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Overview

Male Call/Waea Mai, Tane Ma was the first nationwide survey of men who have sex with men (msm) in New Zealand. The project was undertaken because no large scale baseline data on this population was available. While a number of other groups are affected by HIV in this country, the virus is most significantly present amongst msm, who account for over 80% of those with AIDS. As there is still no vaccine or cure for HIV infection, behaviour change remains the only strategy available to manage the HIV epidemic. In order to develop effective and efficient HIV prevention programmes, it was recognised that there was an urgent need for up to date, accurate data on the socio-sexual characteristics of men who have sex with men. The aims of this survey were to:

- describe men who have sex with men’s HIV and AIDS knowledge and their sexual practices with a special focus on the adoption of safer strategies;
- examine the ways in which HIV and AIDS knowledge and safe sex practice are related to a number of important demographic and contextual variables;
- provide baseline data on the sexual behaviour of men who have sex with men which can be used to assist in the planning and development of HIV prevention programmes; and
- to develop a core set of baseline questions which could be used in future surveys of men who have sex with men.

The method used was a nationwide telephone survey which was conducted over a six week period between May and June 1996. All men who had sex with another man in the previous five years were eligible to participate. Respondents called an 0800 toll-free phone number and answered a questionnaire, which took approximately forty minutes to complete. Respondents were able to terminate the call at any time. This method ensured that participants could remain anonymous, and encouraged a wide range of msm to participate. The questionnaire was developed by modifying and expanding the original Australian Project Male Call instrument, which was first used in 1992.

The questionnaire was completed in full by 1852 men. Male Call/Waea Mai, Tane Ma attracted a broad cross section of msm through a successful recruitment campaign that spanned both mainstream and gay media.
Introduction

It has been suggested that 'bisexual' men pose a threat of HIV infection to the wider 'heterosexual community', through their sexual relations with women. These men are often imagined in the public perception as a potentially dangerous 'bridging' group between the 'gay community' (a known focus of HIV infection), and the relatively safe 'heterosexual community'. Yet prior to Male Call/Waea Mai, Tane Ma, there had been very little research undertaken which investigated the socio-sexual lives of men who have sex with men and women (msmw) in New Zealand (see Horn and Chetwynd 1989; Chetwynd 1991; Chetwynd et al. 1992). The information presented here is of considerable significance as it represents the first local in-depth data on the sexual practices of mswm.

This report focuses on the characteristics, sexual practices and condom use of 287 men who had sex with men and with women in the six months prior to interview. While the report is mainly descriptive, some statistical analysis has been undertaken. For the main aims listed below, logistic regressions were carried out. The details of these are given in Appendix I and the results are discussed alongside charts in the body of the text. Where it was more appropriate to carry out univariate tests of difference, the results of chi squared tests and t-tests are footnoted. The aims of this report are:

- to analyse the demographic and social milieu variables of men who had sex with men and with women (msmw) in the six months prior to interview, comparing them with the rest of the sample;

- to examine the sexual practices and condom use of mswm with their male partners (both regular and casual) in the previous six months, comparing them with the rest of the sample;

- to investigate sexual practices and condom use of mswm with female partners (both regular and casual) in the previous six months; and

- to examine levels of safe sexual practices of mswm, comparing them with the rest of the sample.
Although a substantial proportion of the msmw identified as bisexual (83.3%), we refer to these men throughout the report as men who have sex with men and women (msmw) - not as 'bisexual men', nor even 'behaviourally bisexual men'. This decision emerges from two concerns. Firstly, although there is undoubtedly a link between sexual behaviour and partner type, and sexual identity, as Ággleton et al. caution (1996:1), "important distinctions must always be made between bisexual behaviours and bisexual identities". The selection of participants for analysis based on 'bisexual' self-identification rather than current sexual practices may include men who are not currently behaviourally bisexual (Wold et al. 1998:362). In our study, those men who had sex with both men and women in the six months prior to interview were included in the category of msmw.

Secondly, there is no straightforward, single 'bisexuality', and the blanket use of this term may incorrectly infer some sort of unity to the meanings and patterns of men's sexual experiences. Previous research has repeatedly noted (Bartos et al. 1993; Davies et al. 1993; Myers and Allman 1996) that 'bisexual' sexual behaviour is a fluid and diverse phenomenon. The meanings of sex with men, and with women, are not universal for all men who have (or who have had) sex with both. Neither are the contexts within which sex occurs, nor the frequency, patterns and history of their sexual behaviour. For example, Boulton and Fitzpatrick (1996) provide an indication of the breadth and diversity of men's experiences. They carried out in-depth interviews with sixty British men who had had sex with both men and women in the previous five years. The researchers noted that not all msmw had male and female partners through all periods of their lives, and whilst for some men bisexual activities overlapped, for other men, sex with men and women occurred at alternate periods in their life. Yet for other men, sex with a woman may only have happened at one stage of their life.

The conceptual slipperiness of the category 'msmw' is highlighted in this report. We are able to provide a snapshot of the characteristics and sexual practices of those respondents who had sex with both men and women in the six month period prior to interview. However, many of these individuals may not necessarily have been included if the study had been carried out in any other time period.
Section I: Sex with Female Partners in Lifetime

Many gay and homosexual men have had sex with a woman at some stage of their life. Nearly three quarters of the total sample (71.1%, or 1318 men) stated they had sex with a woman at least once in their lifetime. This compares very closely with other research, such as the 1996 Australian Project Male Call which found that 76.6% of their total sample had engaged in sex with women during their lifetime (Crawford et al. 1993), the Social Aspects of the Prevention of AIDS (SAPA) study in which 69% of respondents had ever had sex with a woman (Crawford et al. 1992), and the British SIGMA survey which reported a figure of 60% (Weatherburn et al. 1992).

Two thirds (68.7%) of the 1318 men had engaged in sex with fewer than five female partners in their lifetime (see Figure 1 below).¹ Men of all age groups were included, although older men were slightly over represented.²

![Figure 1: Number of female sex partners respondents had sex with in lifetime (n=1318)](image)

While it is perhaps not surprising that 91.4% of all respondents who identified as heterosexual, and 94.2% of those who identified as bisexual had engaged in sex with at least one woman in their lifetime, it is of interest to note that approximately two thirds of all men who identified as gay (65.9%), homosexual (65.8%) and queer (63.4%) also stated they had engaged in sex with at least one female partner during their lifetime.

¹ Section V outlines number of female partners in previous six months.
² For example, whilst almost two thirds of respondents aged fifteen to nineteen years (61.4%), and twenty to thirty-nine years (67.3%) had sex with a women in their lifetime, the proportion for men aged forty and over was 80.0%.
Sex with female partners in previous six months

A total of 323 respondents, or 17.4% of the total sample, stated they had sex with a woman, or women, in the previous six months. However, thirty six of these men had not had sex with a man in that time. Only those 287 respondents who had sex with both men and with women in the previous six months are included in this analysis. These men represent 15.4% of the total sample (Figure 2).

![Figure 2: Proportion of total sample who had sex with both men and women in previous six months (n=1652)](image)

Section II: Demographic and Social Milieu Characteristics

This section will explore the demographic and social milieu characteristics of the group of 287 msmw, and will compare them with the rest of the Male Call/Waea Mai, Tane Ma sample.

