

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/254367341>

Beyond “Risk”: Exploring Sexuality among Diverse Typologies of Bisexual Men in the United States

Article in *Journal of Bisexuality* · January 2012

DOI: 10.1080/15299716.2012.645696

CITATIONS

18

READS

248

6 authors, including:



Brian Dodge

University of Arizona

262 PUBLICATIONS 8,542 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Vanessa Schick

The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston

166 PUBLICATIONS 5,396 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Debby Herbenick

Indiana University Bloomington

327 PUBLICATIONS 9,790 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



David S Novak

87 PUBLICATIONS 2,065 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Beyond “Risk”: Exploring Sexuality among Diverse Typologies of Bisexual Men in the United States

BRIAN DODGE

Center for Sexual Health Promotion, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, USA

JOSHUA G. ROSENBERGER

*Department of Global and Community Health, George Mason University, Fairfax,
Virginia, USA*

VANESSA SCHICK, MICHAEL REECE, and DEBBY HERBENICK

Center for Sexual Health Promotion, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, USA

DAVID S. NOVAK

Online Buddies, Inc., Boston, Massachusetts, USA

Little public health research has explored male bisexuality and the wide range of behaviors experienced by bisexual men beyond disease transmission and other negative consequences. There is a general lack of information on diverse expressions of sexuality among diverse groups of bisexual men in the United States. Researchers collected data on a wide range of variables related to sexual behavior from a sample of 26,042 participants, recruited via a large social and sexual networking Website. Four distinct typologies of male bisexuality were constructed: self-identified bisexual, bisexual dating, bisexual with current sexual partners and bisexual by behavior. These categories were examined individually as well as compared and contrasted with one another. Demographic characteristics varied among men depending on bisexual categorization. Although participants that identified as bisexual within each typology often met criteria for other categories for other typologies, there was no absolute overlap between categories. The recency and frequency of sexual behaviors significantly varied based upon the participant's bisexual typology. Findings suggest that previous research

Address correspondence to Brian Dodge, PhD, Indiana University, Department of Applied Health Science, Center for Sexual Health Promotion, 1025 East 7th Street, HPER 116, Bloomington, IN 47405, USA. E-mail: bmdodge@indiana.edu

on bisexual men's sexual behaviors and sexual risk behaviors may be misleading if bisexuality is restricted to a single typology. Further research should examine the potential subjective meanings and health implications of diverse typologies of male bisexuality, beyond sexual risk. Comprehensive and insightful research on aspects of life other than disease infection and transmission among bisexual men will help to ensure a more accurate understanding of male bisexuality in a comprehensive sexual health framework.

KEYWORDS *bisexuality, bisexual men, men who have sex with both men and women (MSMW), sexual behavior, sexual experience, typologies*

INTRODUCTION

From the time of Kinsey and onward, research has demonstrated that substantial numbers of men and women across cultural contexts and throughout the life span report sexual behaviors, relationships and/or desire with men and women (Bell, Weinberg, & Hammersmith, 1981; Blumstein & Schwartz, 1976a, 1976b; Dodge, Reece, & Gebhard, 2008; Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948; Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, & Gebhard, 1953; Klein, 1993; Rust, 2000; Weinberg, Williams, & Pryor, 1994). The term *bisexual* is also a commonly used, and scientifically understudied, sociocultural, and sexual identity label (Hutchins & Kaahumanu, 1991; Rust, 2000). Although behavioral and self-identified bisexuality have received substantial less scientific attention than homosexuality in scientific research, bisexual men represent a substantial and diverse group that was relatively ignored in the United States until reports of elevated HIV/AIDS among this population (Angelides, 2001).

Given the significance of the epidemic, an emphasis on the factors related to risk of HIV infection and transmission for bisexual men and their partners has been crucial (Doll, Myers, Kennedy, & Allman, 1997). However, a consequence of the narrow focus on disease in research is that much of the contemporary knowledge related to the sexual behaviors of bisexual men has been constructed solely in the context of "risk" (Malebranche, 2008; Sandfort & Dodge, 2008). In many health-related research and practice circles, this has led to a conceptualization of bisexual men as little more than vectors of disease transmission between "homosexual" and "heterosexual" individuals and communities, most notably their presumably monogamous and heterosexual female partners (Chu, Peterman, Doll, Buehler, & Curran, 1992; Doll & Beeker, 1996; Doll et al., 1992; Hollander, 2009; Mercer, Hart, Johnson, & Cassell, 2009; Stokes, McKirnan, Doll, & Burzette, 1996; Zule, Bobashev, Wechsberg, Costenbader, & Coomes, 2009). Health research has

not yet examined male bisexuality beyond disease transmission and other “risky” negative outcomes.

Male bisexuality is common; however, interpretation of data on its prevalence is inconclusive. A complexity inherent in the study of bisexual men is that there remains a wide range of diversity in terms of what constitutes “bisexuality.” Estimating the number of behavioral and self-identified bisexual men in the general population is, in and of itself, a complex task (Aggleton, 1996). Differences exist across studies in terms of the time frame in which the bisexual behavior was measured (i.e., lifetime, past 12 months, past 6 months) and because many individuals who engage in bisexuality are particularly hidden and often do not readily disclose their bisexual behavior (Malebranche, Arriola, Jenkins, Dauria, & Patel, 2010; Siegel, Schrimshaw, Lekas, & Parsons, 2008). In large national studies, behavioral bisexuality among men has been found to be between 0.7% and 5.8% in the general U.S. population (Laumann, Gagnon, Michael, & Michaels, 1994; Reece et al., 2010), depending on the time period in which the behavior took place. Numbers of self-identified bisexual men in these samples are often smaller. The relationship between sexual behavior and identity is complex (Muñoz-Laboy & Dodge, 2007; Wilson, 2008; Zellner et al., 2009). In general, self-identified bisexual individuals also report high rates of bisexual behaviors (Dodge, Jeffries, & Sandfort, 2008; Stokes, McKirnan, & Burzette, 1993; Stokes, Vanable, & McKirnan, 1997). Longitudinal studies of bisexual individuals have demonstrated that bisexual identity remains stable for many self-identified bisexual individuals (Weinberg et al., 1994; Weinberg, Williams, & Pryor, 2001). However, fluidity and fluctuations in self-identity have also been found to occur often, particularly among women (Diamond & Butterworth, 2008; Diamond, 2003, 2008).

