a multidimensional measure of sexual minority identity: The Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Identity Scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 58(2), 234–245. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022858>
- Morrison, M. A., Bishop, C., & Morrison, T. G. (2019). A systematic review of the psychometric properties of composite prejudice and discrimination scales. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 66(4), 549-570. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2017.1422935>
- Norris, C. J. (2021). The negativity bias, revisited: Evidence from neuroscience measures and an individual differences approach. *Social Neuroscience*, 16(1), 68-82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17470919.2019.1696225>
- Paul, R., Smith, N. G., Mohr, J. J., & Ross, L. E. (2014). Measuring dimensions of bisexual identity: Initial development of the Bisexual Identity Inventory. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, 1(4), 452–460. <https://doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000069>

- Price, D. M., Gesselman, A. N., & Garcia, J. R. (2020). Single bisexual men's and women's perceptions of acceptance in the LGBTQ community. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 67(14), 1923–1947. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2019.1618645>
- Riggle, E. D. B., Mohr, J. J., Rostosky, S. S., Fingerhut, A. W., & Balsam, K. F. (2014). A multifactor Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Positive Identity Measure (LGB-PIM). *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, 1(4), 398–411. <https://doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000057>
- Riggle, E. D. B., Whitman, J. S., Olson, A., Rostosky, S. S., & Strong, S. (2008). The positive aspects of being a lesbian or gay man. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 39(2), 210–217. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7028.39.2.210>
- Ross, L. E., Dobinson, C., & Eady, A. (2010). Perceived determinants of mental health for bisexual people: A qualitative examination. *American Journal of Public Health*, 100(3), 496–502. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2008.156307>
- Ross, L. E., Salway, T., Tarasoff, L. A., MacKay, J. M., Hawkins, B. W., & Fehr, C. P. (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(4–5), 435–456. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2017.1387755>
- Rostosky, S., Riggle, E. D. B., Pascale-Hague, D., & McCants, L. E. (2010). The positive aspects of a bisexual self-identification. *Psychology and Sexuality*, 1(2), 131–144. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19419899.2010.484595>
- Salim, S., Robinson, M., & Flanders, C. E. (2019). Bisexual women's experiences of microaggressions and microaffirmations and their relation to mental health. *Psychology*

of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity, 6(3), 336–346.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000329>

Salway, T., Ross, L. E., Fehr, C. P., Burley, J., Asadi, S., Hawkins, B., & Tarasoff, L. A. (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(1), 89–111.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-018-1150-6>

Schrimshaw, E. W., Downing, M. J., & Cohn, D. J. (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. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-016-0762-y>

Shokoohi, M., Salway, T., Ahn, B., & Ross, L. E. (2020). Disparities in the prevalence of cigarette smoking among bisexual people: A systematic review, meta-analysis and meta-

regression. *Tobacco Control*, e78-e86. [https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2020-](https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2020-055747)

[055747](https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2020-055747)

Spitzer, R. L., Kroenke, K., Williams, J. B. W., & Löwe, B. (2006). A brief measure for

assessing generalized anxiety disorder: The GAD-7. *Archives of Internal Medicine*,

166(10), 1092. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.166.10.1092>

Troiden, R. R. (1993). The formation of homosexual identities. In L. D. Garnets & D. C. Kimmel

(Eds.), *Psychological perspectives on lesbian and gay male experiences* (pp. 191–217).

Columbia University Press.

Vaccaro, A., & Koob, R. M. (2019). A critical and intersectional model of LGBTQ

microaggressions: Toward a more comprehensive understanding. *Journal of*

Homosexuality, 66(1), 1317-1344. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2018.1539583>

- Vaughan, M. D., & Rodriguez, E. M. (2014). LGBT strengths: Incorporating positive psychology into theory, research, training, and practice. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity, 1*(4), 325–334. <https://doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000053>
- Wang, A. Y., & Feinstein, B. A. (2020). The perks of being bi+: Positive sexual orientation–related experiences among bisexual, pansexual, and queer male youth. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity. <https://doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000459>*
- Yost, M. R., & Thomas, G. D. (2012). Gender and binegativity: Men’s and women’s attitudes toward male and female bisexuals. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 41*(3), 691–702. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-011-9767-8>
- Zhang, Z., Zyphur, M. J., & Preacher, K. J. (2009). Testing multilevel mediation using hierarchical linear models: Problems and solutions. *Organizational Research Methods, 12*(4), 695-719. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428108327450>

Table 1*Descriptive Statistics for Measures Used*

Measure	Range	Mean				Standard Deviation				Alpha				Confidence Interval			
		B	W1	W2	W3	B	W1	W2	W3	B	W1	W2	W3	B	W1	W2	W3
BII-IB	0-500	83.55	97.43	88.12	94.15	97.16	102.22	93.22	98.66	.85	.88	.86	.88	.81-.88	.85-.90	.82-.89	.84-.91
LGBIS-IU	0-400	98.17	96.71	85.87	96.19	95.43	94.85	93.08	101.54	.87	.90	.92	.92	.84-.90	.88-.92	.89-.94	.90-.94
BII-A	0-600	453.72	440.80	442.37	440.97	112.04	108.91	105.78	112.11	.88	.88	.90	.90	.85-.90	.86-.91	.87-.92	.88-.92
BICC-CERT	0-900	607.88	598.14	601.07	601.03	175.02	173.14	181.74	185.19	.82	.82	.86	.86	.79-.86	.78-.86	.83-.89	.82-.89
CESD	7-28	16.56	16.58	16.23	16.08	4.77	5.00	5.06	5.18	.82	.85	.86	.86	.79-.85	.82-.88	.83-.89	.83-.89
GAD	7-28	16.22	15.99	15.47	15.45	5.56	5.61	5.48	5.75	.89	.92	.92	.93	.87-.91	.90-.94	.90-.94	.91-.94
BICC-CENT	0-800	432.12	423.63	430.10	421.31	145.94	139.87	144.52	147.12	.82	.80	.83	.83	.78-.85	.75-.84	.79-.87	.79-.87
SORRS-P	0-300	159.76	162.81	155.32	154.95	71.75	71.63	76.47	79.88	.82	.82	.86	.90	.77-.85	.77-.86	.82-.89	.87-.92
BMS	0-48	-	16.60	15.33	14.47	-	8.94	10.35	9.41	-	.87	.92	.89	-	.85-.90	.90-.93	.87-.92
BMS-A	0-12	-	5.19	4.99	4.65	-	3.35	3.46	3.47	-	.83	.83	.82	-	.79-.86	.78-.87	.77-.87
BMS-R	0-18	-	3.82	3.44	3.27	-	3.23	3.41	3.23	-	.75	.78	.77	-	.70-.80	.72-.83	.70-.82
BMS-SS	0-9	-	3.64	3.39	3.14	-	2.23	.246	2.48	-	.66	.74	.79	-	.57-.73	.66-.80	.72-.84
BMS-ES	0-9	-	3.72	3.62	3.56	-	2.52	2.57	2.50	-	.68	.72	.71	-	.60-.75	.64-.79	.63-.78

Note. BMS = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale; BMS-A = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Acceptance Subscale; BMS-SS = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Social Support Subscale; BMS-R = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia Subscale; BMS-ES = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Emotional Support Subscale; BII-IB = Bisexual Identity Inventory – Internalized Binegativity Subscale; BII-A = Bisexual Identity Inventory – Affirmation Subscale; LGBIS-IU = Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Identity Inventory - Identity Uncertainty Subscale; SORRS-P = Sexual Orientation Reflection and Rumination Scale - Preoccupation Subscale; BICC-CENT = Bisexual Identity Certainty and Centrality Scale - Identity Centrality; BICC-CERT = Bisexual Identity Certainty and Centrality Scale - Identity Certainty; GAD = Generalized Anxiety Disorder 7 Scale; CESD = Centre for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale

Table 2*Baseline Correlations*

Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. BII-A	--	.373**	.566**	-.493**	-.381**	-.082	.959	.129
2. BICC-CENT	.373**	--	.184**	-.182**	-.090	.235**	.075	.040
3. BICC-CERT	.566**	.184**	--	-.245**	-.588**	-.220**	-.159*	-.166*
4. BII-IB	-.493**	-.182**	-.245**	--	.343**	.193**	.038	.098
5. LGBIS-IU	-.381**	-.090	-.588**	.343**	--	.089	.052	.053
6. SORRS-P	-.082	.235**	-.220**	.193**	.089	--	.360**	.350**
7. GAD	.959	.075	-.159*	.038	.052	.360**	--	.710**
8. CESD	.129	.040	-.166*	.098	.053	.350**	.710**	--

Note. ** $p < .001$. * $p < .05$. BII-IB = Bisexual Identity Inventory – Internalized Binegativity Subscale; BII-A = Bisexual Identity Inventory – Affirmation Subscale; LGBIS-IU = Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Identity Inventory - Identity Uncertainty Subscale; SORRS-P = Sexual Orientation Reflection and Rumination Scale - Preoccupation Subscale; BICC-CENT = Bisexual Identity Certainty and Centrality Scale - Identity Centrality; BICC-CERT = Bisexual Identity Certainty and Centrality Scale - Identity Certainty; GAD = Generalized Anxiety Disorder 7 Scale; CESD = Centre for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale

Table 3*Week One Correlations*

Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. BMS	--	.848**	.820**	.803**	.683**	.348**	.291**	.215**	-.149*	-.077	.187**	.058	.076
2. BMS-A	.848**	--	.620**	.551**	.451**	.324**	.179*	.205**	-.190**	-.097	.116	-.040	-.004
3. BMS-SS	.820**	.620**	--	.577**	.486**	.272**	.256**	.173*	-.132	-.079	.096	.124	.142*
4. BMS-R	.803**	.551**	.577**	--	.350**	.207**	.282**	.109	.070	.012	.196**	.109	.133
5. BMS-ES	.683**	.451**	.486**	.350**	--	.296**	.163*	.202**	-.189**	-.055	.144*	-.045	-.091
6. BII-A	.348**	.324**	.272**	.207**	.296**	--	.420**	.626**	-.604**	-.415**	-.101	-.079	-.125
7. BICC-CENT	.291**	.179*	.256**	.282**	.163*	.420**	--	.248**	-.168*	-.155*	.328**	.169*	.076
8. BICC-CERT	.215**	.205**	.173*	.109	.202**	.626**	.248**	--	-.447**	-.599**	-.263**	-.174*	-.168*
9. BII-IB	-.149**	-.190**	-.132	.070	-.189**	-.604**	-.168*	-.447**	--	.357**	.300	.093	.170*
10. LGBIS-IU	-.077	-.097	-.079	.012	-.055	-.415**	-.155*	-.599**	.357**	--	.123	.085	.065
11. SORRS-P	.187**	.116	.096	.196**	.144*	-.101	.328**	-.263**	.300	.123	--	.280**	.234**
12. GAD	.058	-.040	.124	.109	-.045	-.079	.169*	-.174*	.093	.085	.280**	--	.746**
13. CESD	.076	-.004	.142*	.133	-.091	-.125	.076	-.168*	.170*	.065	.234**	.746**	--

Note. ** $p < .001$. * $p < .05$. BMS = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale; BMS-A = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Acceptance Subscale; BMS-SS = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Social Support Subscale; BMS-R = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia Subscale; BMS-ES = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Emotional Support Subscale; BII-IB = Bisexual Identity Inventory – Internalized Binegativity Subscale; BII-A = Bisexual Identity Inventory – Affirmation Subscale; LGBIS-IU = Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Identity Inventory - Identity Uncertainty Subscale; SORRS-P = Sexual Orientation Reflection and Rumination Scale - Preoccupation Subscale; BICC-CENT = Bisexual Identity Certainty and Centrality Scale - Identity Centrality; BICC-CERT = Bisexual Identity Certainty and Centrality Scale - Identity Certainty; GAD = Generalized Anxiety Disorder 7 Scale; CESD = Centre for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale

Table 4*Week Two Correlations (N = 151)*

Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. BMS	--	.892**	.850**	.873**	.809**	.407**	.211**	.269**	-.178*	-.096	.221**	.051	.005
2. BMS-A	.892**	--	.681**	.681**	.611**	.351**	.223**	.238**	-.181*	-.070	.159*	-.044	-.039
3. BMS-SS	.850**	.681**	--	.673**	.572**	.363**	.194*	.194*	-.188*	-.055	.157*	.091	.068
4. BMS-R	.873**	.681**	.673**	--	.584**	.269**	.169*	.206**	-.054	-.091	.262**	.112	.054
5. BMS-ES	.809**	.611**	.572**	.584**	--	.311**	.134	.207**	-.146	-.061	.119	.033	-.042
6. BII-A	.407**	.351**	.363**	.269**	.311**	--	.389**	.569**	-.630**	-.442**	-.007	.002	-.059
7. BICC-CENT	.211**	.223**	.194*	.169*	.134	.389**	--	.201*	-.220**	-.188*	.291**	.126	.133
8. BICC-CERT	.269**	.238**	.194*	.206**	.207**	.569**	.201*	--	-.445**	-.599**	-.122	-.114	-.160*
9. BII-IB	-.178*	-.181*	-.188*	-.054	-.146	-.630**	-.220**	-.445**	--	.442**	.187*	.172*	.181*
10. LGBIS-IU	-.096	-.070	-.055	-.091	-.061	-.442**	-.188*	-.599**	.442**	--	.072	-.002	.095
11. SORRS-P	.221**	.159*	.157*	.262**	.119	-.007	.291**	-.122	.187*	.072	--	.324**	.307**
12. GAD	.051	-.044	.091	.112	.033	.002	.126	-.114	.172*	-.002	.324**	--	.755**
13. CESD	.005	-.039	.068	.054	-.042	-.059	.133	-.160*	.181*	.095	.307**	.755**	--

Note. ** $p < .001$. * $p < .05$. BMS = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale; BMS-A = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Acceptance Subscale; BMS-SS = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Social Support Subscale; BMS-R = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia Subscale; BMS-ES = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Emotional Support Subscale; BII-IB = Bisexual Identity Inventory – Internalized Binegativity Subscale; BII-A = Bisexual Identity Inventory – Affirmation Subscale; LGBIS-IU = Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Identity Inventory - Identity Uncertainty Subscale; SORRS-P = Sexual Orientation Reflection and Rumination Scale - Preoccupation Subscale; BICC-CENT = Bisexual Identity Certainty and Centrality Scale - Identity Centrality; BICC-CERT = Bisexual Identity Certainty and Centrality Scale - Identity Certainty; GAD = Generalized Anxiety Disorder 7 Scale; CESD = Centre for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale

Table 5*Week Three Correlations (N = 142)*

Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. BMS	--	.877**	.820**	.833**	.700**	.333**	.308**	.125	-.205*	-.093	.117	.046	.055
2. BMS-A	.877**	--	.672**	.612**	.526**	.353**	.306**	.127	-.202*	-.075	.121	.023	.051
3. BMS-SS	.820**	.672**	--	.657**	.395**	.235**	.257**	.074	-.121	-.047	.103	.156	.145
4. BMS-R	.833**	.612**	.657**	--	.402**	.223*	.246**	.136	-.122	-.148	.183*	.049	.073
5. BMS-ES	.700**	.526**	.395**	.402**	--	.262**	.178*	.044	-.219**	-.054	.007	.019	-.009
6. BII-A	.333**	.353**	.235**	.223**	.262**	--	.489**	.525**	-.652**	-.440**	-.003	.045	-.059
7. BICC-CENT	.308**	.306**	.257**	.246**	.178*	.489**	--	.195*	-.256**	-.133	.252**	.072	.070
8. BICC-CERT	.125	.127	.1074	.136	.044	.525**	.195*	--	-.448**	-.620**	-.191*	-.058	-.111
9. BII-IB	-.205*	-.202*	-.121	-.122	-.219**	-.652**	-.256**	-.448**	--	.464**	.169*	-.050	.088
10. LGBIS-IU	-.093	-.075	-.047	-.148	-.054	-.440**	-.133	-.620**	.464**	--	.161	.031	.147
11. SORRS-P	.117	.121	.103	.183*	.007	-.003	.252**	-.191*	.169*	.161	--	.253**	.301**
12. GAD	.046	.023	.156	.049	.019	.045	.072	-.058	-.050	.031	.253**	--	.786**
13. CESD	.055	.051	.145	.073	-.009	-.059	.070	-.111	.088	.147	.301**	.786**	--

Note. ** $p < .001$. * $p < .05$. BMS = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale; BMS-A = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Acceptance Subscale; BMS-SS = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Social Support Subscale; BMS-R = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia Subscale; BMS-ES = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Emotional Support Subscale; BII-IB = Bisexual Identity Inventory – Internalized Binegativity Subscale; BII-A = Bisexual Identity Inventory – Affirmation Subscale; LGBIS-IU = Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Identity Inventory - Identity Uncertainty Subscale; SORRS-P = Sexual Orientation Reflection and Rumination Scale - Preoccupation Subscale; BICC-CENT = Bisexual Identity Certainty and Centrality Scale - Identity Centrality; BICC-CERT = Bisexual Identity Certainty and Centrality Scale - Identity Certainty; GAD = Generalized Anxiety Disorder 7 Scale; CESD = Centre for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale

Table 6*Overall Correlations*

Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. BMS	--	.932**	.912**	.861**	.886**	.186**	.146**	.138**	-.135**	-.107**	.078*	-.020	.003
2. BMS-A	.932**	--	.812**	.740**	.755**	.189**	.135**	.138**	-.150**	-.103**	.057	-.060	-.017
3. BMS-SS	.912**	.812**	--	.720**	.768**	.156**	.134**	.110**	-.121**	-.087*	.052	.025	.053
4. BMS-R	.886**	.755**	.768**	--	.652**	.141*	.154**	.117**	-.051	-.090*	.126**	-.047	-.049
5. BMS-ES	.861**	.740**	.720**	.652**	--	.160**	.093**	.116**	-.146**	-.088*	.036	.022	.043
6. BII-A	.186**	.189**	.156**	.160**	.141**	--	.401**	.575**	-.566**	-.412**	-.059	-.008	-.064
7. BICC-CENT	.146**	.135**	.134**	.093**	.154**	.401**	--	.203**	-.179**	-.127**	.258**	.109**	.070
8. BICC-CERT	.138**	.138**	.110**	.117**	.116**	.575**	.203**	--	-.417**	-.601**	-.210**	-.131**	-.148**
9. BII-IB	-.135**	-.150**	-.121**	-.146**	-.051	-.566**	-.179**	-.417**	--	.453**	.253**	.059	.100**
10. LGBIS-IU	-.107**	-.103**	-.087*	-.088*	-.090*	-.412**	-.127**	-.601**	.453**	--	.137**	.057	.081*
11. SORRS-P	.078*	.057	.052	.036	.126**	-.059	.258**	-.210**	.253*	.137**	--	.303**	.293**
12. GAD	-.020	-.060	.025	-.047	.022	-.008	.109**	-.131**	.059	.057	.303**	--	.739**
13. CESD	.003	-.017	.053	-.049	.043	-.064	.074*	-.148**	.100**	.081*	.293**	.739**	--

Note. ** $p < .001$. * $p < .05$. BMS = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale; BMS-A = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Acceptance Subscale; BMS-SS = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Social Support Subscale; BMS-R = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia Subscale; BMS-ES = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Emotional Support Subscale; BII-IB = Bisexual Identity Inventory – Internalized Binegativity Subscale; BII-A = Bisexual Identity Inventory – Affirmation Subscale; LGBIS-IU = Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Identity Inventory - Identity Uncertainty Subscale; SORRS-P = Sexual Orientation Reflection and Rumination Scale - Preoccupation Subscale; BICC-CENT = Bisexual Identity Certainty and Centrality Scale - Identity Centrality; BICC-CERT = Bisexual Identity Certainty and Centrality Scale - Identity Certainty; GAD = Generalized Anxiety Disorder 7 Scale; CESD = Centre for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale

Table 7*Baseline to Week One Change Correlations*

Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. BMS	--	.848**	.820**	.803**	.683**	.074	.078	.001	.054	.013	.248**	.013	-.012
2. BMS-A	.848**	--	.620**	.551**	.451**	.042	.030	.075	-.079	-.082	.166*	-.044	-.057
3. BMS-SS	.820**	.620**	--	.577**	.486**	.034	.127	.081	-.034	.004	.120	.012	.020
4. BMS-R	.803**	.551**	.577**	--	.350**	-.002	.091	-.077	.055	.060	.241**	.068	.045
5. BMS-ES	.861**	.740**	.720**	.652**	--	.129	.038	.003	-.084	.072	.226**	-.028	-.088
6. BII-A	.074	.042	.034	-.002	.129	--	-.125	-.142	.127	.248**	.098	.034	.029
7. BICC-CENT	.078	.030	.127	.091	.038	-.125	--	.038	.003	.044	.267**	.026	.149*
8. BICC-CERT	.001	.075	.081	-.077	.003	-.142	.038	--	-.079	-.341**	-.239**	-.008	-.078
9. BII-IB	.054	-.079	-.034	.055	-.084	.127	.003	-.079	--	.270**	.122	.082	.063
10. LGBIS-IU	.013	-.082	.004	.060	.072	.248**	.044	-.341**	.270**	--	.143	-.052	-.063
11. SORRS-P	.248**	.166*	.120	.241**	.226**	.098	.267**	-.239**	.122	.143	--	.005	.007
12. GAD	.013	-.044	.012	.068	-.028	.034	.026	-.008	.082	-.052	.005	--	.543**
13. CESD	-.012	-.057	.020	.045	-.088	.029	.149*	-.078	.063	-.063	.007	.543**	--

Note. ** $p < .001$. * $p < .05$. BMS = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale; BMS-A = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Acceptance Subscale; BMS-SS = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Social Support Subscale; BMS-R = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia Subscale; BMS-ES = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Emotional Support Subscale; BII-IB = Bisexual Identity Inventory – Internalized Binegativity Subscale; BII-A = Bisexual Identity Inventory – Affirmation Subscale; LGBIS-IU = Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Identity Inventory - Identity Uncertainty Subscale; SORRS-P = Sexual Orientation Reflection and Rumination Scale - Preoccupation Subscale; BICC-CENT = Bisexual Identity Certainty and Centrality Scale - Identity Centrality; BICC-CERT = Bisexual Identity Certainty and Centrality Scale - Identity Certainty; GAD = Generalized Anxiety Disorder 7 Scale; CESD = Centre for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale. With the exception of the BMS and its subscales, all scale scores in this table are residual change scores.

Table 8*Week One to Week Two Change Correlations*

Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. BMS	--	.892**	.850**	.873**	.809**	.256**	.036	.058	-.027	-.131	.108	.072	.101
2. BMS-A	.892**	--	.681**	.681**	.611**	.138	.012	-.030	-.068	-.019	.080	.029	.077
3. BMS-SS	.850**	.681**	--	.673**	.572**	.179*	.033	.008	-.041	-.113	.062	.098	.106
4. BMS-R	.873**	.681**	.673**	--	.584**	.186*	.069	.122	.041	-.161*	.173*	.093	.121
5. BMS-ES	.809**	.611**	.572**	.584**	--	.190*	.016	.034	-.046	-.152	-.004	.014	.032
6. BII-A	.256**	.138	.179*	.186*	.190*	--	-.074	-.097	-.117	.072	.032	.129	.072
7. BICC-CENT	.036	.012	.033	.069	.016	-.051	--	-.118	-.074	.060	.093	-.006	-.039
8. BICC-CERT	.058	-.030	.008	.122	.034	.205**	-.118	--	-.097	-.371**	-.100	-.040	-.112
9. BII-IB	-.027	-.068	-.041	.041	-.046	-.117	-.074	-.097	--	.072	.032	.129	.072
10. LGBIS-IU	-.131	-.019	-.113	-.161*	-.152	-.110	.060	-.371**	.072	--	.046	-.012	-.022
11. SORRS-P	.108	.080	.062	.173*	-.004	-.065	.093	-.100	.032	.046	--	.162*	.163*
12. GAD	.072	.029	.098	.093	.014	.051	-.006	-.040	.129	-.012	.162*	--	.439**
13. CESD	.101	.077	.106	.121	.032	-.072	-.039	-.112	.072	-.022	.163*	.439**	--

Note. ** $p < .001$. * $p < .05$. BMS = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale; BMS-A = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Acceptance Subscale; BMS-SS = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Social Support Subscale; BMS-R = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia Subscale; BMS-ES = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Emotional Support Subscale; BII-IB = Bisexual Identity Inventory – Internalized Binegativity Subscale; BII-A = Bisexual Identity Inventory – Affirmation Subscale; LGBIS-IU = Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Identity Inventory - Identity Uncertainty Subscale; SORRS-P = Sexual Orientation Reflection and Rumination Scale - Preoccupation Subscale; BICC-CENT = Bisexual Identity Certainty and Centrality Scale - Identity Centrality; BICC-CERT = Bisexual Identity Certainty and Centrality Scale - Identity Certainty; GAD = Generalized Anxiety Disorder 7 Scale; CESD = Centre for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale. With the exception of the BMS and its subscales, all scale scores in this table are residual change scores.