Predictors of men having sex with men and women

A logistic regression was used to investigate whether demographic and social milieu variables had an effect on whether or not respondents had had sex with both women and men in the previous six months (see Appendix I for full details of variables and results). The test found that the variables of age, income, gay community attachment and sexual identity were correlated with whether men had engaged in sex with men and with women over that period. These findings are discussed below.

Age

Men of all age groups reported having engaged in sex with both men and women in the previous six months. However it was found that younger men were more likely than other
age groups to have done this. For example, one fifth (20.8%) of all respondents aged between fifteen and nineteen had sex with both male and female partners in the previous six months, compared with 14.5% of men aged between twenty and twenty-nine, 14.7% of men aged between thirty and thirty-nine and 16.1% of men aged forty and over. Davies et al. (1991) suggest that younger men are more likely to 'experiment' with different sexual partners (see also Myers and Allman 1996).

**Income**

It was also found that men who were on lower incomes were more likely than those on higher incomes to have had sex with men and women in the previous six months. For example, of all respondents earning less than $10,000 pa, 20.3% were MSMW, compared with 14.9% of all men earning $10,000 pa and over.

**Gay Community Attachment**

Male Call/Waea Mai, Tane Ma was interested in gauging men's attachment to the gay community for the purpose of exploring the relationship between community involvement and sexual practice, including condom use. A gay community attachment scale was constructed by ranking (on a scale of one to twelve) respondents' social contact with other gay/homosexual men, and places they visited with their gay friends. A score of five or more was regarded as indicating the respondent was gay community attached (gca), and a score of four or less meant that the respondent was non-gay community attached (non-gca).

Men's attachment to the gay community was found to have a negative effect on the likelihood of them having sex with men and women. That is, non-gca men were more likely to have had sex with both men and women than gca men. Nearly one third of all non-gca respondents to the survey (30.1%) had engaged in sex with men and women in the previous six months, compared to 7.1% of gca respondents (see Figure 3).

---

9 p=0.04.
4 p=0.04.
5 p=0.005.
Sexual Identity

Previous research has found that for many msmw the term ‘bisexual’ is used primarily as a descriptor of sexual practice, and not as a personal identity. For example, following a series of qualitative interviews with Australian msmw, Bartos et al. (1993:iv) noted that some men actively refused a gay identity, and they point out that for many msmw, the idea of a sexual identity is largely irrelevant, noting “sexuality [was] not a key part of [the men’s] sense of personal identity, which was based instead on other personal relationships, i.e. family and career” (see also Weinberg 1978, Hood et al. 1994, and Boulton and Fitzpatrick 1996). Nonetheless, this survey found that there were several significant relationships between respondents’ sexual identity and sexual partner type.\(^5\) Figure 4 shows the association between sexual identity and msmw status.

---

\(^5\) Please note that survey respondents were allowed to choose multiple sexual identities, and on average men chose 2.5 different identities. See Male Cal/Waea Mai, Tane Ma Report No. 5: Sexual Identity for a more detailed analysis of the relationship between msm’s sexual identity and sexual practice.
It is perhaps not surprising that men who identified as gay were significantly less likely than those who did not choose that identity to be msmw, and men who identified as heterosexual or bisexual were significantly more likely than the men who did not choose those identities to be msmw. Only 7.5% of all men who identified as gay were msmw, which is considerably lower than figures for men who identified as heterosexual (54.7%) or bisexual (47.1%). No other sexual identities were found to be significantly related to the likelihood of having had sex with both male and female partners.

Within the sample group of 287 msmw, respondents chose a variety of sexual identities, further highlighting that the link between sexual behaviour and bisexual identity is not straightforward. Whereas the most frequently chosen identity within this group was 'bisexual' (83.3%), over a third identified as 'gay' (38.3%), and just under a quarter (22.3%) identified as 'heterosexual'.

In line with the finding that age was a significant factor in msmw status, there was also an interesting relationship between age and choice of bisexual identity. A lower proportion of msmw aged fifteen to nineteen identified as bisexual (65.0%) than msmw in other age groups (85.2% of those aged twenty to thirty-nine, and 83.6% of those aged forty and over chose this identity).

**Disclosure to others**

Respondents were asked whether they had told anyone that they were sexually attracted to men, and if so, whom they had told. Overall, most msmw (81.9% or 235 men) had told someone. However, this figure was slightly lower than that for the rest of the sample, at 96.3%.

Within the group of 235 msmw who had told someone that they were sexually attracted to men, the largest group (88.0%) had told their gay and bisexual friends. Msmw were much less likely than the rest of the sample to have told their straight friends (50.6% compared with 88.7%), members of their family (40.4%; 80.9%) or workmates (38.2%; 76.5%).

---

7 p values are < 0.0001 for gay, 0.002 for heterosexual and < 0.0001 for bisexual.
8 p<0.0001.
9 p value of <0.0001 for all three comparisons.
Subgroups of msmw

Previous commentators have attempted to categorise the socio-sexual lives of msmw (see for example Boulton and Fitzpatrick 1996; Buchbinder and Waddell 1992; Crawford et al. 1996 and Ross 1991). Following their observations that sex with both men and women occurs in quite different social contexts, Boulton and Fitzpatrick (1996:13) suggest that three social contexts can be distinguished. That is, sex with men and women may occur within a heterosexual embedded context - where a man identifies predominantly as heterosexual and may be in a primary relationship with a woman; a homosexually embedded context - where a man identifies as gay and is involved in the gay community; or in a bisexual context - where a man identifies as bisexual and may have on-going social contact with other individuals who identify as bisexual.

Bearing in mind the pitfalls of 'over-simplification' as cautioned by Crawford et al. (1996:55), it is nonetheless possible to trace the outlines of two subgroups within the Male Call/Waea Mai, Tane Ma sample of msmw, using relationship status with women as the distinguishing feature. Just under half of the total msmw sample (47.3% or 136 men) were in a regular sexual relationship with a woman of six months or longer, forming one subgroup who perhaps could be said to be living in a 'heterosexually embedded context'. The remaining 151 msmw who were not in a relationship with a woman form the other subgroup.

Of the 136 msmw who were in a regular sexual relationship with a woman, 77.9% were married or living in a de facto relationship with a woman. Two thirds of those men (66.2%) were in a relationship of six years and over in length. Nearly all of these men (91.2%) identified as bisexual.

Predictors of being in a relationship with women

A logistic regression was used to investigate whether demographic and social milieu variables have an effect on the likelihood of msmw having a regular female sexual partner (see Appendix I for full details of variables and results). It was found that age, ethnicity, income, and gay community attachment were correlated with being in a relationship with women. These findings are summarised over.
• Older msmw were more likely than rest of the group to be in a regular sexual relationship with a woman.\textsuperscript{10} For example, two thirds (67.3\%) of all msmw aged forty and over were in a regular relationship with a woman, compared with 37.0\% of msmw aged under forty.

• Men who identified as NZ European, Māori and Pacific Island were less likely than other respondents to have a regular female sexual partner.\textsuperscript{11} Nearly two thirds (61.1\%) of msmw who identified as Chinese, Indian or 'other' were in a regular sexual relationship with a woman, compared with 50.6\% of NZ European, 27.5\% of Māori and 30.0\% of Pacific Island respondents.

• Msmw on lower incomes were less likely than those on higher incomes to have regular female partners.\textsuperscript{12} One fifth (20.7\%) of msmw who earned under $20,000 pa had a regular female partner, compared with 58.6\% of msmw who earned $20,000 pa or more.

