



BI-PASSING ERASURE:

Exploring the strengths
and weaknesses of
research about/for
bisexual survivors



Report By:

Savy F.R. Elahian
Amanda Gould
Chelsie Holmes



National LGBTQ Institute on Intimate Partner Violence

A PROJECT OF THE LOS ANGELES LGBT CENTER

In partnership with the National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs and In Our Own Voices, Inc.

“

“My freedom to love lifted me out of sadness and into happiness. Embracing my bisexuality allowed me to receive the love I needed, bringing comfort, safety, and a sense of calm to my nervous system.”

–From a Black and Southeast Asian bisexual woman survivor

”



Introduction

Intimate partner violence (IPV) is often cited as a leading public health crisis that has deep impacts on the social, physical, and mental wellbeing of survivors. Research has consistently demonstrated that LGBTQ+ individuals are at higher risk of experiencing IPV (Chen, et. al., 2023). These prevalence rates are related to the widespread discrimination, hatred, and violence experienced by LGBTQ+ people.

The continuing crisis of IPV within LGBTQ+ communities also coincides with a severe shortage of service providers equipped to meet their unique and specific needs. However, bisexual women are often largely left out of efforts to train service providers, research the lived experiences of LGBTQ+ survivors, and create resources to educate and shift cis- and heteronormative narratives around IPV. Bisexual women face shockingly high rates of IPV, yet there is very little research, visibility, or resources focused on their needs and experiences.

According to a national study conducted by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), 69% of bisexual women experience IPV in their lifetimes (compared to 56% of lesbian women, 46% of heterosexual women, 46% of bisexual men, 48% of gay men, and 46% of heterosexual men). It is also critical to note that for 90% of these bisexual women, their abusive partner was a man (Chen, et. al., 2023). Bisexual women of color—particularly Latine women—were found to be even more devastatingly impacted. The CDC study found that 80% of Latine bisexual women will experience IPV in their lifetime.



Though this CDC study did not include transgender or nonbinary survivors' experiences, important research done by the U.S. Transgender Survey helps to fill in these gaps. Over 54% of transgender people experience IPV, with nonbinary and trans women of color often facing the greatest risks of violence (James et al., 2016). Prevalence rates for bisexual transgender and nonbinary individuals were not directly researched, but we can infer from these studies that transgender and nonbinary bisexual people experience much higher rates of IPV than other subsets of the community. The purpose of this report is to understand, educate, and uplift the experiences of bisexual women for service providers and researchers.

Purpose

This study will aim to explore how bisexual survivors have been understood within the research community, with a focus on bisexual women and nonbinary survivors, communities which experience disproportionately high rates of violence yet are vastly under-researched and under-resourced. The report will primarily explore gaps in the research and recommendations for future research.

Additionally, quotes will be shared throughout this document from a qualitative study done by the National LGBTQ Institute on Intimate Partner Violence. These quotes will build on the information presented and add a richness to the often colorless and even pathologized research published about bisexual survivors. This report aims to celebrate the strength of the bisexual community and give a platform to stories of resilience, wisdom, and care within our community. Bisexual survivors deserve systems of response that are equipped to holistically support the community.



Definitions

Labels are deeply personal. Different people often adopt the same label for different reasons. A common definition of bisexuality was written by bisexual activist Robin Ochs:

"I call myself bisexual because I acknowledge that I have in myself the potential to be attracted—romantically and/or sexually—to people of more than one sex and/or gender, not necessarily at the same time, not necessarily in the same way, and not necessarily to the same degree."

Bisexuality & Bisexual Erasure

In this report, the term bisexual is used as an umbrella term that encompasses all identities that are targeted by monosexism, including but not limited to pansexual, queer, and other identities.



“

“I honestly don't really feel safe identifying as Bi unless I'm with my friends or coworkers who also are part of the LGBTQ community and support or identify as such. If not, then I choose not to talk about my orientation or past experiences. I've even had experiences at gay clubs or spaces where people tell me I'm 'not really part' of the community when I mention having kids or being in a relationship with a male now. Bisexuality comes with this, like, forced choice people want to place on you because society likes categories and boxes and grouping to make sense of the world. Complexities and intersectionalities, are more difficult to understand and make sense of, I guess.”

