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## 1. Overview

A lack of systematic, nuanced research on the health and wellbeing of Australian lesbian, bisexual and queer (LBQ) women has been a significant barrier to understanding, recognising and addressing their health needs. At worst, LBQ women's health needs have been largely ignored. At best, they have been considered to be synonymous with general women's health.' While sex between women is considered relatively low risk to health, a range of social, psychological and economic factors mean that this minority group has poorer health outcomes than their heterosexual peers. Stigma, family and community rejection and discrimination can impact on health and wellbeing, the delivery of health services, and women's access to services.

The SWASH survey is a comprehensive survey of important health issues relevant to LBQ and other non-heterosexual identifying women engaged with Sydney's lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer (LGBTQ) communities. The survey covers sexual health and wellbeing, violence, mental health, tobacco use, illicit drug use, alcohol consumption, and cancer screening behaviours. SWASH has run every two years since 1996, and since 2009 has been run by researchers at the University of Sydney in collaboration with ACON. The survey is regularly revised to reflect the needs of LGBTQ communities and knowledge deficits identified through research literature. Where possible, questions are sourced from established national surveys such as the Australian Health Survey (AHS), National Drug Strategy Household Survey (NDSHS), Australian Study of Health and Relationships (ASHR), and Australian Longitudinal Survey of Women's Health (ALSWH).

SWASH provides a much needed local evidence base to inform best practice in healthcare and prevention for chronic diseases, mental health and wellbeing, sexual and reproductive health and ageing. Full background on the SWASH project and the results from the 2018 survey can be found in the main SWASH report.

For the 2018 iteration of SWASH, we undertook sustained community engagement in the Northern Rivers and Mid North Coast region of NSW to generate sufficient numbers for a regional analysis. The SWASH NR-MNC report presents results based on surveys where participants who resided in this region.

## 2. Methods

### 2.1 Survey instrument

A two-page self-complete questionnaire (see Appendix for the questionnaire), including items on demographics; sexual and gender identity; LGBTQ communities connection; smoking, alcohol and drug use; sexual health; general health; chronic illness; psychological wellbeing; experiences of anti-LGBTQ behaviour, intimate partner violence; parenthood intentions; preventive health practices health-related help-seeking behaviour; and healthcare access and satisfaction.

### 2.2 Sampling and recruitment

SWASH is a repeated cross-sectional survey that takes place every two years in February during the Sydney Mardi Gras season. It employs a modified version of the Time-Location convenience sampling also used for the HIV behavioural surveillance undertaken by the Gay Community Periodic Survey. ${ }^{2}$ This venue-based method is often employed for populations that cluster in locations. We draw on the knowledge of ACON health promotion staff to identify venues and events likely to have a high concentration of LBQ women and non-binary people during the survey recruitment period. We used this same approach to generate a sample in the Northern Rivers and Mid North Coast region, attending LGBTQ events and groups across the region throughout March 2018 including during the Lismore Women's Festival.

Questionnaires were offered to everyone identifying as a woman who was willing to respond. Because of practical difficulties, refusal rates were not calculated. Recruitment takes place in public spaces and entertainment venues, so potential respondents who wish to avoid completing the questionnaire can easily do so; few explicitly refused a verbal offer to contribute.

The SWASH survey was also made available online using REDCap electronic data capture tools hosted at The University of Sydney. ${ }^{3}$ The survey was open for one month at the same time as face-to-face recruitment.

### 2.3 Analysis

Data were entered from the coded questionnaires and loaded into SPSS v24.0 software for analysis. Data were cleaned and checked for internal consistency and, where inconsistencies were found, checked against the questionnaires. Additional comments and answers to openended questions were transferred from the questionnaires. The analysis presented here is primarily descriptive, with cross-tabs and t-tests to confirm significant differences between subgroups; $p$ values were calculated using Pearson's chi-square statistic or Fisher's exact test where appropriate (i.e. where the 'expected' number was very small).

The non-answer rate for some questions completed face-to-face was relatively high, especially those requiring writing text rather than ticking a box. (The online version of the survey contained controls alerting participants to non-completed questions). We assume that many respondents simply left a question blank when it did not apply to them, rather than ticking the 'no' response. However, percentages have generally been calculated on the total sample, not on the question-specific response rate, which would have inflated the 'yes' percentages. Readers can take the 'yes' percentages as lower-bound estimates and judge for themselves whether to interpret the missing people as likely to be similar to the respondents or likely to mean 'no' or 'not applicable'. Exceptions to this are tables reporting summaries of questions where respondents could select more than one item, and tables reporting sub-samples.

## 3. Findings

Respondents who identified as heterosexual ( $n=4$ ) or identifying as male (regardless of gender assigned at birth; $n=1$ ) have not been included in this report. Thus, this report focuses on lesbian, bisexual, queer and other non-heterosexual identifying (LBQ) women (regardless of gender assigned at birth), and includes non-binary people.

The final sample of Northern Rivers and Mid North Coast respondents comprised 245 responses: 69 (28\%) via face to face recruitment and 176 ( $72 \%$ spacevia online recruitment). There was no difference between the two regions in mode of survey completion. In addition to presenting the sample demographics below, we also note demographic differences between the Northern Rivers (NR) respondents and the Mid North Coast (MNC) respondents.

### 3.1. Sample Characteristics

### 3.1.1 Age

The age range was 16-76 years, with a median age of 46 ; there were no significant differences across the two regions. This is a markedly higher median age compared to median age of 34 in the main SWASH sample; as a result comparisons between these two samples should be made with caution. When reporting the main SWASH findings we use four age categories; Figure 1 shows the proportion of respondents in these four age categories. For the rest of this report we have collapsed the two youngest age categories into 16-34 years, as the numbers were so small.

While younger respondents were just as likely to have completed the survey face to face as online, respondents aged over 35 years were much more likely to have completed the survey online.

Figure 1: Age distribution of sample


### 3.1.2. Sexual identity and attraction

Respondents were significantly more likely to report identifying as lesbian (61\%) than bisexual (20\%) or queer and other non-heterosexual identity (18\%) ( $p<0.05$; Table 1). Notably, lesbian identifying respondents were more likely to be in the MNC ( $72 \%$ compared to $56 \%$ NR) and queer and other identifying respondents were more likely to be in the NR ( $24 \%$ compared to $7 \%$ in MNC; $p<0.005$ ). The main SWASH sample showed a much higher proportion of respondents reporting a queer or other non-heterosexual identity (lesbian 55\%, bisexual 17\%, queer and other $27 \%$ ).

Exclusive attraction to women was not the majority experience (23\%; Table 2), even among this highly community-attached sample, the majority of whom (53\%) had been sexually active with a woman in the preceding six months. As would be expected, lesbian-identifying respondents were most likely to say they were attracted only or mostly to women (97\%), followed by queer and other non-heterosexual identifying respondents (51\%), and then bisexual respondents (24\%).