• Msmw who identified as gay were significantly less likely than other msmw to be in a regular sexual relationship with a woman.\textsuperscript{13} Whereas just under a third (30.0\%) of all msmw who identified as gay had a regular female sex partner, the corresponding figure for those msmw who identified as heterosexual was 57.8\%.

• Men’s social environment had a strong effect on their sexual relationships. Msmw who were gay community attached (gca) were significantly less likely than the rest of the group to be in a regular sexual relationship with a woman. Whilst only one fifth (20.2\%) of gca msmw had a regular female partner, the figure for non-gca msmw was 58.6\%.

Unfortunately, numbers were too small for adequate statistical comparison of the sexual practices and condom use of these two subgroups of msmw. Nonetheless, it is important to note that there was a diversity of men within the broad group of msmw.

\textsuperscript{10} p<0.0003.
\textsuperscript{11} p=0.004.
\textsuperscript{12} p<0.0001.
\textsuperscript{13} p<0.0001.
Section III: Sexual Practices with Men

This section investigates the number of partners, sexual relationships and sexual practices of the group of 287 msmlw with their male partners. The overall findings for numbers of male sex partners in the previous six months and the predictors of msmlw engaging in anal sex with any male partner are outlined first. Reported sexual practices of msmlw with their regular and casual male partners are then discussed.

Number of male partners

Previous research on the numbers of male partners amongst msmlw has reported a diversity of results. For example, in some surveys which asked respondents about sexual partners within restricted time periods (such as the previous six months) msmlw have often reported sex with fewer regular partners than non-msmlw, and with more casual partners than non-msmlw (see Diaz et al. 1993; Doll et al. 1992; Stokes et al. 1997; Wood et al. 1993). However, some Australian research has found that msmlw tended to have sex with fewer male partners than exclusively homosexual men, both within their lifetime and in the previous six months (see Crawford et al. 1996).

Male Call/Waea Mai, Tane Ma found that msmlw reported having engaged in sex with fewer male partners in their lifetime than non-msmlw. However, the overall pattern for number of male partners in the previous six months (of all respondents who had sex with at least one male partner in the previous six months) was similar for the two groups (see Figure 5).

![Figure 5: Number of male sex partners in last six months - comparison of msmlw and non-msmlw](image-url)
Of the 287 msmw, more men had engaged in sex with a casual male partner than a regular male partner, in the previous six months. Over a quarter (29.3%) had engaged in sex with a regular male partner (of six months or longer), and 83.6% had engaged in sex with a casual male partner.14

Predictors of anal sex

Just over two thirds of all msmw (68.9%) had engaged in anal sex with any male partner in the previous six months - this is very similar to the figure of 67.6% for the rest of the men who had sex with men in that time period. A logistic regression was undertaken to investigate factors which effect whether or not msmw have anal sex with a male partner (see Appendix I for full details of variables and results). Being in a regular relationship with a man and finding anal sex the most physically satisfying sexual practice were the only two variables which were statistically significant. No demographic variables were found to be significant.

Regular male partners

Within Male Call/Waea Mai, Tane Ma, a regular male partner was defined as any sexual partner “you have had sex with more than once, and with whom you plan to have sex again in the near future”.15 As the survey questioned respondents on their sexual practices and condom use in the previous six months, for the purpose of analysis only those men who were in a regular sexual relationship of six months or longer are included here.16

Msmw were less likely than the rest of the sample to be in a regular sexual relationship with a male partner of six months or longer - over a quarter of msmw (29.3% or 84 msmw) were in such a relationship, compared with 41.9% of the rest of the sample (see Figure 6).17

14 Crawford et al. (1993:51) suggest that the regular casual spat may need to be re-considered in terms of msmw. Many have a primary relationship which is heterosexual, and they may regard all male-to-male sex activity as casual.
15 For the purposes of this study the SIGMA definition of a regular partner was modified. The SIGMA work defines a regular partner as one with whom you have had sex more than once, where the second and subsequent meetings were not accidental, and with whom you intend to have sex in the near future (Davies et al. 1993).
16 See Male Call/Waea Mai, Tane Ma Report No. 2: Men in Relationships with Men for more detailed analysis of the demographic characteristics, sexual practices and condom use of respondents who were in a regular relationship with another man.
17 p<0.0001.
Of the eighty-four msmw in a regular sexual relationship with a man (of at least six months duration), the largest proportion (46.4%) had been in the relationship for two to five years.

![Figure 6: Length of msmw's regular sexual relationships with men (n=287)](image)

Respondents were asked how they would describe their regular sexual partner. The two most popular terms chosen by msmw were 'fuck buddy' (40.5%) and 'boyfriend' (33.3%). Msmw were significantly more likely than other men to refer to their regular sexual partners as a fuck buddy (10.5%), and were less likely to call them a de facto partner / husband (11.9% compared with 52.8%).18

Sexual practices with regular male partners

All sexual practices that were included in the questionnaire have been broadly divided into two categories: First, sexual activities which do not involve penile-anal intercourse but may still involve the anus, such as rimming and finger fucking. We have called this 'oral and other sex'. Second, those sexual practices that involve penile-anal intercourse are referred to as 'anal sex'.

When the oral and other sex practices of msmw with their regular male partners were compared with those of other men in relationships with men, few differences were found. Msmw were less likely than the other men to deep kiss their regular male partner, and they were more likely than the other men to have engaged in receptive oral sex without ejaculation.19 See Appendix II for details of oral and other sex practices by msmw with their regular male partners.

18 p values of <0.005 for fuck buddy, and <0.005 for de facto partner / husband.
19 p values of 0.05 for deep kissing and 0.02 for receptive oral sex.
Just over three quarters (77.3%) of the eighty four msmw in regular sexual relationships with men had anal sex with their regular partner in the previous six months. This is very similar to the figure of 75.6% for the rest of the men in regular sexual relationships (Figure 7).

**Figure 7: Proportion of men who had anal sex with regular male partners in previous six months**
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**Types of anal sex**

More msmw reported engaging in anal sex with ejaculation than anal sex with withdrawal with their regular male partners. For example, of all the msmw who had anal sex with their regular male partners, the largest group (75.4%) stated they had engaged in insertive anal sex with ejaculation inside their partner, whilst 55.4% stated they had engaged in insertive anal sex with withdrawal, on at least one occasion in the previous six months (see Figure 8). However, it must be noted that overall, withdrawal was a significantly less popular act than ejaculation inside a partner for all respondents who were in regular sexual relationships with men.

**Figure 8: Anal sex with regular male partners - comparison of msmw and others**

- **Receptive with withdrawal**
- **Insertive with withdrawal**
- **Receptive with ejaculation inside partner**
- **Insertive with ejaculation inside partner**

---

20 Note respondents were able to choose more than one practice.
21 See *Male Call/Waea Mai, Tane Ma Report No. 2: Men in Relationships with Men* for more detailed analysis of the sexual practices of respondents who were in a regular relationship with another man.
Although not statistically significant, it is interesting to note that when the anal sex practices of msmw with regular male partners were compared with those of other men in relationships with men, msmw reported higher levels of insertive anal sex with ejaculation inside. For example, whilst 75.4% of msmw engaged in insertive anal sex with ejaculation inside their partner, 69.6% of the rest of men in relationships did this. Msmw also reported lower levels of receptive anal sex with ejaculation. In previous research, Bartos et al. (1993:43) posit that for many msmw, ‘real sex’ results in the man’s orgasm inside his partner.