–From a Latine bisexual woman survivor

”

Bisexual erasure refers to the systemic invisibility of bisexual people within society. When we use this term, it is often implied that we are referring primarily to a lack of media and cultural representation. While this is one component of bisexual erasure, it can also be found in support services, academia, public health, government, queer organizing, and other institutions that are intended to address disproportionate harm toward marginalized communities.

Compared to straight, gay, and lesbian people, bisexual people are more likely to live in poverty, more likely to need public benefits, and more likely to be underemployed. They are also more likely to report being in poor health and face discrimination when seeking healthcare. Bisexual people are more likely to be diagnosed with a mental health condition, have a substance use disorder, and contemplate or attempt suicide (Movement Advancement Project, 2016).



Monosexism



“

“As an asexual/panromantic person, I often feel misunderstood. I feel like my identity does not fit in the ‘typical’ boxes that folks want to put me in, but they make it my issue. I have had to fight for my queer identity, but so often ... my identity is erased. This is due to how I dress, my hair, my clothes, and even who I am married to.”

–From a queer, nonbinary Latine survivor

”

Bisexual erasure allows monosexism to go unnamed and unaddressed. While “biphobia” is the most frequently used term to describe bias and discrimination that specifically harms the bisexual community, this term suggests that oppression of bisexual people is strictly interpersonal. “Monosexism” is a more comprehensive term that includes institutional, ideological, and internalized oppression. The dramatically high rates of intimate partner and sexual violence toward bisexual women are evidence of a systemic problem that uniquely affects bisexual women.

Many service providers, survivor advocates, researchers, and therapists may be working with bisexual women survivors and not identifying that they are bisexual. Monosexist assumptions about survivors’ identities deeply shape survivors’ experiences of abuse and their ability to access support and safety. Additionally, bisexual people are less likely to be out to important people in their lives and are therefore less likely to have community support to turn to when experiencing sexual or domestic violence.

Non-monogamy and Polyamory

Non-monogamy is an umbrella term that refers to intimate relationships that are not strictly monogamous. This can take many forms, including polyamory, swinging, ethical non-monogamy, casual dating, open relationships, relationship anarchy, situationships, and more. Much like identity labels, these words can mean different things to different people. They can also have different implications between different cultures. Because bisexual people are often engaged in intimate relationships with people who do not identify as LGBTQ+, they are more likely to be in cross-cultural relationships. Norms and terms surrounding non-monogamy can differ for them and their partners, creating a gap that can sometimes be exploited in abusive relationships.

Polyamory is associated with higher rates of intimate partner violence (Borgogna, 2024), however it is unclear if the practice of polyamory leads to more systematic discrimination that increases IPV rates or if those who practice polyamory are systematically vulnerable through other aspects of their identity such as race, gender, and/or sexuality. It is important for service-providers to create space for individuals who may be experiencing abuse in a variety of relational structures in order to be inclusive of bisexual women and others who engage in non-monogamy.



Literature Review

Roughly 40% of LGBTQ+ people of color identify as bisexual, and half of all transgender people identify as bisexual (Minkin et al., 2025). While research on bisexual survivors remains limited, intersectional research that includes information on bisexual people who are not cisgender and white is even more so. This, compounded with bisexual erasure more broadly, further excludes entire sections of the community. Conversely, vital data is found when research explores intersections in the community.

Government Research

In 2023, the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) released a report titled *National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey: 2016/2017 Report on Victimization by Sexual Identity*. This survey included over 27,000 participants, 1,290 of whom identified as a lesbian, bisexual, or gay person. This survey found the staggering statistic that 80% of Latine bisexual women have a lifetime prevalence of intimate partner violence. This alarming figure should raise alarms in communities and highlight the need for culturally responsive resources, practices, and systems to support bisexual Latine women (Zhang et al., 2023).

