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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 the 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.
MALE CALL/WAEA MAI, TANE MA
Report No. 5: Sexual Identity

Introduction

The term 'sexual identity' has often been misunderstood or ignored when researching men who have sex with men (msm) in the context of HIV and AIDS. Occasionally it has been used as a synonym for sexual orientation (Stewart and Came 1995), while many other studies have focussed on sexual practice and marginalised issues of sexual identity as a result. A focus on sexual behaviour at the expense of sexual identity has ignored an important dimension to how men approach their sexuality, and increased focus on sexual identity may be necessary as new responses to the AIDS pandemic are sought.

It may be that a lack of in-depth research in this area is a result of sexual identity being viewed as a problematic notion. Internationally, the concept of sexual identity has been subject to revision on a more regular basis than most other aspects of socio-sexual life. The fact that the study of sexuality itself has undergone major shifts over the last twenty years may account for much of this dynamism. In particular, the ever-increasing construction of the sexual as social must stimulate new understandings of related issues such as sexual identity.

A side-effect of these movements has been a clearer distinction between homosexual orientation, homosexual practice and homosexual identity (Reiter 1989; Chetwynd et al. 1992; Hamer et al. 1993). For example, Weeks (1977) has argued that homosexual practices have always existed, but the meanings attached to them by society have not been so constant. The construction of sexual identities has changed over time, and these have varied according to particular social and cultural contexts.

This fluid conceptualisation of sexual identity has been reflected in mainstream media and gay community publications in New Zealand since homosexual law reform in 1986. A number of different representations of msm are revealed in this literature - most
notably the three identities of 'gay', 'homosexual' and 'queer'. It appears that the labels attached to and by MSM have changed, and multiplied, even over this last decade.

The main goal of this report is to analyse whether the sexual identities that respondents claimed in Male Call/Waea Mai, Tane Ma made any difference in the sexual practices that put men at risk of HIV infection. Specifically, the aims of this report are to:

- examine the different sexual identities that respondents chose;
- analyse the demographic and milieu influences on the choice of a given sexual identity; and
- analyse whether the sexual behaviours, condom use, and HIV knowledge and testing differed for respondents who chose a given sexual identity.

Theories about sexual identity

Theories about sexual identity have also been subject to contestation and change. Changing conceptualisations of sexual identity have found expression in political movements such as gay liberation, minority identity politics, and the more recent queer theory. Commentators (Stein 1990; De Cecco and Elia 1993; Jagose 1996) generally suggest that the differences in theoretical positions held over the last thirty years can be understood in terms of social constructionist versus essentialist accounts.

Beginning with Mary MacIntosh's (1968) work on *The Homosexual Role*, the social constructionist approach to sexual identity critiqued the ideology of heterosexual normalisation for its inherent inability to legitimise same-sex desire. Early social constructionist theorists (Gagnon and Simon 1973; Berger and Luckmann 1967) examined how categories of identity were created through discourse - the way language, concepts and therefore meanings and values are structured. They posited that although the category of 'homosexual' was viewed by society as an identity option, it continued to be labelled as 'not normal', and therefore 'deviant', by the dominant (heterosexual) social discourse. Many of these ideas were absorbed by the gay liberation movement, which critiqued the notion of heteronormativity on which the stigmatisation of 'homosexual' relied (Altman 1972). In this movement, to label oneself as 'gay' was to assert a pride which had previously been denied. Being 'gay' meant
something different from being 'homosexual' for liberationists, and was an attempt to
elevate same-sex desire to the same 'natural/normal' status that heterosexuality
enjoyed.

The project to normalise 'gay', however, became partnered with a search for the etiology
of homosexuality - that is, to uncover an underlying 'gay' self. The question of what it
meant to be gay was increasingly being addressed by subcultures forming in the wake
of political visibility, and a renewed interest in essentialist models of identity was
consequently generated throughout the 1980s. Some social theorists also used
biological evidence to argue for essentialist models of sexual orientation, as a way of
gaining greater legitimacy as a group created 'naturally', rather than through choice.
This period, experienced in many Western countries, resulted in a collision of
essentialist and social constructionist perspectives on male to male sexuality (Epstein
1994). As Stein (1990:5) writes:

According to essentialists, it is legitimate to inquire into the origin of
heterosexuality or homosexuality...[t]his follows from the essentialist
tenet that there are objective, intrinsic, culture-independent facts about
what a person's sexual orientation is. In contrast, the social
constructionist denies that there are such facts about people's sexual
orientation and would agree with the exhortation that it is wrong to look at
an individual as being of a particular sexual orientation in the absence of
a cultural construction of that orientation.

These contestations about what it meant to be gay were intensifying by a growing interest
in minority and marginalised identities in general. In recent years, unitary accounts of
sexual identity have become problematised in an effort to include other experiences
(e.g. ethnic, generational) into sexuality (Balka and Rose 1989). These accounts view
identity as being both multi-faceted and fluid, and identities such as 'queer' have
emerged partly as an attempt to incorporate this sense of difference. In other accounts,
Dowsett's (1996, 1997) notion of "sexual cultures" emphasises the interconnectedness
not only of culture and identity, but also of identity and behaviour. If understood in this
way, sexual identity, or identities, can help plot the patterns of sexual behaviour of msm
(Prestage 1997). It is this idea - that there may be identifiable patterns to one's sexual
identity - that has prompted much of the analysis in this report. It may consequently give
those involved in HIV/AIDS research and education valuable insights into the ways in which MSM are responding to the AIDS pandemic.

The idea of multi-faceted sexual cultures, however, is not easily applied to quantitative research, which seeks simply defined (and exclusive) indicators of sexual behaviour. Rather than avoid the whole question of sexual identity altogether, our approach was to allow respondents the opportunity of choosing more than one identity. The researchers viewed this as an important approach, in that it gave respondents ways of describing themselves in greater detail than did demographic characteristics or gay community attachment alone. For researchers, it potentially provides an ability to more precisely identify contributing influences to MSM’s sexual behaviour.

However, it should be pointed out that this approach is still quite artificial. We do not know what the categories of sexual identity that we presented to our respondents actually mean to them, nor can we relate identities to the specific contexts in which they might be formed. The ensuing results therefore come with a note of caution. Perhaps the most important finding here is that differences in knowledge and behaviour do exist, and that these occur in patterns outside the usual fields of gay community attachment and/or demographic characteristics.

For these reasons this report will be mainly descriptive. However, some statistical analysis has been undertaken. Logistic regressions were carried out to determine the influence of a particular variable over and above the effects of other (mainly) demographic variables on the choice of sexual identities. Logistic regression analyses were also used to investigate the effect of a particular sexual identity choice on unsafe sexual practices and HIV testing. The details of these analyses are given in footnotes, and are fully set out in Appendix I.
Section I: The Sexual Identity Choices of Male Call/Waea Mai, Tane Ma
Respondents

Respondents were asked whether they "personally identified" with a number of sexual identities presented to them. Ten sexual identities were offered as prompts, with an open-ended option of "other" included at the end. This approach to sexual identity differed from most other quantitative surveys (e.g. SMASH, SAPA, SIGMA) in that the respondents' selections were not exclusive, nor restricted to gay, bisexual or heterosexual. As outlined in the previous section, this decision was based largely on recent literature which suggests that people assume multiple identities. However, it is also a reflection of the particular cultural context specific to New Zealand in the mid-1990s, where indigenous and other ethnic cultures exist and impart their culturally specific meanings about same-sex sexuality. The categories of gay, bisexual, and heterosexual usually offered in similar surveys would misrepresent the experiences of many men who may not prioritise or even adhere to such constructions.

The research team had two intentions in their design of the sexual identity question. As mentioned in the introduction, we firstly sought to gain an impression of the specific class-cultural positions of men who describe themselves through a given sexual identity. Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, the researchers wanted to investigate the relationship between any one sexual identity and the sexual practices of MSM.

Sexual identity word associations

Figure 1 shows the proportions of respondents who selected each sexual identity option. Nearly eighty percent (79.6%) of respondents chose the term gay, many more than chose homosexual (66.4%). This difference is not as marked as in two recent Australian studies where sexual identity had been an exclusive choice: Prestage et al. (1995) recorded that twice as many respondents identified as gay or queer than homosexual, and Kippax et al. (1994) found a ratio of 3 to 1 in favour of gay over homosexual.