In contrast to research such as Stokes et al. (1997:393), which found that gay men were more likely than bisexual men to have engaged in receptive anal sex (with any male partner), this survey found no difference between msmw and other men with respect to having engaged in exclusively insertive or receptive anal sex in the previous six months (with both regular and casual male partners). Most msmw engaged in both insertive and receptive anal intercourse with male partners over that period. See Appendix III for relevant tables.

**Casual male partners**

Within the survey a casual male partner was broadly defined as any sexual partner who did not fall into the definition of a regular partner (see page 11 for definition of regular male partner). Of all 1743 respondents who had sex with at least one male partner in the previous six months, msmw were significantly more likely than the other men to have engaged in sex with a casual male partner on at least one occasion during that time. A total of 83.6% of all msmw had done this, compared with 76.4% of the rest of the group.22

---

\[22\] p=0.01.
Although gay saunas and gay bars were the most popular venues overall to meet or look for male sex partners among msmw, at 52.5% and 46.2% respectively, they were less likely overall than other msm to have gone to gay venues such as gay bars, gay nightclubs and gay dance parties to meet male sex partners. Msmw were more likely than the other respondents to have gone to straight bars or to have used escort agencies.\footnote{All have a p value of less than 0.005. Refer to Male Cail/Waea Mai, Tane Ma Report No. 4: Casual Sex between Men for more detailed analysis of where men went to meet or look for male sex partners.}

\textit{Sex practices with casual male partners}

Msmw were significantly less likely than other respondents to have engaged in both deep and dry kissing, sensuous touching, rimming and finger fucking with their casual male partners.\footnote{p values of <0.0001 for deep kissing, 0.0003 for dry kissing, 0.04 for sensuous touching, 0.02 for rimming a partner and 0.04 for finger fucking a partner.} However, they were more likely than the other men to have engaged in the use of sex toys and to have had insertive oral sex with ejaculation.\footnote{p values of 0.02 for sex toys and <0.0001 for insertive oral sex with ejaculation.} See Appendix II for details.

Nearly two thirds (54.5% or 155 men) of all 240 msmw who had sex with a casual male partner had engaged in anal sex with a casual male partner at least once in the previous six months. Although not statistically significant, this proportion was slightly higher than that for the rest of the men who had sex with casual male partners, at 59.0% (see Figure 10).

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure10.png}
\caption{Proportion of men who had anal sex with casual male partners in previous six months}
\end{figure}

Although proportionately more msmw had sex with a casual male partner than a regular partner in the previous six months, an inverse relationship between partner type and the incidence of anal sex was found. That is, proportionately fewer msmw had engaged in anal sex with their casual male partners than with regular male partners. This echoes other Male Call/Waea Mai, Tane Ma findings, namely that msm tend to engage in anal sex with regular
male partners more often than with casual partners (see also Davies et al. 1993; Kippax et al. 1994; Myers et al. 1993; Weatherburn et al. 1998).

**Types of anal sex**

Similar to the findings for msmw with regular male sex partners, the most frequently reported anal sex practice by msmw with their casual male sex partners was anal sex with ejaculation. For example, over two thirds (69.0%) of the 155 msmw who had anal sex with their casual partners had engaged in insertive anal sex with ejaculation and half (51.0%) had engaged in receptive anal sex with ejaculation in the previous six months (Figure 11).

When the anal sex practices of msmw were compared with those of the rest of the men who had anal sex with their casual partners, it was again found that msmw were significantly more likely than the other men to have engaged in insertive anal sex with ejaculation. While 69.0% of the msmw sample engaged in insertive anal sex with ejaculation inside their casual partner, only half (50.9%) of the rest who engaged in anal sex did so (see Figure 11).\(^{26}\) No other significant differences between msmw and others were found.

![Figure 11: Anal sex with casual male partners - comparison of msmw and others](image)

\(^{26}\) p<0.005.
Section IV: Condom Use with Male Partners

This section discusses predictors of condom use amongst msmw, and explores condom use by msmw with their male partners, both regular and casual, comparing the findings to those from non-msmw. Only those men who engaged in anal sex with their male partners are included in these analyses.

Respondents were asked to indicate condom use on a scale of “always” to “never” and were asked to do this separately for each type of anal sex.\(^{27}\) Note that respondent’s answers may have differed for each type of anal sex (for instance, some men may have reported “never” using a condom for anal sex with withdrawal, but may have indicated “always” if ejaculation inside was involved). Notwithstanding, a clear subgroup of men who “never used a condom” with casual male partners was isolated. This category includes only those men who indicated that they had “never” used a condom for any type of anal sex in the previous six months (that is, msmw who reported that they “very rarely” or “sometimes” used condoms were not included).

Most of the msmw who had anal sex with male partners were practising safe sex. That is, most men used condoms (either always or sometimes) for anal sex with their male partners. Overall, msmw were more likely than the rest of the sample to have used a condom for anal sex with any male partner. Of the total 1251 survey respondents who reported they had engaged in anal sex with any male partner in the previous six months, 12.8% of msmw (25 out of 196 men) had never used a condom, compared to 24.3% of the rest of the sample (256 out of 1055 men).\(^{28}\) These results are broadly similar to other research findings, such as Prestage et al. (1995:3) who noted msmw “were generally as precautionary [as other msm] in negotiating safe sex strategies with their [male] partners”.

Condom use by msmw with their regular and casual male partners is discussed separately over.

\(^{27}\) The full scale for condom use was: Never/ Very rarely/ Sometimes/ Almost always /Always.

\(^{28}\) p=0.0004.
Condom use with regular male partners

The survey found that overall, men's condom use with regular male partners was generally low, and was much lower than condom use with casual male partners - echoing other research findings (see Davies et al. 1993; Kippax et al. 1993 and 1994; Myers et al. 1993; and Weatherburn et al. 1992). Yet when condom use of msmw with regular partners was compared to that of other msm, we found that rates of condom use by msmw were higher - of the sixty five msmw who had anal sex with their regular sexual partners, 25% or sixteen men never used a condom, which is significantly lower than the corresponding figure of 47.6% for condom use by the rest of the men who had anal sex with their regular male partner.

Patterns of condom use by msmw with regular male partners is outlined in Figure 12. Overall, the patterns were similar, however msmw reported slightly more frequent condom use for insertive anal sex (both with ejaculation and withdrawal).

![Figure 12: Condom use by msmw with regular male partners](image)

When these patterns of condom use by msmw were compared to those of the other men who had anal sex with regular male partners, it was found that msmw reported higher rates of condom use for all types of anal sex (see Figure 13).

---

20 See Male Call/Waea Mai, Tane Ma Report No. 2: Men in Relationships with Men for a more detailed analysis of the overall patterns of condom use with regular male partners, and Report No. 4: Casual Sex between Men for patterns of condom use with casual male partners.

30 p=0.0003.
Agreements with regular partner about condom use

Many MSM have difficulty negotiating condom use with their regular partner, and do not engage in an explicit decision making process with them (see Reid et al. 1997). Respondents were asked about agreements they had with their regular male sex partner concerning anal sex and condom use.\(^{31}\) Of all MSM who had anal sex with their regular male sex partner, a quarter (24.6%) did not have an agreement with them. This figure was marginally higher than for the rest of men in relationships with men (21.3%) (see Figure 14).