The median age of lesbian respondents was 50 years, of bisexual respondents 43 years, and of queer and other non-heterosexual identifying respondents 38 years (Table 3). As with the main SWASH, and sexual identity are correlated, with younger respondents more likely than older respondents to identify as bisexual, queer or other, and less likely to identify as lesbian (Figure 2).

| Table 1: Sexual identity |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| Lesbian/Dyke/Gay/homosexual | $149(60.8)$ |
| Bisexual | $50(20.4)$ |
| Queer/Other | $45(18.4)$ |
| Not reported | $1(0.4)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 4 5}(\mathbf{1 0 0})$ |


| Table 2: Sexual attraction to males and females <br> ("I have felt sexually attracted to") <br>  <br> Only to females <br> More often to females <br> Equally often to both <br> More often to males <br> Only to males <br> To no one at all <br> Not reported <br> Total $\mathbf{5 6 ( 2 3 . 6 )}$ |  |
| :--- | :---: |


| Table 3: Mean and median age, by sexual identity |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | Mean (median) |
| Lesbian | $49(50.0)$ |
| Bisexual | $41(42.5)$ |
| Queer/Other | $41(42.5)$ |
| Not reported | $49(49.0)$ |

Figure 2: Sexual identity by age group


### 3.1.3. Gender identity

Following ACON's recommendations on how to ask about gender, we asked a two-step question: "Which of the following best describes your gender identity: female, male, non-binary, other (please specify)" and "What gender were you assigned at birth: female, male". We report seven categories for the main SWASH sample: Female (female at birth); Female (male at birth); Nonbinary (female at birth); Non-binary (male at birth); Other/multiple (female at birth); Other/ multiple (male at birth); Not reported. In the SWASH NR-MNC sample, the numbers in most categories were very small and we were concerned about potential identification of respondents. We are reporting three categories: Female including both cisgender women and people assigned male as birth who now identify as female (93\%), Non-binary including people assigned either male or female at birth ( $6 \%$ ), and Other including people who selected multiple categories (1\%). One respondent who identified as male (whether assigned male or female at birth) was excluded from the data set.

| Table 4: Gender identity |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n} \%$ |
| Female (assigned female or male at birth) | $227(92.7)$ |
| Non-binary (assigned female or male at birth) | $14(5.7)$ |
| Other/multiple (assigned female or male at birth) | $4(1.6)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 4 5}(\mathbf{1 0 0 )}$ |

### 3.1.4. Intersex status

Fewer than 5 women and non-binary people reported an intersex status. We have decided not to report precise data as the numbers are so small.

### 3.1.5. Children

Thirty percent of respondents said they had dependent children, this is twice the rate reported in the main SWASH sample ( $16 \%$; Table 5 ). Eleven percent said they were planning to have children in the next two years (Table 6); three quarters of these respondents did not already have dependent children.

| Table 5: Dependent children (birth or co-parent) |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| No | $170(69.4)$ |
| Yes | $74(30.2)$ |
| Not reported | $1(0.4)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 4 5}(\mathbf{1 0 0})$ |


| Table 6: Planning to have children in next two years |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| No | $217(88.6)$ |
| Yes / Maybe | $27(11.0)$ |
| Not reported | $1(0.4)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 4 5 ( 1 0 0 )}$ |

### 3.1.6. Social attachment to LGBTQ communities

Unsurprisingly for a sample that is generated through attendance at LGBTQ community events, $34 \%$ reported they felt mostly or very connected to LGBTQ communities in their everyday life (Table 7). Of the 245 respondents, $98 \%$ said that at least a few of their friends were lesbian women, gay men or bisexual, transgender or queer people (Table 8).

In the preceding six months, $62 \%$ had attended at least one LGBTQ group, event or venue (Table 9). While this is overall lower than the main SWASH sample, there was little difference between the two samples on attendance at a LGBTQ dance party, community meeting, or community event, suggesting the differences are likely to due to lack of opportunity to socialise in commercial spaces.

| Table 7: Connection to LGBTQ communities, by age group |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $16-34$ yrs | $35-44$ yrs | $45+$ yrs | Total |  |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |  |
| Very | $8(15.4)$ | $4(6.9)$ | $17(12.6)$ | $29(11.8)$ |  |
| Mostly | $9(17.3)$ | $16(27.6)$ | $30(22.2)$ | $55(22.4)$ |  |
| Somewhat | $21(40.4)$ | $17(29.3)$ | $44(32.6)$ | $82(33.5)$ |  |
| Rarely | $10(19.2)$ | $16(27.6)$ | $31(23.0)$ | $57(23.3)$ |  |
| Not at all | $3(5.8)$ | $5(8.6)$ | $13(9.6)$ | $21(8.6)$ |  |
| Not reported | $1(1.9)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $1(0.4)$ |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 2 ( 1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{5 8 ( 1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 5}(\mathbf{1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 5 ( 1 0 0 )}$ |  |


| Table 8: Number of friends who are LGBTQ |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| None | $4(1.6)$ |
| A few | $62(25.3)$ |
| Some | $80(32.7)$ |
| Most | $96(39.2)$ |
| All | $2(0.8)$ |
| Not reported | $\mathbf{1}(0.4)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 4 5}(\mathbf{1 0 0 )}$ |


| Table 9: Attendance at LGBTQ social venues, events or groups |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| in past 6 months |  |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| Lesbian/queer women's night/bar | $62(25.3)$ |
| Gay night/bar | $29(11.8)$ |
| LGBTQ dance party | $70(28.6)$ |
| LGBTQ group meeting | $55(22.4)$ |
| LGBTQ community event | $111(45.3)$ |
| LGBTQ sports group | $6(2.4)$ |
| Any of the above | $\mathbf{1 5 1 ( 6 1 . 6 )}$ |

### 3.1.7. Education, employment and income

Fifty two percent of respondents reported a university qualification; (Table 10) there were few differences between the two regions. Of those who answered the questions on employment, $36 \%$ were employed full-time, $12 \%$ were students and $15 \%$ were receiving a pension or social security (Table 11). Notably, NR respondents were significantly more likely to report they were receiving pension or social security ( $18 \%$ compared to MNC 9\%, $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ ). Close to a third of respondents reported an annual before tax income of $\$ 60,000$ or more (Table 12).

| Table 10: Education |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| Up to Year 10/School Certificate | $30(12.2)$ |
| Year 12/Higher School Certificate | $33(13.5)$ |
| Tertiary diploma/trade certificate | $54(22.0)$ |
| University or college degree | $72(29.4)$ |
| Postgraduate degree | $56(22.9)$ |
| Not reported | $0(0.0)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 4 5}(\mathbf{1 0 0 )}$ |


| Table 11: Employment status |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| Employed full-time | $89(36.3)$ |
| Employed part-time | $75(30.6)$ |
| Unemployed | $16(6.5)$ |
| Student | $30(12.2)$ |
| Pensioner/social security benefits | $36(14.7)$ |
| Domestic duties | $20(8.2)$ |
| Not in work force | $26(10.6)$ |
| NOTE: Summary table; adds up to more than $100 \%$ <br> more than one category. |  |


| Table 12: Annual income before tax |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| Nil-\$19,999 | $67(27.3)$ |
| $\$ 20,000-\$ 39,999$ | $59(24.1)$ |
| $\$ 40,000-\$ 59,999$ | $44(18.0)$ |
| $\$ 60,000-\$ 99,999$ | $51(20.8)$ |
| $\$ 100,000+$ | $22(9.0)$ |
| Not reported | $2(0.8)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 4 5}(\mathbf{1 0 0})$ |