In their early research, Kinsey and colleagues stressed the significance of viewing sexuality on a continuum of possibilities rather than rigid and discrete categories (Dodge, Reece et al., 2008). More recently, the social context in which bisexuality occurs has proven to be an important factor in understanding bisexual behaviors, identities, and potential risk behaviors across cultures (Parker, Herdt, & Carballo, 1991; Stokes, Miller, & Mundhenk, 1998; Tielman, Carballo, & Hendriks, 1991). For example, a substantial body of ethnographic and other research has shown that Latin American bisexual men are unique in the ways they construct, express, and experience their sexualities (Greco et al., 2007; Izazola-Licea, Gortmaker, Tolbert, De Gruttola, & Mann, 2000; Muñoz-Laboy, 2004; Muñoz-Laboy & Dodge, 2005; Muñoz-Laboy et al., 2009). A limited amount of research on social and cultural factors related to bisexuality, outside of the context of risk, has been conducted in other cross-cultural settings but not to a great extent among bisexual men in the United States (Aggleton, 1996). As yet, scientific explorations of bisexuality among men in the United States have not yet adequately described the complexity of their sexual behaviors outside of the context of “risk,”

for themselves and their partners (Dodge, Jeffries et al., 2008; Malebranche, 2008). Additionally, recent given sensationalized media coverage of Black men “on the down low,” explorations of sexuality among diverse groups of men, including White men, have been ironically absent (Sandfort & Dodge, 2008).

In one of the few examinations of bisexuality in a large and diverse sample of men (now nearly two decades old), Stokes and colleagues proposed different “typologies” of male bisexual behavior in the contexts of masculinity, homophobia, socioeconomic status and race/ethnicity (McKirnan, Stokes, Doll, & Burzette, 1995; Stokes et al., 1998). In their model, they developed typologies derived from previous research and practical experiences including “men in transition,” “experimenters,” “opportunity-driven men,” and “men with dual involvement.” Although these categorizations were interesting in a theoretical sense, they are somewhat limited without the ability to be linked to actual behavioral, sexual, dating and/or relational patterns of bisexual men. In addition, sexual identity was noticeably absent in these categorizations. The proposition of diverse “typologies” of bisexuality among men in the United States is interesting and relevant not only in terms of understanding their potential risk behaviors but also their sexualities, in general.

METHOD

Procedures

This study was conducted in collaboration with a large international Internet site for men seeking social or sexual interactions with other men. An electronic internal e-mail recruitment message was sent to registered users of the site at the time of the study (July 2009) who resided within the 50 U.S. states or the District of Columbia. The message provided a brief description of the study, its incentives, and a link to the study Website. Individuals visiting the Website were able to read a detailed description of the study and the consent form. Upon consenting, men were able to complete the questionnaire which took approximately 20 minutes. Participants were offered the opportunity to receive an electronic coupon valued at US\$10 for merchandise from an affiliate of the site from which they were recruited. Recruitment messages remained in each individual’s electronic mailbox for one week, after which any unopened emails were automatically removed. A total of 127,489 individuals opened the recruitment e-mail, and 43,477 (34%) clicked on the link to the study Website and consent form. Of those, 26,257 (60%) participated in the study. All study protocols were approved by Institutional Review Board at Indiana University–Bloomington. All analyses for this article were constrained to participants who identified as male ($N = 26,042$).

Construction and Comparisons of Typologies of Bisexual Men

Typologies were constructed based on the sexual identities, sexual behaviors, dating and relationship patterns of participants. Table 1 provides a detailed descriptive overview of the criteria used for categorization. Participants who were categorized as bisexual in one or more categories (19%, $n = 4,927$) were included in the final sample. Comparisons were made using the category inclusion criteria for each typology. For instance, participants who were categorized within the “bisexual dating” category were compared to participants who were 1. categorized as bisexual within at least one other category and 2. met the eligibility criteria for the category (i.e., participants in a relationship with one partner were excluded). Approximately one half (46%, $n = 2,251$) of the participants were only categorized as bisexual within one category, with a minority of the participants meeting the inclusion criteria for all four categories (2%, $n = 110$).

RESULTS

Participant Characteristics

Table 2 presents a summary of the participant characteristics according to their bisexual categorization. Participants were nearly equal in terms of age distribution up to age 50, at which point the numbers declined. Most men had at least some college education, with a majority holding a bachelor's degree or higher. The majority of the sample was White (81%, $n = 3,952$), with relatively smaller numbers of participants from other ethnicities. Most participants were employed full time (71%, $n = 3,460$). In terms of relationship status, the largest number of men reported not currently dating anyone (54%, $n = 2,616$) with a sizeable number of men who had been in a relationship for more than 5 years (23%, $n = 1,114$). With regards to sexual relationships, the largest proportions of men were either sexually active but not in a relationship (39%, $n = 1,894$) or in a sexual relationship with more than one person (30%, $n = 1,460$). Participants classified as bisexual in all of the typologies varied in terms of their demographic characteristics.

Comparisons Across Bisexual Typologies

Overall, the Cohen's kappa between typologies indicated moderate to good agreement (.57–.84). Table 3 displays comparisons across criteria for categorization in each bisexual typology. For men classified as bisexual dating, high consistency was found in terms of bisexual identity (90%, $n = 152$), bisexuality with multiple sexual partners (83%, $n = 134$), sexual behavior with women in the past year (94%, $n = 134$) and sexual behaviors with men

TABLE 1 Construction of Our Four Bisexual Typologies of Male Bisexuality

Typology	Description	Exclusion	Inclusion
Identity (<i>n</i> = 4,120)	Participants who self-identified their sexual orientation as bisexual	Participants who self-identified their sexual orientation as gay/homosexual, heterosexual, asexual or other	Participants who self-identified their sexual orientation as bisexual
Dating (<i>n</i> = 169)	Participants who reported dating males and females at the time of the survey	Participants with one or fewer dating partners; Participants with multiple male or multiple female dating partners	Participants with at least one male and one female dating partner at the time of the survey
Sexual partners (<i>n</i> = 2,071)	Participants who reported having both male and female sexual partners at the time of the survey	Participants who indicated that they were not currently sexually active or only sexually active with one sexual partner	Participants who reported male and female sexual partners at the time of the survey
Sexual experience (<i>n</i> = 2,800)	Participants who reported engaging in sexual behavior with males and females in the year prior to the survey	Participants who did not report engaging in sexual behavior with a male or a female partner in the past year; Participants who reported engaging in sexual behaviors with only male or only female partners in the past year	Participants who reported engaging in oral, anal and/or penile-vaginal intercourse with at least one male and one female partner within the previous year

Note. All participants self-identified as male.

