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The Sydney Women and Sexual Health (SWASH) survey was first carried out in 1996. It was initiated by workers from two ACON projects, Women Partners of Gay and Bisexual Men and the Gay and Lesbian Injecting Drug Use Project, who were faced with a lack of empirical evidence on which to base their intervention work. While research on same-sexattracted women's health and wellbeing has increased since then, epidemiological data on sexual health, mental heatth, experiences of abuse and violence and behaviours such as screening, illicit drug use, alcohol and smoking that can leave women vulnerable to adverse health outcomes, is still scarce Moreover as long as the inclusion of sexulity questions in large epidemiological surveys remains patchy or data are reported only by sexuality and not by sexuality and gender, SWASH provides a unique and important source of healthrelated information in Australian lesbian, bisexual and queer (LBQ) women

SWASH has been run biennially since 1996 by a collaboration of ACON and researchers at the University of New South Wales (until 2009), and now the University of Sydney (since 2010 ). The survey is regularly revised to reflect the needs of the community and research needs identified through research literature. Over its lifetime, SWASH has become a comprehensive survey of sexual health and wellbeing, violence, mental health and levels of psychological distress, and a number of other important health issues relevant to LBQ women, such as illicit drug use, alcohol consumption, and cancer screening behaviours. Where possible, questions have been used from established national surveys such as the National Drus Strategy Household Survey (NDSHS) the Australian Study of Health and Relationships (ASHR) and the Australan Study of Heath and Reationships (ASHRR, and the report presents results from surveys collected at the Sydney report presents results from surveys collected at the Sydney
Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras Fair Day and other community events and venues during the Sydney Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras seasons in 2006,2008 and 2010.

## 2010 Key Findings

Sample: 964 participants returned valid surveys; $72 \%$ of valid surveys from Sydney Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras Fair Day, $22 \%$ at other Lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans and queer (LGBTQ) social venues and events and $6 \%$ at LGBTQ groups.

Demographics: The age range was 17-81 years (median age 31 years) and $65 \%$ had post-school education. $64 \%$ were employed full-time and $18 \%$ were students. $14 \%$ had dependent children and $13 \%$ were planning children in the coming two years. 43\% lived in the city or Inner West of Sydney, but few lived in the core 'gay' suburbs around Oxford Street in Sydney's Inner East.

Sexual identity: 75\% thought of themselves as lesbian/ dyke/homosexual/gay, $11 \%$ as bisexual, and $9 \%$ as queer, $3 \%$ chose the 'other' category. Most women (63\%) had a regular female partner.

Community engagement: 55\% felt very or mostly connected to the LGBTQ community in their everyday life.

Sexual relations with women: $95 \%$ had ever had sex with a woman; $78 \%$ had done so in the preceding six months. Among women who had had sex with a woman in the preceding six months, $71 \%$ reported one sexual partner.

Sexual relations with men: $59 \%$ had ever had sex with a man; $10 \%$ had done so in the preceding six months. $18 \%$ had ever had sex with a man they knew to be gay or bisexual; 39 women had done so in the preceding six months, 7 of whom often had unprotected sex.

Sex work: $5 \%$ had ever done sex work.
Pap smears: $18 \%$ had never had a Pap smear screen, and a further $11 \%$ had their last screening more than three years ago. Women who had never had sex with a man were most likely to be overdue for screening.

HIV/STI/Hepatitis $\lceil$ screening: Fewer women than ever before (43\%) had been tested for HIV; no women were HIVpositive. $45 \%$ reported ever having had a test for hepatitis C ; of those tested, 4\% were positive

## Knowledge of sexually transmissible infections (STI):

6\% were aware that a person with a cold sore could give a partner genital herpes through oral sex, and $87 \%$ were aware that you can have an STI but not have any symptoms.

Tobacco: $35 \%$ were tobacco smokers, a substantially higher proportion than the general community; smoking was most common in $16-24$ year olds ( $42 \%$ )

Alcohol: 83\% reported drinking alcohol; $50 \%$ consumed more than the NHMRC guidelines recommend to reduce the lifetime isk of alcohol-related disease or injury, while 20\% drank at levels likely to put them at risk of alcohol-related injury on a single drinking occasion. Risky drinking was higher than in the general community.

Illicit drugs: In the preceding six months, $48 \%$ had used one or more illicit druǵs including cannabis (33\%), ecstasy ( $25 \%$ ) and cocaine $(17 \%)$ ) Rates of drug use were much higher than in the general community

Self-reported health status: While most women rated thei physical health as good/very good/excellent, $14 \%$ said their health was poor or fair.

Weight: While 40\% of women had a body mass index (BMI) in the healthy range, nearly as many ( $39 \%$ ) were overweight or obese, and $11 \%$ were underweight.

Psychological health: $8 \%$ of women reported high psychological distress ( (12\% of 16-24 year olds); ; 50\% had accessed psychological services in the past 5 years and $33 \%$ had received a mental health diagnosis.

Experiences of abuse and violence: २२\% had ever experienced sexual coercion by a man, and $7 \%$ had ever experienced sexual coercion by a woman. $29 \%$ had ever experienced domestic violence with a female partner; $54 \%$ of hese women had sought help. $34 \%$ had experienced some kind of anti-LGBTQ behaviour in the past year.

SWASH highlights several areas of physical and mental health concern for LBQ women.

## Recommendations

## Tobacco use

- The rate of smoking among LBQ women is twice the rate of women in the general population; this demands urgent public heath attention.
- Detailed exploration is required to understand why progressively successful anti-smoking campaigns and programs are not proving successful within this group of women. Targeted interventions to prevent young LBQ taking up smoking may be needed.
- Examination of the role and efficacy of smoking cessation programs for LBQ women is necessary.


## Alcohol use

- LBQ women are at a higher risk of lifetime risk of alcoholrelated disease or injury than women in the general community, and are more often drinking at levels that put them at risk of alcohol-related injury on a single drinking occasion.
- Further research is needed to understand the social and cultural context of alcohol use among LBQ women; this knowledge can inform targeted interventions.
- Levels of risky drinking among younger LBQ women demonstrate an urgent need for early interventions. Messages about responsible drinking should be integrated into existing programs delivered by LGBTQ community organisations, while LGBTQ community organisations need to consider the role of alcohol sponsorship of community events.
- While SWASH reports alcohol use there is an urgent need for research on alcohol-related harms and the utilisation of treatment programs among this group.


## Illicit druǵ use

- LBQ women are using illicit druǵs at rates several times higher than women in the general community, demonstrating an urgent need for interventions targeted to LBQ women.

Without a sophisticated understanding of the drivers of illicit drug use in LBQ women, and the conditions under which these practices become problematic and harmful, interventions are unlikely to succeed.

- Research is needed to understand LBQ women's utilisation of and satisfaction with drug treatment programs, as well as treatment outcomes.


## Sexual Health

- Those designing STI prevention programs need to be aware that a significant proportion of women who do not identify as heterosexual are having sex with men and consider the reach of their profiams; LBQ women may not respond to heath promotion campaigns directed at assumed heterosexual audiences.
- STl prevention programs need to address skill development amonǵ LBQ women to support successful negotiation of safe and satisfying sexual relationships with all sexual partners.


## Prevention-related screening

- Efforts to raise awareness of cervical cancer and the need for all women to have Pap screening regularly must continue. The message that a history of sex with men is not a prerequisite for a Pap screen is particularly important.
- STI testing campaigns and resources targéting LBQ women about their sexual health, risks and the need for testing are required.
- The need continues for the development of education and capacity building strategies targeting primary healthcare providers that focus on building their understanding of th screenings needs of LBQ women. This must also include information on creating culturally sensitive environments that encourage open dialogue around sexual health and behaviour, including same-sex-attracted women's sexual activities with men.


## Health indicators

- Public health programs on weight, exercise and diet need to target and be accessible to LBQ women, and sensitively engage with LGBTQ communities around the health impacts of these issues.


## Mental Health

- There is a clear need to assist young women who are disproportionately represented in the high rates of drinking, smoking, illicit drug use and mental health distress within this sample. Programs aimed at improving the social and emotional wellbeing of this group, including strategjes around 'coming out' and self-acceptance, may well prove important to an eventual decline in rates of behaviours that present a health risk.
- Further investigation is required to understand the utilisation of mental health services in this group of women. Questions include: who is providing these services, whether women are receiving the services they desire, and what are the outcomes of treatment for LBQ women.


## Experiences of abuse and violence

- increased capacity is required in the provision of support services around domestic violence to respond to LBQ women and to understand their crisis and longer term needs. This includes support to report to law enforcement agencies.
- Campaigns that raise awareness of domestic violence in lesbian relationships are still needed.
- Further research is required to better understand the dynamics of lesbian relationships and the contexts of domestic violence in order to inform culturally appropriate and sensitive responses.


## Engaging with LBQ women around health

- We need to know more about the patterns of engagement among LBQ women and with the wider LGBTQ communities. In particular, how is community connection generated, what accounts for the feeling of high connection in the context of reduced face-to-face engagement in LGBTQ spaces and how important is community connection for health and wellbeing?
- As 'E-health' gains more prominence, it is important to know more about how LBQ women access information online - and how health services can access women - to improve the future effectiveness of health promotion, prevention messages or early interventions to this group.


## Conclusion

SWASH highlights several areas of physical and mental health concern for LBQ women. The lack of health promotion, prevention and intervention programs that specifically address these health issues for lesbian, bisexual and queer women is disappointing and unacceptable. The consistent messages from national and community-based research is that the health outcome gains being made in the general population are not being replicated for this group of Australian women; it is time for action.

A lack of systematic, nuanced research on the heath 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 women's health. ${ }^{(1)}$ While sex between women is rarely a health risk in itself, a range of social, psychological and economic factors mean that this minority group has worse health outcomes than their heterosexual peers. Stisma, family and community rejection and discrimination can impact on health and wellbeing, the delivery of health services, and women's access to services. The inclusion of lesbian and bisexual women in the 2010 National Women's Heath Policy ${ }^{(2)}$ was a timely recognition of persuasive international and local evidence that some health problems may be more prevalent, risk factors may be different, and interventions may need to be tailored to the needs of this group. With a focus on LBQ women's health, the long-running Sydney Women and Sexual Health (SWASH) project 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.
The first round of the SWASH survey was carried out in 1996 and has been run every two years since. It was initiated by workers from two ACON (formerly the AIDS Council of NSW) projects, Women Partners of Gay and Bisexual Men and the Gay and Lesbian Injecting Drug Use Project, who were faced with a lack of empirical evidence on which to base their intervention work. Concern had been voiced about the possibility of HIV spreading from gay men to the 'general community' so the first SWASH survey focused on sexual and injection-related HIV transmission risks. The survey was addressed to all women in social contact with the gay and lesbian communities in Sydney. In the succeeding years, the focus shifted from sex with men to lesbian sexual practice, and questions on hepatitis $A, B$ and $C$ were added; later questions were added about knowledge of sexually transmissible infections (STIS), Pap smears and testing for STls, tobacco smoking, and illicit drug use. More recently, questions about domestic violence, experiences of anti-LGBIQ behaviour, and self-report measures of physical heath, mental health, alcohol consumption, and height and weight were added. The shift in focus since the
survey's inception in 1996 extended the reach of SWASH to a broader survey of the health of women in and around Sydney's lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer (LGBTQ) and communities. SWASH is now the longest running and only resular survey of LBQ women's health and wellbeing in Australia (and probably the world). This important and unique resource on LBQ women's health and wellbeing is a selffunded partnership between a community-based NGO and its university partners.