Figure 1: Sexual identity choices of Male Call/Waea Mai, Tane Ma respondents* (n=1852)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>% Chose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexual</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takiaapui**</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transvestite/ crossdresser</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fag/fagpot***</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poof/poofer***</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drag queen***</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transsexual/transgender</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fo'afine</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple responses were allowed.
**See page 7.
***These sexual identities were the most popular choices in the category “other”.

The term queer was chosen by 39.2% of respondents, a result which is surprisingly high given its traditionally low selection in single-identity survey questions (c.f. Kippax et al. 1994). This may indicate that while few MSM have been willing to use the term queer as their primary self-description, it represents a particular feature of their sexuality that is not adequately accounted for by the more traditional labels. For example, the emergence of ‘queer politics’ may have increased the uptake of the term amongst MSM who would normally refer to themselves as gay.
Just over a quarter of all respondents identified as bisexual (27.4%). This figure is similar to the 26.9% found in the Australian Project Male Cell (Kippax et al. 1994). It must be emphasised here that bisexual refers to a self-described sexual identity, and not to reported sexual behaviour (this connection is examined later in Section IV). Social scientific research on men who have sex with men and women (msmw) has highlighted the fluid and contingent nature of their sexual behaviour. This research has noted that msmw's sexual behaviour is regulated by a variety of social variables (such as cultural or situational context) rather than being organised around a describable sexual identity (Aggleton 1996). Cross-national studies have therefore found little evidence of a consistent bisexual politics which expresses a distinctive bisexual identity (Aggleton 1996). Msmw often describe themselves as heterosexual in these studies, and it is interesting that so many of our respondents chose to identify as bisexual given the other options available.

The terms heterosexual and straight were selected by around 6% of the sample. This is slightly higher than other surveys (e.g. Kippax et al. 1994), where sexual identity was asked as an exclusive choice.

The two ethnic-specific choices of takataapui (Maori) and fa'afafine (Samoan) were not heavily represented at 2.9% and 0.2% respectively. This was not surprising given the proportion of respondents identifying with each ethnicity in the sample (see Male Call/Waea Mai, Tane Ma Report No.1: Methodology and Demographic Characteristics). Takataapui is a Maori term which has been used to describe a Maori msm (or "an intimate friend of the same sex"; see Aspin 1997), while fa'afafine literally means "way of the woman" in Samoan (Mageo 1992). Since both are specific to their respective ethnicity, only those respondents who were Maori or Samoan and who identified with the corresponding identity are included in the results. While an extraordinary case might warrant otherwise, it would be inappropriate to speak of a European or Chinese takataapui. Therefore the small number of reported responses of this kind were not included in the analysis that follows.

Fifty men described their sexual identity as transvestite or crossdresser (2.7%). Seventeen men described themselves as transgender or transexual (0.9%). Of the
alternative sexual identities offered by respondents under the category "other," forty-seven (2.5%) stated fag or faggot, thirty-six (1.9%) poo or poofer, and eighteen (1%) stated drag queen.

Multiple sexual identities

On average, respondents chose 2.5 sexual identities. The ways in which MSM claimed multiple identities is illustrated in Figure 2 below. Less than a quarter of the total sample (23.6%) chose to describe themselves through one sexual identity only. Of particular interest is the high number of men (31.2% of the 507) selecting bisexual only. This result is dissonant with the argument that men who have sex with men and women (MSMW) tend not to claim bisexual as an identity per se. Furthermore, more respondents who identified as bisexual also identified as gay (46%) than as heterosexual (16.6%). This also disturbs the notion that most MSMW define themselves within the mainstream, and suggests the presence of a different set - that of gay men using bisexual to describe the kind of sex occurring now or in the past (Boulton and Fitzpatrick 1996).

![Figure 2: Multiple sexual identities chosen (%)](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Others chosen (↓)</th>
<th>Heterosexual</th>
<th>Bisexual</th>
<th>Gay</th>
<th>Homosexual</th>
<th>Queer</th>
<th>Takataapui</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only that identity</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>66.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexual</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tekataapui</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although a high number of respondents chose the term queer, very few (10 men, or 1.4% of those choosing queer) chose this as their only identity. In addition, 95% of the men who identified as queer also chose gay. This suggests that for most of these men, queer has not been used as an 'open conceptualisation' with which to replace a

---

2 This finding is not represented in Figure 2.

3 Each column heading shows the number of men in total who chose a particular sexual identity, with each cell beneath illustrating the percentage of this number who also chose another identity. For example, 1230 men (56.4% of the total sample) described themselves as homosexual. Of these men, 2.7% (or 33 men) chose only this sexual identity, while 92.4% (1137) of these men also chose to call themselves gay. By reading across the table, it is also possible to determine which sexual identities were more popular within identity groupings (e.g., 3.1% of the men calling themselves homosexual also chose heterosexual, compared with just 1.5% of the men who selected queer).
stereotyped gay identity, despite the fact that many theorists (Butler 1993; Halperin 1990) saw this as a possible outcome.

Some surprising results emerged when men who identified as gay were compared with men who identified as homosexual. While 92.4% of the men who described themselves as homosexual also chose gay, only 77.1% of all men choosing gay also chose homosexual. Also, a higher proportion of men chose gay as their only identity (14.2% of 1475) compared with homosexual (2.7% of 1230). Respondents may therefore consider gay to be the most encompassing term, while homosexual is used in more specific ways.

Accounting for multiple identities

As early as 1973, Gagnon and Simon argued that the surrounding sociocultural environment articulates the 'scripts' which provide us with our affective and cognitive boundaries, allowing msm to name and define their own feelings in a way that makes sense within a particular cultural context. This may offer some explanations for the apparent incompatibility between identifying as both heterosexual and gay. The stigma that still surrounds male to male sex may lead certain msm to adopt heterosexual as a primary sexual identity, while they may choose bisexual or queer to describe themselves in a sauna, or amongst gay friends. In this case, distinctions can be made between a personal and a social sexual identity - how you see yourself, and how you communicate to others about yourself. For other men, their interpretation of the social messages about what it means to be gay may focus on behavioural traits such as effeminacy, and this may lead them to identify as heterosexual only, even when they engage in sex with another man. Weinberg (1978) has referred to this situation as the difference between 'doing' and 'being' gay, and Bartos (1993) and Hood (1994) have also noted that sexual object choice may not be central to some men's sense of identity.

There is even diversity and multiplicity within the 'homosexually-oriented' identities, with men choosing queer, takataapui and gay.⁴ There are reasons for this which must go

⁴ 'Homosexually-oriented' is a term used here to avoid repetition and for pragmatism. It refers to the sexual identities of gay, homosexual, queer and takataapui.
beyond sexual practice alone. As Cox and Gallois (1995) suggest, men are attaching themselves to identity ‘groups’ which hold particular meanings in different contexts. Multiple attachment can indicate the different ways of expressing both personal and social identity that are now available. Examining the constructions of sexuality also provides a way of interpreting the surprising number of men identifying as faggot or poofier. While some of these men might use the terms in an act of reclamation, pride, or politics, it is also likely that these terms have constituted the dominant representations of homosexuality for others.

By allowing respondents to choose multiple sexual identities, Male Call/Waea Mai, Tane Ma created the opportunity to trace the more subtle, incremental changes occurring in these communities. This is especially important considering the current dynamic nature of identity politics - how increasingly eclectic ‘identity’ is, and how alternative identities are forming away from previous, often subsuming, categories. Circumstances which lead to the adoption of a particular sexual identity may consequently be explored, and these can in turn inform researchers of the predictors of certain behaviours.

In order to make our analysis of sexual identity more manageable, we decided to limit the comparison to five categories that were both most regularly chosen and outcome divergent - heterosexual, bisexual, gay, queer, and takataapui.\(^6\) Two other frequently chosen identities - homosexual and straight - will not be discussed in detail because they yielded very similar results to the identities of gay and heterosexual respectively on almost every outcome index investigated. The identities of gay and heterosexual were selected for analysis since out of each pairing, these two were claimed by the highest number of respondents (see Figure 1). Nevertheless, it must be remembered that the second most common identity category overall was homosexual, and where clear differences did emerge between pairings (see the discussion of age in Section II for example) these results will be discussed.