Table 9*Week Two to Week Three Change Correlations*

Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. BMS	--	.877**	.820**	.833**	.700**	.026	.107	-.102	.093	.015	-.033	.028	.034
2. BMS-A	.877**	--	.672**	.612**	.526**	.032	.119	-.052	-.033	-.025	-.036	.045	.074
3. BMS-SS	.820**	.672**	--	.657**	.395**	-.027	.182*	-.070	-.070	.013	-.071	.095	.069
4. BMS-R	.833**	.612**	.657**	--	.402**	.036	.055	-.070	-.080	-.013	.029	.028	.022
5. BMS-ES	.700**	.526**	.395**	.402**	--	.021	.042	-.160	-.150	.105	-.045	-.015	.017
6. BII-A	.026	.032	-.027	.036	.021	--	.115	.004	-.144	-.074	-.023	-.115	-.127
7. BICC-CENT	.107	.119	.182*	.055	.042	.115	--	.048	.082	-.003	-.067	-.021	-.100
8. BICC-CERT	-.102	-.052	-.070	-.070	-.160	.004	.048	--	.094	-.281**	.026	-.051	-.085
9. BII-IB	-.093	-.033	-.070	-.080	-.150	-.144	.082	.094	--	-.043	.005	.032	.082
10. LGBIS-IU	.015	-.025	.013	-.013	.105	-.074	-.003	-.281**	-.043	--	.157	-.062	.123
11. SORRS-P	-.033	-.036	-.071	.029	-.045	-.023	-.067	.026	.005	.157	--	.053	.041
12. GAD	.028	.045	.095	.028	-.015	-.115	-.021	-.051	.032	-.062	.053	--	.669**
13. CESD	.034	.074	.069	.022	.017	-.127	-.100	-.085	.082	.123	.041	.669**	--

Note. ** $p < .001$. * $p < .05$. BMS = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale; BMS-A = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Acceptance Subscale; BMS-SS = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Social Support Subscale; BMS-R = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia Subscale; BMS-ES = Bisexual Microaffirmations Scale – Emotional Support Subscale; BII-IB = Bisexual Identity Inventory – Internalized Binegativity Subscale; BII-A = Bisexual Identity Inventory – Affirmation Subscale; LGBIS-IU = Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Identity Inventory - Identity Uncertainty Subscale; SORRS-P = Sexual Orientation Reflection and Rumination Scale - Preoccupation Subscale; BICC-CENT = Bisexual Identity Certainty and Centrality Scale - Identity Centrality; BICC-CERT = Bisexual Identity Certainty and Centrality Scale - Identity Certainty; GAD = Generalized Anxiety Disorder 7 Scale; CESD = Centre for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale. With the exception of the BMS and its subscales, all scale scores in this table are residual change scores.

Table 10*Hypothesis 2 Findings: Scores*

Event Type	Outcome	Level	Overall	Women	Men	Non-Binary
Total	Internalized Binegativity	Within				
		Between	✓			
	Sexual Identity Uncertainty	Within				
		Between				
	Preoccupation	Within				
		Between	X			X
	Identity Affirmation	Within	✓			✓
		Between	✓	✓	✓	
	Identity Centrality	Within				
		Between	✓	✓		
	Identity Certainty	Within				
		Between	✓	✓		
	Anxiety	Within				
		Between				
Depression	Within					
	Between					
Acceptance	Internalized Binegativity	Within		✓		
		Between	✓			
	Sexual Identity Uncertainty	Within				
		Between				
	Preoccupation	Within				
		Between	X			
	Identity Affirmation	Within	✓			✓
		Between	✓	✓	✓	
	Identity Centrality	Within				
		Between	✓	✓		
	Identity Certainty	Within				
		Between	✓	✓		
	Anxiety	Within				
		Between				
Depression	Within					
	Between					
Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia	Internalized Binegativity	Within				
		Between				
	Sexual Identity Uncertainty	Within				
		Between		✓		
Preoccupation	Within					

		Between	X		X
	Identity Affirmation	Within			
		Between	✓	✓	
	Identity Centrality	Within			✓
		Between	✓	✓	
	Identity Certainty	Within			
		Between	✓	✓	
	Anxiety	Within			
		Between			
	Depression	Within			
		Between		X	
Social Support	Internalized Binegativity	Within			
		Between	✓	✓	
	Sexual Identity Uncertainty	Within			
		Between			
	Preoccupation	Within			
		Between			
	Identity Affirmation	Within			✓
		Between	✓	✓	✓
	Identity Centrality	Within			✓
		Between	✓	✓	
	Identity Certainty	Within			X
		Between	✓	✓	✓
	Anxiety	Within			
		Between			X
Depression	Within				
	Between	X		X	
Emotional Support	Internalized Binegativity	Within			X
		Between	✓	✓	
	Sexual Identity Uncertainty	Within			
		Between		✓	
	Preoccupation	Within			
		Between			X
	Identity Affirmation	Within			✓
		Between	✓	✓	
	Identity Centrality	Within			
		Between	✓	✓	
	Identity Certainty	Within			
		Between	✓	✓	✓
	Anxiety	Within			
		Between			X
Depression	Within				

Between

✓

Note. ✓: hypothesis was supported by the data. X: finding was significant but in the opposite direction predicted.

Table 11*Hypothesis 2 Findings: Change Scores*

Event Type	Mediator	Level	Overall	Women	Men	Non-Binary
Total	Internalized Binegativity	Within				
		Between				
	Sexual Identity Uncertainty	Within				
		Between				
	Preoccupation	Within				
		Between	X			
	Identity Affirmation	Within				
		Between				
	Identity Centrality	Within				
		Between	✓	✓		
	Identity Certainty	Within				X
		Between				
	Anxiety	Within				
		Between				
Depression	Within					
	Between					
Acceptance	Internalized Binegativity	Within			✓	
		Between				
	Sexual Identity Uncertainty	Within				
		Between				
	Preoccupation	Within				
		Between	X		X	
	Identity Affirmation	Within				
		Between				
	Identity Centrality	Within				
		Between	✓	✓		
	Identity Certainty	Within				
		Between				
	Anxiety	Within				
		Between				
Depression	Within					
	Between					
Recognition of Bisexuality and Biphobia	Internalized Binegativity	Within				
		Between	✓			
	Sexual Identity Uncertainty	Within				X
		Between				
	Preoccupation	Within			X	
		Between				

		Between	X		X	
	Identity Affirmation	Within				
		Between				
	Identity Centrality	Within				
		Between		✓		
	Identity Certainty	Within				
		Between				
	Anxiety	Within				
		Between				
	Depression	Within				
		Between	X	X		
Social Support	Internalized Binegativity	Within				
		Between				
	Sexual Identity Uncertainty	Within				
		Between				
	Preoccupation	Within				
		Between				
	Identity Affirmation	Within				
		Between				
	Identity Centrality	Within				✓
		Between		✓		X
	Identity Certainty	Within				
		Between				
	Anxiety	Within				
		Between				
Depression	Within					
	Between					
Emotional Support	Internalized Binegativity	Within				
		Between				
	Sexual Identity Uncertainty	Within				
		Between				
	Preoccupation	Within				
		Between	X			X
	Identity Affirmation	Within				
		Between				
	Identity Centrality	Within				
		Between				
	Identity Certainty	Within				X
		Between				
	Anxiety	Within				
		Between				
Depression	Within					
	Between					

Note. ✓: hypothesis was supported by the data. X: finding was significant but in the opposite direction predicted.

Appendix A

Qualitative Responses and Subsequent Categorizations

Acceptance: acceptance of bisexuality as a legitimate sexual identity; understanding bisexuality easily, accepting being bisexual without any questions, acknowledging bisexuality without making a big deal about it, letting someone figure out their sexuality without making assumptions

1. At best, I would say that when watching TV shows with attractive people, my equal attraction to the women and men supported my belief of my own sexuality. I would say this is bi-affirmative events, as in, affirmations of my own bisexuality. Saying bipositive events creates the idea that I had a positive bisexual experience related to my sexuality, which feels like it has to relate to my liking for women and for men, at the same time, as opposed to me just experiencing my sexuality. I am a cys female, and I have a cys boyfriend. We both acknowledge my pansexuality, and make jokes about having threesomes with women, and the like. These are, I suppose, bipositive events, as in, events related to my bisexuality where I felt comforted that my boyfriend wasn't weird about my attraction to women. This is different from watching Charlie's Angels and thinking Kristen Stewart is hot. That has to do with my bisexuality, but it affirms it to me, myself, not to anyone else
2. Friends discussed various aspects of relationships with both men and women with me without my sexuality being a talking point - I was simply able to add input to both sides and did so normally
3. Coming out to a friend and them not questioning me, just fully accepting. Experienced once.
4. Told my parents that if I ever get married, it would more likely be to a woman than a man; received support.
5. Discussions with partner about opening up our relationship to explore my sexuality
6. Due to the Holidays and Covid, I haven't been around anyone other than family and immediate friends - family does not know, my friends are supportive and do not ask questions anymore as we have already had great conversations about it - they support me fully
7. I didn't really see many other people other than my partner this week so not much happened on this front, but yesterday I felt comfortable bringing it up while we were watching a TV show and my partner was cool with it so that was a positive experience.
8. Going out with friends and being able to acknowledge everyone's beauty regardless of their gender
9. I have been watching a lot of tiktoks that make me feel like a Kinsey 4 rather than a Kinsey 3, and my male identified partner was very supportive of the fact that I may be more attracted to women
10. I constantly express my mutual affection for both genders in casual conversation and have not once felt uncomfortable in my peer group
11. I came out to my parents this week by telling them that I had a girlfriend and they were super awesome about it.