This report presents results from the 2010, 2008 and 2006 surveys, and follows reports on previous survey iterations. (r) Slight differences in sampling and questions between iterations mean that differences between the years canno be attributed solely to change over time. We make note of changes in questions, and years when particular questions were not asked.

## SWASH is now the longest running and only regular survey of LBQ women's health and wellbeing in Australia (and probably the world).

In March 2006, २008 and 2010 a two-page self-complete questionnaire was distributed to women attending the Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras Fair Day at Victoria Park in inner western Sydney and in 2006 and 2010 at several othe lesbian community venues and heath services in Sydney. The questionnaire included items on demographics; sexual and gender identity; community connection; smoking, alcohol and drug use; sexual heath; height and weight; psychologica wellbeing; experiences of anti-gay, sexual and domestic violence; parenthood intentions; preventive heath behaviour; healthcare access and satisfaction; and knowledge questions on reproductive heath Some survey questions were included in all three iterations; others appeared only once (e.s.s. a snapshot question on cancer diagnosis). See Appendices for copies of the 2006,2008 and 2010 questionnaires.

Results were entered from the coded questionnaires and loaded into Stata IC 11.0 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 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 was high, especially those requiring witing a word or phrase rather than simply ticking a box. We assume that many respondents simply left a question blank when it did not apply to them, rather than ticking the no response. For this reason, percentages have generally been calculated in this report on the total sample, not on the question-specific response rate, which would have inflated the 'yes' percentages. Readers can take the 'yes' percentages given 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 women could select more than one item, and tables reporting sub-samples.

### 3.1. Recruitment

s in previous years, the primary recruitment site in 201 was the Mardi Gras Fair Day. Additional recruitment took place at other lesbian, bisexual and queer venues, social events during the Mardi Gras season (over February and March) or through targeted recruitment to selected LGBTQ organisations to over-sample older women and women living in the western suburbs. After 2006, we excluded clinics and needle and syringe programs as recruitment sites. ${ }^{(3)}$ ) $n 2008$ ecruitment occurred only at Fair Day Questionnaires were fredto orertitine offered to everyone identifying as a woman who was wiliti sal rates
 and entertainment venues, 50 women who wish to avoid completing the survey can easily do so. Few women explicitly efused a verbal offer to contribute. In 2006 recruiters at Fair Day wore caps with the slogan 'Secret lesbian business'; this appears to have resulted in a lower number of bisexual and queer/other women than in previous and later years.

## Age and sexual identity have been correlated in each SWASH.

It is impossible to calculate a response rate for SWASH. Very few women declined the invitation to participate but it was easy for women in recruitment sites to avoid the survey recruiters. Reflecting the decision taken for the 2004 survey report, ${ }^{(5)}$ responses of women who identified as heterosexual have not been included in this report. While women who identify as straight may still have sex with women, many of them do so only rarely (of the 128 heterosexual women who responded to the 2010 survey, 17 had ever had sex with a woman, only four in the last six months). Thus, this report focuses on LBQ women. Table 1 summarises the valid responses by recruitment venue.

### 4.1. Sample Characteristics

### 4.1.1. Age

The age range was 17-81 years, with a median age of 31 (2006 range was 16 - 68 years, median age 33 ; 2008 range was $16-6$ years, median age 31). Figure 1 compares the proportion of respondents in 5 -year age categories over the three surveys. Since 2006, more women aged $20-30$ years and fewer women over the age of 30 years have responded.


### 41.2. Sexual identity and attraction

In 2010 we added the response option 'queer' to the
question 'Do you think of yourself primarily as: Lesbian/ dyke/homosexual/say, Bisexual, Heterosexual/straight, Other (please specify)?' that was posed in 2006 and 2008. We did this because of the number of women in previous yers wha ticked 'other' and wrote 'qued' This chene is yoflocted in the drop in the nombor of wom sence in reflected in the drop in the number of women selecting "oth in 2010 , compared to 2006 and 2008 (Table 2). To allow easy comparison we have collapsed 'queer' and 'other' in
the analyses. Some women resisted sexual categorisation, making comments such as 'label free' or 'no specific label' or 'homoflexible' or "just me'. Tension between identity labels and practice was evident in a few replies, such as the woman who ticked 'lesbian' and added 'mostly lesbian with a bisexual twist'. Throughout this report, when women are referred to as lesbian, bisexual, etc., it is this self-description that is being used, whatever their reported sexual behaviour.

| Table 2: Stated sexual identity |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006 | 2008 | 2010 |
|  | n (\%) | n (\%) | n (\%) |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Lessiann } \\ \text { homosexual } \end{gathered}$ | 828(86.1) | 773 (76.3) | 726 (75.3) |
| Bisexual | 84 (8.7) | 122 (12.0) | 101 (10.5) |
| Queer' |  | - | 91 (9.4) |
| Other | 50 (5.2) | 105 (10.4) | 33 (3.4) |
| Not reported | 0 (0.0) | 13 (1.3) | 13 (1.4) |
| Total | 962 (100) | 1013 (100) | 964 (100) |
| 'The ofition'uvere' was intoducedi in 2010 |  |  |  |

Age and sexual identity have been correlated in each SWASH survey since it began in 1996. Younger women were more likely than older women to identify as bisexual and less likely to identify as lesbian (Figure 2).


In 2010, the median age of lesbian women was 33 years, of bisexual women 25 years, and of queer and other women 28 years (Table 3). Althouğh women under 25 years only constituted $24 \%$ of the sample, $45 \%$ of the bisexual women were in the $16-24$ year age group. There are several possible reasons for this. Some older bisexual women, if they are in long-term relationships with men, may be less likely to take part in LGBTQ social events where they can be recruited for the survey. People's identities may also become more fixed and more polarised as they age, partly as a result of the elationships they have. Almost a third (30\%) of the queer or other identifying women were also in this youngest age sroup; together with the higher proportion of bisexual women tis may also reflect a greater acceptance of queer and fluid dentities in the younger age groups.

| Table 3: Mean and median age, by sexual identity |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lesbian | Bisexal | Queer Other | Notreported |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mean } \\ \text { (median) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mean } \\ \text { (median) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mean } \\ \text { (median) } \end{gathered}$ | Mean (median) |
| 2006 | 35 (34.0) | 29 (26.5) | 32 (31.0) | -1 |
| 2008 | 33 (32.0) | 29 (27.5) | 30 (28.0) | 36 (34.0) |
| 2010 | 34 (33.0) | 28 (25.0) | 31 (28.0) | 40 (38.0) |

We also asked about sexual attraction to men and women. After heterosexual identifying women were excluded from the sample, all but $1.5 \%$ of respondents indicated at least some attraction to women, thoush only $36 \%$ indicated exclusively same-sex attraction. As Table 4 shows, not everyone felt sexual attraction exclu-sively or even mostly to women, even in this sample of women who were in contact with and recruited through LGBTQ community venues and functions, and $82 \%$ of whom had been sexually active with a woman in the preceding six months (and $94 \%$ in their lives). As would be expected, lesbian-identified women were most likely to say they were attracted only or mostly to women (96\%) when compared to bisexual women ( $33 \%$ ) and queer or other women ( $67 \%$ ).

| Table 4: Sexual attraction to males and females ("I have felt sexually attracted to") |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006 | 2008 | 2010 |
|  | $n$ (\%) | n (\%) | n (\%) |
| Only to females | 367 (38.2) | 399 (39.4) | 343 (35.6) |
| More often to females | 475 (49.4) | 454 (44.8) | 475 (4.3) |
| Equally often to both | 71 (7.4) | $\left.{ }^{99} 9.8\right)$ | 102 (1.6) |
| More often to males | 24 (2.5) | 30 (3.0) | 25 (2.6) |
| Only to maes | $1(0.1)$ | $3(0.3)$ | $4(0.4)$ |
| Tono one at all | $5(0.5)$ | $5(0.5)$ | $3(0.3)$ |
| No answer | 19 (2.0) | 23 (2.3) | 12 (1.2) |
| Total | 962 (100) | 1013 (100) | 964 (100) |

### 4.1.3. Transgender respondents

In 2010, 31 respondents ( $3 \%$ ) indicated that they were transgender (Table 5). The number of transgender respondents in the survey has increased since 2006. We asked more detailed questions about gender identity in 2010 because ACON had experienced an increasing number of transidentified people accessing their Young Women's Project. Most of the 2010 respondents identified as female transgender ( $n=16$ ) or 'other' transgender ( $n=11$ ); most people that ticked 'other' wrote 'genderqueer'. Only four people identified as male which may reflect the recruitment stratesy and the branding which may reflect the rectuitment strategy and the iranding of the survey as for women. Transgender people are incluc
with the other women in the analyses that follow unless with the other women in the analyses that follow unless
stated otherwise. Sexual attraction varied similarly among stated otherwise. Sexual attraction varie similialy atmong
the transsender respondents, with $87 \%$ reporting attraction the transsender respondents, with 87\% reporting attraction mostly or always to women

|  | 2006 | 2008 | 2010 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n (\%) | n (\%) | n (\%) |
| No | 925 (96.2) | 970 (95.8) | 925 (99.0) |
| Yes | 11 (1.1) | 25 (2.5) | 31 (3.2) |
| Identitiy as female | - | - | 16 (1.7) |
| Identify as male | - | - | $4(0.4)$ |
| Identitiy as other | - | - | $11\left(\begin{array}{l}\text { (1) }\end{array}\right.$ |
| Notreported | 26 (2.7) | 18 (1.8) | 8 (0.8) |
| Total | 962 (100) | 1013 (100) | 964 (100) |

$13 \%$ of respondents said they were planning to have children in the next two years.