### 3.1.8. Ethnicity

Table 13 shows responses to the question on ethnic or cultural background. We report 12 categories for the main SWASH sample, however for the MNC-NR sample the numbers in most category were very small so we used three categories. The proportion identifying as Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander persons (8\%) was slightly higher than the proportion that would be expected if the sample were similar to the total NSW population and is likely due to recruitment efforts targeted to relevant events ( $4.4 \%$ of the female population of NSW (aged 15 years and older) identified as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander). ${ }^{4}$

| Table 13: Ethnicity | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | $178(72.7)$ |
| Anglo-Australian only | $42(17.1)$ |
| Other incl Oceania, Asia, Africa, Americas and multiple identifications | $20(8.2)$ |
| Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander including multiple identifications | $5(2.0)$ |
| Not reported | $\mathbf{2 4 5}(\mathbf{1 0 0})$ |
| Total |  |
| NOTE: Open text responses were classified into the above categories |  |

### 3.2. Sexual partners and practices

### 3.2.1. Sex with women

The great majority of respondents (94\%) reported that they had ever had sex with a woman; $53 \%$ had done so in the preceding six months (Table 14). As expected, lesbian respondents were most likely (61\%) to report recent sex with a woman, and bisexual respondents least likely (28\%). Respondents who reported sex with a woman in the preceding six months were most likely to report one sexual partner ( $82 \%$; Table 15); they were as likely to report having no sex in the preceding four week (33\%) as having had sex between two and five times (32\%; Table 16).

| Table 14: Last had sex with a woman, by sexual identity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lesbian | Bisexual | Queer/Other | Not reported | Total |  |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |  |
| Never | $3(2.0)$ | $5(10.0)$ | $3(6.7)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $11(4.5)$ |  |
| Over 6 months ago | $52(34.9)$ | $31(62.0)$ | $18(40.0)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $101(41.2)$ |  |
| In the past 6 months | $91(61.1)$ | $14(28.0)$ | $23(51.1)$ | $1(100.0)$ | $129(52.7)$ |  |
| Not reported | $3(2.0)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $1(2.2)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $4(1.6)$ |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 4 9}(\mathbf{1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 ( 1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{4 5}(\mathbf{1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{1 ( 1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 5 ( 1 0 0 )}$ |  |


| Table 15: Number of sexual partners in the preceding six months, by sexual identity |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lesbian | Bisexual | Queer/Other | Not reported | Total |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| One | $79(87.8)$ | $11(78.6)$ | $14(60.9)$ | $1(100.0)$ | $105(82.0)$ |
| $2-5$ | $8(8.9)$ | $2(14.3)$ | $8(34.8)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $18(14.1)$ |
| $>5$ | $2(2.2)$ | $1(7.1)$ | $1(4.3)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $4(3.1)$ |
| Not reported | $1(1.1)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $1(0.8)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{9 0}(\mathbf{1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{1 4}(\mathbf{1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{2 3}(\mathbf{1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 8 ( 1 0 0 )}$ |
| NOTE: Table only includes respondents who reported sex with a woman in the preceding 6 months |  |  |  |  |  |


| Table 16: Number of times women had sex with |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| a woman in the past $\mathbf{4}$ weeks |  |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| 0 | $42(32.8)$ |
| 1 | $21(16.4)$ |
| $2-5$ | $41(32.0)$ |
| $6-10$ | $14(10.9)$ |
| $11+$ | $8(6.3)$ |
| Not reported | $2(1.6)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 2 8}(\mathbf{1 0 0})$ |
| NOTE: Table only includes respondents who reported sex with a <br> woman in the preceding 6 months |  |

### 3.2.2. Sex with men

Seventy six percent of respondents reported they had ever had sex with a man; $16 \%$ in the last 6 months. Bisexual ( $96 \%$ ) and queer and other non-heterosexual identifying ( $84 \%$ ) respondents were more likely to have ever had sex with a man compared to lesbian respondents (66\%). The fact that a majority of lesbian respondents have a sexual history that includes men is perhaps familiar and unremarkable to members of LGBTQ communities. However, health service providers, policy makers and those designing STI prevention programs need to be aware that a significant proportion of women and non-binary people who do not identify as heterosexual are having sex with men, and consider the reach of their programs. LBQ women and non-binary people may not respond to health promotion campaigns directed at assumed heterosexual audiences.

Seventy three percent of respondents said they had ever had sex with a man they believed to be heterosexual (Table 17), while 30\% said they had ever had sex with a man they believed to be gay or bisexual (Table 21). Of the 36 respondents who reported sex with a heterosexual man in the last 6 months, $86 \%$ had had any vaginal or anal intercourse without a condom; $44 \%$ had done so often. Of the 21 respondents who reported sex with a gay or bisexual man in the last 6 months, $57 \%$ had had any vaginal or anal intercourse without a condom; $14 \%$ had done so often. We do not know if the sex reported was with cis or trans men as the SWASH survey does not ask respondents (or allow them to indicate) the specific gender experience of their partners.

| Table 17: When respondents last had sex with a heterosexual man, by sexual identity |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lesbian | Bisexual | Queer/Other | Not reported | Total |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| Never | $55(36.9)$ | $3(6.0)$ | $7(15.6)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $65(26.5)$ |
| Over 6 months ago | $94(63.1)$ | $24(48.0)$ | $24(53.3)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $142(58.0)$ |
| In the past 6 months | $0(0.0)$ | $23(46.0)$ | $13(28.9)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $36(14.7)$ |
| Not reported | $0(0.0)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $1(2.2)$ | $1(100.0)$ | $2(0.8)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 4 9}(\mathbf{1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 ( 1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{4 5}(\mathbf{1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{1 ( 1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 5 ( 1 0 0 )}$ |

Table 18: When respondents last had sex with a gay or bisexual man, by sexual identity

|  | Lesbian | Bisexual | Queer/Other | Not reported | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| Never | $127(85.2)$ | $26(52.0)$ | $17(37.8)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $170(69.4)$ |
| Over 6 months ago | $21(14.1)$ | $20(40.0)$ | $12(26.7)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $53(21.6)$ |
| In the past 6 months | $1(0.7)$ | $4(8.0)$ | $16(35.5)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $21(8.6)$ |
| Not reported | $0(0.0)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $1(100.0)$ | $1(0.4)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 4 9}(\mathbf{1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 ( 1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{4 5}(\mathbf{1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{1 ( 1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 5 ( 1 0 0 )}$ |

### 3.2.3. Sexual practices

Among the $53 \%$ of respondents who had had sex with a woman in the preceding six months, the most common sexual practice was manual sex (involving hands and genitals; Table 19). Stimulation of the external genitals was practised by only a few more respondents than sex with the fingers or hand inside the vagina. Most respondents also practised oral sex (cunnilingus), and of those $97 \%$ had both given and received. Just over half ( $53 \%$ ) reported having used a sex toy. Anal practices were less common ( $26 \%$ ), with manual stimulation (20\%) a more common practice than oral stimulation (rimming; 8\%) or the use of sex toys (7\%). We do not know if the sex reported was with cis or trans women as the SWASH survey does not ask respondents (or allow them to indicate) the specific gender experience of their partners.