TABLE 2 Participant Sociodemographic Distribution by Bisexual Categorization ($N = 25,294$)

Characteristics	Identity		Dating		Sexual Partner		Sexual Experience		Total Sample	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Age										
18-23	725	17.9	21	12.8	356	17.4	508	18.4	966	19.9
24-29	716	17.7	32	19.5	367	18.0	474	17.2	869	17.9
30-39	838	20.7	39	23.8	437	21.4	578	20.9	974	20.1
40-49	1005	24.8	46	28.0	521	25.5	732	26.5	1180	24.4
50-59	571	14.1	18	11.0	273	13.4	364	13.2	641	13.2
60+	196	4.8	8	4.9	87	4.3	103	3.7	214	4.4
Education										
Less than high school	27	.7			15	.7	24	.9	41	.8
High school or General Equivalency Diploma	504	12.3	15	8.9	244	11.8	330	11.8	614	12.5
Some college or Associates degree	1430	34.9	47	27.8	695	33.6	978	35.0	1727	35.2
Bachelor's degree	1246	30.4	56	33.1	642	31.1	850	30.5	1487	30.3
Master's degree	584	14.2	36	21.3	300	14.5	397	14.2	681	13.9
Professional	284	6.9	15	8.9	161	7.8	194	7.0	326	6.6
Other	28	.7			10	.5	18	.6	33	.7
Race/Ethnicity										
Black	228	5.6	9	5.4	91	4.4	133	4.8	272	5.6
White	3315	81.1	128	77.1	1712	83.4	2295	82.9	3952	80.9
Hispanic/Latino	306	7.5	18	10.8	152	7.4	213	7.7	383	7.8
Asian/Pacific Islander	110	2.7	2	1.2	35	1.7	45	1.6	122	2.5
Other	127	3.1	9	5.4	62	3.0	84	3.0	157	3.2
Job status										
Employed full-time	2922	72.0	134	79.8	1522	74.6	2068	74.9	3460	71.4
Employed part-time	510	12.6	15	8.9	254	12.4	320	11.6	635	13.1
Not employed/Looking for work	383	9.4	12	7.1	160	7.8	233	8.4	462	9.5
Not employed/Not looking for work	243	6.0	7	4.2	105	5.1	139	5.0	290	6.0

(Continued on next page)

TABLE 2 Participant Sociodemographic Distribution by Bisexual Categorization ($N = 25,294$) (*Continued*)

Characteristics	Identity		Dating		Sexual Partner		Sexual Experience		Total Sample	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Relationship status										
In a relationship: 5 years	971	24.0	2	1.2	614	30.1	781	28.3	1114	23.0
In a relationship: 1–5 years	402	9.9			173	8.5	258	9.4	457	9.4
In a relationship: 6 months–1 year	103	2.5			39	1.9	83	3.0	124	2.6
In a relationship: 3–6 months	81	2.0			24	1.2	54	2.0	99	2.0
In a relationship: Less than 3 months	120	3.0	1	.6	33	1.6	86	3.1	149	3.1
Currently dating more than one person	232	5.7	165	97.6	148	7.3	190	6.9	284	5.9
Not currently dating anyone	2136	52.8	1	.6	1008	49.4	1303	47.3	2616	54.0
Current sexual relationship										
In a monogamous sexual relationship	634	15.6	7	4.1	1	.0	405	14.6	754	15.5
Sexual relationships with more than one person	1237	30.4	104	61.5	1010	48.8	1068	38.6	1460	30.0
Sexually active but not in a sexual relationship	1523	37.4	57	33.7	1059	51.1	1033	37.3	1894	38.9
Not sexually active with another person	678	16.7	1	.6	1	.0	263	9.5	765	15.7

TABLE 3 Bisexual Typologies by Components of Bisexual Typologies

Bisexual Category Criteria	Bisexual Typology									
	Dating More Than One Person			Identity		Multiple Sexual Partners			Sexual Behavior Past Year	
	Only Men or Women	Men and Women	Other Than Bisexual	Bisexual Identified	Only Men or Women	Men and Women	None or Men or Women	Only Men or Women	Men and Women	
	% Endorsed Category (n)									
Dating more than one person										
Men Only	.	.	98.5 (1272)	35.0 (84)	97.6 (1205)	9.9 (15)	97.6 (1241)		30.6% (60)	
Women Only	.	.	.2 (2)	1.7 (4)	.2 (2)	1.3 (2)	.2 (2)		1.5% (3)	
Men and women	.	.	1.3 (17)	63.3 (152)	2.2 (27)	88.7 (134)	2.2 (28)		67.9% (133)	
Sexual orientation										
Homosexual/Gay	91.9 (1252)	5.9 (10)	.	.	91.9 (13524)	5.5 (114)	90.0 (19727)		17.6% (491)	
Bisexual	6.5 (88)	89.9 (152)	.	.	6.7 (992)	85.5 (1768)	8.1 (1775)		74.9% (2090)	
Heterosexual/Straight	.1 (1)	.6 (1)	.	.	.1 (15)	2.3 (47)	.3 (71)		1.9% (52)	
Unsure/Questioning	.6 (8)	1.8 (3)	.	.	.8 (114)	5.1 (105)	1.2 (259)		4.4% (123)	
Other	1.0 (13)	1.8 (3)	.	.	.4 (64)	1.6 (34)	.4 (96)		1.3% (35)	
Multiple sexual partners										
Men only	98.4 (1205)	16.8 (27)	97.7 (13701)	35.6 (983)	.	.	97.6 (13641)		22.4% (470)	
Women only	.2 (2)	.0 (0)	.1 (16)	.3 (9)	.	.	.1 (18)		.2% (5)	
Men and women	1.4 (17)	83.2 (134)	2.1 (300)	64.1 (1768)	.	.	2.3 (320)		77.4% (1623)	

(Continued on next page)

TABLE 3 Bisexual Typologies by Components of Bisexual Typologies (*Continued*)

Bisexual Category Criteria	Bisexual Typology							
	Dating More Than One Person		Identity		Multiple Sexual Partners		Sexual Behavior Past Year	
	Only Men or Women	Men and Women	Other Than Bisexual	Bisexual Identified	Only Men or Women	Men and Women	None or Only Men or Women	Men and Women
Sexual behavior with women in the past year								
No sexual behavior	94.8 (1171)	15.7 (25)	96.1 (19236)	41.9 (1580)	96.4 (13062)	14.3 (277)	.	.
At least one sexual activity	5.2 (64)	84.3 (134)	3.9 (780)	58.1 (2192)	3.6 (482)	85.7 (1657)	.	.
Sexual behavior with men in the past year								
No sexual behavior	.2 (3)	.6 (1)	3.3 (692)	5.9 (227)	.4 (57)	2.3 (44)	.	.
At least one sexual activity	99.8 (1303)	99.4 (160)	96.7 (20162)	94.1 (3638)	99.6 (14077)	97.7 (1899)	.	.

in the past year (99%, $n = 160$). For men categorized as bisexual identified, sizeable but somewhat lower agreement was found in terms of dating men and women (63%, $n = 152$), bisexuality with multiple partners (64%, $n = 1,768$), and sexual behaviors with women in the past year (58%, $n = 2,192$). Most had engaged in sexual behavior with men in the past year (94%, $n = 3,638$). For men classified as bisexual with multiple sexual partners, high agreement was found in terms of bisexual dating (89%, $n = 134$), bisexual identity (86%, $n = 1,768$), sexual behavior with women in the past year (86%, $n = 1,657$) and sexual behavior with men in the past year (98%, $n = 1,899$). Last, for men classified as engaging in sexual behavior with men and women during the past year, considerable agreement was found in terms of bisexual dating (68%, $n = 133$), bisexual identity (75%, $n = 2,090$) and bisexuality with multiple sexual partners (77%, $n = 1,632$). Although participants classified as bisexual within each typology often met criteria for other categories for other typologies, it is notable that there was no absolute overlap between categories.