### 4.1.4. Children

In 2010, 139 women ( $14 \%$ ) said they had dependent children, a similar proportion to 2006 ( $14 \%$ ) and 2008 ( $12 \%$ ) (Table 6 ). Some women who are biolosical mothers or co-parents may no longer have dependent children if the children have left home and are self-supporting.

| Table 6: Dependent children (birth or co-parent) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006 | 2008 | 2010 |
|  | n (\%) | n (\%) | $n$ (\%) |
| No | 814 (84.6) | 892 (8.1) | 816 (84.7) |
| Yes | 137 (14.2) | 119 (11.8) | 139 (14.4) |
| Not reported | 11 (1.1) | 2 (0.2) | $9(0.9)$ |
| Total | 962 (100) | 1013 (100) | 964 (100) |

One hundred and twenty-nine women (13\%) said they were planning to have children in the next two years, with a further 145 women ( $15 \%$ ) reporting they were not sure (Table 7 ). The vast majority of women ( $75 \%$ ) considering children in the coming two years did not already have dependent children.

| Table 7 : Planning to have children in next two years |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006 | 2008 | 2010 |
|  | n (\%) | n (\%) | n (\%) |
| No | 699 (72.7) | 676 (66.8) | 677 (70.2) |
| Yes | 100 (10.4) | 156 (15.4) | 129 (13.4) |
| Not sure | 149 (15.5) | 153 (15.1) | 145 (15.0) |
| Notreported | $14(1.5)$ | 28 (2.8) | 13 (1.4) |
| Total | 962 (100) | 1013 (100) | 964 (100) |

For the women who were considering having children in the coming two years, two different conception options were common: anonymous IVF (24\%) and self-insemination with a known donor (20\%) (Table 8). Intended conception methods varied significantly between sexual identities ( $\mathrm{p}<0.01$ ). For lesbian women, the most common intended method of conception was anonymous donor IVF (29\%), followed by known donor sel--Insemination (18\%) and known donor JVF ( $16 \%$ ). For bisexual women the most common intended method of conception was sex with a male partner (33\%) followed by known donor self-insemination (19\%). For queer and other women the most common intended method f concention was known donor self-insemination (30\%) and known donor IVF (15\%).

| e 8 : How plan to conceive, by sexual identity (2010) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lesbian <br> n (\%) | Bisexual <br> n (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Queerl } \\ & \text { other } \\ & \mathrm{n}(\%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Not } \\ \text { reported } \\ \mathrm{n}(\%) \end{gathered}$ | Total <br> n (\%) |
| $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \text { Sex with } \\ \text { male partner } \end{array} \end{gathered}$ | 8 (3.7) | 9 (33.3) | $2(7.4)$ | 0 (0.00) | 196 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Anonymous } \\ & \text { NF } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 62 \\ (28.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 3 (11.1) | $1(3.7)$ | 0 (0.00) | $\begin{gathered} 66 \\ (24.1) \end{gathered}$ |
| Known VF | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (16.1) \end{gathered}$ | ${ }^{1(3.7)}$ | $4(14.8)$ | 1 (33.3) | $\begin{gathered} 41 \\ (15.0) \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Anonymuus } \\ & \text { insemint. } \\ & \text { insmate } \end{aligned}$ | 11 (5.1) | 0 (0.0) | $2(7.4)$ | 0 (0.00) | $13(4.7)$ |
| Known self inseminate | $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ (18.4) \end{gathered}$ | 5 (18.5) | $8(29.6)$ | 1 (33.3) | $\begin{gathered} 54 \\ (19.7) \end{gathered}$ |
| Considering more than one oftion one option | 17 (7.8) | $2(7.4)$ | 0 (0.0) | 1 (33.3) | 20 (7.3) |
| Notreported | $\stackrel{44}{(20.3)}$ | 7 (25.9) | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (37.0) \end{gathered}$ | 0 (0.0) | $\stackrel{61}{(22.3)}$ |
| Total | $\begin{gathered} 217 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 27 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 27 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 3 (100) | (100) |

## $94 \%$ reported that they had ever had sex with a woman; $82 \%$ had done so in the preceding six months.

### 4.1.5. Social attachment to the gay and lesbian community

This sample of women was highly attached to the gay and lesbian community. Of the 964 respondents in 2010, $96 \%$ said that at least a few of theirfriends were lesbians, gay men, bisexual, transgender or queer (Table 9).

| Table 9: Number of friends who are LGBTQ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lesbian friends <br> n (\%) | Gay male friends <br> n (\%) | LGBTQ friends <br> n (\%) |
| 2006 |  |  |  |
| None | 13 (1.4) | 80 (8.3) | - |
| Afew | 131 (13.6) | 419 (43.6) | - |
| Some | 345 (35.9) | 328 (34.1) | - |
| Most | 428 (44.5) | 115 (12.0) | - |
| All | 38 (4.0) | $9(0.9)$ | - |
| Not reported | 7 (0.7) | 11 (1.1) | - |
| Total | 962 (100) | 962 (100) | - |
| 2008 |  |  |  |
| None | 13 (1.3) | 55 (5.4) | - |
| Afew | 113 (11.2) | 383 (37.8) | - |
| Some | 395 (39.0) | 387 (38.2) | - |
| Most | 435 (42.9) | 158 (15.6) | - |
| All | 53 (5.2) | 20 (2.0) | - |
| Not reported | 4 (0.4) | 10 (1.0) | - |
| Total | 1013 (100) | 1013 (100) | - |
| 2010 |  |  |  |
| None | - | - | 23 (2.4) |
| Afew | - | - | 127 (13.2) |
| Some | - | - | 285 (29.6) |
| Most | - | - | 471 (48.9) |
| All | - | - | 38 (3.9) |
| Notreported | - | - | 20 (2.1) |
| Total | - | - | 964 (100) |

For the first time we asked women how connected they felt to a LGBTQ community in their everyday life. Unsurprisingly for a sample that is generated through attendance at LGBTQ community events, levels of connection were high, with over half reporting they felt mostly or very connected in their everyday lives (Table 10). These findings contrast with those from Private Lives, a national survey conducted online, where half (10\%) as many women reported they were very connected and twice (23\%) as many reported feeling rarely connected. ${ }^{(8)}$

|  | Lesbian <br> n (\%) | Bisexval $n$ (\%) | Queer/ <br> Other <br> n (\%) | $\underset{\text { Not }}{\text { reported }}$ <br> n (\%) | Total <br> n (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Very | $\begin{gathered} 147 \\ (20.3) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 9 (8.9) | $34(27.4)$ | 3 (23.1) | $\begin{gathered} 193 \\ (20.0) \end{gathered}$ |
| Mosty | $\begin{gathered} 230 \\ (31.7) \end{gathered}$ | 22 (21.8) | 41 (33.1) | 1 (7.7) | $\begin{gathered} 294 \\ (30.5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Somewhat | $\begin{gathered} 221.4) \\ (20.4) \end{gathered}$ | 43 (42.6) | 35 (28.2) | 3 (23.1) | $\begin{gathered} 302 \\ (31.3) \\ ( \end{gathered}$ |
| Rarely | 79 (10.9) | 16 (15.8) | 4(3.2) | 1 (7.7) | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ (10.4) \end{gathered}$ |
| Notatall | 44 (6.1) | 8 (7.9) | 9 (7.3) | 2 (15.4) | 63 (6.5) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Not } \\ & \text { repored } \end{aligned}$ | 5 (0.7) | 3 (3.0) | $1(0.8)$ | 3 (23.1) | $12(1.2)$ |
| Total | $\begin{gathered} 726 \\ (100) \\ (100 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 101 \\ & (100) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 124 \\ & (100) \\ & (10) \end{aligned}$ | 13 (100) | $\begin{gathered} 964 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

In the preceding six months, $81 \%$ (2006: 86\%; 2008: 93\%) had attended at least one LGBIQ social group or venue (Table 11). The drop in attendance compared to previous survey years is striking and may suggest a change in the patterns of socialising among the broader community. LBQ women may be attending more mixed mainstream venues. It may also be that the number of venues or opportunities to attend events such as women's nights has changed in recent years.

| Table 11:Attendance at LGBTQ social venues or groups in the past 6 month |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006 | 2008 | 2010 |
|  | n (\%) | n (\%) | n (\%) |
| Lesbian/queer women's nightbar | 689 (71.6) | 773 (76.3) | 614 (33.7) |
| Gay nightbar | 584 (60.7) | 659 (65.1) | 496 (51.5) |
| LGBTQ" dance party | 415 (43.1) | 489 (48.3) | 295 (30.6) |
| LGBT0" group meeting | 333(34.6) | 244 (24.1) | 205 (21.3) |
| LGBT0" community event | - | 563 (55.6) | 403 (41.8) |
| LGBT0" sports group | - | 129 (12.7) | 133 (13.8) |
| Any of the above | 828 (86.1) | 942 (93.0) | 781 (81.0) |

There was a wholesale decrease in the proportion of women reporting the use of gay and lesbian street press (Table 12), from $91 \%$ to $75 \%$. When asked which LGBTQ internet sites they visited most often, $39 \%$ of women responded and named 508 sites. The top 10 sites were: Pink Sofa, Same Same, LoTL, Gaydargirls/Gaydar, Atter Ellen, ACON, SSO (Sydney Sta Observer), Sapphic Sydney, Mardi Gras, and Facebook. Most of these sites are Australian-based and only Gaydargirls and Pinksofa are primarily LGBTQ social networking sites. Although we asked, "Which LGBTQ websites do you visit most often", women reported accessing many internet sites that were not specifically LGBTQ, such as Facebook.

| Table 12: Number of respondents reading gay and lesbian street press |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006 | 2008 | 2010 |
|  | n (\%) | n (\%) | n (\%) |
| LOTL | 865 (89.9) | 804 (79.4) | 705 (73.1) |
| Cherrie | - | 532 (52.5) | 378 (39.2) |
| SSO (Sydney Star | 461 (47.9) | 429 (42.4) | 276 (28.6) |
| sx | 351 (36.5) | 377 (37.2) | 227 (23.6) |
| Any of the above | 875 (91.0) | 850 (83.9) | 733 (76.0) |
|  |  |  |  |

### 4.1.6. Education, employment and income

The SWASH sample has always been well educated around $65 \%$ had post-school qualifications in 2010 (Table 13). For comparison, only $36 \%$ of New South Wales women aged over 5 had post-school qualifications in 2006 .(9)

| Table 13: Education |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006 | 2008 | 2010 |
|  | n (\%) | n (\%) | n (\%) |
| Up to Year $10 /$ School | 140 (14.6) | 131 (12.9) | 133 (13.8) |
| Year 12 Higher School Certificate | 191 (19.9) | 202 (19.9) | 197 (20.4) |
| Tertiary diploma/trade certificate certificate | 167 (17.4) | 206 (20.3) | 159 (16.5) |
| Univesisity or college | 291 (30.3) | 351 (34.7) | 305 (31.6) |
| Postgraduate degree | 161 (16.7) | 115 (11.4) | 160 (16.6) |
| Not reported | 12 (1.3) | 8 (0.8) | 10 (1.0) |
| Total | 962 (100) | 1013 (100) | 964 (100) |

Of those who answered the question on employment, $64 \%$
were employed full-time and $18 \%$ were students, some of whom were also employed (Table 14). It is difficult to compare the employment status of the SWASH sample with Census data, as our sample is skewed towards younger and childless women.

| Table 14: Employment status |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006 | 2008 | 2010 |
|  | $n$ (\%) | n (\%) | n (\%) |
| Emploged tull-time | 618 (64.2) | 691 (68.2) | 615 (63.8) |
| Employed part-time | 164 (17.1) | 163 (16.1) | 168 (17.4) |
| Unempoyed | 42 (4.4) | $42(4.2)$ | 40 (4.2) |
| Student | 150 (15.6) | 140 (13.8) | 168 (17.4) |
| Pensioner/social seurity benefits | 65 (6.8) | 27 (2.7) | $22(2.3)$ |
| Doing domestic duties | $22(2.3)$ | 25 (2.5) | 15 (1.6) |
| Not in the work force | $14(1.5)$ | 14 (1.4) | 22 (2.3) |
| Not reported | 10 (1.0) | 8 (0.8) | 9 (0.9) |
| Note: Summay tabe; adds ip to moret than 10\%\% beeause responotents could be in move tha one categoy. |  |  |  |