Sixteen percent of respondents reported having been involved in 'S/M dominance/bondage' (i.e. sadomasochism or slave-mistress encounters) without or with blood (i.e. practices such as cutting, piercing, whipping or fisting; Table 20). Seven percent of respondents reported they had had group sex in the preceding six months; of those reporting group sex $88 \%$ said this had involved a woman (Table 21). Ten percent of respondents reported they had ever done sex work (Table 22).

| Table 19: Sexual practices with a woman in the past 6 months |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| Fingers/hand on external genitals | $124(96.9)$ |
| Fingers/hand inside vagina | $117(91.4)$ |
| Fingers/hand inside anus | $26(20.3)$ |
| Oral sex (mouth on partner's genitals) | $104(81.3)$ |
| Oral sex (mouth on respondent's genitals) | $99(77.3)$ |
| Rimming (mouth on partner's anus) | $10(7.8)$ |
| Rimming (mouth on respondent's anus) | $11(8.6)$ |
| Sex toy used on external genitals | $61(47.7)$ |
| Sex toy used inside vagina | $63(49.2)$ |
| Sex toy used inside anus | 9 (7.0) |
| NOTE: Summary table; adds up to more than $100 \%$ because respondents could be in more than one <br> category; only includes respondents who reported sex with a woman in the past 6 months |  |


| Table 20: Experience of S/M dominance/bondage in the <br> past 6 months |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| Yes | $40(16.3)$ |
| - with blood | $5(2.0)$ |
| No | $199(81.2)$ |
| Not reported | $6(2.4)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 4 5}(100)$ |


| Table 21: Group sex in the past $\mathbf{6}$ months |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Group sex which included: | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| A woman | $15(6.1)$ |
| A straight or heterosexual man | $8(3.3)$ |
| A gay or bisexual man | $6(2.4)$ |
| BDSM ${ }^{1}$ no blood | $7(2.9)$ |
| BDSM $^{2}$ with blood | $2(0.8)$ |
| Any group sex | $\mathbf{1 7}(6.9)$ |
| NOTE: Summary table; adds up to more than 100\% because respondents could be <br> in more than one category. <br> (1) BDSM is bondage, dominance or sadomasochism or slave-mistress encounters <br> (2) Practices such as cutting, piercing, whipping or fisting |  |


| Table 22: Sex work |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| Never | $221(90.2)$ |
| Over 6 months ago | $18(7.3)$ |
| In last 6 months | $6(2.4)$ |
| Not reported | $0(0.0)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 4 5}(\mathbf{1 0 0 )}$ |

### 3.2.4. Sexual relationships

Forty five percent of respondents were in a regular sexual relationship with a woman, 10\% with a man and $40 \%$ were not in a regular sexual relationship (Table 23). We do not know if respondents are reporting relationships with cis or trans people as the SWASH survey does not ask respondents (or allow them to indicate) the specific gender experience of their partners. The most common relationship length was over five years ( $53 \%$; Table 24).

Nineteen per cent of respondents reported they had had a casual partner(s) in the preceding six months; $16 \%$ reported casual sex with a female partner (Table 25). Of those reporting recent casual sex who were also in a regular relationship ( $n=24$ ), $83 \%$ were in a relationship of longer than 6 months, that is, their casual partner was in addition to their regular partner.

| Table 23: Current sexual relationship with a regular partner |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | 2014 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| No | $97(39.6)$ |
| With a woman | $109(44.5)$ |
| With a man | $24(9.8)$ |
| Poly/Multiple partners | $15(6.1)$ |
| Not reported | $0(0.0)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 4 5}(\mathbf{1 0 0})$ |


| Table 24: Length of regular relationship |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| Less than 6 months | $10(6.8)$ |
| 6-11 months | $10(6.8)$ |
| 1-2 years | $23(15.5)$ |
| 3-5 years | $26(17.6)$ |
| Over 5 years | $79(53.4)$ |
| Not reported | $0(0.0)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 4 8}(\mathbf{1 0 0})$ |
| NOTE: Table only includes respondents who reported being in a regular relationship. |  |


| Table 25: Casual sexual partners in past 6 months |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| No | $198(80.8)$ |
| Yes, with women | $30(12.2)$ |
| Yes, with men | $9(3.7)$ |
| Yes, with both | $8(3.3)$ |
| Not reported | $0(0.0)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 4 5}(\mathbf{1 0 0})$ |

### 3.3. Tobacco, alcohol and other drug use

### 3.3.1. Tobacco use

Twenty eight percent of respondents were current tobacco smokers (Table 26), with $69 \%$ of smokers smoking daily. Among 16-34 year olds, smoking was $42 \%$. Rates of smoking remain higher among this population group when compared with the general population, especially among younger people. In comparison, in 2017, $12 \%$ of women in NSW smoked, and $13 \%$ of those aged 16-34. ${ }^{5}$

| Table 26: Smoking status, by age group |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $16-34 y r s$ | $35-44 y r s$ | $45+$ yrs | Total |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| Current smoker | $22(42.3)$ | $17(29.3)$ | $31(23.0)$ | $70(28.6)$ |
| Ex-smoker | $9(17.3)$ | $19(32.8)$ | $55(40.7)$ | $83(33.9)$ |
| Never smoked | $21(40.4)$ | $22(37.9)$ | $49(36.3)$ | $92(37.6)$ |
| Not reported | $0(0.0)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $0(0.0)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 2 ( 1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{5 8 ( 1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 5}(\mathbf{1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 5}(\mathbf{1 0 0 )}$ |

### 3.3.2. Alcohol

The majority of respondents (83\%) reported drinking alcohol. Of NSW women, 63.5\% drink alcohol. ${ }^{5}$ Table 27 illustrates the distribution of drinking frequency. There was little difference in drinking patterns across the age categories apart from daily drinking, where younger drinkers were the least likely to report drinking daily (6\%), followed by 35-44 years olds (9\%) and $45+$ year olds (13\%).