This also raises the question of what infrastructure is failing to keep bisexual Latine women safe? Should next steps focus on policy reform, community education in the form of culturally inclusive workshops, specialized prevention education, training for domestic violence agencies, or all the above? Resources for bisexual people and Latine women are already limited—finding resources that honor a holistic understanding of this identity is rare.

This CDC report is interesting to dissect because it gives providers some essential information about LGB survivors. However, it has strong limitations due to its lack of an intersectional approach. Asian, Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander, American Indian, and Alaska Native participants were all combined into one category due to the limited number of respondents. The data on transgender people is even more limited. Of the more than 27,000 participants, only 51 identified as transgender (Zhang et al., 2023). Another crucial limitation of this report is that the only categories used for gender were “male,” “female,” and “transgender.” This set of options is not culturally inclusive, does not allow for a range of experiences, incorrectly use sexes instead of genders, and overall disallows transgender and gender-nonconforming people to authentically name their identity. Intentional inclusion is essential to understanding the diverse experiences of LGBTQ+ survivors and to the ability to investigate a specific identity within the community.



Academic Research

Beyond government agencies like CDC, much of the data on bisexual survivors' experiences of IPV is held by the academic research community. A systemic review of the existing research on IPV in the bisexual community conducted by Dr. Autumn Bermea found that only one out of 36 articles examined were specific to bisexual people (Bermea, 2018). A majority of the journal articles used quantitative analysis amongst primarily white participants. As mentioned, the CDC report found that bisexual women face a higher rate of IPV than

heterosexual women or lesbians. Another alarming finding is that bisexual women are more likely to experience physical violence, psychological/emotional abuse, and coercive control. It is known that bisexual people are less likely to disclose their identity, but support from the LGBTQ+ community increases their likelihood of coming out. The article also explores risk factors for victimization, focusing on substance abuse, risky sexual behavior, mental illness, internalized homophobia, and external experiences of abuse. These links are not necessarily causal, but they are correlations worth exploring.

Dr. Bermea also explores help-seeking extensively, identifying the importance of understanding that leaving an abusive situation can often escalate the violence. Monosexism, also identified as “internalized heterosexism,” can make it difficult for bisexual people to receive support. Overall, data on help-seeking specifically for the bisexual community is limited. Stereotypes surrounding gender expression make it difficult for masculine women or masculine people socialized as feminine to receive support. They often experience judgment from providers who wrongly associate masculinity with abuse.

Another systematic review of existing literature by Dr. Julia Corey, et al. supports the findings of the research mentioned. For example, this article also found an increased prevalence of IPV for those who identify as bisexual over lesbian or heterosexual women. Multiple studies found that biphobia contributes to abuse and controlling behaviors. The authors also found that bisexual women have an increased risk of IPV if their partners are male. Similarly, again, non-monogamy was found to be associated with IPV victimization. Interestingly, this exploration found Black participants to be at a higher risk for IPV than other races. However, inequities related to race, gender, education, income, immigration status, and indigeneity all increased a bisexual women’s likelihood of experiencing abuse of some kind (Corey, & Travers, 2023).



Additional exploration looked at how stereotypes such as promiscuity impacted the prevalence of IPV. Oversexualization was particularly difficult for bisexual people in open or polyamorous relationships. The prevalence of IPV was also higher in relationships with more internalized biphobia (Turrell et. al., 2018). One study that focused on gay and bisexual men found more internalized biphobia in bisexual men than homophobia in gay men. Additionally, researchers found more bias toward bisexual men, however they noted that bisexual women were more likely to be victim-blamed (Brienzo & Galupo, 2021).

The larger explorations of literature in the field offer a blurry look at the impacts of IPV on bisexual people. The prevalence of and risk factors for IPV need to be dramatically uplifted in order to understand the severity of violence within this community. Multiple reports mentioned that both biphobia from a partner and internalized biphobia are impacting relationships of bisexual people. Other factors such as race and gender expression affect how marginalized intersections of the community are impacted. However, more information is essential to better understand these nuances.

Religious Trauma

“

“While I have never practiced an organized religion, my family did. They are Catholic. When they found out about my queer identity, they shamed me, and they used religion to justify it. The queer community in my town is super white ... and do not practice intersectionality, or obviously only gravitated to other white queer people.”