With nearly two-thirds employed full-time and the proportion dependent on state benefits low (even compared to previous years), this is a reasonably well-off group. The distribution of income levels among respondents in the sample is illustrated in Table 15 . For comparison, the average before-tax annual income for NSW women in February 2010 was $\$ 40,158$. $^{(10)}$

|  | 2006 | 2008 | 2010 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n (\%) | n (\%) | n (\%) |
| Ni-\$19,999 | 192 (20.0) | 167 (16.5) | 181 (18.8) |
| \$20,000-839,999 | 200 (20.8) | 212 (20.9) | 197 (20.4) |
| \$40,000-559,999 | 281 (29.2) | 300 (29.6) | 234 (24.3) |
| \$60,000-\$99,999 | 196 (20.4) | $251(24.8)$ | 248 (25.7) |
| \$100,000+ | 48 (5.0) | 47 (4.6) | 90 (9.3) |
| Not repoted | 45 (4.7) | 36 (3.6) | $14(1.5)$ |
| Total | 962 (100) | 1013 (100) | 964 (100) |

### 4.1.7. Ethnicity

Table 16 shows responses to questions on ethnic or cultural background grouped into broad categories. This cannot be compared directly with the Census data, which report several variables including place of birth, lanǵuage spoken and ancestry rather than our less specific category of ethnic affiliation. However, according to the 2006 Census, $65 \%$ of the female population of New South Wales aged 15-64 was born in Australia, $11 \%$ in Europe or the Middle East and $11 \%$ in Asia. ${ }^{(9)}$ This suggests that this sample of lesbian, bisexual
 be expected ifit were similar to the total NSW population. (9) Thirty-seven women self-identified as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander: this is hisher than would be expected ifthe Strait Islander; this is higher than would be expected if the
sample were similar to the total NSW population ( $2 \%$ of the sample were similar to the total NSW population ( $2 \%$ of the female population of NSW identified as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander in the 2006 census). ${ }^{(9)}$

| Table 16: Ettrnicity |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006 | 2008 | 2010 |
|  | n (\%) | n (\%) | n (\%) |
| Anglo-Austalaian' | 652 (67.8) | 647 (63.9) | 627 (65.0) |
| Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander ${ }^{2}$ | 36 (3.7) | 39 (3.9) | 37 (3.8) |
| European and Middle | 101 (10.5) | 124 (12.2) | 137 (14.2) |
| Asian | 34 (3.5) | 39 (3.9) | 58 (6.0) |
| Other | 75 (7.8) | 94 (9.3) | 91 (9.4) |
| Notreported | $64(6.7)$ | 70 (6.9) | 14 (1.5) |
| Total | 962 (100) | 1013 (100) | 964 (100) |
| (1) Including UK and lrish/Scottish/Celtic, <br> (2) In 2010, 29 respondents also indicated Anglo-Australia European, Asian or other ethnic or cultural background; in 2006 it was 25 and in 2008 it was 29 |  |  |  |

### 4.1.8. Seographical location

Half of the respondents lived in the city, inner west or eastern suburbs (Table 17). This is unsurprising as recruitment sites were all located in the metropolitan area. As in earlier years, ew women lived in what has traditionally been considered he core gay Sydney suburbs of Darlinghurst, Potts Point, Kings Cross, and Surry Hills. A significant proportion of women lived outside the Sydney region ( $16 \%$ ) demonstrating the number f women coming into the resion for the Sydney Mardi Gras lestival.

| Table 17: Where erspondents lived |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006 | 2008 | 2010 |
|  | n (\%) | n (\%) | n (\%) |
| Gay Sydney' | 39 (4.1) | 26 (2.6) | 23 (2.4) |
| Eastern suburbs | 51 (5.3) | 56 (5.5) | 56 (5.8) |
| City and iner western <br> Sydney ${ }^{2}$ | 361 (37.5) | 426 (42.1) | 414 (43.0) |
| Southern suburrs ${ }^{3}$ | 68 (7.1) | 57 (5.6) | 57 (5.9) |
| Notherm suburbs ${ }^{4}$ | 96 (10.0) | 82 (8.1) | 110 (11.4) |
| Western suburbs ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 166 (17.3) | 187 (18.5) | 157 (16.3) |
| Outisid Sydney region ${ }^{6}$ | 133 (13.8) | 116 (11.5) | 136 (14.1) |
| Not reportedifivalid | 48 (5.0) | ${ }^{63}$ (6.2) | 11 (1.1) |
| Total | 962 (100) | 1013 (100) | 964 (100) |
| Note: The classification of postoodes and suburbs into the above regions is based on the <br> Austraiian Statistical Geography Standard (ASGS): Volume 3 (270.0.55.003) (1) Surry Hills, Daringhurst, Kings Cross and Potts Point, eastern inner city districts. <br> (2) Including Newtown and EIskineville, bounded by Homebush, Cooks River, Canterbury. <br> (3) South to Waterfall/Menai and west to Punchbow. <br> (d) North to Norah Head and west to Pennant Hills/Epping. <br> Mountains as far as Bell, out to Pheasants Nest anow, Newington across the Blue <br> (5) Based on the Austrailian Statistical Geography Standard (ASGS): Volume 3 <br> (270.0.55.003). |  |  |  |

## Among the $82 \%$ of women who had had sex with a woman in the preceding six months, the most common sexual practice was manual sex.

### 4.2. Sexual partners and practices

### 4.2.1. Sex with women

The great majority of respondents (94\%) reported that they had ever had sex with a woman; 82\% had done so in the preceding six months. The great majority of lesbian (84\%) and queer/other (81\%) women reported having recently had sex with at least one woman, as did $69 \%$ of bisexual women (Table 18).


Women who reported sex with a female partner in the preceding six months were mos likely to report only one sexual partner ( $71 \%$ ), with $22 \%$ reporting between two and five partners (Table 19).

|  | Lesbian <br> n (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bisexual } \\ & n(\%) \end{aligned}$ | Queer/ Other <br> n (\%) | Not reported <br> $n(\%)$ | Total <br> n (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2006 |  |  |  |  |  |
| One | 532 (79.9) | 36 (66.7) | 21 (52.5) | - | 589 (77.5) |
| 2-5 | 112 (16.8) | 15 (27.8) | 9 (22.5) | - | 136 (17.9) |
| >5 | 14 (2.1) | $2(3.7)$ | 3 (7.5) | - | 19 (2.5) |
| Not reported | 8 (1.2) | 1 (1.9) | 7 (17.5) | - | 16 (2.1) |
| Total | 666 (100) | 54 (100) | 40 (100) | - | 760 (100) |
| 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |
| One | 481 (75.0) | 43 (71.7) | 49 (58.3) | 6 (6.7) | 579 (72.9) |
| 2-5 | 132 (20.6) | 14 (23.3) | 29 (34.5) | 1 (11.1) | 176 (22.2) |
| >5 | 18 (2.8) | 3 (5.0) | $5(6.0)$ | 0 (0.0) | 26 (3.3) |
| Not reported | 10 (1.6) | $0(0.0)$ | 1 (1.2) | 2 (22.2) | 13 (1.6) |
| Total | 641 (100) | 60 (100) | 84 (100) | 9 (100) | 974 (100) |
| 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |
| One | 462 (75.0) | 41 (57.8) | 61 (59.8) | 6 (50.0) | 570 (71.2) |
| 2-5 | 126 (20.5) | 16 (22.5) | 31 (30.4) | 3 (25.0) | 176 (22.0) |
| >5 | 16 (2.6) | 8 (11.3) | $5(4.9)$ | 0 (0.0) | $29(3.6)$ |
| Not reported | 12 (2.0) | 6 (8.5) | $5(4.9)$ | 3 (25.0) | 26 (3.3) |
| Total | 616 (100) | 71 (100) | 102 (100) | 12(100) | 801 (100) |

### 4.2.2. Sex with men

Five hundred and seventy-one women (59\%) reported they had ever had sex with a man. Bisexual ( $82 \%$ ) and queer/other ( $79 \%$ ) women were more likely to have ever had sex with a man compared to lesbian women (53\%). This is lower than international research showing $80 \%$ - $85 \%$ of LBQ women have a sexual history with men. ${ }^{(1 \cdot 3)}$ In our sample, sex was
overwhelmingly with men the respondents believed to be heterosexual:539 women reported sex with heterosexual men (Table 20) compared to 177 women reporting sex with a gay or bisexual man (Table 21). Of the 39 women reporting sex with a gay or bisexual man in the past six months, seven (18\%) often had unprotected sex (similar to previous years). Of the 92 women reporting sex with a heterosexual man in the preceding six months, 14 (15\%) often had unprotected sex.

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lesbian } \\ & n(\%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Bisexval } \\ \mathrm{n}(\%) \end{gathered}$ | Queer/ Other <br> n (\%) | Not reported <br> n (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \\ & \mathrm{n} \text { (\%) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2006 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never | 307 (37.1) | 11 (13.1) | 13 (26.0) | - | 331 (34.4) |
| Over 6 montrs ago | 476 (57.5) | 36 (42.9) | 24 (48.0) | - | 536 (55.7) |
| In the past 6 months | 19 (2.3) | $35(41.8)$ | 8 (16.0) | - | 62 (6.4) |
| Not reported | 26 (3.1) | 2 (2.4) | 5 (10.0) | - | 33 (3.4) |
| Total | 828 (100) | 84 (100) | 50 (100) | - | 962 (100) |
| 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never | 383 (49.6) | 22 (18.0) | 31 (29.5) | 5 (38.5) | 441 (43.5) |
| Over 6 monts ago | 348 (45.0) | 42 (34.4) | 53 (50.5) | 6 (46.2) | 449 (44.3) |
| In the past 6 months | 20 (2.6) | 56 (45.9) | 18 (17.1) | 1 (7.7) | 95 (9.4) |
| Not reported | 22 (2.9) | $2(1.6)$ | 3 (2.9) | 1 (7.7) | $28(2.8)$ |
| Total | 773 (100) | 122 (100) | 105 (100) | 13 (100) | 1313 (100) |
| 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never | 293 (40.4) | 16 (15.8) | 29 (23.4) | 3 (23.1) | 341 (35.4) |
| Over 6 month ago | 339 (46.7) | 34 (33.7) | 68 (54.8) | 6 (46.2) | 447 (46.4) |
| In the past 6 months | 25 (3.4) | 46 (45.5) | 21 (16.9) | 0 (0.0) | $92(9.5)$ |
| Not reported | 69 (9.5) | 5 (5.0) | 6 (4.8) | 4 (30.1) | 84 (8.7) |
| Total | 726 (100) | 101 (100) | 124 (100) | 13 (100) | 964 (100) |

Forty eight women (5\%) reported they had ever done sex work.