Participants who were categorized as bisexual in one or more categories ($n = 4,927$, 18.9%) were included in the final sample. Comparisons were made using the category inclusion criteria. For instance, participants who were categorized within the 'bisexual dating category' were compared to participants who were 1. categorized as bisexual within at least one other category and 2. met the eligibility criteria for the category (i.e., participants in a relationship with one partner were excluded).

Bisexual Typologies and Recency/Frequency of Sexual Behaviors

As seen in Table 4, there is substantial diversity in terms of men's bisexual categorization and reports of recent sexual behavior with male and female partners, including masturbation, vaginal intercourse and insertive/receptive anal intercourse. Table 5 displays the relations among bisexual typologies and frequency of sexual behaviors during the past year. As with recency, a wide range of variation was found in men's reports of engaging in specific sexual behaviors with male and female partners based on their bisexual categorization, particularly in terms of vaginal intercourse and insertive/receptive anal intercourse. Overall, the recency and frequency of sexual behaviors significantly varied based upon the bisexual typology.

DISCUSSION

Over a decade ago, Ehrhardt (1996) declared:

(i)n the United States, increasingly, studies on sexuality are solely or predominantly conceptualized, assessed, and discussed within the context

TABLE 4 Bisexual Categories by Recency of Sexual Behaviors, Past Month, Year and Lifetime

Sexual Act	Sexual Behavior with a Female						Sexual Behavior with a Male					
	Relationship			Single			Relationship			Single		
	Identity	Sexual Partner	Sexual Experience	Identity	Dating	Sexual Partner	Identity	Sexual Partner	Sexual Experience	Identity	Dating	Sexual Partner
% Engaged in Behavior (<i>n</i>)												
Received oral												
Past month	36.3 (572)	52.3 (435) ^a	48.2 (604) ^a	18.3 (394) ^a	52.5 (83) ^a	36.3 (389) ^a	32.9 (488) ^a	68.7 (1097) ^a	71.1 (596) ^a	65.8 (1450) ^a	88.6 (140)	75.9 (815) ^a
Past 3 months	12.0 (189)	14.9 (124) ^a	16.6 (208) ^a	11.1 (240) ^a	15.2 (24) ^a	19.0 (204) ^a	20.8 (309) ^a	15.4 (245) ^a	15.5 (130) ^a	15.1 (333) ^a	5.1 (8)	12.9 (139) ^a
Past year	11.0 (173)	12.1 (101) ^a	18.7 (235) ^a	14.1 (304) ^a	9.5 (15) ^a	18.0 (193) ^a	33.0 (489) ^a	9.1 (145) ^a	9.2 (77) ^a	9.9 (218) ^a	5.1 (8)	6.5 (70) ^a
Lifetime	32.1 (505)	16.9 (141) ^a	12.7 (159) ^a	35.1 (757) ^a	17.7 (28) ^a	20.2 (216) ^a	9.2 (136) ^a	5.6 (90) ^a	3.8 (32) ^a	5.4 (120) ^a	.6 (1)	3.0 (32) ^a
Gave oral												
Past month	34.2 (540)	49.6 (413) ^a	45.4 (569) ^a	16.3 (350) ^a	49.7 (78) ^a	32.8 (350) ^a	29.2 (431) ^a	67.5 (1076) ^a	70.6 (591) ^a	61.8 (1360) ^a	82.9 (131) ^a	69.3 (744) ^a
Past 3 months	11.7 (184)	14.4 (120) ^a	15.9 (199) ^a	8.9 (191) ^a	9.6 (15) ^a	14.2 (152) ^a	16.2 (239) ^a	14.0 (223)	13.3 (111) ^a	14.7 (324) ^a	6.3 (10) ^a	14.3 (154) ^a
Past year	10.3 (163)	12.1 (101) ^a	17.1 (214) ^a	12.8 (276) ^a	10.8 (17) ^a	17.6 (188) ^a	28.3 (418) ^a	10.0 (159)	9.8 (82) ^a	11.9 (261) ^a	7.0 (11) ^a	8.3 (89) ^a
Lifetime	31.5 (497)	17.9 (149) ^a	14.3 (179) ^a	32.9 (707) ^a	17.8 (28) ^a	20.7 (221) ^a	14.2 (209) ^a	6.0 (96)	4.4 (37) ^a	6.7 (148) ^a	2.5 (4) ^a	5.5 (59) ^a
Vaginal intercourse												
Past month	46.3 (731)	65.3 (545) ^a	61.6 (776) ^a	18.6 (403) ^a	55.4 (87) ^a	36.7 (393) ^a	32.9 (489) ^a	—	—	—	—	—
Past 3 months	10.5 (166)	14.3 (119) ^a	15.2 (191) ^a	11.5 (249) ^a	15.3 (24) ^a	19.8 (212) ^a	22.0 (327) ^a	—	—	—	—	—
Past year	10.3 (162)	10.5 (88) ^a	18.3 (231) ^a	15.2 (328) ^a	8.3 (13) ^a	19.3 (207) ^a	33.5 (499) ^a	—	—	—	—	—
Lifetime	27.4 (433)	9.1 (76) ^a	3.5 (44) ^a	34.1 (739) ^a	17.2 (27) ^a	17.8 (191) ^a	7.8 (116) ^a	—	—	—	—	—