MSM were less likely than other respondents to have made an agreement with their regular male partner that anal sex could be without a condom.\(^{32}\) The largest proportion of MSM (38.5%) had agreed with their partner that all anal sex was to be with a condom.

\(^{31}\) The criterion for having an 'agreement' was that men had discussed anal sex and had come to a decision with their partner about condom use.

\(^{32}\) p=0.02.
Condom use with casual male partners

As stated previously, other research has frequently found that condom use with casual male partners is generally higher than with regular male partners. This pattern was also true for MSMW. Condom use was relatively high amongst the 155 MSMW who had anal sex with casual male partners. Only 10.3%, or sixteen men, never used a condom with a casual partner in the previous six months. This was very similar to the figure of 10.0% for other MSMW who had anal sex with casual partners.

When patterns of condom use by MSMW with their casual male partners was investigated, we noted that MSMW reported slightly lower levels of condom use during anal sex with withdrawal (see Figure 15).

![Figure 15: Condom use with casual male partners by MSMW](image)

When the patterns of condom use by MSMW were compared with those of other respondents who had anal sex with casual male partners, similar patterns emerged (Figure 16).

![Figure 16: Proportion of men who never used a condom with casual male partner in previous six months, by type of anal sex](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSMW</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>% who 'never' used a condom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insertive anal sex with ejaculation</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptive anal sex with ejaculation</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insertive anal sex with withdrawal</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptive anal sex with withdrawal</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communication with casual male partners

All men who had anal sex with casual male partners were asked about their verbal and non-verbal communication with them about anal sex and condom use. Respondents were asked whether they "always", "sometimes" or "never" negotiate these issues with their casual male partners. The questions were not related to any specific time period. Results for the total group of 155 msmw who had anal sex with casual male partners are outlined in Figure 17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of communication</th>
<th>Msmw n=155</th>
<th>Others n=662</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbally let partner know you want anal sex without a</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>condom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbally tell partner you want anal sex without a condom</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbally let partner know you don't want anal sex</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without a condom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbally let partner know you don't want anal sex without</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a condom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask partner their HIV status</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell partner your HIV status</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compare HIV status and then decide</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just under two thirds (60.0%) of the 155 msmw reported that they always verbally tell their casual partner that they do not want anal sex without a condom, and just under a half (49.0%) reported they always indicate this to their partner non-verbally. In contrast, a very low percentage of msmw reported that they always negotiate anal sex without a condom - either verbally (5.1%) or non-verbally (4.5%).

The only area in which the findings for msmw were significantly different than for the rest of the men who had anal sex with casual partners was in regard to negotiation concerning HIV status. Over a quarter of msmw (27.7%) reported that they always ask their partner their HIV status, and 23.2% reported that they always compare HIV status with their casual partners before deciding what type of sex to have, compared to 15.7% and 14.1% of the rest of the men respectively.

---

Note that respondents were able to choose more than one option.

p values of <0.005 and 0.05.
Predictors of condom use

A logistic regression was undertaken to investigate which factors affect whether or not msmw used condoms with (any) male partners (see Appendix I for full details of variables and results). The only statistically significant finding was that msmw who had an HIV test at least once in their lifetime were more likely than those who had never been tested to use condoms.\(^{35}\) Again, no demographic variables were found to be of significance.

Section V: Sexual Practices with Female Partners

This section focuses on the sexual relationships and condom use of a group of 219 msmw with their female sexual partners. This group is smaller than that of the 287 msmw we have been discussing so far. The survey asked all respondents who indicated they had sex with a woman in the previous six months to define their sexual relationship with women at present. The choices were 'in a regular sexual relationship with a woman', 'you have casual sex only with women' and 'other'. A total of fifty three men who answered 'other' were not asked about sexual practices and condom use with female partners, and a further fifteen men who had sex with a regular female partner of less than six months are not included in this analysis.

Similar to the findings of Weatherburn et al. (1998), more msmw in this survey had sex with a regular female partner than a casual female partner in the previous six months. Of the 219 msmw, 136 (62.0%) were in a regular sexual relationship with women of six months or longer. A total of 118 msmw (53.8%) had engaged in sex with a casual female partner in the previous six months (thirty five of these men were also in regular relationships with women).

**Number of female partners in previous six months**

As Figure 18 indicates, most of the 219 msmw (67.1%) had had sex with only one female partner in the previous six months. This figure is higher than reported in the 1996 Australian Project Male Call, in which 49.1% of respondents who had sex with a women in the previous six months reported sex with one female partner only (Crawford et al. 1998).

\(^{35}\) p=0.007.
Disclosure and negotiation with female partners

As Wold et al. (1998:366) state, "disclosure about one's bisexuality to female partners is important to understanding whether or not informed negotiations about condom use are taking place". In their study, fewer than one half of msmw (46.0%) had told their female partners that they have sex with men. Male Call/Waea Mai, Tane Ma also found relatively low levels of disclosure to female partners amongst msmw, and similar to the findings of Weatherburn et al. (1998), msmw in this survey tended to disclose to male sex partners more than female sex partners. Just over half of the 219 msmw (53.8%) had not told their female sex partners that they had sex with men, and 16.8% had not told their male sex partners that they also had sex with women (see Figure 19 for disclosure to female partners). A group of twenty seven msmw (12.3%) had not told either their male or their female partners. There could be a variety of reasons for this, but the most likely is a fear of rejection by female partners.
Msmw were also asked about any agreements they had concerning sex and condom use with their regular female partners, and about negotiation with their casual female partners. In line with the findings that half of the msmw had not told any of their female partners that they had sex with men, just over three quarters (77.9%) of the 136 msmw who were in regular sexual relationships with women stated they did not have an agreement with their female partner about anal sex with men. Of the thirty men who did have an agreement, the largest group (twenty men) had agreed that all anal sex with men is to be with a condom.

There were no clear patterns of negotiation of condom use with casual female partners. For example, just under a half (45.7%) of the 118 msmw who had sex with a casual female partner said that they did not do anything about protection unless the woman asked them to, in which case they used a condom. Yet a similar proportion (40.8%) reported that they always told their casual female partners they did not want to have sex without a condom. However the survey did find that msmw reported very little negotiation around HIV status with their casual female partners. For instance, over three quarters (79.3%) of all msmw who had sex with casual female partners stated that they had not compared HIV results with their female partners.

Sexual practices with female partners
Davies et al. (1993:125) found that although the average number of female partners of msmw is lower than the average number of male partners, “[t]he proportion of female partners [of msmw] with whom penetration occurs is very much higher than for male partners”, and Wold et al. (1998:363) remark that msmw engage in “markedly different behaviours with their male and female partners”. Similar observations were made in this survey.

The most popular type of intercourse with both regular and casual female partners was overwhelmingly vaginal sex with ejaculation inside their partner - 93.3% of the 136 msmw in relationships with women, and 83.0% of the 118 msmw who had sex with casual female partners had done this in the previous six months (see Figure 20).
It is interesting to note that around one fifth of the msmw practised anal sex with ejaculation with their regular and casual female partners. For example, 19.8% (or 27 men) of the 136 msmw in regular sexual relationships with women, and 20.3% or 24 of the 118 msmw who had sex with a casual female partner, engaged in anal sex with ejaculation inside. Msmw reported slightly higher figures for anal sex with ejaculation than with withdrawal.