—From a queer, nonbinary Latine survivor

”

Religious trauma amongst bisexual people is under-researched, however, it deeply affects the community. Researchers have found that almost every religion has moral regulations or assumptions around “proper” sexual activity, relationships, and identities. There is evidence of less opposition toward gay and lesbian people, but an increased damnation specifically targeted at bisexual and transgender people. Reports from a qualitative study on bisexual trans folks found that religious people in positions of power often held explicit discriminatory rhetoric related to gender and sexuality. Participants noted a lack of disclosure in order to stay safe in their communities. Unfortunately, only 35% of respondents reported a positive experience with religion (Sumerau et. al., 2019).

Highlighting Bisexual Black Men

Bisexual Black men are particularly vulnerable to scrutiny from the Black community, the LGBTQ+ community, and the general public. Research on this community supports the need for sensitivity, honoring their agency, and community connection. For example, one study found that among bisexual Black men, higher rates of internalized heterosexism—not wanting to appear “gay”—was continuously linked to higher rates of sexually transmitted infections and HIV diagnoses. Interestingly, disclosing their sexuality to their community was linked to lower risk of all negative sexual health outcomes (Watson et al., 2019). Though we can’t assume causation, this information suggests the importance of community for the health of bisexual Black men. However, it is important to validate the choices individuals make to protect themselves whether or not they are out to their community.

Another study found that 57% of Black men who had sex with men and women did not feel supported by the gay community. The researchers argued that nondisclosure is not inherently problematic. For Black men, sharing their bisexual identity can potentially lead to reduced social support and contribute to an increased risk of intimate partner violence. Many bisexual Black men live covertly to protect themselves (Friedman, 2014). Though everyone deserves to feel safe in their identities, respecting survivors' choices around disclosure is essential. Understanding the complexity of coming out for diverse intersections of the LGBTQ+ community gives service providers and researchers an opportunity to support survivors with nuance.



Gaps in the Field

Though there are powerful researchers exploring the nuance of bisexuality and survivorship, information on bisexual survivors of intimate partner violence is limited and often disconnected from the reality of the community itself. The lack of targeted research on bisexual survivors of intimate partner violence both indicates and perpetuates the larger problem of bisexual erasure. Existing research often lacks an intersectional lens, adequate and diverse sample sizes, and theoretical grounding beyond qualitative analysis.

Despite high rates of abuse, poverty, discrimination, and other negative health and wellness indicators, a 2018 report on grant funding for LGBTQIA+ services, projects, and research found that less than 1% was dedicated specifically to the bisexual community (Kan & Wallace, 2018). In public health reports, for example, sexual minorities are often lumped together, which distorts the data. Sexual minorities share a common experience of homophobia and heterosexism, but combining them erases the impact of monosexism on the bisexual community, which exemplifies and perpetuates bisexual erasure.

Intersectionality

“

“You see a spectrum from binary to pan-normativity reflected in our Native culture. Although many would believe that our culture is [cisgender- and heteronormative] focused, it isn't when you speak with older generations and see symbolism reflect our beliefs in a spectrum in certain areas. This makes me feel at ease. Also, I connect with others who are Indigi-queer, and they make me feel safe. Certain Native matriarchal societies are also a safe spaces as well.”

-From a Native American woman/nonbinary survivor

”

There are a vast range of diverse experiences, including different races, religions, socioeconomic status, disability status, and more. It is essential to understand intersectionality when examining the lives of survivors within this community. Coined by Kimberlé Crenshaw, intersectionality is a framework, initiated within the legal field, that has grown to encompass an understanding of the experiences of those with multiple identities. For example, a Black bisexual transgender woman experiences a different reality than a white, disabled bisexual cisgender man. There are complexities in both examples that may overlap, but the lived experience varies dramatically.

The limitations of the currently available research on bisexual people deeply harms members of the community. The power of inclusion leads to investigations, awareness, education, reform, and culturally responsive care. It is the responsibility of the research community and the domestic violence field to support the safety of the community. Without intentional practices to understand the depth of experiences in the bisexual community, people will go from ignored to silenced.