---

\(^6\) See Male Call/Waea Mai, Tane Ma Report No.3: Maori Men who have Sex with Men for a discussion of the differences between Maori who identified as takataapui and those who did not. As there were only four Samcan men who identified as la'aafafine, this identity was excluded from the rest of the analysis for reasons of statistical significance.
Section II: Demographic Influences on Sexual Identity

Sexual identity can be influenced by demographic factors. In the previous section, it was noted that respondents claimed multiple sexual identities. The demographic data presented here suggests that there may be patterns to this association. MSM chose different sexual identities according to their age, their ethnicity, where they lived, their education and the type of employment they were in. This appears to be a clear reflection of the contexts in which our respondents live - how they have negotiated their sexual identity both socially and personally.

Ethnicity

Large numbers of non-NZ European respondents participated in the survey. Of particular interest were Maori MSM, and a high participation rate by Maori (170 men) allowed us to highlight how the meanings attached to same-sex attraction differ across cultures. Ethnicity was found to be a significant factor in the choice of each identity, and this suggests that in New Zealand, the dominant Western categories of sexual identity were not shared by everyone.6

![Figure 3: Sexual identity by ethnicity](image)

For example, fewer respondents who identified as Maori described themselves as gay (68%) than did non-Maori (around 80%, see Figure 2). On the other hand, more Maori respondents described themselves as bisexual than other respondents. Almost a third

---

6 Statistical analysis revealed that Maori were more likely than non-Maori to identify as heterosexual \( p=0.01 \) or bisexual \( p=0.03 \), and NZ European respondents were more likely than other ethnic groups to identify as gay \( p=0.002 \) or queer \( p=0.02 \) (see Appendix I for details).
(31.2%) of Maori respondents included takataapui in their identity repertoire. The use of the term takataapui (meaning an intimate friend of the same sex) has been promoted by some Maori msm as a way of incorporating both their Maori identity and their sexual identity. As Aspin (1997) explains, Maori culture is often subsumed within established msm subcultures, and the discussion of sexuality of any kind has been discouraged within Maori discourse since European colonisation. Hence the term takataapui has a dual purpose - to avoid prioritising one's ethnic or sexual identity; and to (re)introduce same sex affection into Maori discourse. While our data does not indicate that Maori msm are replacing gay with takataapui at this time (86.8% of Maori respondents who chose takataapui also chose gay - see Figure 2), future studies may want to explore this possibility in more depth.

A higher proportion of respondents who identified as Pacific Islander, as well as those in the category "other" (mainly Chinese and Indian) used heterosexual as a self descriptor. Fewer Maori and those of an "other" ethnicity chose queer as an identity. In both cases, more chose to identify with bisexual than queer. Conversely, substantially more Pacific Islanders and NZ Europeans used queer as opposed to bisexual, with just under half (46.9%) of Pacific Island respondents choosing this term.
Age
Age was a significant factor in the choice of most sexual identities. Differences were evident between each age grouping, the exception being those aged between 25-39 who tended to have similar choices. Figure 4 below shows the sexual identity choices for each age group.

![Figure 4: Sexual identities by age group](image)

Respondents between the ages of 25-39 demonstrated the greatest attachment to gay and queer, and the lowest to a bisexual identity.

Younger MSM (under 25 years old) were lower users of gay, homosexual and queer. On the other hand, a higher proportion of respondents aged 15-19 identified as bisexual compared to those aged 25-39. This result echoes other studies (Prestage et al. 1995) which show higher levels of “non-homosexual” identities among participants aged 25 and under. Takataapui was chosen more by Maori respondents aged under 30, and was most favoured by those aged 25-29.

---

7 This figure represents a ‘snapshot’ picture for respondents in each age group, and does not plot longitudinal change.

8 The Sydney Men And Sexual Health (SMASH) study asked for a singular sexual identity choice. ‘Non-homosexual’ identities were classified as anything other than ‘homosexual’, ‘gay’, ‘queer’ and ‘camp’ (Prestage et al. 1995).

9 Respondents identifying as heterosexual (p=0.01) were more likely to be older, those choosing bisexual (p<0.0001) were more likely to be aged 15-19 or over 50, those choosing gay (p<0.001) or queer
Respondents aged 50 years and over shared similarities with the youngest age bracket, and were more inclined to avoid the terms gay and queer. In addition, proportionately more older msm identified as bisexual compared to other groups. Unique to those aged 50 and over was a relatively high attachment to a heterosexual identity.

These results indicate that at least two effects are likely to impact on msm's sexual identity. Several commentators suggest stages (Troiden 1989) or processes (Cox and Gallois 1996) which are instrumental in the formation of a homosexual or 'homosexually-oriented' identity, of which age plays an important part. Other findings suggest that most msm discover that they are attracted to other men well before the age of twenty, and when this occurs msm must redefine themselves outside the boundaries of heteronormativity. The consequences of claiming certain sexual identities socially at this point may be reflected in the tensions apparent in the results, which show an aversion to identities which may place msm in a stigmatised or vulnerable position whilst opting instead for identities which are considered to be 'safer' at the time (e.g. bisexual). In turn, this may account for the group aged between 25-39 choosing different sexual identities than the rest of the sample. In this survey, these men tended to be more socially and financially independent, had a higher involvement in the gay community, and were perhaps less prone to the negative external effects of claiming 'out' identities.

There may also be a specific age cohort effect. For example, respondents aged 50 and over may belong to a group of men who faced considerable social and legal pressure to have heterosexual relationships. The high use of heterosexual as a sexual identity may be a reflection of that experience. Moreover, the meanings attached to sexual identities change over time and relate to specific socio-cultural periods. The contexts in which homosexual, queer and gay have been used, for example, may differ for each age cohort, and thus result in different rates of attachment. The low numbers of msm aged

\(^{(p=0.0006)}\) were more likely to be aged between 25-39, and those choosing takataapui \(^{(p=0.004)}\) were more likely to be aged 20-24, compared to those who did not identify in these ways.

\(^{19}\) 1653 men, or 89.3\% of the Male Call/Waee Mai, Tane Ma sample reported that they first realised they were attracted to men by the age of nineteen.

\(^{20}\) See Male Call/Waee Mai, Tane Ma Report No. 7: Gay Community Involvement for a broader discussion of gay community attachment.
over 50 who chose these identities may therefore simply be an historical effect on that cohort rather than one which endures for this age stage.

**Place of residence**

A comparison of MSM from urban and rural areas revealed a relationship between urban size and sexual identity. MSM from secondary urban areas displayed a preference towards 'non-homosexual' identities such as heterosexual and bisexual. More men from these towns chose to identify as heterosexual (15.9%) than other respondents, and half of these men (50.8%) described themselves as bisexual. At the same time, a lower proportion of this group identified as gay or queer (68.3% and 27% respectively). Interestingly however, this trend did not hold amongst men living in smaller urban and rural areas, many of whom did not choose heterosexual or bisexual identities. Men from smaller towns and rural areas were also less pronounced in their resistance to gay and queer identities.

![Figure 5: Sexual identities by town size](image)

If these results are indicative of an association between urban size and sexual identity, then the relationship is a complex one. Perhaps men residing in secondary urban towns find 'homosexually-oriented' sexual identities more problematic when support networks are scarce, whereas men living in rural communities find it harder to hide their sexuality.

---

12 Respondents choosing heterosexual (p=0.04) or bisexual (p=0.0036) were more likely to come from secondary urban settings, and those choosing gay (p=0.06) were more likely to come from main urban settings, compared to those who did not identify in these ways.
but also experience higher levels of cooperation and support in their community networks.