4.2.3. Sexual practices

Among the $82 \%$ of women who had had sex with a woman in the preceding six months, the most common sexual practice was manual sex (Table 22). Stimulation of the external genitals was practised by only a few more women than sex with the fingers or hand inside the vagina. Most women also practised oral sex (cunnilingus), both given and received, although a few ( $8 \%$ ) had experienced only giving or receiving, not both. Over
hatf (55\%) reported having used a sex toy. Almost all women (99\%) who had used a toy used it both on the external genitals and inside the vagina. Anal practices were less common; 28\% had given or received manual stimulation of the anus and 21\% had practised rimming (oral-anal contact). Again, these practices were generally reciprocal.

Smoking was highest among bisexual women (47\%), followed by lesbians ( $35 \%$ ) and queer/other women ( $26 \%$ ).

| Table 22: Sexul practices with a woman in the past 6 month |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | n \% ) | n \%) | n (\%) |
| Fingers hand on external | 723 (96.3) | 751 (94.8) | 753 (95.6) |
| Fingers/hand inside vagina | 704 (93.7) | $74694.2)$ | 741 (94.0) |
| Fingersh hand inside a aus | 230 (30.6) | 246 (31.1) | 223 (28.3) |
| Oral sex (mouth on partner's genitals) | 640 (85.2) | 686 (86.6) | 693 (87.9) |
| Oral sex (mouth on respondent's genitals) | 611 (81.4) | 668 (84.3) | 663 (84.1) |
| Rimming (mouth on partner's anus) | 118 (15.7) | 146 (18.4) | 128 (16.2) |
| Rimming (mouth on respondent's anus) | 112 (14.9) | 145 (18.3) | 119 (15.1) |
| Sex toy used on external genitals | 421 (56.1) | 474 (59.9) | 470 (59.6) |
| Sex toy used inside vagina | 427 (56.9) | 485 (61.2) | 482 (61.2) |
| Sex toy used inside anus | 108 (14.4) | 138 (17.4) | 110 (14.0) |
| NOTE : Summary table; adds up to more than $100 \%$ because respondents could be in more than one category; only include women who reported sex with a woman in the past 6 months |  |  |  |

Respondents were also asked how many times they had had sex with a woman in the previous four weeks (Table 23). A small proportion of women ( $6 \%$ ) wrote an estimate in words rather than numbers

| Table 23: Number of times women had had sex with a woman in the past 4 weeks (2008 and 2010) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2010 |
|  | $n$ (\%) | n (\%) |
| 0 | 100 (12.6) | 129 (16.4) |
| 1 | 73 (9.2) | 82 (10.4) |
| 2-5 | 223 (28.2) | 244 (31) |
| 6-10 | 136 (17.2) | 139 (17.6) |
| 11+ | 127 (16.0) | 107 (13.6) |
| "Afew" | 6 (0.8) | 9 (1.3) |
| "Many", "Lots" | 41 (5.2) | 31 (3.9) |
| "Too many to count" | 14 (1.8) | $2(0.3)$ |
| "Not enough" | $3(0.4)$ | $3(0.4)$ |
| "Don't know", "Forget" | 19 (2.4) | $4(0.5)$ |
| Notreported | 50 (6.3) | 388 (4.8) |
| Total | 792 (100) | 788 (100) |
| NOTE: TTale only inculde women who reported sex w with w woman in the past months |  |  |

One hundred and fitty-one ( $16 \%$ ) of women reported having been involved in 'S/M dominance/bondage' (i.e. sadomasochism or slave-master encounters) without or with blood (i.e. from practices such as cutting, piercing, whipping o fisting) (Table 24).

| Table 24: Experience of $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{M}$ dominance/bondage in the past 6 month |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006 | 2008 | 2010 |
|  | ก \%) | ก\%) | n \%) |
| Yes, no blood | 172 (17.9) | 198 (19.6) | 145 (15.0) |
| Yes, with blood | $62(6.4)$ | 68 (6.7) | $35(3.6)$ |
| No | 770 (80.0) | 772 (76.2) | 753 (78.1) |
| Notreported | 15 (1.6) | 34 (3.4) | 60 (6.2) |
| Total | 751 (100) | 792 (100) | 788 (100) |

One in 10 women reported that they had had group sex in the preceding six months; most respondents reported that this group sex involved a woman (Table 25).

| Table 25: Group sex in the past 6 months |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006 | 2008 | 2010 |
|  | n (\%) | n (\%) | $n$ (\%) |
| Group sex which <br> included |  |  |  |
| A gay or bisexval man | 11 (1.1) | 20 (2.0) | 14 (1.5) |
| A straight or heterosexual man | 21 (2.2) | 31 (3.1) | 31 (3.2) |
| A woman | $62(6.4)$ | 949.3 ) | 77 (8.0) |
| BSSM' no blood | - | - | $35(3.6)$ |
| BOSM w with hlod | - | - | $9(0.9)$ |
| Any group sex | 69 (7.2) | 111 (11.0) | ${ }_{93}(9.6)$ |
| Note: Summary table; adds up to more than $100 \%$ because respondents could be in more than one category <br> dominance or sadomasochism or slave-master encounters (2) For example, involving practices such as cutting, piercing, whipping or fisting |  |  |  |

4.2.4. Sexual relationships

Six hundred and seven women (63\%) were in a regular sexual relationship with a woman; $28 \%$ were not in a regular sexual relationship (Table 26).


Of those in regular relationships, the most common length was over five years (Table 2?).

| Table 27: Length of regular relationship |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006 | 2008 | 2010 |
|  | n (\%) | n (\%) | n (\%) |
| Less than 6 months | 90 (13.4) | 133 (18.2) | 122 (17.7) |
| 6-11 months | 78 (1.4) | 75 (10.3) | 84 (12.2) |
| $1-2$ years | 142 (21.1) | 145 (19.9) | 161 (23.3) |
| $3-5$ years | 146 (21.7) | 152 (20.9) | 101 (14.6) |
| Over 5 years | 203 (30.1) | 182 (25.0) | 189 (27.4) |
| Notreported | 15 (2.2) | 42 (5.8) | 34 (4.9) |
| Total | 674 (100) | 729 (100) | 691 (100) |



Two hundred and ten women (2२\%) reported that they had had a casual female partner(s) in the preceding six months (Table 28). Almost half ( $48 \%$ ) of these women were also in
a regular relationship. That is, $23 \%$ of women in a regular
relationship with a woman had had a casual sexual partner in
the preceding six months.

| Table 28: Casual parters |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006 | 2008 | 2010 |
|  | n (\%) | n \% ) | n (\%) |
| No | 702 (73.0) | 644 (63.6) | 620 (64.3) |
| Yes, with women | 184 (19.1) | 233 (23.0) | 210 (21.8) |
| Yes, with men | 11 (1.1) | $37(3.7)$ | 24 (2.5) |
| Yes, with both | 37 (3.9) | 48 (4.7) | 53 (5.5) |
| Notreported | 28 (2.9) | 51 (5.0) | 57 (5.9) |
| Total | 962 (100) | 1013 (100) | 964 (100) |

### 4.2.5. Sex work

Forty eight women (5\%) reported they had ever done sex work
(Table 29)

| Table 29: Sex work |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006 | 2008 | 2010 |
|  | $n$ (\%) | n (\%) | n (\%) |
| Never | 914 (95.0) | 934 (92.2) | 887 (92.0) |
| Over 6 month ago | 36 (3.7) | $52(5.1)$ | 34 (3.5) |
| In last 6 months | $2(0.2)$ | 10 (1.0) | 14 (1.5) |
| Not reported | 10 (1.0) | 17 (1.7) | 29 (3.0) |
| Total | 962 (100) | 1013 (100) | 964 00) |

Women were as likely to self-report height and weight that placed them in the overweight or obese category (39\%) than in the healthy category ( $40 \%$ ),
4.3. Tobacco, alcohol and other drug use

### 4.3.1. Tobacco use

Over a third of women ( $35 \%$ ) said they were current tobacco smokers (Table 30), 25\% of women (or 71\% of current smokers) were daily smokers and the median number of smokerss were daily smokers and the mecian number of
cigarettes smoked per day was 10 . These are high rates of smoking compared with the general population, especially considering that this is a highly educated urban sample. For comparison, in the 2010 National Drug Strategy Household survey (NDSHS) of the general population, ${ }^{(4)} 16 \%$ of women 18 or older were current smokers (vs 35\% SWASH), with 14\% of women dally smokers (vs 25\% SWASH). In the NDSHS sample, gay women and men (not reported by gender) were twice as
kely to smoke and amons smokers were twice as likely to eport smoking daily, compared to the heterosexual women and men in the sample. ${ }^{(4)}$ In SWASH, tobacco use was twice as likely in the youngest age group compared to the oldest ge group ( $42 \%$ of 16 -24 year olds vs. $22 \%$ of women over 5 years) (Table 34). The closest comparison in the NDSHS is $20-29$ year old women, of whom $22 \%$ are smokers. ${ }^{(4)}$ Smoking was highest among bisexual women (47\%), followed by lesbians (35\%) and queer/other women (26\%) (Table 31); this nay reflect the association between sexual identity and age.

| Table 30: Smoking status by age group |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 16-24 \text { years } \\ & n(\%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25-34 \text { years } \\ n(\%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 35-44 \text { years } \\ n(\%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45+ \\ & n(\%) \end{aligned}$ | Not reported <br> n (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \\ & n \text { (\%) } \end{aligned}$ |
| 2006 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Current smoker | 69 (4.1) | 139 (39.2) | 78 (31.3) | 50 (29.2) | 2 (5.9) | 338 (35.1) |
| Ex-smoker | 25 (16.3) | $94(26.5)$ | 85 (34.1) | 63 (36.8) | 0 (0.0) | 267 (27.8) |
| Never smoked | 56 (36.6) | 121 (34.1) | 84 (33.7) | 57 (33.3) | 2 (5.9) | 320 (33.3) |
| Notreported | 3 (2.0) | 1 (0.3) | $2(0.8)$ | 1 (0.6) | 30 (88.2) | $37(3.9)$ |
| Total | 153 (100) | 355 (100) | 249 (100) | 171 (100) | 34 (100) | 962 (100) |
| 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Current moker | 119 (50.6) | 123 (33.3) | 89 (39.2) | 38 (28.8) | 6 (12.0) | 375 (37.0) |
| Ex-smoker | 33 (1.0) | 115 (31.2) | 67 (29.5) | 65 (49.2) | 1 (2.0) | 281 (27.7) |
| Never smoked | $82(34.9)$ | 131 (35.5) | 71 (31.3) | 29 (22.0) | $3(6.0)$ | 316 (31.2) |
| Notreported | 1 (0.4) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | $0(0.0)$ | 40 (80.0) | 41 (4.1) |
| Total | 235 (100) | 369 (100) | 227 (100) | 132 (100) | 50 (100) | 1013 (100) |
| 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Current smoker | 98 (42.1) | 127 (36.7) | 75 (33.2) | ${ }_{3} 3$ (21.6) | 1 (16.7) | $334(34.7)$ |
| Ex-smoker | 32 (1.7) | 77 (2.3) | 66 (29.2) | 68 (44.4) | 2 (3.3) | 245 (25.4) |
| Never smoked | 86 (36.9) | 120 (34.7) | 78 (34.5) | $42(27.5)$ | $2(3,3)$ | 328 (34.0) |
| Notreported | 17 (7.3) | 22 (6.4) | 7 (3.1) | 10 (6.5) | 1 (16.7) | 57 (5.9) |
| Total | 233 (100) | $3469100)$ | 226 (100) | 153 (100) | 6 (100) | 964 (100) |