The National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) recommends drinking no more than two standard drinks on any day to reduce the lifetime risk of harm from alcoholrelated disease or injury. ${ }^{6}$ We asked respondents: on a day when you drink alcohol, how many standard drinks do you usually have? Thirty nine percent of respondents ( $46 \%$ of those who drank) and 50\% of 16-34 year olds ( $63 \%$ of younger drinkers) reported they usually drank at levels that exceed this recommendation (Table 28).

The NHMRC recommends drinking no more than four standard drinks on a single occasion to reduce the risk of alcohol-related injury arising from that single occasion. ${ }^{6}$ Using data from the same question about how many standard drinks respondents usually have, $11 \%$ of all respondents ( $14 \%$ of those who drank) reported that they usually drank at levels that exceeded this recommendation (Table 28). Fourteen percent of respondents ( $17 \%$ of those who drank) reported drinking five or more drinks ('binge drinking') weekly or more often in the past six months (Table 29). Younger respondents aged 16-34 years ( $56 \%$ ) were more likely to report binge drinking once a month or more in the last 6 months, compared to 35-44 years olds (32\%) or $45+$ year olds (27\%).

| Table 27: Frequency of drinking alcohol |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| Never | $40(16.3)$ |
| Less often than weekly | $86(35.1)$ |
| 1 or 2 days a week | $35(14.3)$ |
| 3 or 4 days a week | $31(12.7)$ |
| 5 or 6 days a week | $27(11.0)$ |
| Every day | $25(10.2)$ |
| Not reported | $\mathbf{1}(0.4)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 4 5}(\mathbf{1 0 0 )}$ |


| Table 28: Number of drinks consumed per occasion |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| 1 or 2 drinks | $91(37.1)$ |
| 3 or 4 drinks | $67(27.3)$ |
| 5 to 8 drinks | $23(9.4)$ |
| 9 or more drinks | $5(2.0)$ |
| Not reported | $19(7.8)$ |
| Non-drinker | $40(16.3)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 4 5}(\mathbf{1 0 0})$ |


| Table 29: Frequency of drinking 5 or more on a single |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| occasion in past 6 months | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
|  | $52(21.2)$ |
| Never | $66(26.9)$ |
| Once or twice | $32(13.1)$ |
| About once a month | $22(9.0)$ |
| About once a week | $12(4.9)$ |
| More than once a week | $0(0.0)$ |
| Every day | $21(8.6)$ |
| Not reported | $40(16.3)$ |
| Non-drinker | $\mathbf{2 4 5}(100)$ |
| Total |  |

### 3.3.3. Illicit drugs

In the preceding six months, $59 \%$ of respondents had used any illicit drug (Table 30); this is markedly higher than the $45 \%$ reported in the main SWASH sample. The most commonly reported drugs used were natural cannabis ( $43 \%$; compared to $30 \%$ in the main SWASH sample), Benzos / Valium ( $25 \%$; compared to $18 \%$ in the main SWASH sample), and ecstasy ( $21 \%$; compared to $16 \%$ in the main SWASH sample). When invited to list other drugs they used, respondents mainly reported pain medications (codeine, OxyContin) and mushrooms. In response to the question 'Have you ever injected drugs?' $12 \%$ of respondents indicated that they had ever done so (higher than the $7 \%$ reported in the main SWASH sample).

Rates of illicit drug use remain several times higher among the SWASH NR-MNC sample than reported for the general community. The NDSHS 2016 found $13 \%$ of women reported using any illicit drug in the past 12 months, compared to $59 \%$ in NR-MNC respondents in the shorter time frame of 6 months. Echoing these disparities, the NDSHS found homosexual and bisexual people (not disaggregated by gender) generally reported recent illicit drug use several times higher than heterosexual people, most notably ecstasy and meth/ amphetamines ( 5.8 times), cocaine ( 3.7 times), and cannabis (3.2). ${ }^{7}$

Respondents indicated whether selected drug types were usually taken at home, at a friend's home or private party, a public venue or party, or before or during sex. Table 31 shows the most common context for each drug: natural cannabis and benzos/Valium were more likely to be consumed in private, ecstasy and methamphetamines at public venues, while cocaine was most likely consumed at a private venue or public party. A small number of respondents (12\%) reported drug use during sex, cocaine and cannabis were the most likely illicit drug consumed in this context. The patterns of drug use closely mirror those reported in the main SWASH sample.

Seventeen percent ( $n=41$ ) of respondents said they had ever sought help for a drug and/ or alcohol issue. The most common support sought was counsellor/psychologist (71\%; Table 32), specialist drug and alcohol services (54\%), friends/relatives ( $42 \%$ ), self-help group (37\%) and GP (32\%). There were some differences to the main SWASH sample with specialist drug and alcohol services and friends/relativesmore commonly accessed, and GPs and LGBT servicesless commonly accessed; these differences likely reflect local conditions such as availability and/or confidentiality concerns. Forty one respondents told us which of these supports they had found the most helpful: counsellor/psychologist ( $20 \%$ ), self-help groups ( $20 \%$ ), specialist drug and alcohol services (17\%), friends/relatives (12\%), and GP (7\%).

| Table 30: Illicit drug use in the past $\mathbf{6}$ months |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| Natural cannabis | $105(42.9)$ |
| Synthetic cannabis | $8(3.3)$ |
| Ecstasy | $51(20.8)$ |
| Methamphetamine | $22(9.0)$ |
| Cocaine | $31(12.7)$ |
| Benzos / Valium | $62(25.3)$ |
| Amyl / poppers | $9(3.7)$ |
| LSD / trips | $20(8.2)$ |
| Special K/ ketamine | $10(4.1)$ |
| GHB | $0(0.0)$ |
| New/emerging psychostimulants | $3(1.2)$ |
| Other drugs | $25(10.2)$ |
| Any of the above | $\mathbf{1 4 5}(59.2)$ |
| NOTE: Summary table; adds up to more than $100 \%$ <br> more than one category. |  |

Table 31: Context of recent drug use, for women reporting use of each drug type

|  | Home | Friends home / <br> Private party | Public venue/ <br> party | Before or during <br> sex |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cannabis (natural) | $82(78.1)$ | $56(53.3)$ | $17(16.2)$ | $17(16.2)$ |
| Ecstasy | $12(23.5)$ | $22(43.1)$ | $38(74.5)$ | $7(13.7)$ |
| Methamphetamine | $10(45.5)$ | $9(40.9)$ | $12(54.5)$ | $3(13.6)$ |
| Benzos / Valium | $54(87.1)$ | $5(8.1)$ | $2(3.2)$ | $2(3.2)$ |
| Cocaine | $7(22.6)$ | $22(71.0)$ | $15(48.4)$ | $5(16.1)$ |
| Alcohol | $136(66.7)$ | $101(49.5)$ | $88(43.1)$ | $23(11.3)$ |