12. I started talking to a new person and they brought up the topic of bisexuality without making a big deal about it which made me feel comfortable enough to disclose my bisexual identity with them.
13. Listening to people in podcast not assume sexuality and gender of people who had written in
14. I experienced a comfortable acceptance of my same-sex partner by my family over the holiday break. (I've been with my partner for years and they are integrated into my family, and vice versa).
15. Visiting my family, who are raising their son in a very inclusive way, including talking about plans for the future (their son's and ours) using both gender-neutral language as well as inclusive gendered language. Using gendered inclusive language makes me feel validated in being attracted by both genders (as opposed to gender-neutral language)
16. I told a friend who I hadn't told yet and he was supportive and excited for me
17. I felt like I could talk openly about it with my friends, it was not taken as a super-serious topic but rather as an enjoyable one
18. I was able to connect with a new guy on Reddit, who was also married and bi. It felt so good to share experiences and have someone to relate to directly. We were almost talking to each other every day.
19. I find people accept it without issue because I'm confident. Also, it's not really something that comes up. Homophobia and sexism are more of an issue.
20. I was able to discuss my attraction to the other genders with my partner who is a male.
21. I had a conversation about labels with a friend, and we celebrated when we discovered we are both on the bisexual spectrum, and both feel similarly about a slight preference for the term "pansexual" while recognizing "bisexual" still applies. It felt great to deepen our friendship with this shared identity.
22. I had a phone call with a nurse about an upcoming surgery and I used the term partner to describe the person picking me up. The nurse on the phone said "can I get his or her phone number to call after the surgery". This happened once.
23. My (bi) partner laughed at a bi pun I made and laughed when I pointed out that the Google doodle for today is accidentally bi. Both happened once.
24. I had one experience where a couple of individuals were simply neutral when I discussed both male and female romantic partners
25. I had someone ask if I was bi and after saying yes, I wasn't met with any kind of biphobia. Also, when my parents made a comment about dating men, I added, "or women" and they just shrugged and were like, "or women." Reactions like this make me feel valid, and gives me hope that the world is progressing, even if it's just a little.
26. My physio (who is a lesbian woman) made no assumptions about who my partner is and did not mind using gender neutral pronouns when referring to them! I thought that was nice and made me feel like I could be more open and honest with her about all aspects of my life because she made me feel validated in not only my injury (which most doctors have sloughed off- turns out after 5+ years of no one believing my pain I have a spinal fracture), but I also feel validated in my sexuality and that it doesn't matter the gender (or lack thereof) of my partner.
27. My partner was ok that I looked "gay"
28. I shared a photo of a female actress that I have had a crush on since I was very young and expressed this- other women chimed in to show similar affection regardless of their

actual sexuality. We can all agree that being complimentary and affectionate toward the same sex is perfectly normal regardless of our sexuality :)

29. I work in a queer owned restaurant, so my bi poly life is frequently affirmed. Also, we did an online work event for the beer importer that I work for. We had to make a little title slide about our lives, and I was totally comfortable putting up the bi pride flag and showing pics of both of my partners.
30. Speaking to my brother for the first time about dating. He made no fuss about my bisexuality we just talked like we always would.
31. Positive reaction from someone I was dating when I told them I was bi
32. My coworker casually asked if I was interested in dating another coworker, who is a different gender to my previous partner. I thought it was nice that she didn't care or make a big deal out of the gender thing.
33. My coworkers ask about my girlfriend often like it's no big deal that we are two women dating. I am not sure if they assume I am bi or gay.
34. There is no question when I talk about my attraction to multiple genders. I am around people that understand the struggles of being sexually attracted to people with different bodies as well
35. People using gender neutral terms asking if I was in a relationship and not assuming the gender of my partner.

Social Support: general support individuals give to bisexual people and relationships; supporting relationships of bi people, being attentive to discussions of bisexuality, showing support for bisexuality

1. A gender outlaws online meeting group allowed me to meet other weekly to chat
2. A person I follow on Instagram posted a photo of a drawing to their story with the caption “your partner does not define your sexuality” which really resonated with me and although it wasn’t directly sent to me or a comment on my personal relationship it felt really validating to see other people acknowledge that although one might be in a straight passing or gay passing relationship does not mean they are one or the other
3. Able to openly express my identity (quite literally, being with both a male and a female)
4. attended a few lgbtia+ groups online
5. facebook posts
6. Attended a meet for bi women and it helped to work my identity and made me understand that am not alone and people faces the same situation am in
7. Chatting with another trans and bisexual friend about what those intersections mean to us. Watching some cool bisexual-focused video essays on Youtube
8. I am in a bisexual relationship. My partner by virtue of existing, affirms my bisexuality.
9. Connected with other Bi people
10. Discussing significant people in our lives who supported the development of our bisexuality - particularly accessing the the « queer » attraction. Also acknowledging that I am their older bi sibling - love queer kinship
11. Generally noting that my experience as an afab masc of centre non-binary person on Grindr has held a lot of space and bipositive events - these are main contending conversations I am referencing in responding to these questions

12. While with a group of friends (including my partner and my friend's partner who are both men, my best friend and I discussed how women are attractive. This was nice and felt affirming!
13. Everyday my romantic partner supported my bisexuality
14. I do sincerely hope that "DM'ing friends pictures of hot people of all genders" is in your survey responses - that's a pretty significant and ongoing expression of bipoisitivity for me and my friends. Please know that this is true every week.
15. Had sex with a fellow bisexual multiple times
16. My partner gave me roses that were dyed in the colours of the bisexual pride flag
17. I follow a bisexual person on Instagram and they posted about a queer prom they went to. I thought that was really sweet and made me hopeful for the acceptance of bisexuality
18. I am in a long term, monogamous other-sex relationship and have been out for over a decade. I have the privilege of not having my sexual orientation come up for discussion every week.
19. I am lucky enough to connect with a few other bisexual guys online. Although we talk soon sporadic, it is super helpful to connect with them on a very personal level. We would share our feelings about bisexuality overall (the struggles of the bi-cycle, or in their case being on the down-low). We would talk multiple times during the week. I am also involved with the bisexual sub-Reddits. I would check these forums daily, but only connect to a few of them multiple times during the week.
20. I have been participating more with other guy married guys from Reddit. It is super nice to share and support each other. We would talk frequently throughout the week. If not every other day at least.
21. I attended a bi-focussed meeting (second week of Jan) organized by Qmunity. It was great to hear experiences of other bi people
22. I attend lgbtai groups a couple a few times a week
23. I haven't discussed sexuality with anyone in the past week. Anything I commented on is what I saw on social media.
24. I recently reconnected with a queer friend and while we did not discuss bisexuality at length our queerness came up in casual ways which I consider to be a bipoisitive experience.
25. I'm personally not 'out', as it were, but I've felt affirmed when I see or read others talking about their bisexuality and how much my own experiences and feelings often mirror their own.
26. I had sex with my own gender last week, and I had sex with my wife
27. I work in the school system and wear a pride pin, pronoun pin, and "protect trans kids" pin on my ID lanyard. I had 2 kids comment on how much they liked my pins and that they knew I was someone safe to talk to, even though I am just a sub. I told them I was happy to hear that, thats why I sport them, and because I am part of the community and I didn't have representation when I was in school.
28. i went to a perfromance by a nonbinary troupe that showcased love and partnership with different presentations of gender.
29. I had really positive conversation with my opposite sex, bisexual partner about my journey of discovering my sexuality.

30. My partner and I had extensive discussions on relationship trauma and healthy boundaries regardless of gender and inclusive of varying queer experiences. This happened once or twice in the past week.
31. I have the fullest support from my wife with respect to my bisexuality.
32. my partner and I are married and live together and are both bi. we validate each other without necessarily having discussions or calling out people in public.
33. I often go attend drag shows where participants showcase their drag with flags and identities clearly stated, performers are trans, non-binary, via and across the queer spectrum and I can attend or participate as a bi performer with a cis het partner
34. I wear a bi flag pin at work, and I had someone (around elementary school age) compliment it and share that they were also bi
35. online there are more opportunities to feel comfortable in my bisexuality
36. One instance, where someone noticed the bi flag colours in a place they usually wouldn't be found.
37. Most of my friends are bi so every time I interact with them and sexuality comes up I feel affirmed in my identity
38. My common-law partner is wonderfully supportive and we often talk cute/hot guys in life or TV. She's always supportive.
39. once, was able to discuss bisexuality and biphobia in an academic seminar
40. online groups
41. My close friends are bi and we share memes. A friend I see in person is bi and we often talk about our experiences through a bi lens.
42. my partner and I are both bisexual and married to one another, so every day we affirm one another?
43. positive experience with co-worker
44. Talking about bisexuality and queerness with friends
45. talking about bisexuality with someone much older than me who also identifies as bisexual in a non-lgbt specific environment
46. Talking about my sexuality with my partner and friends and feeling safe because they also have queer sexualities.
47. The r/bisexual subreddit is a place where I feel welcomed, affirmed, and accepted

Emotional Support: emotional support people provide a bisexual individual; being happy regardless of sex/gender of partner, providing emotional support in relation to bisexuality, supporting romantic and/or sexual relationships

1. "all of my above events over the past week should be clarified to note that I had one event where my sexuality was acknowledged in anyway - in that situation, the person I encountered was very positive, generally accepting and indifferent to whomever or whichever gender I want to pursue romantically/sexually. I've had no other events where its been an issue whatsoever."
2. Spoke positively about it with my husband
3. A pal and I celebrated dating people of different genders
4. I had a bisexual person offer to be a sperm donor for myself and my partner, with the support of their partner. That was a great experience and they acknowledged that it can be very difficult to find a straight donor.