Non-monogamy and Polyamory

Bisexuality is sometimes conflated with polyamory. Bisexual people can be polyamorous or non-monogamous, but not all are. Additionally, not all people who are in non-monogamous or polyamorous relationships identify as bisexual. While bisexuality and non-monogamy/polyamory are not mutually exclusive, several studies have shown that bisexual people are more likely to prefer non-monogamous relationships than monosexual people (Turrell et. al., 2018).



Polyamory, which is one form of non-monogamy, is associated with higher rates of IPV (Turrell et. al., 2018), but little research exists to identify the implications of this for service-providers and future research. Reviewing the existing research on bisexual women and intimate partner violence, there is a lack of intentionality around how individuals from various cultures might interpret words differently. Even the term “intimate partner” might preclude someone from self-reporting abuse if they did not consider their abuser a “partner.” Labels are intertwined with culture. The LGBTQ+ community uses language such as casual dating, friends with benefits, hooking up, and more to convey nonconformity amid rigid, heteronormative relationship expectations. It is essential to understand how bisexual survivors discuss their experiences of abuse and mirror the language they use when talking about a person who has caused them harm. Given that many bisexual+ women prefer non-monogamous relationships, the lack of research on IPV in a variety of relationship structures disproportionately impacts them.

Analytical Frameworks

Thus far, the high rates at which bisexual women experience intimate partner violence have been examined as a structural vulnerability primarily through a public health and psychology lens. Because this type of violence happens in an intimate context, it is sometimes oversimplified as a product of intergenerational trauma and systemic vulnerability. This ignores the impact of the messages people receive about marginalized populations within our broader culture. There are layers as to why bisexual women are targeted that are difficult to explore without a culturally competent context. The movement to end intimate partner violence has roots in feminist activism and gender theory, but this issue is now typically treated as a public health, psychological, or criminal justice issue, leaving its ideological justifications unchallenged. The pathologizing of intimate partner violence, sexuality, and gender increases the barriers for support. Exploring clarifying paradigms gives color and complexity to survivors who are often treated one dimensionally.



Recommendations for Future Research



Applying an Intersectional Lens

Most of the data from systematic reviews looks at cisgender straight white people, meaning more exploration around intersections in community is vital. This report focuses on bisexual survivors, which may initially seem a narrow scope. However, the data suggests a range of experiences within this community, and thus it cannot be understood one-dimensionally. In-depth exploration of race, ethnicity, gender, disability, economic status, immigration experience can expand the understanding of the bisexual community.

For example, as previously mentioned, 80% of Latine bisexual women experience intimate partner violence and sexual assault in their lifetimes. This staggering number offers more questions than answers to the experiences of this community. Deeper investigations on the impacts of racism, sexism, biphobia, familismo, machismo, etc. could lead to greater understanding. Additionally, in this current political climate, the systemic racism brought against the Latine community through discrimination and violence committed by immigration enforcement, detainment, and displacement, and threats of deportation is an acute experience that has heightened in 2025 and has deep impacts on Latine survivors' ability to seek safety and support. Organizations and researchers from the community should utilize quantitative and qualitative approaches to delve into nuances that those outside of the community may be ignorant to. Lastly, resilience-based approaches to understanding the protective factors that exist in the bisexual Latine community is a unique and progressive approach for exploring supportive micro-systems in the face of intimate partner violence.

Community Research Focus

In order for future research to be impactful, it is essential to shift away from traditional Western research practices. To honor survivors and provide the most trauma-informed approach to understanding their experiences, community-oriented research is essential. Often research is created to understand the experiences of marginalized people, but that gained knowledge rarely trickles back to the communities that gave their stories to the researchers. The goal of research should always be to benefit the subject matter of the project. For bisexual survivors, that means information highlighted by institutions through vessels such as journal articles should then be accessible to the LGBTQ+ community, not just the service providers, medical providers, or organizations who connect with them.