[^0]| Table 32: Drug/alcohol help-seeking behaviour |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| GP | $13(31.7)$ |
| Counsellor/psychologist | $29(70.7)$ |
| Helpline | $5(12.2)$ |
| Specialist drug \& alcohol service | $22(53.7)$ |
| LGBTQ service | $1(2.4)$ |
| Community organisation | $7(17.1)$ |
| Friends/relatives | $17(41.5)$ |
| Self-help groups (AA/NA/SMART) | $15(36.6)$ |
| Hospital/ED | $3(7.3)$ |
| Online/apps | $5(12.2)$ |
| Other support | $3(7.3)$ |
| NOTE: Summary table; adds up to more than $100 \%$ <br> more than one category. |  |

### 3.4. Health status and behaviour

### 3.4.1. Relationships with doctors

The majority of respondents reported they had a regular doctor (65\%) or regular health practice ( $20 \%$; Table 33). The vast majority of respondents with a regular doctor/health practice reported being satisfied or very satisfied ( $81 \%$; Table 34). Respondents who were out to their regular GP were more likely to be satisfied or very satisfied ( $84 \%, p<0.001$ ) than those who were not out ( $72 \%$ ). That is, while respondents were largely satisfied with the service they received, disclosing sexuality appeared to be associated with a more positive evaluation of that service/relationship.

| Table 33: Regular doctor |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| No regular doctor | $39(15.9)$ |
| Yes, regular GP | $158(64.5)$ |
| Yes, regular health practice | $48(19.6)$ |
| Not reported | $0(0.0)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 4 5}(\mathbf{1 0 0})$ |


| Table 34: Satisfaction with regular doctor/health practice |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| Very satisfied | $77(37.4)$ |
| Satisfied | $89(43.2)$ |
| Neither | $23(11.2)$ |
| Unsatisfied | $4(1.9)$ |
| Very unsatisfied | $4(1.9)$ |
| Not reported | $9(4.4)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 4 5}(\mathbf{1 0 0})$ |
| NOTE: Table only includes respondents who reported having a regular GP or health <br> practice |  |

### 3.4.2. General health

The majority of respondents rated their general health as excellent/very good/good (72\%); $28 \%$ reported their health as fair/poor (Table 35). There was no significant variation by age. Seventy respondents (29\%) said they had a chronic (long-term) illness or disability.

| Table 35: General health, by age group |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $16-34 y r s$ | $35-44 y r s$ | $45+$ yrs | Total |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| Poor/Fair | $16(30.8)$ | $14(24.1)$ | $38(28.1)$ | $68(27.8)$ |
| Good/Very good | $20(38.5)$ | $20(34.5)$ | $52(38.5)$ | $92(37.6)$ |
| Excellent | $16(30.8)$ | $24(41.4)$ | $45(33.3)$ | $85(34.7)$ |
| Not reported | $0(0.0)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $0(0.0)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 2 ( 1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{5 8 ( 1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 5}(\mathbf{1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 5 ( 1 0 0 )}$ |

### 3.4.3. Height and weight

We use height and weight to calculate a body mass index (BMI) for each respondent. The BMI is an internationally recognised standard for classifying overweight and obesity in adult populations, and is one of the World Health Organisation's 100 Core Health Indicators ${ }^{8}$. It is an imperfect measure as people tend to overestimate height and underestimate weight when self-reporting, ${ }^{9}$ and it does not recognise differences in height and weight proportions which may be related to cultural heritage. We acknowledge understandable concern among members of LGBTQ communities about a focus on body weight, and in particular on using normative ideals of body shape. While $35 \%$ of the sample was within "healthy weight" range, $55 \%$ reported height and weight that placed them above this (Table 42).

| Table 36: Body mass index |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| Below range | $4(1.6)$ |
| Within range | $86(35.1)$ |
| Above range | $71(29.0)$ |
| Higher range | $63(25.7)$ |
| Not reported | $21(8.6)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 4 5}(100)$ |
| NOTE: cut off scores were Below range $=<18.50$, Within range $=18.50-$ <br> $24.99, ~ A b o v e ~ r a n g e ~$$=25-<29.99$, Higher range $=>30$ |  |

### 3.4.4. Mental health

We use the Kessler 6 (K6) to measure non-specific psychological distress (e.g. feeling nervous, hopeless, restless, worthless) in the preceding four weeks. ${ }^{10}$ Forty one percent reported high or very high distress (Table 37). HealthStats NSW use the K10, ${ }^{11}$ and while these measures cannot be directly compared, the categories are broadly equivalent: in 2017, $4 \%$ of women in NSW reported very high levels of distress, and $8 \%$ reported high distress. ${ }^{5}$

Reflecting the levels of acute distress reported, $28 \%$ said that in the preceding 12 months they had felt that life was not worth living (suicidal ideation; Table 38) and $12 \%$ said they had deliberately hurt themselves or done something they knew might harm or kill them (selfharm; Table 39). A majority of respondents ( $65 \%$ ) had accessed mental health services in the last five years (Table 40), and $46 \%$ had received a diagnosis of depression, anxiety disorder or other mental health disorder (Table 41).

Psychological distress among 16-34 year olds is alarming; 65\% reported high/very high acute distress (Table 37). Looking to 2017 NSW HealthStats, where we have collapsed their younger age categories to make them equivalent to ours; among 16-34 year old women in NSW, $7 \%$ report very high and $16 \%$ high mental distress. ${ }^{5}$ Over the preceding 12 months, 28\% of our younger respondents had felt that life was not worth living and $12 \%$ had deliberately hurt themselves or done something they knew might harm or kill them. These are higher levels than reported by 18-23 year old women in the Australian Longitudinal Survey of Women's Health, where $13 \%$ reported self- harm in the last 12 months and $31 \%$ reported suicidal ideation. ${ }^{12}$ A majority of our younger respondents ( $71 \%$ ) had accessed mental health services
in the last five years (Table 40), and 62\% had received a diagnosis of depression, anxiety disorder or other mental health disorder (Table 41).

The self-harm question ("have you deliberately hurt yourself or done something you knew might harm or kill you") was drawn from the Australian Longitudinal Survey of Women's Health. ${ }^{13}$ It covers self-harm with suicidal intent and non-suicidal self-harm and relies on respondents' self-definition of self-harm. We have heard anecdotally of SWASH respondents discussing how to interpret this question, whether to include for example drug use or snapping yourself with an elastic band. We do not know how these respondents ultimately responded to the question. However researchers using this question have argued that there is good evidence that people understand what is meant by self-harm. ${ }^{13}$

| Table 37: Kessler 6 measure of acute psychological distress, by age group |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $16-34$ yrs | $35-44$ yrs | $45+$ yrs | Total |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| Low distress | $10(19.2)$ | $17(29.3)$ | $56(41.5)$ | $83(33.9)$ |
| Medium distress | $7(13.5)$ | $18(31.0)$ | $30(22.2)$ | $55(22.4)$ |
| High distress | $13(25.0)$ | $13(22.4)$ | $30(22.2)$ | $56(22.9)$ |
| Very high distress | $21(40.2)$ | $10(17.2)$ | $14(10.4)$ | $45(18.4)$ |
| Not reported | $1(1.9)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $5(3.7)$ | $6(2.4)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 2 ( 1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{5 8}(\mathbf{1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 5}(\mathbf{1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 5 ( 1 0 0 )}$ |
| NOTE: cut off scores were Low = 0-3, Medium = 4-7, High = 8-12, Very high = 13+4 |  |  |  |  |