Received penis in anus												
Past month	—	—	—	—	—	36.3	36.2	36.7	30.5	49.4	35.5	39.2
	(143)	(116)	(12.9)	(9.2)	(21.7)	(579) ^a	(303) ^a	(463)	(669) ^a	(78) ^a	(381) ^a	(581) ^a
Past 3 months	—	—	—	—	—	13.3	15.2	13.7	13.2	9.5	13.7	14.0
	(55)	(43)	(60)	(55)	(15)	(212) ^a	(127) ^a	(173)	(290) ^a	(15) ^a	(147) ^a	(208) ^a
Past year	—	—	—	—	—	14.0	14.7	15.2	14.2	10.1	13.5	13.6
	(107)	(70)	(116)	(107)	(12)	(223) ^a	(123) ^a	(192)	(311) ^a	(16) ^a	(145) ^a	(202) ^a
Lifetime	—	—	—	—	—	17.7	14.5	14.9	18.2	13.9	14.4	13.2
	(474)	(248)	(345)	(474)	(33)	(282) ^a	(121) ^a	(188)	(399) ^a	(22) ^a	(154) ^a	(196) ^a
Inserted penis in anus												
Past month	9.2	14.1	12.9	9.2	21.7	11.7	43.1	42.8	41.3	60.8	48.2	50.6
	(143)	(116)	(159)	(143)	(33)	(170)	(685) ^a	(539) ^a	(907) ^a	(96)	(519) ^a	(753) ^a
Past 3 months	3.5	5.2	4.9	3.5	9.9	7.1	11.5	11.4	13.9	8.9	15.6	15.4
	(55)	(43)	(60)	(55)	(15)	(105)	(183) ^a	(143) ^a	(305) ^a	(14)	(168) ^a	(230) ^a
Past year	6.9	8.5	9.4	6.9	7.9	9.6	13.3	14.5	14.0	5.7	11.8	12.4
	(107)	(70)	(116)	(107)	(12)	(101)	(211) ^a	(183) ^a	(307) ^a	(9)	(127) ^a	(185) ^a
Lifetime	30.6	30.1	27.9	30.6	21.7	21.5	18.7	17.0	14.4	9.5	10.7	9.6
	(474)	(248)	(345)	(474)	(33)	(226)	(298) ^a	(214) ^a	(317) ^a	(15)	(115) ^a	(143) ^a
Any sexual behavior												
Sexual behavior past year	69.5	91.8	.	49.5	84.6	80.8	95.4	97.8	93.3	99.4	97.7	.
	(1087) ^a	(766) ^a	.	(1063) ^a	(132) ^a	(865) ^a	1522	819	(2056) ^a	157	(1051) ^a	.
No sexual behavior past year	30.5	8.2	.	50.5	15.4	19.2	4.6	2.2	6.7	.6	2.3	.
	(476) ^a	(68) ^a	.	(1083) ^a	(24) ^a	(206) ^a	74	18	(147) ^a	1	(25) ^a	.

^aFrequencies reflect significant differences between (1) participants categorized as bisexual per the respective category and (2) participants who were not categorized as bisexual per the respective category but who fit the category inclusion criteria (e.g., multiple sexual partners) and were categorized as bisexual using a minimum of one of the other categorization systems.

TABLE 5 Bisexual Categories by Frequency of the Sexual Behavior in the Behavior Within the Previous Year

	In a Relationship						Not in a Relationship												
	Bisexual Identity			Male and Female Sexual Partner			Male and Female Sexual Experience			Bisexual Identity			Male and Female Sexual Partner			Male and Female Sexual Experience			
	No	Yes	<i>p</i>	No	Yes	<i>p</i>	No	Yes	<i>p</i>	No	Yes	<i>p</i>	No	Yes	<i>p</i>	No	Yes	<i>p</i>	
Masturbated alone	% Engaged in Behavior (<i>n</i>)																		ns
	<0.001																		
	63.2 (321) 55.6 (471) 59.3 (635) 55.7 (471) 59.3 (635) 56.4 (687) 57.7 (852)																		
	44.9 (114) 40.3 (639) 43.6 (160) 40.3 (348) 42.5 (250) 50.1 (501) 30.7 (156) 35.9 (785) 10.3 (7.0) 6.5 (4.9) 6.6 (4.9) 6.9 (5.8) 35.8 (34.5) 38.8 (34.4) 35.8 (34.5) 35.4 (34.5)																		
Weekly	39.0 (99)	45.7 (726)		40.9 (150)	44.1 (381)		42.9 (252)	45.8 (574)		30.7 (156)	35.9 (785)		38.8 (45)	34.4 (54)		35.8 (303)	34.5 (369)		35.4 (34.5)
Monthly	11.0 (28)	11.8 (187)		12.8 (47)	12.5 (108)		12.2 (72)	11.5 (144)		5.3 (27)	6.5 (142)		10.3 (12)	7.0 (11)		6.6 (56)	4.9 (52)		6.9 (5.8)
Yearly	5.1 (13)	2.2 (35)		2.7 (10)	3.1 (27)		2.4 (14)	2.8 (35)		.8 (4)	2.0 (44)		4.3 (5)	3.8 (6)		1.9 (16)	1.3 (14)		1.4 (2.0)
Vaginal intercourse	<0.001																		<0.001
	.9 (1) 2.9 (22) .0 (0) 3.4 (40) .9 (3) 1.6 (16) .0 (0) 1.6 (2) .0 (0) 1.4 (11) 3.0 (1) 1.4 (18)																		
	23.5 (43) 35.3 (384) 13.0 (15) 35.9 (269) 59.7 (37) 32.7 (384) 10.6 (36) 16.1 (156) 3.8 (2) 31.7 (39) 5.7 (13) 17.1 (138) 21.2 (14.5) 38.8 (34.4) 35.8 (34.4) 35.8 (34.5) 35.4 (34.5)																		
	29.0 (53) 37.3 (405) 33.0 (38) 38.0 (285) 33.9 (21) 36.2 (425) 25.3 (86) 38.1 (370) 15.4 (8) 43.9 (54) 20.2 (46) 39.7 (320) 42.4 (34.5) 44.1 (441) 42.4 (34.5) 42.4 (34.5) 42.4 (34.5)																		
Yearly	45.4 (83)	23.8 (259)		53.0 (61)	23.2 (174)		6.5 (4)	27.7 (326)		63.2 (215)	44.1 (428)		80.8 (42)	22.8 (28)		74.1 (169)	41.8 (337)		33.3 (49.6)