For the first time we asked respondents whether they had ever been diagnosed with cancer; $7 \%$ of women said that they had.

| Table 31: Smoking status by sexual identity |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lesbian | Bisexual | Queer/Other | Not reported | Total |
|  | n (\%) | n (\%) | n (\%) | n (\%) | n (\%) |
| 2006 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Curent smoker | 292 (35.3) | 30 (35.7) | 16 (32.0) |  | 338 (35.1) |
| Ex-smoker | 237 (28.6) | 19 (22.6) | 11 (22.) |  | 267 (27.8) |
| Never smoked | 271 (32.7) | 30 (35.7) | 19 (38.0) |  | 320 (33.3) |
| Not reported | 28 (3.4) | $5(6.0)$ | $4(8.0)$ | - | 37 (3.9) |
| Total | 828 (100) | 84 (100) | 50 (100) | - | 962 (100) |
| 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Curent smoker | 279 (36.1) | 47 (38.5) | $43(4.0)$ | 6 (45.2) | 375 (37.0) |
| Ex-smoker | 225 (29.1) | 26 (21.3) | 28 (26.7) | 2 (15.4) | 281 (27.7) |
| Never smoked | 237 (30.7) | 44 (36.1) | $32(30.5)$ | 3 (23.0) | 316 (31.2) |
| Not reported | $32(4.1)$ | 5 (4.1) | $2(1.9)$ | 2 (15.4) | 41 (4.1) |
| Total | 773 (100) | 122 (100) | 105 (100) | 13 (100) | 1013 (100) |
| 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Curent smoker | 251 (34.6) | 47 (46.5) | $32(25.8)$ | $4(30.8)$ | 334 (34.7) |
| Ex-smoker | 192 (26.5) | 21 (20.8) | 27 (21.8) | $5(38.5)$ | 245 (25.4) |
| Never smoked | 244 (33.6) | 26 (25.7) | 56 (45.2) | 2 (15.4) | 328 (34.0) |
| Not reported | 39 (5.4) | 7 (6.9) | 9 (7.3) | 2 (15.4) | 57 (5.9) |
| Total | 726 (100) | 101 (100) | 124 (100) | 13 (100) | 964 (100) |

### 4.3.2. Alcohol

The majority of women (83\%) in the 2010 survey reported drinking alcohol. Table 32 illustrates the distribution of drinking frequency.

The National Heath and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) recommends that adults drink no more than two standard drinks on any single day to reduce the lifetime risk of alcoholrelated disease or injury. ${ }^{(5)}$ Half of all women - $56 \%$ of drinkers - exceeded this recommendation (Table 33). This compares to $11 \%$ of women in the general population. ${ }^{(4)}$ The level of drinking in our sample decreased with age; $63 \%$ of 16-24 year olds reported consuming more than 2 standard drinks on a typical day compared to $25 \%$ of women aged over 45 years.

| Table 33: Drinks consumed on a typicial day |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006 | 2008 | 2010 |
|  | $n(\%)$ | $n(\%)$ | $n(\%)$ |
| 1 or 2 drinks | $345(35.9)$ | $307(30.3)$ | $302(31.3)$ |
| 3 or 4 drinks | $320(33.3)$ | $348(33.4)$ | $275(28.5)$ |
| 5 to d drinks | $114(11.8)$ | $154(15.2)$ | $160(16.6)$ |
| 9 or more drinks | $56(5.8)$ | $61(6.0)$ | $51(5.3)$ |
| Not reported | $31(3.2)$ | $52(5.1)$ | $76(7.9)$ |
| Non-drinker | $96(10.0)$ | $91(9.0)$ | $100(10.4)$ |
| Total | $866(100)$ | $922(100)$ | $864(100)$ |

The NHMRC recommends that adults drink no more than four standard drinks on a single occasion to reduce the risk of alcohol-related injury on that occasion. ${ }^{(5)}$ ) One in five women - 24\% of drinkers - exceeded this advice (Table 33) This is lower than women in the general population ( $30 \%$ in the preceding 12 months). ${ }^{(14)}$ However, 2.5 times as many LBQ women drank at these risky levels daily or weekly (23\% of the whole sample), compared to women in the general population (9\%) (Table 34). ${ }^{(14)}$ Again, risky drinking was associated with age; $57 \%$ of 16 -24 year olds reported binge drinking more than twice in the preceding six months compared to $20 \%$ of women aged over 45 years ( $p<0.001$; Table 34 )

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2008 \\ 7+\text { dinins } \\ n(\%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2010 \\ 5+\text { drinks } \\ \mathrm{n}(\%) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Never | 229 (23.8) | 240 (23.7) | 139 (14.4) |
| Once or twice | 305 (17.7) | 322 (31.8) | 234 (24.3) |
| About once a month | 154 (16.0) | 125 (12.3) | 202 (21.0) |
| About once a week | 104 (10.8) | 134 (13.2) | 153 (15.9) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { More than once } \\ & \text { a week } \end{aligned}$ | 39 (4.1) | 50 (4.9) | 63 (6.5) |
| Every day | $3(0.3)$ | $3(0.3)$ | $8(0.8)$ |
| Notreported | $32(3.3)$ | 48 (4.7) | 65 (6.7) |
| Non-drinker | 96 (10) | $91(9.0)$ | 100 (10.4) |
| Total | 962 (100) | 1013(1) | $964(100$ |

### 4.3.3. Illicit drugs

In the preceding six months, 47\% of respondents had used any illicit drug including cannabis (33\%), ecstasy (25\%), and cocaine (17\%) (Table 35). Use of speed and crystal meth has dropped significantly since 2006 ( $p<0.001$ for each), while cocaine use has significantly increased ( $p<0.001$ ). These trends echo the 2010 NDSHS. ${ }^{(4)}$ In response to the question 'Have you ever injected drugs? $8 \%$ of women indicated that they had ever done so (2006: 10\%; 2008: 10\%; 2010: 8\%).

| Table 35: Illicit drug use in the past 6 months |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006 | 2008 | 2010 |
|  | n (\%) | n (\%) | n (\%) |
| Cannabis | 329 (34.2) | 388 (38.3) | 319 (3.1) |
| Ecstasy | 262 (27.2) | 328 (32.4) | 241 (25.0) |
| Cocaine | 113 (11.8) | 186 (18.4) | 164 (17.0) |
| Speed | 223 (23.2) | 259 (25.6) | 150 (15.6) |
| Crystal meth | 82 (8.5) | 66 (6.5) | 40 (4.2) |
| Benzos/Valium | 92 (9.6) | 150 (14.8) | 130 (13.5) |
| Amy/ / poppers | - | 110 (10.9) | 93 (9.7) |
| LSD/trips | - | 73 (7.2) | 53 (5.5) |
| Special W kelamine | 70 (7.3) | 62 (6.1) | 48 (5.0) |
| GHB | 355 (3.6) | $32(3.2)$ | $22(2.3)$ |
| Heroin | $9(0.9)$ | 19 (1.9) | 13 (1.4) |
| Steroids ${ }^{(0)}$ | - | 10 (1.0) | 13 (1.4) |
| Viagra, Ciails etc. | $5(0.5)$ | $9(0.9)$ | 12 (1.2) |
| Any other orug ${ }^{(1)}$ | 40 (4.2) | 75 (7.4) | 60 (6.2) |

Note: Sunmay table;
than one categoy:

Rates of use of illicit drug use were several times higher among our respondents than rates reported in the general community by the NDSHS (Table 36). Gay women and men (not reported by gender) in the NDSHS had the highest rate of recent drug use (36\%) among all subpopulation groups. ${ }^{(44)}$


A total of 522 respondents (54\%) had ever had a diagnostic or screening test for an STI other than HIV.

### 4.4. Health behaviour and knowledge

### 4.4.1. Relationships with doctors

In 2010, the majority of women said they had a regular doctor (49\%) or attended the same health centre (22\%) (Table 37). Two thirds of women ( $67 \%$ ) said they were out - open about their sexuality - to their doctor about their sexuality. If women had a regular doctor or attended the same health centre, they were most likely to be out ( $(88 \%)$.


In 2006 and 2008 women indicated in a single question ift they were out to their doctor or if they did not have a regular GP (Table 38).

| Table 38: Regular doctor |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006 | 2008 |
|  | n (\%) | n (\%) |
| No regular doctor | 233 (24.2) | 157 (15.5) |
| Out of reguar GP | 537 (55.8) | 645 (63.7) |
| Not out to regular GP | 157 (16.3) | 165 16.3) |
| Notreported | 35 (3.6) | 46 (4.5) |
| Total | 962 (100) | 1013 (100) |

Of the 19 women who had hepatitis $\complement$, 18 had ever injected drugs.

### 4.4.2. Self-reported general health

The majority of respondents rated their general health as excellent/very good/good (81\%); ; 14\% of respondents reported their health as fair/poor (Table 39). There has been a significant drop in ratings of self-reported general health; about 10\% fewer women rated their health as excellent/very good/ good in 2010 compared to 2008, and the proportion of women rating their health as fair/poor increased by the same amount ( $p<0.001$ ). The reasons for this decrease in self-reported general health are not clear.