**Education**

Research on MSM has commonly revealed high levels of educational attainment (see *Male Call/Waea Mai, Tane Ma Report No.1: Methodology and Demographic Characteristics*). Within this sample, education is also a significant factor in the choice of sexual identities (Figure 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No school qualification</th>
<th>Some school qualification</th>
<th>Professional /technical/ trade certificate</th>
<th>Attended university but did not graduate</th>
<th>Bachelors degree attained</th>
<th>Graduate degree attained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>89.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takataapui</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A higher proportion of respondents with no school qualification identified as heterosexual or bisexual than respondents with some formal qualification. In turn, proportionately more MSM with post-graduate degrees used gay and queer to describe themselves. The sexual identities of gay and queer were most prevalent amongst respondents who had attained at least one university degree. In respect of the comments above, a relationship therefore appears to exist not only between education and being an MSM, but also between education and ‘being gay’.¹³

**Occupation, employment status, and income**

Occupation, employment status and income were all highly associated with educational attainment when it came to sexual identity choices (Figure 7). Proportionately more MSM in professional and semi-professional occupations identified as gay than other respondents. Labourers were least inclined to identify as gay, but proportionately more

---

¹³ Respondents choosing bisexual (p=0.006) were more likely to have no school qualifications, and those choosing gay (p<0.0001) or queer (p<0.0001) were more likely to have a University degree, compared to those who did not identify in these ways.
men in this group identified as bisexual and queer compared with MSM in other occupational categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Professional and Semi-professional</th>
<th>Clerical/ Technical</th>
<th>Skilled/ Semi-Skilled</th>
<th>Labourer</th>
<th>Not in Paid Workforce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>4.6 (n=501)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takataapui</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment status also seemed to have an effect on MSM’s sexual identity decisions. Bisexual and heterosexual were popular identities among respondents who were not in the paid workforce, and when this finding is compared with the results for the labourer occupational category, there is some evidence of a ‘class’ effect occurring within sexual identity decisions. The identity choices of men defined as being in an ‘under-class’ position support this assertion, as proportionately more of these men chose heterosexual and bisexual and fewer called themselves gay or queer.¹⁴

Section III: The Social-Sexual Milieu and Sexual Identity

Sexual attraction

Disclosure of sexual attraction has been intimately linked with sexual identity formation (Plummer, 1975; Cass, 1979). Most respondents signalled some attraction to men (95.4%, or 1787 men). The degree of attraction to men was found to be a significant factor in the choice of each sexual identity (Figure 8).¹⁵ Almost ninety percent (88.3%) of respondents who were very attracted to men called themselves gay, while this was a choice for few respondents who stated they were not attracted to men (16.7%). Not surprisingly, of the eighty four respondents who were not particularly attracted to men...

¹⁴ Male Call/Waea Mai, Tane Me Report No. 1: Methodology and Demographic Characteristics defined men in an ‘under-class’ position as earning less than $20,000 a year and with a highest educational qualification of School Certificate. One hundred and seventy one men (9.2% of the total sample) fell into this category, and their average income ($11,856) was a third of that of the total sample.

¹⁵ Degree of sexual attraction to men had a significant influence on the choices of heterosexual (p<0.0001), bisexual (p<0.0001), gay (p<0.0001) and queer (p<0.0001) (see Appendix I, Table 2).
almost half (47.6%) identified as heterosexual. The term bisexual was also used more often by respondents who were either not very attracted or ambivalent in their attraction towards men.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual identities by sexual attraction to men (%)</th>
<th>Not very attracted n=84</th>
<th>Ambivalent n=211</th>
<th>Very attracted n=1556</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takataapui</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of identities such as heterosexual and bisexual was alternatively associated with sexual attraction to women (Figure 9). However, this was not always the case, and large numbers of men who described their sexual attraction to women as ambivalent identified as bisexual (77.6%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual identities by sexual attraction to women (%)</th>
<th>Not very attracted n=1464</th>
<th>Ambivalent n=228</th>
<th>Very attracted n=1650</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takataapui</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Disclosure of attraction**

There appeared to be a strong relationship between disclosure of sexual attraction to men and the identities that respondents chose, depending on who had been told (Figure 10). Of the 110 respondents who hadn't told anyone that they were attracted to men, almost a third (30%) described themselves as heterosexual. More than two-thirds of these 'non-disclosers' (71.8%) also described themselves as bisexual.

---

16 Degree of sexual attraction to women had a significant influence on the choices of heterosexual (p<0.00001), bisexual (p<0.00001), gay (p<0.0001) and queer (p<0.005) (see Appendix I, Table 2).
Disclosure to someone (anyone!) was found to be highly related to having a gay identity. In fact, the likelihood of identifying as gay increased as more people (or the ‘more difficult’ people) were told, and this almost certainly reflects the degree to which our respondents were comfortable with their sexual orientation. For most MSM, telling family and workmates is still a difficult thing to do (with many potential negative consequences), and it is therefore not surprising that those men who had done this were the highest claimants of gay and queer and the least likely to identify as heterosexual.17

**Involvement in the gay community**

Gay community involvement had a significant influence on the sexual identities respondents chose. The ‘gay community’ can broadly refer to the people, places and activities around which MSM organise the social and sexual aspects of their lives. Since the issue of sex between men still carries a degree of social stigma and discrimination, the gay community performs important functions such as providing networks of support, information about safe sex and community and personal development (for a fuller discussion see Male Call/Waea Mai, Tane Ma Report No.7: Gay Community Involvement). We were interested to find out whether involvement in the gay community was related to identity formation.

An index of ‘gay community attachment’ (GCA) was created, which combined respondents’ answers to questions relating to whether they had gay friends and whether they went out socially with gay men. Respondents were subsequently categorised into those who were ‘gay community attached’ and those who were ‘non-gay community attached’.18 As Figure 11 illustrates below, proportionately more men who were gay

---

17 Disclosure to family had a significant influence on the choice of heterosexual (p=0.03), bisexual (p=0.01) and queer (p=0.002).
18 Respondents who scored five or greater on a twelve-point scale were deemed to be ‘gay community attached’.
community attached described themselves as gay (92.5%), queer (50%), or takataapui (3.7%) compared to those who were not attached. In comparison, fewer respondents who were not gay community attached identified as gay, with around half (48.7%) identifying as bisexual and 14.4% identifying as heterosexual.\textsuperscript{19} These results suggest that interactions with other msm play an important role in many gay men's identity development. However, these figures also show that there may be many msm who consider themselves to be gay (385 men, or 57.2% of the non-gca respondents), but who are isolated from the important networks mentioned above. It may also be that the most gay-identified men gravitate towards the gay community when they have an opportunity to do so, and strong gay identity formation preceded community attachment for many of these individuals.

![Figure 11: Sexual identities by gay community attachment](image)

Other measures of gay community involvement included consumption of gay media and membership of gay organisations. As might be expected, regular consumption of gay media or participation in gay organisations was highly related to a gay identity. Of those men who read gay magazines or newspapers regularly, 91.9% identified as gay while only 2.4% identified as heterosexual and 13.5% identified as bisexual. Men who do not see themselves as gay appear not to be accessing these publications, which is likely to reduce their access to information on safe sex.

\textsuperscript{19} Gay community attachment had a significant influence on the choices of heterosexual ($p=0.06$), bisexual ($p=0.0003$), gay ($p=0.0001$) and queer ($p=0.0001$) identities (see Appendix I, Table 2).
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Section IV: Sexual Behaviour and Condom Use

This section explores how sexual identities can frame the way MSM interact sexually with each other. Whereas Sections II and III examined how demographic and social milieu variables influenced sexual identity decisions, here the report looks at the men who adopted each of the five sexual identities and shows how they differed in their sexual behaviour.

Sexual relationships with men

Regular relationships
Coleman (1982) has argued that having a regular sexual relationship with someone of the same sex can be viewed as an acceptance of one’s homosexual attraction, and, ultimately, of 'homosexual' identity itself. In this survey, proportionately more men who identified as gay (54.6%), queer (55.8%) or takataapui (56.6%) were in a regular relationship with a man compared to men who identified as heterosexual (33.3%) or bisexual (39.4%) (Figure 12).