**Condom use with female partners**

Overall, condom use for sex with women was low, and was generally much lower than condom use by msmw with male partners. This has also been found in other studies of msmw (see Crawford et al. 1992; Kippax et al. 1994; McKirnan et al. 1995; and Wold et al. 1998). As Bartos et al. (1993:53) comment, “it is likely that the extent of condom use between the [msmw] and their female partners more approximates the extent of condom use in society as a whole, than it does the extent of condom use amongst gay men”.

Mirroring the pattern of condom use found with male partners, condom use by msmw was markedly lower with regular female partners than with casual ones. While nearly three quarters (71.6%) of the men who had vaginal sex with ejaculation with their regular female partner never used a condom, only a third (33.6%) of msmw who had vaginal sex with casual female partners never did so. Figure 21 shows condom use of msmw with regular female partners.
Condom use was higher for anal intercourse than vaginal intercourse, but it was far from universal. Over half (55.5%) of the msmw had not always used a condom for anal intercourse with ejaculation with their regular female partner.

While condoms are often used with male partners, there is evidence from other studies that some msmw fear that the introduction of condoms into their regular sexual relationship with women may raise some unwanted suspicions, or imply risk. For example, Bartos et al. (1993:54) found that for the majority of their respondents, sex with a regular female partner tended to be unsafe (that is, without a condom), because of “the lack of trust in the woman that [condom use] implies, or the acknowledgement that they have placed themselves at some risk”.
Condom use was higher for anal intercourse than vaginal intercourse, but it was far from universal. Over half (55.5%) of the msmw had not always used a condom for anal intercourse with ejaculation with their regular female partner.

While condoms are often used with male partners, there is evidence from other studies that some msmw fear that the introduction of condoms into their regular sexual relationship with women may raise some unwanted suspicions, or imply risk. For example, Bartos et al. (1993:54) found that for the majority of their respondents, sex with a regular female partner tended to be unsafe (that is, without a condom), because of “the lack of trust in the woman that [condom use] implies, or the acknowledgement that they have placed themselves at some risk”.

Figure 21: Condom use with regular female sex partners
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Section VI: Highly Unsafe Sex

Although the patterns of condom use discussed so far indicate that most of the 287 msmw practised safe sex with their male partners, we found that a considerable proportion had engaged in highly unsafe sex with a male partner on at least one occasion in the previous six months. This section will examine the characteristics of that group.

Highly unsafe sex is defined as unprotected anal sex in the previous six months with a male partner whose HIV status was unknown to the respondent, or was different from their own. This definition has been chosen because such a scenario includes the combination of two potentially high risk elements: unprotected anal intercourse and unawareness of their partner's serostatus. However, it must not be assumed that unprotected anal intercourse with a partner whose HIV status is 'known' can be regarded as a safe strategy, because this may be based on an assumption or on cut off date information.

Respondents were asked whether highly unsafe sex with a male partner had occurred in the previous six months. A total of fifty six msmw, or 26.3% of all msmw who had engaged in anal sex with a male partner in the previous six months stated that this had happened on at least one occasion. Moreover, msmw were significantly more likely than other respondents who had anal sex (19.1%) to have done this.\textsuperscript{36} Figure 22 compares the reported incidences of highly unsafe sex of these two groups.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{chart.png}
\caption{Proportion of men who had highly unsafe sex in the previous six months - comparison of msmw and others}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{36} p=0.002.
Whilst just over one third of the fifty-six msmw (37.5%) reported that highly unsafe sex had occurred only once in the past six months, a similar proportion (35.7% or twenty msmw) stated that this had happened over five times in the previous six months. This pattern differed from that of the other respondents who had highly unsafe sex (see Figure 23 for comparison of msmw and other men). Although the numbers are too small to test for statistical significance, it appears that proportionately more of the twenty msmw who had engaged in highly unsafe sex over five times in the previous six months were in a regular relationship with a woman, and were non-gay community attached, than is the case with other msmw.37

![Figure 23: Number of times in past six months respondents have had highly unsafe anal sex with any male partner](image)

As previously discussed, rates of anal sex were lower with casual male partners than with regular male partners amongst msmw. However, a larger proportion of msmw reported highly unsafe sex with casual male partners than with regular partners - while just over one quarter (27.0%) of the 155 msmw who had anal sex with casual partners in the previous six months reported they had engaged in highly unsafe sex with a casual partner, only 15.3% of the sixty five msmw who had anal sex with their regular male partners had done this (see Figure 24).

37 Two thirds (65.0%) of the twenty msmw who had highly unsafe sex more than five times in the previous six months were non-gay community attached (compared with 50.0% of the others), and 60.9% were in a regular sexual relationship (of over six months) with a woman (compared with 30.6% of the others). Most (78.2%) of the men in a regular sexual relationship with a woman were in a long term relationship (six years and over).
These findings were significantly higher than those of the non-msmw who had anal sex in the previous six months. Of the 662 non-msmw who had anal sex with casual partners in the previous six months, 19.1% reported at least one incident of highly unsafe sex with them, and 6.6% of the 497 non-msmw who had anal sex with regular male partners reported at least one incident of highly unsafe anal sex.\(^{35}\)

Condom use amongst these fifty six msmw (ie. those who reported highly unsafe sex with a male partner in the last six months) with their female partners was low, indicating a real risk for the transmission of HIV and other STDs. For example, over three quarters (78.2%) of the twenty three men who also had sex with a regular female partner never used a condom for insertive vaginal intercourse with ejaculation, and 41.3% of the twenty nine men who had sex with casual female partners never used a condom. Furthermore, with the exception of two men who reported that they always use a condom for anal intercourse with ejaculation, none of the msmw in regular relationships with women indicated they always use a condom, for any type of sex.

**Predictors of highly unsafe sex**

A logistic regression was used to investigate which factors influence whether or not msmw reported engaging in highly unsafe sex with a male partner in the previous six months (see Appendix I for the variables used and full results). Several variables emerged as significant predictors of msmw engaging in highly unsafe sex.

It was found that of those 198 msmw who had engaged in anal sex with a male partner in the previous six months, men from minor urban and rural areas were less likely than those from major cities to have engaged in highly unsafe sex. Msmw who had undertaken an HIV

\(^{35}\) p value for casual partners is 0.05.
test in their lifetime were also less likely to have had highly unsafe sex than the msmw who had never been tested. Bartos et al. (1993:31) found that "[o]ne of the key reasons [msmw] ... practised unsafe sex was their sense of isolation from the HIV epidemic. Msmw were significantly less likely than other respondents to know someone who was HIV positive." The test also found that msmw with higher qualifications, and those who were gay community attached were more likely to have reported highly unsafe sex. This last finding is of interest, as it differs from other research findings which suggest that msmw who are not gay community attached are more likely to engage in unsafe sex practices (see Bartos et al. 1993).

It is difficult to explain why msmw reported such relatively high levels of highly unsafe sex, and research that explores this topic in the New Zealand context should be carried out. Previous commentators have suggested that self esteem and a positive attitude towards condom use are important factors (Bartos et al. 1993; Horn and Chetwynd 1989 and Myers et al. 1993). Bartos et al. (1993:48) also note that for many msmw, “sex with other men functions as a ‘rite of reversal’, in which the power and impact of an experience is derived from deliberately turning the natural world on its head ... they experience sex with other men as a time when the logic of the rest of their lives is stood on its head”. In addition, Heckman et al. (1995) suggest that for some msmw, gay-focused HIV/AIDS prevention messages may be less personally relevant, and thus the messages are ignored.