| Table 38: Have you ever felt that life was not worth living? |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $16-34$ yrs | $35-44$ yrs | $45+$ yrs | Total |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| Yes | $43(82.7)$ | $44(75.9)$ | $83(61.5)$ | $170(69.4)$ |
| in the last 12 months | $22(42.3)$ | $18(31.0)$ | $28(20.7)$ | $68(27.8)$ |
| No | $9(17.3)$ | $14(24.1)$ | $52(38.5)$ | $75(30.6)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 4}(\mathbf{1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{5 8 ( 1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 5}(\mathbf{1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 5 ( 1 0 0 )}$ |


| Table 39: Have you ever deliberately harmed yourself? |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $16-34 \mathrm{yrs}$ | $35-44 \mathrm{yrs}$ | $45+\mathrm{yrs}$ | Total |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| Yes | $33(63.5)$ | $29(50.0)$ | $34(25.2)$ | $96(39.2)$ |
| in the last 12 months | $15(28.8)$ | $7(12.1)$ | $7(5.2)$ | $29(11.8)$ |
| No | $19(36.5)$ | $29(50.0)$ | $100(74.1)$ | $148(60.4)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 2 ( 1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{5 8 ( 1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 5}(\mathbf{1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 5 ( 1 0 0 )}$ |


| Table 40: Ever accessed counselling or psychological services |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $16-34$ yrs | $35-44$ yrs | $45+$ yrs | Total |  |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |  |
| No | $10(19.2)$ | $9(15.5)$ | $17(12.6)$ | $36(14.7)$ |  |
| Yes, in the past 5 years | $37(71.2)$ | $38(65.5)$ | $84(62.2)$ | $159(64.9)$ |  |
| Yes, over 5 years ago | $5(9.6)$ | $11(19.0)$ | $33(24.4)$ | $49(20.0)$ |  |
| Not reported | $0(0.0)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $1(0.8)$ | $1(0.4)$ |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 2 ( 1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{5 8 ( 1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 5}(\mathbf{1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 5 ( 1 0 0 )}$ |  |

Table 41: Ever diagnosed (self-report) with anxiety, depression or other mental health disorder

|  | $16-24$ yrs | $35-44$ yrs | $45+\mathrm{yrs}$ | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| No | $15(28.8)$ | $26(44.8)$ | $50(37.0)$ | $91(37.1)$ |
| Yes, in past 5 years | $32(61.5)$ | $21(36.2)$ | $56(41.5)$ | $109(44.5)$ |
| Yes, over 5 years ago | $5(9.6)$ | $11(19.0)$ | $29(21.5)$ | $45(18.4)$ |
| Not reported | $0(0.0)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $0(0.0)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 2 ( 1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{5 8 ( 1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 5}(\mathbf{1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 5 ( 1 0 0 )}$ |

### 3.4.5. Preventive health practices

From 1st December 2017, the National Cervical Screening Program changed to recommend the age at which screening starts increase from 18 to 25 years (ending at age 74 years) and the time between screening tests increase from two to five years. The Pap smear test (looking for physical changes indicating cancer) was replaced by a Cervical Screening Test (CST; testing for the Human Papilloma Virus (HPV) that may lead to cancer). Anyone who had previously had a Pap smear test is due to attend for the new CST within two years, after which they will be on a five-year cycle. ${ }^{15}$ The new CST began a few months before SWASH was conducted; we continued to ask about Pap smears, apply the two-year rule and not remove anyone due to age (too young/old) as the overwhelmingly majority of respondents would have been screened under the previous program. ${ }^{16}$ We also did not exclude anyone who self-reported that they did not have/no longer had a cervix, because our knowledge of this fact is incomplete for the whole sample. There may be a slight overestimation in the proportion who are overdue for screening.

Table 42 shows that $46 \%$ of respondents were overdue for screening - that is, they were last screened more than three years ago, never had screening or were not sure when they last had a Pap smear. The proportion of women in NSW who had had at least one Pap smear test in the preceding 3 years (the 3-year participation) for the period 2015-2016 (the latest available) was $68 \% .{ }^{17}$ The equivalent screening rate for our respondents aged 20-69 years is very similar: $66 \%$. However, respondents who had never had sex with a man were 2.6 times more likely to have never been screened ( $20 \%$ compared to $13 \%$ who had ever had sex with a man; Table 42). The main reasons respondents gave for not having had a Pap smear in the last three years were, being busy (17\%), the awkward nature of the test ( $25 \%$ ), and fear
of the test (29\%; Table 43). In response to an invitation to provide other reasons the most common provided were: not having a cervix or having had a hysterectomy (18\%); being too young or too old (6\%); choice/unsure if needed/had never occurred to them/never invited or told by a doctor that it was not necessary (10\%); and trauma (e.g. sexual abuse or past experiences of prejudice around body shape or sex worker status), pain (e.g. vaginismus) or the lack of a safe inclusive service ( $2 \%$ ).

Under the new National Cervical Screening Program, people are able to self-collect their CST in a clinical setting (i.e. not at home) if they are aged 30 years or older and at least two years overdue (that is, four years since their last test) or have never been screened. ${ }^{18}$ Self-collection is less accurate than a test conducted by a clinician using a speculum. However, for people who may be put off seeking CST due to past experiences of trauma or pain, anticipated trauma or pain, or fear of discrimination including around sexuality, gender identity or presentation, self-collection may be a valuable access option. We asked respondents if they would prefer to take their own sample and $44 \%$ said yes (Table 44).

BreastScreen NSW recommend a free mammogram to screen for breast cancer every two years for all women aged 50 to 74 (we have chosen to reflect the gendered language used by Breast Screen in their eligibility information). Women aged $40-49$ or over 74 can also access a mammogram free of change but they are not directly invited. We asked respondents aged 40 years and older if they had ever had a mammogram: 72\% had. However, $56 \%$ were overdue - that is they were last screened more than two years ago, never had a mammogram (25\%) or were not sure if they had been screened (Table 45). According to HealthStats NSW, 58\% of women aged 50-69 years old in the Mid North Coast Local Health District and 56\% of women in the Northern NSW Local Health District had received a mammogram in the preceding two years. ${ }^{5}$ The equivalent screening rate for SWASH respondents aged 50-69 years is $54 \%$. Other Australian studies asking LBQ women about mammography report rates are slightly higher or slightly lower than the general population. ${ }^{19,20}$ ACON's ongoing breast health campaign Talk Touch Test has been promoting breast cancer awareness and working to bring the BreastScreen Bus to community events and expand access to trans and gender diverse people. ${ }^{21}$

Two thirds of respondents had ever had a test for an STI other than HIV; 14\% had done so in the previous six months (Table 46). Echoing the findings on Pap smears, respondents who had ever had sex with a man were 1.3 times more likely to have had an STI test (70\%) compared to those who had never had sex with a man ( $53 \%, \mathrm{p}<0.05$ ). Of those ever tested for an STI, 35\% had ever received an STI diagnosis. An STI diagnosis was more likely among respondents who reported ever having had sex with a man (39\%) compared to those who had never had sex with a man ( $19 \%, \mathrm{~ns}$ ). In comparison to STI testing, the proportion of respondents who reported ever having had an HIV test was 45\% (markedly higher than 35\% in the SWASH main sample). Surprisingly, respondents who had ever had sex with a gay or bisexual man were slightly less likely to have ever had a HIV test ( $41 \%$ ) compared to those who had never had sex with a gay or bisexual man ( $46 \%$ ).