![Figure 12: Sexual relationships with men by identity](chart)

There were also differences in the way respondents described their regular male partner. Most respondents (approximately 44%) identifying as gay, queer or takataapui described their partner as "defacto" or a "husband". Less who identified as heterosexual (23.1%) and bisexual (17.5%) described their regular male partner in this way, and more
of these men referred to their regular partner as a “boyfriend” (around 40%) or a “fuck buddy” (around 33%).

Casual partners
The differences were less pronounced in relation to whether or not respondents reported casual sex with another man in the last six months (Figure 12). In particular, there was a remarkable similarity in the proportion of men who had one to five partners in this period over all identities, and most men fell into this category (Figure 13). Having said this, proportionately more respondents who identified as heterosexual or bisexual did not have any casual male partners in the last six months, while more gay and queer identifying respondents had over eleven partners.

| Figure 13: Number of male partners in last 6 months by sexual identity (%) |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| No. men last 6 months      | Heterosexual | Bisexual | Gay   | Queer | Takataapui |
|                            | n=117 | n=507 | n=1475 | n=728 | n=53 |
| zero                       | 17.1  | 8.3   | 3.8    | 2.3   | 5.7   |
| 1                          | 23.1  | 23.7  | 22.6   | 20.4  | 20.8  |
| 2-5                        | 34.2  | 37.5  | 35.1   | 33.7  | 35.8  |
| 6-10                       | 11.1  | 13.0  | 15.8   | 16.8  | 13.2  |
| 11-20                      | 6.0   | 7.9   | 10.6   | 11.6  | 5.7   |
| over 20                    | 7.7   | 9.5   | 11.9   | 14.9  | 18.9  |

Sexual relationships with women
Not surprisingly, proportionately more men who identified as heterosexual and bisexual had a regular female partner (Figure 14). Over forty percent (42.7%) of men identifying as heterosexual and 31.6% of men identifying as bisexual were in a regular relationship with a woman, and 68.4% and 52.5% of heterosexual and bisexual identifying men in total reported sex with a woman in the last six months. Most respondents who identified as gay (92.2%), queer (93%) or takataapui (88.7%) had not had sex with a woman in the last six months.
While the patterns of sexual involvement described above generally support a notion of sexual identities mirroring sexual behaviour, there are some points of interest. For example, seven respondents who identified as heterosexual (6%) and twenty four who identified as bisexual (4.7%) had never had sex with a woman (Figure 15). Also, none of them reported being sexually attracted to women. It could be posited that something other than sexual orientation is prompting these men to use these identities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ever had sex</th>
<th>Heterosexual n=117</th>
<th>Bisexual n=507</th>
<th>Gay n=1475</th>
<th>Queer n=726</th>
<th>Takataapui n=53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environments where men go to find male sexual partners

Differences in the venues that respondents chose to look for male sexual partners further dramatised the interaction between sexual orientation, identity and disclosure for some men (Figure 16). For example, a higher proportion of men identifying as heterosexual went to a 'public sex environment' such as a bog/public toilet to look for a male sexual partner in the previous year.\(^{20}\) Venues such as these have been described as a "forum in which sexual identities are suspended and sexual motivation masked" (Flowers et al. 1996), and this might explain their popularity amongst men who find a 'gay' sexual identity problematic. A similar rationale might account for the higher

\(^{20}\) 'Bogs' are also known as 'beats' in Australia, 'cottages' in the United Kingdom, and 'tea houses' in North America. The venues listed are those which respondents indicated they visited to look for a male sexual partner. However, respondents were not asked about their sexual practices at these venues, or whether they met men there (see Male Call/Waea Mai, Tane Ma Report No. 4: Casual Sex between Men).
attendance of heterosexual and bisexual identifying men at gay saunas as opposed to gay bars. In fact, venues such as saunas constituted the most popular site for these men to visit. This again may illustrate the pattern of seeking partners in environments which prioritise sexual behaviour as opposed to organising around identity.

![Figure 16: Venues visited to find male sexual partner by identity](image)

An interesting result is that proportionately more respondents who identified as takataapui went to each venue compared with non-takataapui. The high rates of gay community attachment for takataapui can shed light on their high attendance at gay-identified venues, yet some aspects of public sex environment usage cannot be accounted for in the same way. Maori respondents as a group indicated that they had been to a wide range of venues, and it seems that takataapui identifying Maori mirrored this behaviour.²¹

²¹ See Male Call/Waea Mai, Tane Ma Report No.4: Casual Sex Between Men, for further discussion of the characteristics of respondents who frequented these venues in the previous year.
Sexual practice and condom use

Oral and other sex

There were some differences in sexual activities practiced with regular and casual partners. Figures 17 and 18 illustrate a range of sexual activities (excluding anal intercourse) performed with casual and regular partners, and the proportion of respondents who engaged in them. Figure 17 suggests that proportionately less men who identified as heterosexual engaged in kissing of any sort with a casual partner. There were also some differences in the oral sex repertoire, as well as rimming, finger fucking, and the use of sex toys. For example, one of the most notable differences occurred for insertive oral sex and ejaculating into their partner’s mouth, which was performed by approximately 30% of those identifying as gay, queer or takataapui, compared to 43.8% of heterosexual and 45.7% of bisexual identifying respondents.

| Figure 17: Activities engaged in with a casual male partner in the last 6 months (%) |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Activity                      | Heterosexual    | Bisexual        | Gay             | Queer           | Takataapui      |
|                               | n=80            | n=376           | n=1098          | n=562           | n=35            |
| Dry kissing                   | 75.0            | 80.3            | 87.2            | 87.9            | 85.7            |
| Deep kissing                  | 53.8            | 73.4            | 83.0            | 86.7            | 74.3            |
| Masturbating together or in groups | 90.0           | 91.8            | 93.9            | 95.2            | 94.3            |
| Sensuous touching             | 87.5            | 90.4            | 92.6            | 95.2            | 82.9            |
| Sucking penis and not swallowing cum | 80.0      | 82.4            | 86.5            | 89.7            | 82.9            |
| Sucking penis and swallowing cum | 18.8           | 17.8            | 19.2            | 18.1            | 16.5            |
| Being sucked and not ejaculating in mouth | 73.8  | 79.5            | 82.9            | 85.8            | 77.1            |
| Being sucked and ejaculating in mouth | 43.8        | 45.7            | 29.5            | 29.5            | 31.4            |
| Rimming                       | 16.2            | 24.7            | 32.5            | 36.8            | 51.4            |
| Being rimmed                  | 45.0            | 50.3            | 52.3            | 55.2            | 60.0            |
| Finger fucking                | 47.5            | 55.9            | 59.9            | 65.5            | 60.0            |
| Being finger fucked           | 56.3            | 58.2            | 60.2            | 64.9            | 57.1            |
| Using sex toys                | 28.8            | 24.2            | 20.2            | 22.1            | 22.9            |

---

22 All sexual activities that were included in the questionnaire have been broadly divided into two categories. "Oral and other sex" refers to activities which do not involve penile-anal intercourse but may still involve the anus, such as rimming and finger fucking. "Anal sex" refers to practices that do involve penile-anal intercourse.