---

39 p values of 0.009 for place of residence and 0.05 for HIV test.
40 One third (35.5%) of all 287 msmw knew someone who was HIV positive, compared to two thirds (66.9%) of all other respondents (p<0.0001).
41 p values of 0.04 for qualifications and 0.05 for gay community attachment.
Section VII: HIV Knowledge and Testing

Overall, Male Call/Wae Ma, Tane Ma respondents were very knowledgeable about the transmission of HIV. Respondents were asked to indicate whether a series of statements were true or false. With the exception of two statements, levels of knowledge amongst msw were generally high (these two questions were found to be confusing by other respondents as well). The first statement was 'Oral sex (sucking a penis and not swallowing semen) is very unlikely to transmit HIV'. Just under two thirds of msw (58.9%) correctly indicated this was true, compared with 71.0% of the rest of the sample.42 The second statement, 'If two people are both infected with HIV they don't need to worry about what they do sexually with each other' was correctly answered 'false' by just over half (59.6%) of msw, compared with 70.7% of the rest of the sample.43 44

HIV Testing

Respondents to this survey were asked whether they had ever had an HIV test and if they had, how long it had been since they were last tested. The survey found that levels of HIV testing amongst msw were significantly lower than for the rest of the sample. Of all survey respondents, just over a half (55.7%) of the 287 msw had taken an HIV test in their lifetime, compared with nearly three quarters (73.0%) of the rest of the sample.45

This discrepancy between the two groups was not quite as large when the analysis was restricted to only those men who had anal sex with any male partner in the previous six months, which may suggest that those msw who engage in anal sex with male partners are more concerned about their health status than the msw who do not. Of the 198 msw who had anal sex with a male partner in the last six months, 60.6% (or 120 men) had an HIV test at least once in their lifetime, compared with 76.5% of the rest of the group.46 Of the 120 msw who had engaged in anal sex in the last six months and who had ever had an HIV test, nearly two thirds (61.7%) were last tested in the twelve months prior to interview.

42 Two HIV positive men who do not use condoms for anal sex may infect each other with different strains of the virus, or with other organisms that stress their immune system.
43 There is only a small risk of contracting HIV through oral sex without ejaculation.
44 Msw were less likely than the rest of the sample to correctly answer these two questions, p values of <0.005 for both questions.
45 p < 0.005.
46 p < 0.005.
Conclusion

It is misleading to assume a readily identifiable and homogenous group of men who have sex with men and women in New Zealand society. The group of msmw that we have been discussing in this report were diverse in terms of their sexual identity and relationship status. Overall, demographic variables did not distinguish msmw from the rest of the respondents as much as did the social milieu that the men lived in. Whilst some of the men identified as bisexual, others chose gay, whilst still others chose to identify as heterosexual. Some of the men were in long term regular sexual relationships with women, whilst others only had casual sex with women in the previous six months. Some were gay community attached and others were not.

Within the broad patterns of number of male partners and overall levels of anal sex in the previous six months, msmw did not differ greatly from the rest of the Male Cell/Waea Mai, Tane Ma sample. However, several specific differences were found. That is, msmw were less likely than men who only had sex with men in the previous six months to have had sex with a regular male partner, but they were more likely to have sex with casual partners. They were also significantly more likely than other men who had anal sex to have engaged in insertive anal sex with ejaculation, with both regular and casual male partners.

The patterns of condom use by msmw - both by partner type and sexual activity - did not differ greatly from those of other respondents, and overall, the survey found that msmw were more likely than other msm who had anal sex to use condoms with their male partners. However, the survey also found that msmw were more likely than the rest of the men who had anal sex in the previous six months to have engaged in unprotected anal sex with a man whose HIV status was different from their own, or unknown to them, and were more likely to have done this more than once in the previous six months. This finding is a cause for concern as it indicates considerable potential for transmission of sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV. Perhaps msmw feel that they are not at risk of infection of HIV or other STDs, or maybe they have difficulty discussing condom use and HIV status with their male partners. It is important that education campaigns targeted at this group reiterate the importance of always using condoms for anal sex with male partners.
A general pattern amongst msmw was one of higher condom use with male partners than with female partners - in fact, condom use with female partners was very low, for both vaginal and anal intercourse. In addition, msmws' disclosure to female partners that they also had sex with men was infrequent. This suggests that many msmw are attempting to 'play it safe' with their male partners, whilst concealing their male-to-male sexual activity from their female partners. However, the finding that some msmw are engaging in unsafe sex with men whose HIV status is unknown to them indicates there may be a serious risk of HIV transmission to women. This must be recognised by sexual health educators.

In conclusion, there is a need in New Zealand for education campaigns that promote an awareness amongst men who have sex with men and women that HIV transmission is a threat which is not restricted to the gay community. It is essential that a safe sex culture and open communication - with both male and female sexual partners - is promoted amongst men who have sex with men and women.
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Appendix I: Statistical Analysis

Several logistic regressions were used to investigate the effect of various demographic and social milieu variables on a number of questions. These questions included the likelihood of being a msmw, the likelihood of having anal sex with a male partner, and the factors that influenced condom use. The variables that were tested differed slightly for each question. Details of the variables that were used and the full results are outlined separately below.

Having had sex with men and women

A logistic regression was used to investigate whether demographic and social milieu had an effect on the likelihood of participants having sex with both men and women in the six months prior to interview. A total of 1760 participants had full information and were included in the analysis, of which 273 were msmw.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>p values on the effect of variables on being a msmw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>NZ European/Pakeha, Maori, Pacific Islander, Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>$20,000 or less vs &gt;$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>15-19, 20-24, 25-39, 40-49, 50 and over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Major and main urban, secondary urban, minor urban and rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Qualification</td>
<td>School Certificate or no school qualification vs others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay community attachment</td>
<td>Index scale 0-12, divided into &lt;=4 and &gt;4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Identity</td>
<td>5 binary variables: Identified as gay or not; Identified as bisexual or not; Identified as heterosexual or not; Identified as queer or not; Identified as takataapui or not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td>Told anyone they were sexually attracted to men, or not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Men aged 15-19 were more likely than any other age group to have sex with women. Men who identified as gay were less likely than men who did not identify as gay to have had sex with women in the previous six months, but men who identified as heterosexual or bisexual were more likely to have done this. As attachment to the gay community increased, men became less likely to have sex with both men and women.
Being in a regular sexual relationship with a woman