For the first time we asked respondents to provide their height and weight. We have used these 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. It is an imperfect measure as people tend to overestimate height and underestimate weight when selfreporting, ${ }^{(16)}$ and it does not recognise differences in height and weight proportions which may be related to diverse cultural heritage. Women were as likely to self-report height and weight that placed them in the overweight or obese category (39\%) than in the healthy category (40\%) (Table 40).

| Table 39: Self reported general health, by sexual identity |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lesbian | Bisexual | Queer O Other | Not reported | Total |
|  | n (\%) | n (\%) | n (\%) | n (\%) | n (\%) |
| 2006 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Poor/fair | $74(8.9)$ | 12 (14.3) | 6 (12.0) | - | 92 (9.6) |
| GoodVer good | 513 (62.0) | 52 (61.9) | 35 (7.0) | - | 600 (62.4) |
| Excellent | 216 (26.1) | 16 (19.1) | 6 (12.0) | - | 238 (24.7) |
| Notreported | 25 (3.0) | $44.8)$ | 3 (6.0) | - | 32 (3.3) |
| Total | 828 (100) | 84 (100) | 50 (100) | - | 962 (100) |
| 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Poorfair | 40 (5.2) | 16 (13.1) | 9 9.6) | 0 (0.0) | 65 (6.4) |
| GoodVer good | 476 (61.6) | 76 (62.3) | $59(56.2)$ | 8 (61.5) | 619 (61.1) |
| Excellent | 225 (29.1) | 25 (20.5) | 35 (3.3) | 3 (23.4) | 288 (28.4) |
| Notreported | $32(4.1)$ | $5(4.1)$ | $2(1.9)$ | 2 (15.4) | 41 (4.1) |
| Total | 773 (100) | 122 (100) | 105 (100) | 13 (100) | 1013 (100) |
| 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Poorfair | 106 (14.6) | 8 (7.9) | 15 (12.1) | 1 (7.7) | 130 (13.5) |
| Goodver good | 443 (61.0) | 65 (64.4) | 79 (63.7) | 8 (61.5) | 595 (61.7) |
| Exellent | 140 (19.3) | $22(21.8)$ | 21 (16.9) | 2 (15.4) | 185 (19.2) |
| Notreported | 37 (5.1) | 6 (5.9) | 9 (7.3) | 2 (15.4) | 54 (5.6) |
| Total | 726 (100) | 101 (100) | 124 (100) | 13 (100) | 964 (100) |

Lesbian women were almost twice as likely to self-report height and weight that placed them in the obese category compared to bisexual ( $(12 \%$ ) and queer or other ( $12 \%$ ). compared to bisexual ( $12 \%$ ) and queer or other ( $(2 \%$ ).
However lesbian women were more likely to be older an there is an association between age and weight; while $3 \%$ of underweight women were aged 45 or older, a third of obese women fell into this age category.

| Table 40: Body mass index (2010) |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | 2010 |
|  | n (\%) |
| Underweight (<20) | 105 (1.9) |
| Heatty (20-<25) | 386 (40.0) |
| Overweight (25-30) | 207 (21.5) |
| Obese ( $>30$ ) | 169 (17.5) |
| Notreported | 97 (10.1) |
| Total |  |

We have provided comparative self-report data from women in the 2008 National Health Survey (NHS) (Table 4) (1). ${ }^{(7)}$ The younger age of our sample may explain the striking differences in the proportion of underweight women.

$$
\left.\begin{array}{r|cc}
\begin{array}{c}
\text { Table 41: Body mass index compared with the general community } \\
\text { (18-54 year olds) }
\end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{c}
\text { SWASH } \\
2010
\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}
\text { NHS } \\
\%
\end{array} \\
\hline \text { 2007-2008 } \\
\%
\end{array} \right\rvert\,
$$

For the first time we asked respondents whether they had ever been diagnosed with cancer; $7 \%$ of women said that they had Table 42). We provide these figures as a means of tracking cancer diagnosis in this sample. There are no comparable statistics on lesbians and cancer in Australia.


### 4.4.3. Self-reported mental health

In 2006 and 2010 we used the Kessler 6 to measure nonspecific psychological distress (e.s.feeling nervous, hopeless, restless, worthless) in the preceding four weeks. ${ }^{(18)}$ Distress was most common in younger women; $12 \%$ of 16 -24 year olds reported high distress compared to $3 \%$ of women aged 45
years and older (p<0.00i; Table 43).

|  | $\begin{gathered} 16-24 \text { years } \\ n(\%) \end{gathered}$ | $25-34 \text { years }$ $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | $\begin{gathered} 35-44 \text { years } \\ n(\%) \end{gathered}$ | $45+$ $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ | Not reported <br> n (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \\ & \mathrm{n}(\%) \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2006 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low distress | 96 (62.7) | 266 (75.0) | 195 (78.3) | 137 (80.1) | $4(11.8)$ | 698 (72.6) |
| Medium distress | 31 (20.3) | $31(8.7)$ | 25 (10.0) | 14 (8.2) | 0 (0.0) | 101 (10.5) |
| High distress | 20 (13.1) | $21(5.9)$ | 3 (1.2) | 9 (5.3) | 0 (0.00) | 53 (5.5) |
| Notreported | 6 (3.9) | 37 (10.4) | 26 (10.4) | 11 (6.4) | 30 (88.2) | 110 (11.4) |
| Total | 153 (100) | 355 (100) | $249(100)$ | 171 (100) | 34 (100) | 962 (100) |
| 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low distress | 124 (53.2) | 215 (62.1) | 165 (73.0) | 114 (74.5) | $2(33.3)$ | 620 (6, 3) |
| Medium distress | 55 (23.6) | 61 (17.6) | 27 (11.9) | 14 (9.2) | 0 0(00) | 157 (16.3) |
| High distress | 28 (12.0) | 29 (8.4) | 12 (5.3) | $4(2.6)$ | 0 (0.00) | 73 (7.6) |
| Not reported | 26 (11.1) | 41 (11.8) | $22(9.7)$ | 21 (13.7) | $4(66.7)$ | 114 (11.8) |
| Total | 233 (100) | 346 (100) | 226 (100) | 153 (100) | 6 (100) | 964 (100) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Only $10 \%$ of women who reported experiencing domestic violence had reported it to the police.

Given the similarity in age it is not clear why more than twic as many queer and other identifying women reported high distress compared to bisexual women (Table 44)

| Table 44: Kessler 6 measure of psychiological distress, by sexual identity (2006 and 2010) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lesbian | Bisexual | Queer/ Other | Notreported | Total |
|  | $n$ (\%) | $n$ (\%) | n (\%) | n (\%) | n (\%) |
| 2006 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low distress | 618 (74.6) | 56 (66.7) | $24(8.0)$ | - | 698 (72.6) |
| Medium distress | 81 (10.0) | 8 (9.5) | $12(24.0)$ | - | 101 (10.5) |
| High distress | 41 (5.0) | 10 (11.9) | $2(4.0)$ | - | $53(5.5)$ |
| Notreported | 88 (10.6) | 10 (11.9) | $12(24.0)$ | - | 110 (11.4) |
| Total | 828 (100) | $84(100)$ | 50 (100) | - | 962 (100) |
| 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low distress | 481 (66.6) | 67 (66.4) | 67(54.0) | $5(38.5)$ | 620 (64.3) |
| Medium distress | 103 (14.2) | 17 (16.8) | 33 (26.6) | 4 (30.8) | 157 (16.3) |
| High distress | 53 (7.3) | $5(5.0)$ | 15 (12.1) | 0 (0) | 73 (7.6) |
| Notreported | 89 (12.3) | 12 (11.9) | 9 (7.3) | 4 (30.8) | 114 (11.8) |
| Total | 726 (100) | 101 (100) | 124(100) | 13 (100) | 964 (100) |

For the first time we asked women if they had ever accessed
counselling or psychological services (Table 45). Half the
counseling or psychological services (Table 45). Half the
sample had accessed such services in the preceding five
years; nearly two thirds ( $64 \%$ ) had ever accessed services.

| Table 45: Ever accessed counselling or ssychological services (2010) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lesbian | Bisexual | Queer/ Other | Not reported | Total |
|  | n (\%) | n (\%) | n (\%) | n (\%) | n (\%) |
| No | 213 (29.3) | 37 (36.6) | 29 (23.4) | 3 (23.1) | 282 (29.3) |
| Yes, in the past 5 years | 359 (49.5) | $45(44.6)$ | 80 (64.5) | 3 (23.1) | 487 (50.5) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes, over } 5 \text { years } \\ & \text { ago } \end{aligned}$ | 105 (14.5) | 10 (9.9) | 8 (6.5) | 4 (30.8) | 127 (13.2) |
| Not reported | 49 (6.8) | 9 (8.9) | 7 (5.7) | 3 (23.1) | 68 (7.1) |
| Total | 726 (100) | 101 (100) | 124 (100) | 13 (100) | 964 (100) |

## The message that a history of sex with men is not a prerequisite for a Pap screen is particularly important.

We also asked women if they had ever been diagnosed with depression, anxiety disorder or other mental health disorder. A third of women in our sample reported that they had received a mental health diagnosis in the preceding five years (Table 46)

|  | Lesbian <br> n (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bisexual } \\ & \mathrm{n}(\%) \end{aligned}$ | Queer/ Other <br> n (\%) | Not reported <br> n (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \\ & \mathrm{n}(\%) \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No | 367 (50.6) | 53 (52.5) | 56 (45.2) | $5(3.5)$ | 481 (50.0) |
| Yes, in past 5 years | 237 (32.6) | 28 (27.7) | 48 (38.7) | 3 (2.1) | 316 (32.8) |
| Yes, over 5 years ago | 67 (9.2) | 11 (10.9) | 13 (10.5) | 2 (15.4) | 93 (9.6) |
| Notreported | 55 (7.6) | 0000 | 7 (5.6) | 3 (2.1) | $74(7.7)$ |
| Total | 726 (100) | 101 (100) | 124 (100) | 13 (100) | 964 (100) |

### 4.4.4. Screening tests

The NSW Ministry of Health recommends that all women should be screened for precursors of cervical cancer by having Pap smears every two years, even if they have never had sex with a man, as sex with men is not the only risk factor. ${ }^{(20)}$ Table 47 shows that $26 \%$ of the women in the sample were overdue for screening: last screened more than three years ago, never had or not sure when last had a Pap smear. The good news is that the proportion of women in this category has decreased from over $30 \%$ in 2006 ( $\mathrm{p}=0.022$ ). A need for education remains however as women who had never had sex with man were 2.5 times more likely to have never been screened. Among women in our sample who had ever had sex with a man, bisexual women were consistently more likely to have never been screened (more than $30 \%$ of bisexual women had never been screened in each of the three iterations of SWASH) while these women are more likely to be younger their sexual practices also put them at increased risk for HPV transmission (and therefore cervical cancer).


A total of 5 २2 respondents ( $54 \%$ ) had ever had a diagnostic or screening test for an STI other than HIV; $16 \%$ had done so in the previous six months (Table 48). Queer and other women ( $66 \%$ ) were most likely to have been ever tested, followed by bisexual women ( $54 \%$ ) and lesbian women ( $52 \%$ ). Women who had ever had sex with a man were more likely to have ever had a diagnostic or screening test for an STI ( $63 \%$ ) compared to women who had never had sex with a man (42\%).

| Table 48:Timing of last STT test other than HIV by sexual identity |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Lessian } \\ \mathrm{n}(\%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bisexual } \\ & \text { n (\%) } \end{aligned}$ | Queer/ Othe <br> $n$ (\%) | Not reported <br> n (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \\ & \mathrm{n}(\%) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 2006 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never | 356 (43.0) | 30 (35.7) | $14(28.0)$ | - | 400 (41.6) |
| Yes, over 6 month ago | 344 (41.6) | 34 (40.5) | 23 (46.0) | - | 401 (41.7) |
| Yes, int the past 6 months | 93 (11.2) | 15 (17.9) | 8 (16.0) | - | 116 (12.1) |
| Not reported | 35 (4.2) | $5(6.0)$ | 5 (10.0) | - | 45 (4.7) |
| Total | 828 (100) | 84 (100) | 50 (100) | - | 962 (100) |
| 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never | 337 (43.6) | 38 (31.2) | $25(23.8)$ | 5 (38.5) | 405 (40.0) |
| Yes, over 6 month ago | 297 (38.4) | 53 (43.4) | 51 (4.6) | 3 (2.1) | 404 (39.9) |
| Yes, int the past 6 months | 106 (13.7) | 27 (22.1) | 27 (25.7) | 3 (23.1) | 163 (16.1) |
| Not reported | 33 (4.3) | 4(3.3) | $2(1.9)$ | 2 (15.4) | 41 (4.1) |
| Total | 773 (100) | 122 (100) | 105 (100) | 13 (100) | 1013 (100) |
| 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never | 305 (42.0) | 39 (38.6) | $34(27.4)$ | 6 (46.2) | 384 (39.8) |
| Yes, over 6 montrs ago | 277 (38.2) | $32(31.7)$ | $54(4.6)$ | 5 (3.5) | 368 (38.2) |
| Yes, int the past 6 months | 103 (14.2) | 23 (22.8) | 28 (22.6) | 0 (0.0) | 154 (16.0) |
| Not reooted | $41(5.7)$ | 7 (6.9) | 8 (6.5) | 2 (15.4) | 58 (6.0) |
| Total | 726 (100) | 101 (100) | 124 (100) | 13 (100) | 964 (100) |

Respondents were asked whether they had experienced any of six specified anti-gay or anti-lesbian acts against them in the preceding 12 months.