Table 42: Timing of last Pap smear, by experience of sex with men

|  | Never had sex <br> with a man | Ever had sex <br> with a man | Not reported | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Less than 3 years ago | $29(49.2)$ | $129(69.7)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $158(64.5)$ |
| More than 3 years ago | $13(22.0)$ | $38(20.5)$ | $1(100.0)$ | $52(21.2)$ |
| Never | $12(20.3)$ | $14(7.6)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $26(10.6)$ |
| Not sure | $2(3.4)$ | $2(1.1)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $4(1.6)$ |
| Not reported | $3(5.1)$ | $2(1.1)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $5(2.0)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 9}(\mathbf{1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 5 ( 1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{1 ( 1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 5 ( 1 0 0 )}$ |


| Table 4 4: Reasons why respondents had not had a Pap smear in past 3 years |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| Being busy/forgetting when your next test is due | $15(17.2)$ |
| Embarrassment/awkward nature of the test | $22(25.3)$ |
| Fear of Pap tests | $25(28.7)$ |
| Other: No cervix | $16(18.4)$ |
| Other: Age | $5(5.7)$ |
| Other: Choice/Unsure if needed/advised not required | $9(10.3)$ |
| Other: Trauma/pain | $2(2.3)$ |
| NOTE: Table only includes respondents who had not had a Pap smear in the past 3 years. |  |


| Table 44: Prefer to self collect HPV test? |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| Yes | $108(44.1)$ |
| No | $56(22.9)$ |
| Unsure of preference | $76(31.0)$ |
| Not reported | $5(2.0)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 4 5}(\mathbf{1 0 0})$ |


| Table 45: Timing of last mammogram |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| Less than 2 years ago | $71(42.8)$ |
| $2-3$ years ago | $20(12.0)$ |
| $3-5$ years ago | $15(9.0)$ |
| More than 5 years ago | $14(8.4)$ |
| Never | $42(25.3)$ |
| Not sure | $2(1.2)$ |
| Not reported | $2(1.2)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 6 6}(100)$ |
| NOTE: Table only includes respondents aged 40 years and older |  |


| Table 46: Timing of last STI test other than HIV, by experience of sex with men |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never had sex <br> with a man | Ever had sex <br> with a man | Not reported | Total |  |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |  |
| Never | $28(47.5)$ | $55(29.7)$ | $1(100)$ | $84(34.3)$ |  |
| Yes, over 6 months ago | $24(40.5)$ | $104(56.2)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $128(52.2)$ |  |
| Yes, in the past 6 months | $7(11.9)$ | $26(14.1)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $33(13.5)$ |  |
| Not reported | $0(0.0)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $0(0.0)$ |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 9}(\mathbf{1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 5 ( 1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{1 ( 1 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 5 ( 1 0 0 )}$ |  |

### 3.5. Experiences of violence and abuse

### 3.5.1. Intimate partner violence

Sixty four percent of respondents reported they had ever been in a relationship where a partner had physically or emotionally abused them; 36\% reported experiencing intimate partner violence (IPV) from a female partner (Table 47).

| Table 47: Abuse experienced in an intimate <br> relationship |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| Never | $88(35.9)$ |
| Yes, with a male only | $67(27.3)$ |
| Yes, with a female only | $66(26.9)$ |
| Yes, with both | $23(9.4)$ |
| Not reported | $1(0.4)$ |
| Total | $245(100)$ |

### 3.5.2. Anti-lesbian, gay, bi, trans and queer behaviour

Respondents were asked whether they had experienced any of six specified anti-LGBTQ acts against them in the preceding 12 months (Table 48). Thirty four percent of respondents had experienced some form of abuse or harassment. The most common experience was verbal abuse or harassment. The pattern of harassment was similar to the main SWASH sample ( $40 \%$ had experienced any harassment), where verbal abuse and harassment has varied over time and is now at back similar rates to those reported in 2006/2008. No respondents had reported abusive behaviour to police; this points to a need for further work to strengthen the relationship between LGBTQ communities and the local police force.

| Table 48: Anti- LGBTQ behaviour experienced in the past $\mathbf{1 2}$ months |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |
| Verbal abuse or harassment | $77(31.4)$ |
| Being pushed or shoved | $11(4.5)$ |
| Being bashed | $0(0.0)$ |
| Physical threat or intimidation | $27(11.0)$ |
| Refusal of service | $7(2.9)$ |
| Refused employment or promotion | $10(4.1)$ |
| Any of the above | $\mathbf{8 3}(33.9)$ |

## 4. Conclusion

SWASH NR-MNC provides a snapshot of the health and wellbeing of community-engaged lesbian, bisexual, queer (LBQ) and other non-heterosexual identifying women and non-binary people. It highlights several areas of particular concern, echoing the findings in the main SWASH report.

Despite the survey's breadth, we are not collecting information on all salient health issues. In particular, presentations at community forums and professional meetings have raised questions about the use of prescribed medication for psychological distress and use of mental health or physical health services. SWASH is a convenience survey rather than a random sample, but recruitment is done in settings not specifically related to the health outcomes under study. People come to LGBTQ community groups or events for social reasons, not because they have health or other problems. This means that the sample is not skewed towards people with high rates of health difficulties or risk factors. On the other hand, a survey of this sort is not likely to include people who do not wish to associate or engage with LGBTQ communities or who are not drawn to the activities or events on offer.

The SWASH NR-MNC report reflects the features of a generally older and communityattached group of LBQ women and non-binary people, rather than merely those who have had sexual experiences with women, or who do not identify as heterosexual.

SWASH NR-MNC and the main SWASH report provide an unparalleled insight into the health and wellbeing of LBQ women and non-binary people in NSW, indicating findings of particular salience and urgency for those interested in improving the health and wellbeing of this population.
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## 6. Appendix 1: Questionnaire







[^0]:    NOTE: Summary table; adds up to more than $100 \%$ because respondents could be in more than one category; percentages are calculated on proportion of respondents who reported using that drug in the past 6 months.