	5.1	2.3	3.4	1.6	2.7	2.8	<0.001	2.7	.9	<0.05	ns	ns	ns	<0.001
Inserted penis in man's anus														
Daily	5.1 (10)	2.3 (25)	3.4 (10)	1.6 (9)	2.7 (11)	2.8 (24)	<0.001	2.7 (11)	.9 (14)	<0.05	1.0 (1)	1.7 (2)	1.3 (9)	1.4 (11)
Weekly	30.5 (60)	19.8 (214)	28.9 (86)	13.5 (76)	28.2 (117)	18.2 (157)	<0.001	19.2 (78)	15.0 (226)	<0.05	32.4 (34)	37.0 (44)	18.5 (130)	16.5 (134)
Monthly	32.5 (64)	34.9 (377)	38.3 (114)	35.5 (200)	37.1 (154)	33.4 (289)	<0.001	40.0 (163)	42.4 (637)	<0.05	41.0 (43)	36.1 (43)	46.4 (327)	44.4 (360)
Yearly	32.0 (63)	42.9 (463)	29.5 (88)	49.5 (279)	32.0 (133)	45.6 (394)	<0.001	38.1 (155)	41.7 (627)	<0.05	25.7 (27)	25.2 (30)	33.8 (238)	37.7 (306)
Received penis in anus														
Daily	2.9 (5)	1.2 (12)	1.5 (4)	.9 (5)	1.1 (13)	1.6 (4)	<0.05	1.4 (5)	1.0 (13)	<0.001	3.3 (3)	1.8 (2)	.8 (7)	.7 (7)
Weekly	25.7 (44)	11.7 (117)	20.4 (54)	8.4 (46)	18.6 (66)	11.6 (95)	<0.05	18.8 (66)	10.2 (128)	<0.001	24.4 (22)	17.4 (19)	36.8 (313)	44.0 (472)
Monthly	32.2 (55)	32.7 (327)	35.8 (95)	33.5 (184)	33.0 (117)	32.4 (265)	<0.05	37.5 (132)	34.3 (429)	<0.001	35.6 (32)	38.5 (42)	27.2 (231)	23.0 (247)
Yearly	39.2 (67)	54.4 (545)	42.3 (112)	57.3 (315)	47.3 (168)	54.4 (445)	<0.05	42.3 (149)	42.2 (679)	<0.001	36.7 (33)	42.2 (46)	35.2 (299)	32.3 (346)

of risk behavior: risk for pregnancy, risk for STDs, and for HIV infection. Too rarely one finds discussions of sexual feelings or behavior as a normal aspect of human development. (p. 1524)

Others have voiced similar concerns regarding the dominance of the risk paradigm in current sexuality research (Parker et al., 2004; Sandfort & Ehrhardt, 2004). To effectively address the sexual health issues facing any segment of society requires that researchers and practitioners attend to the individual, social and cultural contexts of the community being studied and to understand the extent to which these influence sexual behaviors of, and ultimately the health status of, a community's members, including bisexual men (Reece & Dodge, 2004). Ironically, previous narrow examinations of sexual risk among bisexual men may have resulted in work that provides us with a very limited understanding of the behaviors and interactions that much of this work seeks to change. Current scientific information on the sexual behaviors of bisexual men with male and female partners outside of the exclusive context of 'risk' is lacking. Thus, the aim of this study was to offer an innovative overview of the sexual behaviors among diverse 'typologies' of bisexual men from a large sample of Internet-using men in the United States.

The findings that we identified in this sample highlight the complex and multifaceted nature of bisexuality among a large diverse sample of men that offers new directions for filling gaps in previous research. Significant differences were found among typologies of bisexual men in terms of numerous demographic characteristics. Although there was some overlap among categories, distinctions were also clear. Across classifications, men engaged in a wide range of sexual behaviors that have rarely been assessed in detail in samples of bisexual men. They also expressed numerous relationships configurations that have rarely been documented. In short, these typologies scratch the surface on the clear fact that men's experiences and expressions of bisexuality are remarkably varied. Although these classifications are certainly not the 'final word' in terms of categories of male bisexuality, they offer a starting point for a new dialogue that acknowledges a broader range of bisexualities than simply behavioral versus self-identified.

In terms of relevance for sexual risk, a wide range of variation was found among the various typologies of bisexual men in terms of frequency and recency of specific sexual behaviors. These findings have implications for preventative sexual health interventions aimed at these men. Traditional programs targeted toward men who have sex with men (MSM) that seek to achieve narrow outcomes such as use of condoms during receptive anal sex may be less relevant to bisexual men. Given the frequency of oral-genital sexual activities among bisexual men, our data support the importance of greater research and prevention attention for barrier use with these sexual acts in relation to potential STI transmission. This is also true for vaginal

intercourse. Overall, our findings suggest that broad conclusions from literature on the relationship between bisexual men and sexual risk behavior may be misleading if bisexuality is restricted to a single typology.

Although this study represents a comprehensive exploration of diverse typologies of bisexual men in the United States, it is limited by the extent to which the sample is one of convenience, as challenges remain with establishing true probability samples bisexual men for research (Jeffries & Dodge, 2007). Data were collected only from members of a single Internet-based social and sexual networking site, and these individuals could have been more comfortable completing a questionnaire on sexuality related topics than other men. It is also likely that, because this Website was designed for men seeking social and sexual interactions with other men, we were more likely to access bisexual men with higher rates of same-sex experience (as is reflected in the higher rates of men reporting sexual behavior with other men as compared to women) and men with multiple sexual partners.

Relatedly, while 'monogamous' bisexual men were not excluded from the overall sample, the inclusion criteria for the typologies automatically excluded them from certain categories as the definition required that they engage in behavior with or have sexual partners who were male and female within a predetermined period of time. Given these limitations, these data are not by any means fully generalizable to the entire population of bisexual men in the United States. The typologies we identified may vary across and within the diverse segments of bisexual male communities. Last, though the large sample size has its benefits, it is true that using quantitative research in a sample as large as this made it impossible to offer the men a chance to reflect on the contexts and meanings of their sexual behaviors and experiences regardless of typology. New qualitative research findings from studies, funded by the National Institutes of Health, are emerging that give insight into these issues from the voices of diverse groups of bisexual men themselves (Dodge et al., 2011; Dodge, Schnarrs et al., in press; Dodge, Van Der Pol et al., in press; Malebranche et al., 2010; Martinez et al., 2011).

The concept of diverse expressions of bisexuality, in and of itself, is not 'new' in sexuality research. Alfred Kinsey and colleagues (1948) offered the field an innovative framework of the continuum on which humans experience their sexualities. Since that time, though many researchers and practitioners have acknowledged a continuum of sexual experience, the majority of behavioral science research on sexual risk among bisexual men has moved toward fixed and binary concepts of sexuality. In many studies on sexual risk, sexuality and gender are treated as fixed and categorical constructs. It is likely that this work has had a role in contributing to the predominant worldviews that continue to peddle a 'black-and-white' conceptualization of sexuality. The findings in this article offer evidence that helps to not only support but also expand the concept of a range of diverse typologies of bisexuality found among men outside of the exclusive context of sexual risk

and stress the importance of developing conceptual and methodological approaches that move us toward a more fluid understanding of expressions of bisexuality among men.