23 Percentages relate to respondents who stated that they had performed an activity “often or occasionally” in the last six months with a casual partner (Figure 17) or with a regular partner of six months or longer (Figure 18).
Many of these differences were repeated with regular partners (Figure 18), emerging within the activities of oral sex, rimming, finger fucking and use of sex toys. One difference, however, was that respondents identifying as bisexual did not always follow the pattern of falling somewhere between heterosexual and gay identifying men in their choice of activities. In some practices, such as masturbating, sensuous touching, and some forms of oral sex, bisexual identifying men reported lower frequencies than men labelling themselves as heterosexual.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>% of men with a regular partner of 6 months or over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heterosexual n=32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep kissing</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masturbating together</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensuous touching</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sucking penis and not swallowing cum</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sucking penis and swallowing cum</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being sucked and not ejaculating in mouth</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being sucked and ejaculating in mouth</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimming</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being rimmed</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finger fucking</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being finger fucked</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using sex toys</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anal sex and condom use

Further differences emerged for anal sex and condom use. As shown in Figure 12, a lower proportion of men who identified as heterosexual had sex with a casual male partner recently. However, of those that did have casual sex, proportionately more had engaged in anal sex compared with other respondents (Figure 19). While not statistically significant, proportionately more men who identified as heterosexual or

---

24 While proportionately more heterosexual identifying men had engaged in anal sex with a casual partner (67.5%), this result was only marginally significant when statistical analyses were performed (p=0.07) (see Male Call/Waea Mai, Tane Ma Report No.4: Casual Sex between Men). In a general sense, sexual identity did not have a significant impact on the decision to have anal sex with a casual male partner.
bisexual also never used a condom with their casual partner (heterosexual 11.3%; bisexual 12.1%; gay 9.19%; queer 8.12%).\textsuperscript{25}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{anal_sex_with_casual_male_partners_by_identity.png}
\caption{Anal sex with \textit{casual male partners} by identity}
\end{figure}

These findings were reversed in the context of anal sex with a regular partner. Proportionately more gay, queer and takataapui identifying respondents engaged in anal sex with their regular partner than other men (Figure 20). Moreover, proportionately fewer of these men always used a condom with their regular partner, although this difference was not statistically significant.\textsuperscript{26}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{anal_sex_with_regular_male_partners_by_identity.png}
\caption{Anal sex with \textit{regular male partners} by identity}
\end{figure}

\textit{Highly unsafe sex}

Another way of measuring risky behaviour is whether men reported engaging in 'highly unsafe sex'. Respondents were asked whether they had engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with a man whose HIV status they didn't know, or was different from their

\textsuperscript{25} The base used for this analysis is men who had anal sex with a casual male partner in the previous six months. A logistic regression analysis was used to investigate whether sexual identity influenced condom use for these men. No identity was found to have a significant influence (see Appendix I).

\textsuperscript{26} The base used for this analysis is men who had anal sex with a regular partner in the previous six months.
biseexual also never used a condom with their casual partner (heterosexual 11.3%; bisexual 12.1%; gay 9.19%; queer 8.12%).

These findings were reversed in the context of anal sex with a regular partner. Proportionately more gay, queer and takataaapui identifying respondents engaged in anal sex with their regular partner than other men (Figure 20). Moreover, proportionately fewer of these men always used a condom with their regular partner, although this difference was not statistically significant.

Highly unsafe sex

Another way of measuring risky behaviour is whether men reported engaging in 'highly unsafe sex'. Respondents were asked whether they had engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with a man whose HIV status they didn't know, or was different from their

---

25 The base used for this analysis is men who had anal sex with a casual male partner in the previous six months. A logistic regression analysis was used to investigate whether sexual identity influenced condom use for these men. No identity was found to have a significant influence (see Appendix I).

26 The base used for this analysis is men who had anal sex with a regular partner in the previous six months.
own, in the last six months. Figure 21 shows that men identifying as heterosexual were more likely to have had highly unsafe sex with a casual partner, compared to respondents who did not identify as heterosexual.27

![Figure 21: "Highly unsafe sex" with regular and casual partners](image)

NB: These percentages are taken from samples of (1) men who had anal sex with a regular partner of at least six months duration; (2) men who had anal sex with a casual partner in the last six months. The sample sizes relating to anal sex with regular and casual partners are: heterosexual n=54, 20; bisexual n=231, 106; gay n=675, 484; queer n=345, 249; takataapui n=22, 16.

And in contrast to the findings for 'never used a condom', men identifying as heterosexual were also more likely to have had highly unsafe sex with a regular partner (Figure 21), compared to men who did not identify as heterosexual.28

Accounting for the differences in sexual practice and condom use

Several different factors are likely to be influencing anal sex and condom use here. Respondents who identified as heterosexual were less gay community attached, and more inclined than other respondents to use 'covert' environments such as public sex environments to meet men for sex. Their higher rates of anal sex with casual partners coupled with lower levels of condom use may be a reflection of their relative isolation from safer sex messages. With many of these men also engaging in sex with women, it

27 Only the identity of heterosexual was found to have a significant influence on whether or not respondents reported engaging in highly unsafe sex with a casual partner (p=0.01). The value of the highly unsafe sex construct to measure levels of unsafe sex is discussed in detail in Male Cal/Waea Mai, Tane Ma Report No.4: Casual Sex Between Men.

28 Only the identity of heterosexual was found to have a significant influence on whether or not respondents reported engaging in highly unsafe sex with a regular partner (p=0.04).
is possible that a heterosexual 'sexual culture' which places high importance on insertive practices - and has not so far been associated with a high risk of HIV transmission in New Zealand - may influence these men's decisions about each sexual session.

Conversely, anal sex appears to attain heightened importance in the context of regular relationships for respondents with certain sexual identities. Gay, queer and takataapui respondents reported having more anal sex with their partners compared with men who do not so identify. And while heterosexual and bisexual identifying respondents reported similar rates of anal sex with both casual and regular partners, men claiming the other identities demonstrated a notable preference towards anal sex with their regular partner.

Furthermore, differences appeared in the types of anal sex that is practiced. More gay and queer identifying respondents had ejaculated inside their regular partner, compared with respondents identifying as heterosexual, who reported no difference between ejaculating and withdrawal. This was not the case for anal sex with a casual partner; gay and queer identifying men being equally divided between withdrawal and ejaculating inside, while fewer men who identified as heterosexual had practiced withdrawal. Interestingly, there were no notable differences across these identities regarding anal sex being the most emotional or physically satisfying sexual act, with around 28% and 36% of all men agreeing with those statements respectively, regardless of identity.

Recent literature (Prieur 1990; Parnell, 1993) which proposes that anal sex serves as an important means of expressing intimacy for gay-identifying MSM would appear at first sight to be supported by such results. It may be that anal sex for non-heterosexual identifying men does constitute a special act, which, in the absence of symbols of intimacy granted to heterosexual couples, is prioritised by these men for similar ends. Alternatively, intimacy may not be the pivotal issue, and both gay identity and a preference for anal sex may be connected in more complicated ways to the dynamics of relationship development. For example, in the context of the AIDS pandemic, gay men may be less willing to explore anal sex in any context other than regular relationships.
Attitudes towards condoms

When asked questions about condoms, heterosexual and bisexual identifying respondents tended to report more negative attitudes (Figure 22).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Heterosexual n=117</th>
<th>Bisexual n=507</th>
<th>Gay n=1475</th>
<th>Queer n=726</th>
<th>Takataapui n=53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement 1: "Condoms are a nuisance, I couldn't be bothered using them" - agree.
Statement 2: "Condoms reduce sensitivity" - agree.
Statement 3: "Condoms are not reliable because they break a lot" - agree.
Statement 4: "Condoms are an OK part of sex" - agree.

Proportionately more respondents who identified as gay (87.2%), queer (90.1%) or takataapui (90.6%) agreed with the statement "condoms are an OK part of sex". While it is important to note that we cannot relate these comments back to specific contexts (such as sex with a regular or casual partner, sex that occurs in different places such as at home, someone else's place or a public sex environment), the data summarised here does suggest that heterosexual and bisexual identifying respondents generally view condoms more unfavourably.

Section V: HIV Knowledge and Testing

Knowledge about transmission of HIV was generally consistent across identities, although respondents identifying as heterosexual or bisexual were less informed than others. Marked differences appeared in terms of two questions, namely about risks involved in oral sex and sex between HIV positive men (Figure 23). The first question (Indicator seven) was answered correctly by just over 80% of heterosexual and bisexual identifying respondents, much less than those identifying as gay (71.5%), queer (76.3%), and takataapui (81.1%). Almost all respondents understood the risks of HIV transmission by mosquitoes and through sex with women, which suggests that the intricacies of infection are understood by a broad range of msm. Yet the issue
addressed in this particular question has not been widely discussed outside the gay community, where a well-developed HIV and AIDS discourse exists. Given the low rates of gay community attachment for men who identified as heterosexual and bisexual, it may be that new information regarding HIV and AIDS takes longer to reach these men.

Figure 23: Knowledge of HIV - differences by sexual identity

Knowledge Indicator 7: "If two people are both infected with HIV they don’t need to worry about what they do sexually with each other" (correct answer = false).