5. In ethically non monogamous relationships with two people of different genders than myself who regularly support me when I share with them my desires and struggles in dating people of a similar gender to my own.
6. I went to visit my best friend in a different city who is also bi so we had lots of discussions about it because she has recently come out
7. my married partner and I are both bi, so we support each other every day!
8. my primary partner (m) went for coffee with my female partner to get to know each other more
9. My primary partner encouraged me to go on a date with someone of a different gender identity, and verbally affirmed to me that it does not change the validity of our same-gender relationship
10. My wife said she is excited to be a part of my bisexual journey.
11. I sent the video of 'bi-wife energy' to my closest friends, saying that it perfectly embodied my husband, and they all agreed. One even said that they had already seen the video, and had thought of my husband as an example.
12. I'm a bisexual nonbinary person engaged to another bisexual nonbinary person, and our relationship itself feels like an inherently bisexual phenomenon - neither of us would feel quite right if the other person identified with a monosexual orientation. To me, doing things together as a couple feels affirming and positive to my bisexual identity. This happens every day!
13. Talked to a close queer (although not bi) friend for the first time in a long while, we talked a bit about queer experiences.
14. My friends have asked me for updates about a crush that I have and are trying to encourage me to go for it!
15. My partner and I are both bi+/pan, so we regularly joke about the crushes we have on fictional characters. It's affirming to be able to joke around about liking characters of any gender together without judgement; my past few exes were not so open.
16. My partner is supportive of me pursuing sexual relationships with other people of any gender
17. Went out on a first date, and my friend asked "how did your date go with him/her/them?" And my other friend mentioned I should watch a TV series because both the leading male and female actors are my type

Recognition: recognition of bisexuality as an identity, and also the identification of and resistance to biphobia; recognizing biphobia as serious, acknowledging difficulties of being bi, challenging biphobia, respecting opinions on bisexuality, asking sincere questions about bisexuality

1. Alternative health care practitioner who asks about emotional wellbeing as part of their intake, and they were accepting my coming out after telling her about a date I went on with a heterosexual/cis gender man- he said microaggressions about bisexuality that were hurtful, I don't think he realized they weren't ok things to say, and I felt a bit stressed for a couple of days after
2. Discussed with friends biphobia in media. They were all very bipoisitive.
3. Discussing what it means to be bi with friends
4. Yes, once. A discussion with a friend who didn't know the differences between bi and pan and accepted my experiences and worked to learn from it.

5. I described a biphobic event that happened to me at work to straight friends, and they were really supportive about it and easily understood why it the event was harmful. They did not question my experience as a bi/queer person, but instead listened and acknowledged my perspective as a bi person.
6. I was telling my biological dad how a certain family member wouldn't support my bisexuality or being polyamorous if they found out, which to me isn't true family. He simply just listened without judgement and fully accepted me for who I am.
7. In an online interaction there was a biphobic statement by a woman, and many people both LGBTQ+ and not responded with informative and affirming comments. I really felt what they were saying and how they were saying it.
8. Talking with bisexual partner about bisexuality.
9. My sister and I often discuss biphobia and bisexuality in the media.
10. most of my friends are trans and queer and though not everybody understands my sexuality perfectly (bi lesbian) most of my people seem to support me through partnerships or sexual encounters with ppl of whichever genders
11. My family was supportive of me and my partner and we celebrated a major milestone together.
12. My best friends met my new same sex partner and were very inviting
13. My partner (pansexual) and I have been watching a show recently that affirms a lot of our bi+/pan feelings and identities, and has led to some great discussions on affirmations, representaiton in media, and biphobia.
14. Joking around with a friend, he started doing couple therapy with his (bi) girlfriend. He was pondering about how the therapy was 60% for him and 40% for her but his girlfriend said it was more like 100% for them as a couple. I said it was like bisexuality, you are not 50% gay and 50% straight, but rather 100% bi. He understood and said I had a fair point.
15. I saw one tik tok video where someone defended the bi community.
16. There was a YouTube video posted by a big creator, interviewing Bisexuals, talking about their identity, and their feelings on bi-erasure and common bisexual experiences. It was affirming to watch.
17. talking about media with bi/queer representation, a few times
18. TikTok has a lot of bi+ creators that make great content about being bi. I like how when I am watching videos on TikTok I regularly see fun content about being bi. I would say this is pretty much every time I use the app so daily or close to daily
19. Watching a show where a character struggled to understand her bisexual identity.
20. seeing person struggle with discovering bi-identity in tv series
21. Seeing this survey on my timeline! (Once)

Appendix B

Consent Form for Baseline Measures (T0)

You are invited to participate in a research project entitled “The Relationships among Gender, Bipositive Events and Psychological Outcomes”. Please read this form carefully.

Researcher: Carolina de Barros (Graduate Student), Department of Psychology, ac.debarros@usask.ca

Supervisor: Dr. Todd Morrison, Department of Psychology, todd.morrison@usask.ca

Purpose and Procedure: The purpose of the research is to examine possible gender differences on the experiences of bipositive events (also known as bisexual microaffirmations; events that affirm or validate bisexual identity). This is the first of four questionnaires. You will be asked to complete an online questionnaire that examines a number of constructs. These include: internalized binegativity (how negatively you feel about your bisexuality); sexual identity uncertainty (how sure or unsure you are of your sexual orientation); preoccupation with others’ thoughts about your sexual orientation; identity affirmation (how positively you feel about your bisexuality); identity certainty and centrality (how sure you are of your bisexuality and how central your bisexuality is to your identity); anxiety; and depression. You also will be asked to provide demographic information such as your age, gender, and sexual orientation. Participation in this initial study should take approximately 20 minutes, and participation in all questionnaires should take approximately 80 minutes.

Potential Risks: There are no known or anticipated risks to you by participating in this research.

Potential Benefits: Participation in this study may increase your knowledge and understanding of psychological research. It also may enhance your awareness of how you feel about your bisexual identity. You will be given the opportunity to enter a draw to win one of five \$50 Amazon gift cards.

Confidentiality: The data collected in this study will be kept confidential. You will be provided with an ID number, which will be used to keep track of your data. This ID number will be linked to your email address in an encrypted, password-protected Excel document, which will be deleted following completion of data collection. All data will be reported in aggregate form. Data will be stored for a minimum of five years after completion of the study, and will be destroyed beyond recovery when they are no longer required. The data collected will be used for a Masters’ thesis, which may be presented at conferences and/or published in an academic journal. E-mail communication with the researchers (e.g., email reminders, emails addressing concerns, or emails requesting the results of the study) will be deleted following communication.

Right to Withdraw: Your participation is voluntary and you are free to omit any questions you wish for any reason. You also may withdraw from the research project, at any time without explanation or penalty of any sort, and without loss of compensation. Should you wish to withdraw, any data that you have contributed will be destroyed beyond recovery. Your right to withdraw data from the study will apply until data collection for this study is completed. After

this point, it is not possible to withdraw data as we have no way of determining the identity of any respondent once we have destroyed the Excel file linking ID numbers to emails.

Questions or Concerns: Feel free to contact the researcher and/or the supervisor if you have any questions or concerns at any point during the study. This research project has been approved on ethical grounds by the Behavioural Research Ethics board on_____. Any questions regarding your rights as a participant may be addressed to the Behavioural Research Ethics board through the Research Ethics Office, ethics.office@usask.ca, (306) 966-2975. Out-of-town participants may call toll free, (866) 966-2975. The results of the study may be obtained by contacting the student researcher or the supervisor with the information provided at the top of this page.

Consent: I understand that any information I provide during the survey will be kept confidential. I have read and understood the description of the research study provided above. I understand that I may contact the researcher and/or the supervisor regarding any questions I have about this study. I agree to participate, understanding that I may withdraw my consent to participate at any time.

[I AGREE TO PARTICIPATE]

[I AM NOT INTERESTED IN PARTICIPATING]

Please print off a copy of this consent form for your records prior to completing the survey.

Appendix C

Consent Form for Weekly Studies (T1-T3)

You are invited to participate in a research project entitled “The Relationships among Gender, Bipositive Events and Psychological Outcomes”. Please read this form carefully.

Researcher: Carolina de Barros (Graduate Student), Department of Psychology, ac.debarros@usask.ca

Supervisor: Dr. Todd Morrison, Department of Psychology, todd.morrison@usask.ca

Purpose and Procedure: The purpose of the research is to examine possible gender differences on the experiences of bipositive events (also known as bisexual microaffirmations; events that affirm or validate bisexual identity). This is the [second/third/fourth] of four questionnaires. You will be asked to complete an online questionnaire that examines a number of constructs. These include: internalized binegativity (how negatively you feel about your bisexuality), sexual identity uncertainty (how sure or unsure you are of your sexual orientation), preoccupation with others’ thoughts about your sexual orientation, identity affirmation (how positively you feel about your bisexuality), identity certainty and centrality (how sure you are of your bisexuality and how central your bisexuality is to your identity), anxiety, and depression. The questionnaire will also ask you about the bipositive events you have experienced in the past week. You also will be asked to provide demographic information such as your age, gender, and sexual orientation. Participation in this questionnaire should take approximately 20 minutes, and participation in all questionnaires should take approximately 80 minutes.