REFERENCES

- Aggleton, P. (1996). *Bisexualities and AIDS: International perspectives*. London, UK: Taylor & Francis.
- Angelides, S. (2001). *A history of bisexuality*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Bell, A. P., Weinberg, M. S., & Hammersmith, S. K. (1981). *Sexual preference: Its development in men and women*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Blumstein, P. W., & Schwartz, P. (1976a). Bisexuality in men. *Urban Life*, 5, 339–358.
- Blumstein, P. W., & Schwartz, P. (1976b). Bisexuality in women. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 5, 171–181.
- Chu, S. Y., Peterman, T. A., Doll, L. S., Buehler, J. W., & Curran, J. W. (1992). AIDS in bisexual men in the United States: Epidemiology and transmission to women. *American Journal of Public Health*, 82, 220–224.
- Diamond, L., & Butterworth, M. (2008). Questioning gender and sexual identity: Dynamic links over time. *Sex Roles*, 59(5/6), 365–376.
- Diamond, L. M. (2003). Was it a phase? Young women's relinquishment of lesbian/bisexual identities over a 5-year period. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(2), 352–364.
- Diamond, L. M. (2008). Female bisexuality from adolescence to adulthood: Results from a 10-year longitudinal study. *Developmental Psychology*, 44(1), 5–15.
- Dodge, B., Jeffries, W. L., & Sandfort, T. G. M. (2008). Beyond the down low: Sexual risk, protection, and disclosure among at-risk Black men who have sex with both men and women (MSMW). *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 37(5), 683–696.
- Dodge, B., Reece, M., & Gebhard, P. H. (2008). Kinsey and beyond: Past, present, and future considerations for research on male bisexuality. *Journal of Bisexuality*, 8(3/4), 175–189.
- Dodge, B., Schnarrs, P. W., Goncalves, G., Malebranche, D., Martinez, O., Reece, M., Rhodes, S. D., Van Der Pol, B., Nix, R., & Fortenberry, J. D. (in press). The significance of privacy and trust in providing health-related services to behaviorally bisexual men. *AIDS Education & Prevention*.
- Dodge, B., Schnarrs, P. W., Reece, M., Martinez, O., Malebranche, D., Goncalves, G., Van Der Pol, B., Nix, R., & Fortenberry, J. D. (2011). Sexual behaviors and experiences among bisexual men in the midwestern United States. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. [Epub ahead of print, doi: 10.1007/s10508-011-9878-2]
- Dodge, B., Van Der Pol, B., Reece, M., Malebranche, D. J., Martinez, O., Goncalves, G., Schnarrs, P. W., Nix, R., & Fortenberry, J. D. (in press). Rectal self-sampling in non-clinical venues for the detection of rectal sexually transmitted infections (STI) among behaviorally bisexual men. *Sexual Health*.
- Doll, L. S., & Beeker, C. (1996). Male bisexual behavior and HIV risk in the United States: Synthesis of research and implications for interventions. *AIDS Education & Prevention*, 8, 205–225.

- Doll, L. S., Myers, T., Kennedy, M., & Allman, D. (1997). Bisexuality and HIV risk: Experiences in Canada and the United States. *Annual Review of Sex Research*, 8, 102–147.
- Doll, L. S., Peterson, L. R., White, C. R., Johnson, E. S., Ward, J. W., & The Blood Donor Study Group. (1992). Homosexually and nonhomosexually identified men who have sex with men: A behavioral comparison. *Journal of Sex Research*, 29, 1–14.
- Ehrhardt, A. A. (1996). Editorial: Our view of adolescent sexuality—A focus on risk behavior without the developmental context. *American Journal of Public Health*, 11, 1523–1525.
- Greco, M., Silva, A. P., Merchán-Hamann, E., Jeronymo, M. L., Andrade, J. C., & Greco, D. B. (2007). Differences in HIV-risk behavior of bisexual men in their relationships with men and women. *Revista De Saúde Pública*, 41(Suppl 2), 109–117.
- Hollander, D. (2009). Heterosexual Latino men's same-sex behavior may put their partners at risk. *Perspectives on Sexual & Reproductive Health*, 41(2), 131.
- Hutchins, L., & Kaahumanu, L. (Eds.). (1991). *Bi any other name: Bisexual people speak out*. Los Angeles, CA: Alyson Books.
- Izazola-Licea, J. A., Gortmaker, S. L., Tolbert, K., De Gruttola, V., & Mann, J. (2000). Prevalence of same-gender sexual behavior and HIV in a probability household survey in Mexican men. *Journal of Sex Research*, 37(1), 37–43.
- Jeffries, W. L. T., & Dodge, B. (2007). Male bisexuality and condom use at last sexual encounter: Results from a national survey. *Journal of Sex Research*, 44(3), 278–289.
- Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W., & Martin, C. (1948). *Sexual behavior in the human male*. Philadelphia, PA: W. B. Saunders.
- Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W., Martin, C., & Gebhard, P. (1953). *Sexual behavior in the human female*. Philadelphia, PA: W. B. Saunders.
- Klein, F. (1993). *The bisexual option* (2nd ed.). Binghamton, NY: Haworth Press.
- Laumann, E. O., Gagnon, J. H., Michael, R. T., & Michaels, S. (1994). *The social organization of sexuality: Sexual practices in the United States*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Malebranche, D. J. (2008). Bisexually active Black men in the United States and HIV: Acknowledging more than the “down low”. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 37(5), 810–816.
- Malebranche, D. J., Arriola, K. J., Jenkins, T. R., Dauria, E., & Patel, S. N. (2010). Exploring the “bisexual bridge”: A qualitative study of risk behavior and disclosure of same-sex behavior among Black bisexual men. *American Journal of Public Health*, 100(1), 159–164.
- Martinez, O., Dodge, B., Reece, M., Schnarrs, P. W., Rhodes, S., Goncalves, G., Muñoz-Laboy, M., Malebranche, D., Van Der Pol, B., Nix, R., Kelle, G., & Fortenberry, J. D. (2011). Sexual health and life experiences: Voices from behaviorally bisexual Latino men in the Midwestern USA. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 13(9), 1073–1089.
- McKirnan, D. J., Stokes, J. P., Doll, L., & Burzette, R. G. (1995). Bisexually active men: Social characteristics and sexual behavior. *Journal of Sex Research*, 32(1), 65–76.