Community research can mean many different things to different people. For example, academic community researchers have specialized methodologies like participatory action research (PAR), which is a peer-reviewed method that requires IRB approval and is often funded by large institutions. Grassroots and community researchers will use similar methods with different language, such as “listening sessions” instead of “focus groups,” or “expert interviews” instead of “one-on-one interviews.” It is important to know that community research originates from Indigenous knowledge-seeking practices (University of Northern British Columbia, n.d.). Traditional Western research often teaches concepts such



as unbiased neutral research, with a goal of removing any personal attachments that could impact the data. However, community research understands that biases are inevitable and acknowledging these realities allows for transparency and trust with participants. In practice community research can include:



Community research is a powerful field within a variety of disciplines. When working with intersectional communities, it is an essential practice to provide safety. The historical trauma that marginalized communities have endured because of research has left many people distrustful of research as a whole. Rebuilding trust and keeping participants safe is the duty of every person who works in the research field.

Dissemination of Results

None of the journal articles explored throughout this project mentioned education, workshops, or connection with bisexual people as a practice to ensure the population is receiving the intellectual resources held by the institutions. This is not surprising, as there is limited community-based research in academia, and even less in the LGBTQ+ IPV field. As mentioned, community-engaged research is an essential practice that can shrink the distance between institutions, organizations, systems, scientists, and all that researchers represent to the community. This report itself is made by and for the research community and thus perpetuates the problem. However, there are several ways to bridge this gap.

MAKE RESEARCH PUBLICLY ACCESSIBLE:

Most of the research articles referenced in this report were not publicly accessible and exist behind a journal's pay wall. The resources to view these publications are not guaranteed, making it difficult for people to find information or trust institutions that privatize information based on their lived experiences.

TRANSLATE EXISTING RESEARCH INTO ACCESSIBLE LANGUAGE:

The limited information on bisexual survivors is often held in spaces that community members have less access to. Converting the information into language that has less jargon, does not pathologize the population, and offers strength or resiliency in the results will make the sometimes dry data more tangible. The information collected by researchers is not unknown to the bisexual community, but there is an affirming validation to knowing that one's experience does not exist in a silo and is instead

connected to numerous people in the community. The difficulty of IPV is often held in solitude, however the strength of knowledge can arm people with recognition and hope.

UTILIZE EXISTING COMMUNITY SPACES OR HELP-SEEKING MODELS:

There are a variety of ways to do outreach with the community. If LGBTQ+ survivors are less likely to utilize domestic violence agencies for support, it is essential to honor the existing models of support. Community events, LGBTQ+ organizations, and LGBTQ-owned businesses can be spaces of intentional partnership building. Finding the appropriate vessel to release information—including publicly available written resources such as zines, leaflets, or social media—can also bridge the gap with the community.

Diversifying Relationship Structures

Additional research should also be dedicated to abuse dynamics and power imbalances in hook-up culture. At the intersection of monosexism and sexism, it is normalized for heterosexual cisgender men to desire non-committal relationships, while women who engage in unstructured and informal intimate relationships are often perceived as having low self-esteem and participating in an act of self-degradation. This can lead to victim-blaming if a relationship becomes abusive, with the perception that women are consenting to mistreatment. While bisexual women may be more likely to form this type of connection, people of many identities engage in hook-up culture. Dedicated research and inquiry that centers bisexual women would have a ripple effect that benefits individuals with other identities.

Researchers need to adapt with evolving times and utilize community language, labels, and definitions when exploring intimate partner violence among bisexual people. Researchers need to understand a survivor's experience when the abuse is not from a partner or when a person is in a traditional relationship style. When doing outreach for participants or community through surveys, interviews, or focus groups, it is important for researchers to allow for flexible definitions. For example, using language like:



Utilizing a community advisory board can help inform inclusive language when referring to bisexual survivors and their harm-doers. Additionally, allowing for language to shift throughout a project by mirroring language when communicating with survivors is an essential trauma-informed practice. More clarity and empowerment should be offered to survivors no matter the relationship structure they have or are currently surviving.