Knowledge Indicator 8: "Oral sex (sucking a penis and not swallowing semen) is very unlikely to transmit HIV" (correct answer = true).

The close relationship between the knowledge levels of different sexual identities and their gca rates for this indicator supports the findings of other researchers who highlight the importance of gca for accuracy of knowledge about HIV (Kippax et al. 1990). It also supports research claiming that place of residence is another significant factor in information uptake (Kippax et al. 1988). This survey indicated that heterosexual and bisexual identifying men often came from secondary urban settings, where the delivery of safe-sex information may be more problematic. In relation to certain aspects of HIV and risky behaviour, these results appear to underline the difficulties of reaching MSM who have 'non-homosexual' identities.

Indicator eight - the risk of HIV transmission during oral sex - deals with an activity whose safe sex status has often been questioned. Recent advances in knowledge have resulted in health educators categorising oral sex without semen present as a 'safer' practice. Again, differences in knowledge may be attributable to a lack of up to date
information received by some men. Respondents who are more distanced from the gay community, and the programmes aimed at it, may miss out on such messages.

The knowledge levels of men who identified as takataapui, however, pose a problem to explanations based on gca. While this group demonstrated the highest levels of knowledge on indicator seven, they were well below other gay-oriented and community-attached identities on indicator eight. This appears to indicate a real knowledge gap, with consequent implications for community education programme design.

**Behaviour change as a result of HIV and AIDS knowledge**

In the absence of previous longitudinal nation-wide surveys of MSM in New Zealand, it is difficult to accurately identify changes in behaviour over time. An analysis of previous studies on MSM in New Zealand, however, does suggest that many men are altering their sexual practices in response to the threat of HIV infection (Worth 1996). In this survey, respondents were asked about sexual behaviour change as a result of their knowledge about HIV and AIDS, and the findings suggest that this knowledge has had some effect on behaviour across identities. While there was general consistency in respondents’ avoidance of risky activities (such as unprotected anal intercourse), there were some interesting changes in that certain sexual practices were performed more often (Figure 24). Proportionately more men who identified as takataapui, for example, increased their use of condoms as a result of their knowledge about HIV and AIDS. Although this question was designed to measure whether behaviour had changed over time, and therefore does not measure the actual level of condom use, this result suggests that this group has been highly receptive to condom promoting messages.

![Figure 24: Sexual activities performed more often as a result of knowledge about HIV and AIDS](image-url)
Other results suggest that certain MSM may be substituting risky activities for those that they consider to be safer. For example, respondents who identified as gay or queer appeared to be adding activities such as massage and mutual masturbation to their sexual repertoire. Heterosexual identifying men showed the lowest increase in massage or body rubbing, and fewer used mutual masturbation as a safe sex technique. Keeping in mind the findings about anal sex and condom use for this latter group, it is possible that given the continued backdrop of homophobia and social stigma, there are men who do not adopt the most rational risk-avoidance strategies.

Testing For HIV

There were marked differences in the rates of HIV testing between respondents (Figure 25). Three-quarters of men identifying as gay (74.2%) and queer (75.8%) had tested for HIV at least once. This figure was higher for men identifying as takataapui, 86.8% of whom had been tested. Conversely, smaller proportions of men identifying as heterosexual or bisexual reported having an HIV test, with rates of 47.9% and 54% respectively. The findings concur with other studies (e.g. Prestage et al. 1995) that indicate significant differences between men with ‘non-homosexual’ identities and other respondents.

![Figure 25: Have ever had an HIV test](image)

More respondents illustrated a preference to go to their GP for an HIV test than anywhere else, with the exception of men identifying as takataapui. Only a quarter of

---

29 Respondents identifying as heterosexual (p=0.02) and those identifying as bisexual (p<0.0001) were less likely to have had an HIV test than respondents who did not identify in these ways. Men identifying as takataapui (p=0.04) were more likely to have had a test compared with men who did not use this identity.
these men went to a doctor, most opting instead for a New Zealand AIDS Foundation (NZAF) clinic (Figure 26). STD clinics were much more popular with heterosexual identifying respondents, who were also the least inclined to visit an NZAF clinic to get tested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place went for last test</th>
<th>Heterosexual</th>
<th>Bisexual</th>
<th>Gay</th>
<th>Queer</th>
<th>Takataapui</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=56</td>
<td>n=274</td>
<td>n=1095</td>
<td>n=549</td>
<td>n=46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STD clinic</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZAF clinic</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other place</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given that there were not large differences in the riskiness of sexual practices between identities, accounting for the differences in testing is likely to involve other factors. One such factor may be contact with the epidemic, and our data shows that the proportion of respondents who knew someone who was HIV positive closely mirrors the HIV testing rates for each identity (Figure 27).

Another factor that might have explained the differences in testing was self-assessed risk of HIV infection. However, when respondents were asked how likely they thought they were to be infected with HIV, no substantial differences emerged (Figure 27). Only a small minority thought that the chances of becoming infected were high, and the only

---

30 The overall level of testing for HIV was however higher in Prestage et al. (1995). Over 90% (91.1%) of the 'homosexually-identified' respondents had tested compared with 75.7% of those who were 'not-homosexually identified'.

---
group of men who reported a higher self-assessed risk and also had higher rates of testing were men identifying as takataapui, but the numbers involved were too small for the difference to be significant. The differences in testing across sexual identities are potentially of concern. Although the proportion of heterosexual identifying men was relatively small, their reluctance to test may hinder the monitoring of new infections in that subgroup.

Section VI: Reaching MSM of Different Sexual Identities

Male Call Publicity

Respondents to Male Call/Waea Ma, Tane Ma heard about the survey through a number of different mediums. As Male Call/Waea Ma, Tane Ma Report No.1: Methodology and Demographic Characteristics has outlined, a large mainstream-media focussed publicity campaign was complemented by several strategies targeted at certain types of msm, so that msm who don't normally identify as gay or who live outside the gay community would respond. As Figure 28 illustrates below, this proved to be a well designed method of recruitment since certain publicity sources were more effective with particular msm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Heterosexual (n=117)</th>
<th>Bisexual (n=507)</th>
<th>Gay (n=1475)</th>
<th>Queer (n=726)</th>
<th>Takataapui (n=53)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream press</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream TV</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay media</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ AIDS Foundation office</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the mainstream media overall was just as successful reaching gay and heterosexual identifying msm, the mainstream press in particular appeared to be more effective in informing heterosexual and bisexual identifying msm of the survey. The gay media, networks of friends, posters and the New Zealand AIDS Foundation were all more effective in reaching gay and queer identifying msm. The AIDS Foundation was a
highly successful source of publicity for respondents who identified as takataapui, and mainstream TV was also a successful vehicle for communication with this group.

It is important to know how to reach different msm when designing HIV prevention initiatives, and this data reinforces the need to utilise different mediums if a wide range of msm are to be accessed.

Conclusion

This report examines the importance of sexual identity in the context of HIV/AIDS. Respondents to Male Call/Waea Mai, Tane Ma showed differences across a number of variables, depending on the sexual identities they chose. Significantly, these differences did not always occur along a research-typical heterosexual - homosexual divide. Instead, it is apparent that identities such as takataapui, queer, and bisexual demonstrate their own special characteristics. This provides an important snapshot of the diverse ways in which msm have reacted to the AIDS pandemic. It also helps us to analyse the successes and shortcomings of the HIV/AIDS community programmes targeting msm in New Zealand.

The data presented here points to a number of key themes. The first is the role that social structure plays in msm's adoption of sexual identities. The demographic influences on sexual identity are important in a number of respects. The data shows that place of residence is a factor, since men from secondary urban centres tended not to label themselves as gay or queer, with half describing their identity as bisexual. Other studies have discovered higher levels of bisexual practice in smaller towns (e.g. Messiah 1996), and this is attributed to the cultural contexts and expectations of such environments. Similar cultural considerations apply for different ethnic groups. Rather than collapsing the many meanings surrounding sexuality into the Western constructs of gay and straight, msm from different ethnic backgrounds consistently demonstrate an attachment to identities that better fit their cultural experiences. Age also reflected the impact of culture, be it in the form of age-specific influences such as in the case of
young MSM, or as an historical effect for older respondents. All these structural influences appear to mediate MSM's decisions to identify in different ways.