Potential Risks: There are no known or anticipated risks to you by participating in this research.

Potential Benefits: Participation in this study may increase your knowledge and understanding of psychological research. It also may enhance your awareness of how you feel about your bisexual identity. You will be given the opportunity to enter a draw to win one of five \$50 Amazon gift cards.

Confidentiality: The data collected in this study will be kept confidential. You will be provided with an ID number which will be used to keep track of your data. This ID number will be linked to your email address in an encrypted, password-protected Excel document, which will be deleted following completion of data collection. All data will be reported in aggregate form. Data will be stored for a minimum of five years after completion of the study, and will be destroyed beyond recovery when they are no longer required. The data collected will be used for a Masters’ thesis, which may be presented at conferences and/or published in an academic journal. E-mail communication with the researchers (e.g., email reminders, emails addressing concerns, or emails requesting the results of the study) will be deleted following communication.

Right to Withdraw: Your participation is voluntary and you are free to omit any questions you wish for any reason. You also may withdraw from the research project, at any time without explanation or penalty of any sort, and without loss of compensation. Should you wish to withdraw, any data that you have contributed will be destroyed beyond recovery. Your right to

withdraw data from the study will apply until data collection for this study is completed. After this point, it is not possible to withdraw data as we have no way of determining the identity of any respondent once we have destroyed the Excel file linking ID numbers to emails.

Questions or Concerns: Feel free to contact the researcher and/or the supervisor if you have any questions or concerns at any point during the study. This research project has been approved on ethical grounds by the Behavioural Research Ethics board on_____. Any questions regarding your rights as a participant may be addressed to the Behavioural Research Ethics board through the Research Ethics Office, ethics.office@usask.ca, (306) 966-2975. Out-of-town participants may call toll free, (866) 966-2975. The results of the study may be obtained by contacting the student researcher or the supervisor with the information provided at the top of this page.

Consent: I understand that any information I provide during the survey will be kept confidential. I have read and understood the description of the research study provided above. I understand that I may contact the researcher and/or the supervisor regarding any questions I have about this study. I agree to participate, understanding that I may withdraw my consent to participate at any time.

[I AGREE TO PARTICIPATE]

[I AM NOT INTERESTED IN PARTICIPATING]

Please print off a copy of this consent form for your records prior to completing the survey.

Appendix D

Debriefing Form for Baseline Measures

Thank you for participating in this survey. The purpose of this survey was to determine your baseline measures as you begin participation in this study. You completed an online questionnaire measuring internalized binegativity, sexual identity uncertainty, preoccupation with others' thoughts about your bisexuality, bisexual identity affirmation, identity certainty and centrality, anxiety, and depression. The demographic information you provided will be used to examine potential differences in these constructs.

Less than 20% of previous research on 2SLGBTQ+ populations has included a strength-based element, reflecting a lack of positive perspectives in 2SLGBTQ scholarship (Vaughan et al., 2014). A recent push for more strengths-based research in 2SLGBTQ communities has led to a focus on bipositive events, which are events that affirm or validate one's bisexual identity (Dyar & London, 2018; Flanders et al., 2017).

You will be contacted in a week, at your chosen day and time, to complete the follow-up measures. If you wish to enter a draw to win one of five \$50 Amazon gift cards, please click on the following link: [LINK].

The results of our study will be presented in a Masters' thesis, research paper, and conference presentation. Your information will be kept in strictest confidence. If you have any questions about our study, please feel free to email Carolina de Barros, at ac.debarros@usask.ca, or Todd Morrison, at todd.morrison@usask.ca. You also may contact us for a copy of the results after the completion of the study.

Thank you again for your participation!
Please print this page for your records.

References and Further Readings:

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. doi:10.1037/sgd0000281

Flanders, C. E., Tarasoff, L. A., Legge, M. M., Robinson, M., & Gos, G. (2017). Positive identity experiences of young bisexual and other nonmonosexual people: A qualitative inquiry. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 64(8), 1014-1032. doi:10.1080/00918369.2016.1236592

Rotosky, S. S., Riggle, E. D. B., Pascale-Hauge, D., & McCants, L. E. (2010). The positive aspects of a bisexual self-identification. *Psychology & Sexuality*, 1(2), 131-144. doi:10.1080/19419899.2010.484595

Vaughan, M. D., Miles, J., Parent, M. C., Lee, H. S., Tilghman, J. D., & Prokhorets, S. (2014). A content analysis of LGBT-themed positive psychology articles. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, 1, 325-334. doi:10.1037/sgd0000053

Appendix E

Debriefing Form for Follow-Ups 1 and 2

Thank you for participating in this survey. The purpose of this survey was to see how you are progressing in this study. You completed an online questionnaire measuring internalized binegativity, sexual identity uncertainty, preoccupation with others' thoughts about your bisexuality, bisexual identity affirmation, identity certainty and centrality, anxiety, and depression. You were also asked about the bipositive events you have experienced in the past week. The demographic information you provided will be used to examine potential differences in these constructs.

Less than 20% of previous research on 2SLGBTQ+ populations has included a strength-based element, reflecting a lack of positive perspectives in 2SLGBTQ scholarship (Vaughan et al., 2014). A recent push for more strengths-based research in 2SLGBTQ communities has led to a focus on bipositive events, which are events that affirm or validate one's bisexual identity (Dyar & London, 2018; Flanders et al., 2017).

You will be contacted in a week, at your chosen day and time, to complete the next follow-up measure. If you wish to enter a draw to win one of five \$50 Amazon gift cards, please click on the following link: [LINK].

The results of our study will be presented in a Masters' thesis, research paper, and conference presentation. Your information will be kept in strictest confidence. If you have any questions about our study, please feel free to email Carolina de Barros, at ac.debarros@usask.ca, or Todd Morrison, at todd.morrison@usask.ca. You also may contact us for a copy of the results after the completion of the study.

Thank you again for your participation!
Please print this page for your records.

References and Further Readings:

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. doi:10.1037/sgd0000281

Flanders, C. E., Tarasoff, L. A., Legge, M. M., Robinson, M., & Gos, G. (2017). Positive identity experiences of young bisexual and other nonmonosexual people: A qualitative inquiry. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 64(8), 1014-1032. doi:10.1080/00918369.2016.1236592

Rotosky, S. S., Riggle, E. D. B., Pascale-Hauge, D., & McCants, L. E. (2010). The positive aspects of a bisexual self-identification. *Psychology & Sexuality*, 1(2), 131-144. doi:10.1080/19419899.2010.484595

Vaughan, M. D., Miles, J., Parent, M. C., Lee, H. S., Tilghman, J. D., & Prokhorets, S. (2014). A content analysis of LGBT-themed positive psychology articles. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, 1, 325-334. doi:10.1037/sgd0000053

Appendix F

Debriefing Form for Follow-Up 3

Thank you for participating in this survey. The purpose of this survey was to see how you are progressing in this study. You completed an online questionnaire measuring internalized binegativity, sexual identity uncertainty, preoccupation with others' thoughts about your bisexuality, bisexual identity affirmation, identity certainty and centrality, anxiety, and depression. You were also asked about the bipositive events you have experienced in the past week. The demographic information you provided will be used to examine potential differences in these constructs.

Less than 20% of previous research on 2SLGBTQ+ populations has included a strength-based element, reflecting a lack of positive perspectives in 2SLGBTQ scholarship (Vaughan et al., 2014). A recent push for more strengths-based research in 2SLGBTQ communities has led to a focus on bipositive events, which are events that affirm or validate one's bisexual identity (Dyar & London, 2018; Flanders et al., 2017).

The aim of our study was to examine whether gender is associated with experiences of bipositive events and their connections to internal stressors (i.e., internalized binegativity, sexual identity uncertainty, and preoccupation), bisexual identity, and internalizing symptoms (i.e., anxiety and depression). Knowing how gender interacts with these experiences can help researchers better examine how bisexual identity is affected by social interaction.

If you wish to enter a draw to win one of five \$50 Amazon gift cards, please click on the following link: [LINK].

The results of our study will be presented in a Masters' thesis, research paper, and conference presentation. Your information will be kept in strictest confidence. If you have any questions about our study, please feel free to email Carolina de Barros, at ac.debarros@usask.ca, or Todd Morrison, at todd.morrison@usask.ca. You also may contact us for a copy of the results after the completion of the study.

Thank you again for your participation!
Please print this page for your records.