Applying Queer Theory

It is necessary to collect and interpret more quantitative data on intimate partner violence toward bisexual women in order to better identify a roadmap for improving services for this population. However, a nuanced theoretical lens is needed to prevent and end the abuse for those living on the margins. Like all forms of oppression, monosexism and sexism are instilled in individuals through cultural norms and manifest in interpersonal violence. In reframing the disproportionate rates of intimate partner violence toward bisexual women as a manifestation of monosexism intersecting with sexism, the root cause of that violence becomes ideological oppression.

Queer Theory was developed by gender theorists Judith Butler and Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick to critique socially constructed norms that exist within binaries and lead to oppression. It values the fluidity of identity and challenges researchers to explore the impacts of Western gender and sexuality norms. There are various other theories that similarly question systems of oppression by exploring intersectional existences including Black Feminist Theory, Africana Womanism, Queer of Color Critique, Black Trans Feminism, and more. Applying a Queer Theory framework can open the conversation on bisexual identity, oppression, and activism (Salamon, 2021).

In a culture that positions women's sexuality relative to men, women claiming the label of bisexuality is an act of self-possession that challenges gendered power dynamics. Bisexuality insists on women's capacity for attraction outside of their relationship as a core part of their identity. This suggests that bisexual women may be targeted because bisexuality is not simply an identity; it is politicized and punished in the context of a patriarchal society.

Bisexuality challenges gender binaries, which challenges power dynamics between genders. The vast majority—89% of bisexual survivors—report that their abuser was a man. In media, bisexual women are often portrayed as pornographic and hypersexual (Zhang et al., 2023). Their sexuality is portrayed as existing for the consumption of men. This breeds a level of entitlement that creeps into their intimate relationships with men.

Additionally, queer theory can argue that carceral approaches fail to address intimate partner violence, because it cannot be resolved one person at a time; it is a cultural problem that is rooted in sexism and monosexism, intersecting with other types of discrimination and oppression. Anti-carceral and preventative approaches to intimate partner violence toward bisexual women could come in the form of community-based accountability for how men treat their partners regardless of their identities and regardless of the level of commitment in the relationship.

Carceral systems also fail to address intimate partner and sexual violence because they rely on black and white answers—good/bad, guilty/not guilty, safe/unsafe, right/wrong, true/false, good victim/asking for it, etc. These binaries make violence administratively manageable, but they are incompatible with the complexities of the intimacy in which this type of violence occurs. Intimate partner violence is not binary; it is full of nuance and impacts different communities differently. Our response to it must be expansive enough to carry that. In order to better support bisexual survivors of abuse—and survivors of abuse more broadly—we must look beyond criminal justice approaches to intimate partner violence. Truly centering bisexual survivors in advocacy requires the interrogation of binaries of all kinds.

Conclusion

The limitations of the current research available on bisexual people and the limited frameworks used to interpret that research deeply harms members of the community. The power of inclusion leads to investigations, awareness, education, reform, and culturally responsive care. It is the responsibility of the research community and the domestic violence field to improve safety and wellbeing of this community. Without intentional practices to understand the depth of experiences in the bisexual community, people will go from ignored to silenced.

References

Bermea, A. M., van Eeden-Moorefield, B., & Khaw, L. (2018). A systematic review of research on intimate partner violence among bisexual women. *Journal of Bisexuality*, 18(4), 399–424. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15299716.2018.1482485>

Borgogna, N. C., Aita, S. L., & Aita, L. J. (2024). Minority stress in consensually non-monogamous individuals: Mental health implications. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy*, 39(1), 46–65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681994.2021.1959545>

Breiding, M. J., Basile, K. C., Klevens, J., & Smith, S. G. (2017). Economic insecurity and intimate partner and sexual violence victimization. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 53(4), 457–464. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2017.03.021>

Brienzo, M. J., & Galupo, M. P. (2021). Sexual intimate partner violence: Effects of prejudice toward bisexual and gay men on victim blame. *Journal of Bisexuality*, 21(4), 581–602. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15299716.2022.2031367>

Brown, A. (2019, June 18). Bisexual adults are far less likely than gay men and lesbians to be “out” to the people in their lives. Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2019/06/18/bisexual-adults-are-far-less-likely-than-gay-men-and-lesbians-to-be-out-to-the-people-in-their-lives/>

Carroll, D., Edwards, D. J., Riley, R., & Redvers, N. (2025). Knowledge connects our hearts and lands: A qualitative research study on stewarding Indigenous traditional ecological knowledges for community well-being. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 22(10), 1573.