A logistic regression was used to investigate whether demographic and social milieu had an effect on whether or not msmw are in a regular sexual relationship with a woman. A total of 256 participants had full information and were included in the analysis, of whom 132 were in regular relationships with women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>NZ European/Pakeha, Maori, Pacific Islander, Other</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>$20,000 or less vs &gt;$20,000</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>15-19, 20-24, 25-39, 40-49, 50 and over</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Major and main urban, secondary urban, minor urban and rural</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Qualification</td>
<td>School Certificate or no school qualification v others</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay community attachment</td>
<td>Index scale 0-12, divided into &lt;=4 and &gt;4</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Identity</td>
<td>4 binary variables: identified as gay or not;</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>identified as bisexual or not;</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>identified as heterosexual or not;</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>identified as queer or not</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td>Told anyone they were sexually attracted to men, or not</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ms mw who identified as Maori, Pacific Island or NZ European were less likely to have a regular female partner than men in the 'other' grouping. Ms mw on lower incomes, and ms mw in 15-39 age groups were also less likely to be in such a relationship. Ms mw who identified as gay were also less likely than those who did not identify as gay to be in a regular relationship with a woman. As gay community attachment increased, ms mw were less likely to have regular female partners.
Anal sex with any male partner
A logistic regression was used to investigate factors which effect whether or not msmw had anal sex with a male partner. A total of 243 participants, of whom 172 had anal sex with male partners, had full information and were included in the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3</th>
<th>p values on the effect of variables on having anal sex with a male partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>NZ European/Pakeha, Maori, Pacific Islander, Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>$20,000 or less vs &gt;$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>15-19, 20-24, 25-35, 40-49, 50 and over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Major and main urban, secondary urban, minor urban and rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Qualification</td>
<td>School Certificate or no school qualification v others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay community attachment</td>
<td>Index scale 0-12, divided into &lt;=4 and &gt;4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Identity</td>
<td>4 binary variables: Identified as gay or not; Identified as bisexual or not; Identified as heterosexual or not; Identified as queer or not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td>Told anyone they were sexually attracted to men, or not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In regular relationship with man</td>
<td>None, in a relationship less than 6 months, in a relationship 6 months and longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In regular relationship with woman</td>
<td>None, in a relationship less than 6 months, in a relationship 6 months and longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical attitude to anal sex</td>
<td>Find anal sex 'the most physically satisfying' sex practise, or not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional attitude to anal sex</td>
<td>Find anal sex 'the most emotionally satisfying' sex practise, or not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two findings were that msmw who have regular male partners (of 6 months or longer) were more likely to have anal sex than those who have no regular male partner or a regular male partner of less than 6 months. Also those msmw who stated that anal sex is the most physically satisfying sex practise were more likely to have anal sex than those who did not find this.
Never use a condom with any male partner

A logistic regression was used to investigate which factors influence whether or not MSMW never used a condom for anal sex with any male partners. A total of 173 men who had anal sex with male partners had full information and were included in the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>NZ European/Pakeha, Maori, Pacific Islander, Other</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>$20,000 or less vs &gt;$20,000</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>15-19, 20-24, 25-39, 40-49, 50 and over</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Major and main urban, secondary urban, minor urban and rural</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Qualification</td>
<td>School Certificate or no school qualification vs others</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay community attachment</td>
<td>Index scale 0-12, divided into &lt;=4 and &gt;4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Identity</td>
<td>4 binary variables:</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>identified as gay or not;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>identified as bisexual or not;</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>identified as heterosexual or not;</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>identified as queer or not;</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In regular relationship with man</td>
<td>None, in a relationship less than 6 months, in a relationship 6 months and longer</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In regular relationship with woman</td>
<td>In a relationship 6 months or longer, or not</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV test</td>
<td>Ever had an HIV test, or not</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those MSMW who had tested for HIV at least once in their lifetime were more likely to use condoms with a male partner.
Highly unsafe sex amongst msmw with any male partner

A logistic regression was used to investigate which factors influence whether or not msmw had engaged in highly unsafe sex with a male partner in the last six months. A total of 171 men who had anal sex, of whom 56 had highly unsafe sex, had full information and were included in the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5</th>
<th>p values on the effect of variables on highly unsafe sex with any male partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>NZ European/Pakeha, Maori, Pacific Islander, Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>$20,000 or less vs &gt;$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>15-19, 20-24, 25-39, 40-49, 50 and over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Major and main urban, secondary urban, minor urban and rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Qualification</td>
<td>School Certificate or no school qualification v others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay community attachment</td>
<td>Index scale 0-12, divided into &lt;=4 and &gt;4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Identity</td>
<td>4 binary variables: Identified as gay or not; Identified as bisexual or not; Identified as heterosexual or not; Identified as queer or not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical attitude to anal sex</td>
<td>Find anal sex 'the most physically satisfying' sex practise, or not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional attitude to anal sex</td>
<td>Find anal sex 'the most emotionally satisfying' sex practise, or not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV test</td>
<td>Ever had an HIV test, or not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Msmw in minor urban and rural areas were less likely to have engaged in highly unsafe sex. Those with higher qualifications were more likely to have highly unsafe sex, as were men who were gay community attached. Those who had an HIV test at least once in their lifetime were less likely to have highly unsafe sex.
Appendix II: Oral and Other Sex Practices with Male Partners

All sexual practices that were included in the questionnaire have been broadly divided into two categories: First, sexual activities which do not involve penile-anal intercourse but may still involve the anus, such as rimming and finger fucking is called 'oral and other sex'. Second, those sexual practices that involve penile-anal intercourse are referred to as 'anal sex'.

Oral and other sex practices with regular and with casual male partners by msmw in the six month period prior to interview are outlined here. These are compared with the oral and other sex practices of the rest of the sample. Any statistically significantly differences between the two groups are noted ('ns' indicates no statistical significance).

With regular male partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Msmw n=84</th>
<th>Non-msmw n=657</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sucking partner and not swallowing cum</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sucking partner and swallowing cum</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being sucked and not ejaculating</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being sucked and ejaculating</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep kissing</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masturbating together</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensuous touching</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimming partner</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being rimmed</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finger fucking partner</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being finger fucked</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using sex toys</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Msmw were less likely than other men in regular sexual relationships with men to engage in deep kissing and receptive oral sex with no ejaculation into the mouth.
With casual male partners

### Table 7

**Sexual practices of msmw with casual male partners, compared with those of non-msmw (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Msmw n=240</th>
<th>Non-msmw n=1122</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oral sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sucking partner and not swallowing cum</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sucking partner and swallowing cum</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being sucked and not ejaculating</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being sucked and ejaculating</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry kissing</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep kissing</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masturbating together</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensuous touching</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimming partner</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being rimmed</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finger fucking partner</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being finger fucked</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using sex toys</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Msmw were less likely than other men who had sex with casual male partners in the previous six months to engage in dry and deep kissing, sensuous touching, rimming and finger fucking partner. They were more likely than other men to engage in insertive oral sex with ejaculation inside partner’s mouth, and to use sex toys with their casual male partners.
Appendix III: Insertive and Receptive Anal Sex with Male Partners

With regular male partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8</th>
<th>Types of anal sex with regular male partners (6 months and over)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Msmw</strong></td>
<td><strong>Other men</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>n=64</strong></td>
<td><strong>n=497</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insertive only</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(18.7%)</td>
<td>(17.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptive only</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12.5%)</td>
<td>(16.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insertive and Receptive</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>325</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(68.7%)</td>
<td>(65.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A chi-squared test (2df) found no significant association between type of anal sex with regular male partners between the two groups of men (p=0.7).

With casual male partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9</th>
<th>Types of anal sex with casual male partners</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Msmw</strong></td>
<td><strong>Other men</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>n=153</strong></td>
<td><strong>n=659</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insertive only</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11.1%)</td>
<td>(17.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptive only</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30.7%)</td>
<td>(29.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insertive and Receptive</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>347</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(58.1%)</td>
<td>(52.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A chi-squared test (2df) found no significant association between type of anal sex with casual partner between the two groups of men (p=0.1).
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