Secondly, more immediate and personal factors also appeared to influence identity. The degree of sexual attraction to men and women, disclosure of this attraction, and involvement in the gay community all affected identification. The gay milieu may ultimately be one of the most significant factors in the formation of sexual identity, and analysis suggests that sexual identity itself has relatively few significant effects over and above that of gay community attachment.

Thirdly, differences emerged in the sexual behaviour, sexual activities, and knowledge and testing for HIV according to sexual identity attachment. This points to the different meanings attached to male to male sexuality for different men, and is allusive of the notion of "sexual cultures" (Dowsett 1997). Respondents preferred to engage in particular activities, with partners of particular relationship status, depending on their sexual identity.

As might be expected, major differences occurred between those men who identified as either heterosexual or bisexual, and those who identified as gay, queer, or takataapui. Knowledge of the risks of HIV associated with various sexual practices appeared to be lower for the first group of men, and heterosexual identifying men also reported that they were more likely to engage in highly unsafe sex, at the same time as being more reluctant to take an HIV test. Furthermore, many of these results appear to be connected with non-participation in the 'gay' community. As Crawford et al. (1992) point out, substituting a 'gay milieu' for a less personal, public sex environment may make sexual behaviour change and the adoption of safer sex more problematic. Although this has not translated into large-scale differences in terms of unsafe sex in our data, there is evidence suggesting a need to design specific interventions for this subgroup.

At the same time, some respondents who identified as gay, queer, and takataapui are also engaging in unprotected sex, albeit in different contexts. These men's lower rates of condom use with their regular partners could be the result of some decision based around notions of an agreement. However, as mentioned in Male Call/Waea Mai, Tane
Ma Report No.2: Men in Relationships with Men, this may point to a false sense of security and is also a culturally generated misconception about 'safety' that presents challenges to educators. These men also need to be targeted to a greater extent in future education programmes.

A fourth theme is the apparent success of campaigns that have already focussed on particular groups, namely men who identified as takataapui. Men identifying as takataapui appear to be especially receptive to campaigns aimed at increasing awareness of HIV risks, and demonstrated the highest increase in condom usage and testing for HIV. More research is needed to track the medium term effects of these specifically targeted programmes.

In summary, this data has identified some important gaps in the HIV education of msm. By looking at men through their chosen sexual identities, those involved in prevention programme design are able to identify areas of reduced impact, and plan new initiatives accordingly. Such a methodology is valuable as it offers a more accurate picture of the variety of 'sexual cultures' than previous research. This recognises the differences between msm culturally, socio-economically, and interpersonally, but not to the extent that they are treated as autonomous units, separated from surrounding contexts and therefore devoid of contributing influences. Instead, it provides a more detailed account of the variety of meanings that frame the social lives of msm, and which may put them at increased risk of HIV infection.
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Appendix I: Statistical Analysis

Several logistic regression analyses were used to investigate the relationships between certain variables. These questions included the effects of demographic variables on the choices of sexual identity, the effect of milieu variables on the choices of sexual identity, the effect of sexual identities on sexual practice and condom use, and the effect of sexual identities on HIV testing. The variables that were used differed for each question. Details of the variables that were used and the full results of the tests are outlined separately below.

Demographic influences on sexual identity

Each respondent had the choice of several identities which were not ranked in any way. Six binary variables were formed to determine influences on this choice. These were: men choosing heterosexual or not, choosing bisexual or not, choosing gay or not, choosing homosexual or not, choosing queer or not, choosing takataapui or not. Separate logistic regressions were used to investigate whether age, ethnicity, residence or academic qualifications had an effect on the choice of a particular sexual identity. 1779 respondents had full information and were included in the analysis.

Age groups: 15-19, 20-24, 25-39, 40-49, 50+

Ethnicity: NZ European, Maori, Pacific Island, Asian + Chinese + other

Residence: main urban, secondary urban, minor urban + rural

Highest Qualification: no school, school, professional, incomplete university, graduate, post-graduate.

Employment and income were not included in the analysis as they were highly correlated with qualifications.

| Table One: p values for the effect of demographic variables on sexual identity |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                                | No. with full information | Age group p     | Ethnicity p     | Residence p     | Qualification p |
| Heterosexual                   | 112              | p=0.01          | p=0.01          | p=0.04          | p=0.3           |
| Bisexual                       | 485              | p<0.0001        | p=0.03          | p=0.0006        | p=0.005         |
| Gay                            | 1410             | p<0.0001        | p=0.002         | p=0.05          | p<0.0001        |
| Homosexual                     | 1179             | p=0.1           | p=0.4           | p=0.05          | p=0.002         |
| Queer                          | 699              | p=0.0006        | p=0.02          | p=0.07          | p<0.0001        |
| Takataapui                     | 52               | p=0.004         | not in model    | p=0.1           | p=0.1           |
Social milieu influences on sexual identity

Separate logistic regressions for each sexual identity were used to investigate whether sexual attraction to men and women, disclosure of attraction to men, and gay community attachment had an effect on whether or not respondents chose a sexual identity. Age, ethnicity, residence and highest qualification were included as covariates. 1768 respondents had full information and were included in the analysis.

Attraction to men: scale 1 = not attracted 5 = extremely attracted

Attraction to women: scale 1 = not attracted 5 = extremely attracted

Disclosed attraction to family: yes or no

Gay community attachment: index scale 1-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Two: p values for the effect of milieu variables on sexual identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takataapui</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sexual identity influences on sexual practice and condom use

These categories were used in the various logistic regressions in this section:

Age: 15-24, 25-39, 40+

Ethnicity: NZ European, Maori, Pacific Island, other

Residency: main urban, secondary urban, minor urban and rural

Highest qualification: School certificate or no school qualification, other qualification

Income: $20,000 or less, over $20,000

Length of relationship: less than six months, six months or longer

Number of casual partners:

1) A logistic regression was used to analyse whether a given sexual identity had an effect on condom use with a regular partner, compared to those who did not use that identity. Age, ethnicity, residence, highest qualification, income, and length of regular relationships were used as covariates. 662 respondents had full information of whom 261 never used condoms with their regular male partner.

No sexual identity was found to have an effect on the decision to never use a condom with a regular male partner.
2) A logistic regression was used to analyse whether a given sexual identity had an effect on 'highly unsafe sex' within regular relationships, compared to those who did not use that identity. Age, ethnicity, residence, highest qualification, income, and length of regular relationships were used as covariates. 863 respondents had full information of whom 62 said they had highly unsafe sex with their regular male partner.

Those who identified as heterosexual were more likely to have highly unsafe sex with a regular male partner \((p=0.04)\), compared to those who did not identify as heterosexual.

3) A logistic regression was used to analyse whether a given sexual identity had an effect on condom use with a casual partner, compared to those who did not use that identity. Age, ethnicity, residence, highest qualification, income, and number of casual partners were used as covariates. 768 respondents had full information of whom 79 never used condoms with their casual male partner.

No sexual identity was found to have an effect on the decision to never use a condom with a casual male partner.

4) A logistic regression was used to analyse whether a given sexual identity had an effect on 'highly unsafe sex' within casual relationships, compared to those who did not use that identity. Age, ethnicity, residence, highest qualification, income, and number of casual partners were used as covariates. 1237 respondents had full information of whom 170 said they had highly unsafe sex with their casual male partner.

Those who identified as heterosexual were more likely to have highly unsafe sex with a casual male partner \((p=0.01)\), compared to those who did not identify as heterosexual.
Sexual identity influences on HIV testing

A logistic regression was used to investigate whether sexual identity influenced whether respondents had ever had an HIV test. Age, ethnicity, residency, highest qualification, and income were included in the model. 1777 respondents had full information of whom 1252 said they had ever had an HIV test.

Those identifying as heterosexual (p=0.02) or bisexual (p<0.0001) were less likely to have had an HIV test, compared to those who did not identify as heterosexual or bisexual. Those identifying as takalaapui (p=0.04) were more likely to have had an HIV test, compared to men who did not identify as takalaapui.
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