Chen, J., Khatiwada, S., Chen, M. S., Smith, S. G., Leemis, R. W., Friar, N., Basile, K. C., & Kresnow, M. (2023). The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS) 2016/2017: Report on victimization by sexual identity. National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Corey, J., Duggan, M., & Travers, Á. (2023). Risk and protective factors for intimate partner violence against bisexual victims: A systematic scoping review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 24(4), 2130–2142. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380221084749>

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1989(1), Article 8. <http://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/uclf/vol1989/iss1/8>

Friedman, M. R., Bukowski, L., Eaton, L. A., Matthews, D. D., Dyer, T. V., Siconolfi, D., & Stall, R. (2019). Psychosocial health disparities among Black bisexual men in the U.S.: Effects of sexuality nondisclosure and gay community support. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 48(1), 213–224. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-018-1162-2>

Friedman, M. R., Dodge, B., Schick, V., Herbenick, D., Hubach, R., 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>

Kan, L., & Wallace, A. (2020). 2018 tracking report: LGBTQ grantmaking by U.S. foundations. Funders for LGBTQ Issues.

Minkin, R., Menasce Horowitz, J., Lin, L., & Braga, D. (2025, May 29). The experiences of LGBTQ Americans today. Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/2025/05/29/the-experiences-of-lgbtq-americans-today/>

Movement Advancement Project. (2016). Invisible majority: The disparities facing bisexual people and how to remedy them. <https://www.mapresearch.org/file/invisible-majority.pdf>

Ochs, R. (n.d.). Quotes. Robyn Ochs. <https://www.robynocho.com/quotes>

Pollitt, A. M., & Roberts, T. S. (2021). Internalized binegativity, LBQ+ community involvement, and definitions of bisexuality. *Journal of Bisexuality*, 21(3), 357–379. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15299716.2021.1984363>

Rosenfeld, M. J., Thomas, R. J., & Hausen, S. (2023). How couples meet and stay together 2017–2020–2022 combined dataset [Data set]. Stanford University Libraries. <https://data.stanford.edu/hcmst2017>

Salamon, G. (2021). Queer theory. In *The Oxford handbook of feminist philosophy* (pp. 506–516). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190628925.013.42>

Sumerau, J. E., Mathers, L. A. B., & Lampe, N. (2019). Learning from the religious experiences of Bi+ trans people. *Symbolic Interaction*, 42(2), 179–201. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26629977>

Turell, S. C., Brown, M., & Herrmann, M. (2018). Disproportionately high: An exploration of intimate partner violence prevalence rates for bisexual people. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy*, 33(1–2), 113–131. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681994.2017.1347610>

University of Northern British Columbia. (n.d.). Indigenous methodology. <https://www.unbc.ca/indigenous-connections/indigenous-methodology>

Usher, K., Bhullar, N., Durkin, J., Gyamfi, N., & Jackson, D. (2020). Family violence and COVID-19: Increased vulnerability and reduced options for support. *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing*, 29(4), 549–552. <https://doi.org/10.1111/inm.12735>

Watson, R. J., Allen, A., Pollitt, A. M., & Eaton, L. A. (2019). Risk and protective factors for sexual health outcomes among Black bisexual men in the U.S.: Internalized heterosexism, sexual orientation disclosure, and religiosity. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 48(1), 243–253. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-018-1216-5>

Zhang Kudon, H., Zhu, S., Chen, B., Breiding, M. J., Leemis, R. W., Zhang, X., Schwank, A., & Basile, K. C. (2026). The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2023/2024 intimate partner violence data brief. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. <https://www.cdc.gov/nisvs/media/pdfs/intimatepartnerviolence-brief.pdf>

Report design by:

Cailey Underhill

This publication was made possible by 90EV0535-01-01 from the Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families. Its contents are solely the responsibility of Los Angeles LGBT Center and do not necessarily represent the official views of the Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families.