- Mercer, C. H., Hart, G. J., Johnson, A. M., & Cassell, J. A. (2009). Behaviourally bisexual men as a bridge population for HIV and sexually transmitted infections? Evidence from a national probability survey. *International Journal of STD & AIDS*, 20(2), 87–94.
- Muñoz-Laboy, M. (2004). MSM: Sexual desire among bisexually-active Latino men in New York City. *Sexualities*, 7, 55–80.
- Muñoz-Laboy, M., & Dodge, B. (2005). Bisexual practices: Patterns, meanings, and implications for HIV/STI prevention among bisexually-active Latino men and their partners. *Journal of Bisexuality*, 5, 81–100.
- Muñoz-Laboy, M., & Dodge, B. (2007). Bisexual Latino Men and HIV and sexually transmitted infections risk: An exploratory analysis. *American Journal of Public Health*, 97(6), 1102–1106. doi:10.2105/ajph.2005.078345
- Munoz-Laboy, M., Leau, C. J. Y., Sriram, V., Weinstein, H. J., del Aquila, E. V., & Parker, R. (2009). Bisexual desire and familism: Latino/a bisexual young men and women in New York City. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 11(3), 331–344.
- Parker, R., di Mauro, D., Filiano, B., Garcia, J., Muñoz-Laboy, M., & Sember, R. (2004). Global transformations and intimate relations in the 21st century: Social science research on sexuality and the emergence of sexual health and sexual rights frameworks. *Annual Review of Sex Research*, 15, 370–406.
- Parker, R. G., Herdt, G., & Carballo, M. (1991). Sexual culture, HIV transmission, and AIDS Research. *Journal of Sex Research*, 28(1), 77–99.
- Reece, M., & Dodge, B. (2004). A study in sexual health applying the principles of community-based participatory research. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 33, 235–247.
- Reece, M., Herbenick, D., Schick, V., Sanders, S. A., Dodge, B., & Fortenberry, J. D. (2010). Sexual behaviors, relationships, and perceived health among adult men in the United States: Results from a national probability sample. *Journal of Sexual Medicine*, 5, 291–304.
- Rust, P. C. R. (2000). *Bisexuality in the United States: A social science reader*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Sandfort, T. G. M., & Dodge, B. (2008). “And then there was the down low”: Introduction to Black and Latino male bisexualities. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 37(5), 675–682.
- Sandfort, T. G. M., & Ehrhardt, A. A. (2004). Sexual health: A useful public health paradigm or a moral imperative? *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 33(3), 181–187.
- Siegel, K., Schrimshaw, E. W., Lekas, H.-M., & Parsons, J. T. (2008). Sexual behaviors of non-gay identified non-disclosing men who have sex with men and women. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 37(5), 720–735.
- Stokes, J. P., McKirnan, D. J., & Burzette, R. G. (1993). Sexual behavior, condom use, disclosure of sexuality, and stability of sexual orientation in bisexual men. *Journal of Sex Research*, 30, 201–213.
- Stokes, J. P., McKirnan, D. J., Doll, K., & Burzette, R. G. (1996). Female partners of bisexual men: What they don’t know might hurt them. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 20(2), 267–284.
- Stokes, J. P., Miller, R. L., & Mundhenk, R. (1998). Toward an understanding of behaviorally bisexual men: The influence of context and culture. *Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality*, 7, 101–113.

- Stokes, J. P., Venable, P., & McKirnan, D. J. (1997). Comparing gay and bisexual men on sexual behavior, condom use, and psychosocial variables related to HIV/AIDS. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 26, 383–397.
- Tielman, R. A. P., Carballo, M., & Hendriks, A. C. (Eds.). (1991). *Bisexuality and HIV/AIDS: A global perspective*. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Weinberg, M. S., Williams, C. J., & Pryor, D. W. (1994). *Dual attraction: Understanding bisexuality*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Weinberg, M. S., Williams, C. J., & Pryor, D. W. (2001). Bisexuals at midlife. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 30(2), 180–208.
- Wilson, P. A. (2008). A dynamic-ecological model of identity formation and conflict among bisexually-behaving African-American men. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 37(5), 794–809.
- Zellner, J. A., Martínez-Donate, A. P., Sañudo, F., Fernández-Cerdeno, A., Sipan, C. L., Hovell, M. F., & Carrillo, H. (2009). The interaction of sexual identity with sexual behavior and its influence on HIV risk among Latino men: Results of a community survey in northern San Diego County, California. *American Journal of Public Health*, 99(1), 125–132. doi:10.2105/ajph.2007.129809
- Zule, W., Bobashev, G., Wechsberg, W., Costenbader, E., & Coomes, C. (2009). Behaviorally bisexual men and their risk behaviors with men and women. *Journal of Urban Health*, 86, 48–62. doi:10.1007/s11524-009-9366-3

Brian Dodge, PhD, is an Associate Professor in the Department of Applied Health Science and Associate Director of the Center for Sexual Health Promotion at Indiana University–Bloomington. His research and training have focused on various social and behavioral aspects of sexual health in relation to HIV/AIDS, other sexually transmitted infections (STI) and other facets of overall well-being. His current research projects focus broadly on men's sexual health, including sexual health among diverse groups of bisexual men (including an exploratory study recently funded by the National Institutes of Health), innovative methods of STI testing among at-risk and asymptomatic men and the ongoing role of male condoms in sexual health promotion.

Joshua G. Rosenberger, PhD, MPH, is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Global and Community Health at George Mason University. His primary areas of research include men's sexuality, LGBT sexual development and utilizing internet and Web based technologies for research. His current research projects include a daily diary study exploring technology behaviors with more than 2,000 MSM, examination of the impact of HIV legislation on testing and disclosure behaviors and a comprehensive assessment of the lifetime sexual repertoire of gay and bisexual identified men.

Vanessa Schick, PhD, is an Assistant Research Scientist in the Department of Applied Health Science at Indiana University–Bloomington. Her background and training is in social psychology with an emphasis on the applications to health. Broadly, her research interests focus on psychosociocultural predictors of women's sexual health and wellness. Specifically, her primary research

interests are related to women's vulvovaginal health/perceptions and sexual wellness outcomes for bisexual women.

Michael Reece, PhD, MPH, is an Associate Professor in the Department of Applied Health Science and Director of the Center for Sexual Health Promotion at Indiana University–Bloomington. Dr. Reece's research is focused on sexual health in both domestic and international settings and is conducted under the auspices of his research team, the Center for Sexual Health Promotion. The Center is a collaborative of sexual health scholars from across the campuses of Indiana University and strategic partner academic institutions who, in partnership with practitioners from community-based health organizations, government and industry, work toward advancing the field of sexual health through research, education and training initiatives. At the Center's core is a commitment to the active engagement of graduate students in ongoing research as an essential part of growing the next generation of sexual health scholars and practitioners.

Debby Herbenick, PhD, MPH, is an Assistant Research Scientist in the Department of Applied Health Science and Associate Director of the Center for Sexual Health Promotion at Indiana University–Bloomington. Her primary areas of interest relate to women's sexual health, behavioral and psychosocial factors related to the use of sexual enhancement products, sexual pleasure and enjoyment, condom use and male and female sexual function.

David S. Novak, MSW, CAS, is Senior Public Health Strategist at Online Buddies, Inc. (OLB) and Managing Director of the OLB Research Institute. In these roles, Mr. Novak oversees health and research related activities across OLB's family of brands, coordinating internet partner notification performed by public health departments, internet outreach by community-based organizations/charities and product and scientific research by a variety of research entities.