References and Further Readings:

- 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. doi:10.1037/sgd0000281
- Flanders, C. E., Tarasoff, L. A., Legge, M. M., Robinson, M., & Gos, G. (2017). Positive identity experiences of young bisexual and other nonmonosexual people: A qualitative inquiry. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 64(8), 1014-1032. doi:10.1080/00918369.2016.1236592
- Rotosky, S. S., Riggle, E. D. B., Pascale-Hauge, D., & McCants, L. E. (2010). The positive aspects of a bisexual self-identification. *Psychology & Sexuality*, 1(2), 131-144. doi:10.1080/19419899.2010.484595
- Vaughan, M. D., Miles, J., Parent, M. C., Lee, H. S., Tilghman, J. D., & Prokhorets, S. (2014). A content analysis of LGBT-themed positive psychology articles. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, 1, 325-334. doi:10.1037/sgd0000053

Appendix G

Demographics Measure

Note: for some questions, participants were simply be provided with a textbox into which they could type their response. No categories were provided for these questions.

How old are you? (Textbox)

Participants' answers were restricted to numerical values between 0 and 100. If their answer did not fit this format, they were provided with the error message "Please provide your age as a number."

Gender: (Man/Woman/Non-Binary/Two-Spirit/Other, please specify)

Participants who answered "other" were provided a textbox to specify their gender.

Country of Residence: (Canada/United States/Other, please specify)

Participants who answered "other" were provided a textbox to specify their country of residence.

Sexual Orientation: (Textbox)

Does the word "bisexual" apply to your sexual orientation? (Yes/No)

Ethnic Identity (Select all that apply): (African American or Black/Caucasian or White/East Asian/Hispanic or Latino/a/Indigenous/Middle Eastern/Pacific Islander/South Asian/Southeast Asian/Other, please specify)

Participants who answered "other" were provided a textbox to specify their ethnic identity.

Appendix H

Measures

The following measures were used:

1. **The Internalized Binegativity Subscale of the BII (Paul, Smith, Mohr, & Ross, 2014).**

“The purpose of this scale is to measure the extent to which you identify with each of the following statements as it relates to identifying as a bisexual individual. Please circle the corresponding number for each item as it relates to you personally.

1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Slightly Disagree, 4 = Neutral, 5 = Slightly Agree, 6 = Agree, 7 = Strongly Agree

1. It’s unfair that I am attracted to people of more than one gender.
2. I wish I could control my sexual and romantic feelings by directing them at a single gender.
3. My life would be better if I were not bisexual.
4. Being bisexual prevents me from having meaningful intimate relationships.
5. I would be better off if I would identify as gay or straight, rather than bisexual.”

2. **The Identity Uncertainty Subscale of the LGBIS (Mohr & Kendra, 2011).**

“For each of the following questions, please mark the response that best indicates your current experience as an LGB person. Please be as honest as possible: Indicate how you really feel now, not how you think you should feel. There is no need to think too much about any one question. Answer each question according to your initial reaction and then move on to the next.

1 = Disagree Strongly, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Disagree Somewhat, 4 = Agree Somewhat, 5 = Agree, 6 = Agree Strongly

1. I’m not totally sure what my sexual orientation is.
2. I keep changing my mind about my sexual orientation.
3. I can’t decide whether I am bisexual or homosexual.
4. I get very confused when I try to figure out my sexual orientation.”

3. **The Preoccupation Subscale of the SORRS (Galupo & Bauerband, 2015).**

“Please read the statements and select how often you currently think similar thoughts.

1 = Almost Never, 2 = Sometimes, 3 = Often, 4 = Almost Always

1. Try to figure out what others think about my sexual orientation.

2. Analyze whether to discuss my sexual orientation in different interactions
3. Wonder how my sexual orientation affected how I was viewed in a situation.”

4. **The Identity Affirmation Subscale of the BII (Paul, Smith, Mohr, & Ross, 2014).**

“The purpose of this scale is to measure the extent to which you identify with each of the following statements as it relates to identifying as a bisexual individual. Please circle the corresponding number for each item as it relates to you personally.

1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Slightly Disagree, 4 = Neutral, 5 = Slightly Agree, 6 = Agree, 7 = Strongly Agree

1. I am grateful for my bisexual identity.
2. I am comfortable being bisexual.
3. I am proud to be bisexual.
4. I feel freedom with people of different genders
5. Being bisexual is rewarding to me.
6. I am okay with my bisexuality.”

5. **The Bisexual Identity Certainty and Centrality Measure (Flanders, 2015).**

“For each of the following questions, please select which answer best describes how you feel about your sexual/gender identity.

1- Strongly Disagree, 2- Disagree, 3- Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4- Agree, 5- Strongly Agree

1. Overall, being bisexual has very little to do with how I feel about myself.
2. In general, being bisexual is an important part of my self-image.
3. My destiny is tied to the destiny of other bisexual people.
4. Being bisexual is unimportant to my sense of what kind of person I am.
5. I have a strong sense of belonging to bisexual people.
6. I have a strong attachment to other bisexual people.
7. Being bisexual is an important reflection of who I am.
8. Being bisexual is not a major factor in my social relationships.
9. I feel certain about my sexual identity.
10. I feel secure in my sexual identity.
11. I feel like an imposter when I claim a bisexual identity.
12. I feel like I have not had enough other-sex sexual experiences to be fully comfortable with claiming a bisexual identity.
13. I feel like I have not had enough same-sex sexual experiences to be fully comfortable with claiming a bisexual identity.
14. I feel like I have not had enough other-sex romantic experiences to be fully comfortable with claiming a bisexual identity.
15. I feel like I have not had enough same-sex romantic experiences to be fully comfortable with claiming a bisexual identity.

16. My level of comfort with my bisexual identity is not dependent upon my past or present sexual behaviour.
17. My level of comfort with my bisexual identity is not dependent upon my past or present romantic relationships.”

6. The Generalized Anxiety Disorder 7 Item (GAD-7; Spitzer et al., 2006).

“Over the last 2 weeks, how often have you been bothered by the following problems?

0 = Not at All, 1 = Several Days, 2 = More than Half the Days, 3 = Nearly Every Day

1. Feeling nervous, anxious or on edge
2. Not being able to stop or control worrying
3. Worrying too much about different things
4. Trouble relaxing
5. Being so restless that it is hard to sit still
6. Becoming easily annoyed or irritable
7. Feeling afraid as if something awful might happen

If you checked off any problems, how difficult have these problems made it for you to do your work, take care of things at home, or get along with other people?

0 = Not difficult at all, 1 = Somewhat difficult, 2 = Very Difficult, 3 = Extremely Difficult”

7. The CESD-SF (Levine, 2013).

“Below is a list of the ways you might have felt or behaved. Please tell me how often you have felt this way during the past week.

0 = Rarely or None of the Time (Less than 1 Day), 1 = Some or a Little of the Time (1-2 Days), 2 = Occasionally or a Moderate Amount of Time (3-4 Days), 3 = Most or All of the Time (5-7 Days)

1. I did not feel like eating; my appetite was poor.
2. I had trouble keeping my mind on what I was doing.
3. I felt depressed.
4. I felt that everything I did was an effort.
5. My sleep was restless.
6. I felt sad.
7. I could not get “going”.”

8. The Bisexual Microaffirmation Scale for Women (Flanders et al., 2019).

“Please think about the number of times you have experienced each situation in the last week, related to your sexual identity. Select the response that best matches your experience.

0 = Never, 1 = Once, 2 = Multiple times, 3 = Every day, 4 = This situation is not applicable to me

1. Someone understood bisexuality easily
2. Someone accepted my being bi without any questions
3. Someone acknowledged my bisexuality without making a big deal about it
4. Someone let me figure out my sexuality for myself without making assumptions
5. Someone supported the relationships of other bisexual people
6. Someone was attentive to discussions of bisexuality
7. Someone did something to show their support of bisexuality
8. Someone recognized biphobia as a serious issue
9. Someone challenged biphobia when they saw it
10. Someone acknowledged that being bi is not always easy
11. Someone respected my opinions about bisexuality
12. Someone asked sincere questions about bisexuality
13. I commiserated with other bisexual people about biphobia
14. Someone was happy for me regardless of the sex or gender of my partner(s)
15. Someone provided emotional support
16. Someone supported my relationships”

Appendix I

Recruitment Material

The following was posted on PAWS and social media, and sent to organizations to post on social media:

“If you are a bisexual person between the ages of 18-35, you are invited to participate in a study on bipoisitive events.

This study is on bipoisitive experiences, bisexual identity, and mental health. As a participant in this study, you will be asked to complete four weekly online questionnaires on bipoisitive experiences, internalized binegativity, bisexual identity affirmation, anxiety, and depression. You will also be asked to fill in a demographics measure with your age, gender, and sexual orientation. Participation in this study is expected to take 15-20 minutes per survey.

For more information about this study please contact the student researcher Carolina de Barros at ac.debarros@usask.ca, or the faculty supervisor Todd Morrison at todd.morrison@usask.ca.

This study has been approved on ethical grounds by the University of Saskatchewan Behavioural Research Ethics board on _____, 2021.

Survey Link: _____”