One hundred and thirty women (14\%) had ever received an STI diagnosis. The most commonly reported STI diagnosis was genital warts followed by Chlamydia (Table 49).

|  | $\begin{aligned} & 2010 \\ & n(\%) \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Genital warts | $35(3.6)$ |
| Chamydia | 30 (3.1) |
| Bacterial vaginosis | $27(2.8)$ |
| Genital herpes | $25(2.6)$ |
| HPV | 22 (2.3) |
| Gonorrtoea | 15 (1.6) |
| Licelcrabs | 10 (1.0) |
| Hepatitis B | 6 (0.6) |
| Syphilis | 0 (0.00) |

In 2010, more women had never been tested for HV (47\%) than reported having been tested ( $43 \%$ ). Testing rates have been dropping since 2006 (2006: 59\%; 2008: 44\%; p<0.001) and may reflect a decreasing perception of risk to HIV or changes in the survey population. Of the 410 women who had ever been tested for HIV, none reported that they were HIVpositive (2006: 9 HIV positive; 2008: 6 HIV positive).

Testino for hepatitis C has varied from year to year (2010: $45 \%$ 2008: 53\%; 2006: 46\%). It is possible that some women answered 'yes' to this question but did not actually know which of the hepatitis viruses they had been tested for (A, B or c). Indeed it is worth noting that $8 \%$ said they were not sure if they had been screened for hepatitis C. Of those who said they ad been tested for hepatitis C, 19 women (4\%) reported they were positive. Cespite the drop in testing among our sample, ne number of women in the survey that are positive remains steady: $2 \%$ in 2006, 2\% in 2008 and $2 \%$ in 2010. It is possible that the drop in testing reflects a tendency for only women who perceive themselves to be at risk to seek screening. Of the 19 women who had hepatitis $C, 18$ had ever injected drugs.

### 4.4.5. Knowledge of sexually transmissible infections (STIs)

Three knowledge questions about STIs and Pap smears were asked in true/false format (Table 50). Most women knew the correct answers for the Pap smear and STI symptoms questions; $14 \%$ were unaware that a person experiencing a cold sore outbreak can give their partner genital herpes during oral sex.

| Table 50: Answers to STI knowledge questions |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2006 | 2008 | 2010 |
|  |  | n (\%) | n (\%) | n (\%) |
| If a person experiencing a cold sore outbreak has oral sex they can give their partner genital herres (F) | Correct | 728 (75.7) | 741 (73.2) | 736 (76.4) |
|  | Incorect | 177 (18.4) | 201 (19.8) | 152 (15.7) |
|  | Notreported | 57 (5.9) | 71 (7.0) | 76 (7.9) |
|  | Total | 962 (100) | 1013 (100) | 964 (100) |
| Lessians do not need Pap smears (f) | Correct | 900 (93.6) | 934 (92.2) | 854 (88.6) |
|  | Incorect | 24 (2.4) | 32 (3.2) | 40 (4.1) |
|  | Not reported | 38 (4.0) | 47 (4.6) | 70 (7.3) |
|  | Total | 962 (100) | 1013 (100) | 964 (100) |
| You can have an STI and not have any symptoms (T) | Correct | - | - | 841 (87.2) |
|  | Incorrect | - | - | $53(5.5)$ |
|  | Not reported | - | - | 70 (7.3) |
|  | Total |  |  | 964 (100) |
| Chlamydia can lead to infertilyt in women (I) | Correct | 784 (81.5) | 832 (82.1) | - |
|  | Incorect | 106 (11.0) | 98 (9.7) | - |
|  | Notreported | 72 (7.5) | 83 (8.2) | - |
|  | Total | 962 (100) | 1013 (100) |  |

### 4.5. Experiences of violence and abuse

### 4.5.1. Sexual coercion

We asked women: 'Since the age of 16 , have you ever been forced or frightened into doing something sexually that you did not want to do?' The majority of respondents ( $66 \%$ ) indicated not want to do? The majority of respondents $(66 \%)$ indicated
that they had never experienced sexual coercion. Among the women ever coerced since age 16 , the majority were coerced by a male (Table 51). Thity-three women reported having been coerced by both males and females in the 2010 survey.

| Table 51: Number of respondents who had ever experienced sexua coercion (2006 and 2010) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006 | 2010 |
|  | n (\%) | n (\%) |
| Never | 595 (61.9) | 640 (66.4) |
| Yes, by a male only | 274 (28.5) | 183 (18.98) |
| Yes, by a female only | 46 (4.8) | 38 (3.9) |
| Yes, both | - | 33 (3.4) |
| Notreported | $47(4.9)$ | 70 (7.3) |
| Total | 962 (100) | 964 (100) |

4.5.2. Domestic Violence

In 2010, 355 women ( $37 \%$ ) reported having ever experienced domestic violence (DV), 15 with both male and female partners (Table 52). Two hundred and sixty-six women (28\%) reported only experiencing domestic violence in a reationship with woman. The increase in reporting since 2006 needs to be interpreted with caution as it is not clear if DV is increasing or awareness has increased, resulting in more women labelling their experiences as domestic violence'.

| Table 52: Number of respondents who experienced domestic violence in a relationship |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006 | 2008 | 2010 |
|  | $n$ (\%) | n (\%) | n (\%) |
| Never | 608 (63.2) | 636 (62.8) | 538 (55.8) |
| Yes, with a female only | 194 (20.2) | 221 (21.8) | 266 (27.6) |
| Yes, with a | 130 (13.5) | 113 (11.2) | 74 (7.7) |
| Yes, with both | $-1$ | $-1$ | 15 (1.6) |
| Not reported | $30(3.1)$ | 43 (4.2) | 71 (7.4) |
| Total | 962 (100) | 1013 (100) | 964 (100) |
| (1) In 2006 and 2008 we did not ask if women had experienced DV with both male and female, but a proportion of respondents are likely to have experienced both |  |  |  |

## Campaigns that raise awareness of domestic violence in lesbian relationships are still needed.

Just over half ( $56 \%$ ) of women who reported experiencing domestic violence had sought help. Women experiencing same-sex DV were as likely to have sought help ( $52 \%$ ) compared to women experiencing other-sex DV (53\%). In 200 and 2008 we asked women where they sought help (Table 53). Counsellors, friends and family were most common, while only $10 \%$ of women who reported experiencing domestic
violence had reported it to the police.

|  | 2006 | 2008 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n (\%) | n (\%) |
| Counsellor or psychologist | 89 (27.5) | 90 (27.0) |
| Friend or neighbour | 86 (26.5) | 98 (29.3) |
| Family or relative | 65 (20.1) | 88 (26.4) |
| Police | 33 (10.2) | 31 (9.3) |
| Doctor or hospital | $32(9.9)$ | 18 (5.4) |
| Gaylesbian service | 12 (3.7) | 18 (5.4) |
| Other | 12 (3.7) | $9(2.7)$ |
| DV hepline | 4 (1.2) | 4 (1.2) |
| Magazine, raio, etic | $3(0.9)$ | $2(0.6)$ |

### 4.5.3. Anti-say and anti-lesbian behaviour

Respondents were asked whether they had experienced any of six specified anti-ģay or anti-lesbian acts against them in the preceding 12 months (Table 54). The most common form of abuse women had experienced was verbal abuse or harassment. Among women responding to SWASH experience of any anti-gay or anti-lesbian acts has dropped significantly from 2006 ( $p<0.001$ ); however, this is primarily due to a reduction in reported verbal abuse.

Over the last three iterations of the SWASH survey (2006, 2008 and 2010 ), a total of 2,939 leshian, bisexual and quee women engaged with the Sydney LGBTQ community have been surveyed (repeat participation rates are unknown) The lack of comparable surveys within Australia (and to the authors' knowledge, internationally) highlights the importance of SWASH. This report provides an unparalleled insight into he health and wellbeing of LBQ women, but also indicates findings of particular salience and urgency for those interested in improving the health and wellbeing of this population.

| Table 54: Anti-gay or anti-esbian behaviour experienced in the past 12 months |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006 | 2008 | 2010 |
|  | n (\%) | n \%) | n \%) |
| Verbal abuse or harassment | 387 (40.2) | 415 (41.0) | 295 (30.6) |
| Being pushed or stoved | $74(7.7)$ | $65(6.4)$ | $91(9.4)$ |
| Being bashed | 23 (2.4) | 22 (2.2) | 23 (2.4) |
| Physical threat or intimidation | 101 (10.5) | 133 (13.1) | 92 (9.5) |
| Refiusal of serice | 73 (7.6) | 53 (5.2) | 70 (7.3) |
| Refused employment or promotion | $46(4.8)$ | $35(3.5)$ | $41(4.3)$ |
| Any of the above | 43.0 | 42.7 | 33.8 |

### 5.1. Tohacco us

Over a third ( $35 \%$ ) of LBQ women reported smoking. This is twice the rate ( $16 \%$ ) among women in the general population. ${ }^{(44)}$ A quarter of all LBQ women were daily smokers (the vast majority of smokers in the sample), compared to 14\% of women in the general population. ${ }^{(4)}$ Of considerable concern is the rate of smoking among younger women: 42\% of $16-24$ year old SWASH respondents smoked. The closest comparison provided by the 2010 National Drug Strategy Household Survey is among $20-29$ year olds, $22 \%$ of whom reported smoking. ${ }^{(14)}$ The Australian Longitudinal Study of Women's Health found a similar level of disparity: $46 \%$ of LBQ women aged $22-27$ years were smokers, compared to $25 \%$ of heterosexual women, suggesting that this finding is robust. ${ }^{(21)}$ These findings that LBQ women are twice as likely to be smoking as women in the general population appear to be consistent and robust.

It is clear that tobacco use is a sisgificant public health problem facing LBQ women and their communities. Wideranging government initiatives have been introduced since the 2006 survey, including graphic pictures on all tobacco products and, in 2007, a ban on smoking in all indoor areas in pubs and nightclubs. Severa hard-hitting campaigns in popular media have also appeared. Despite these populationlevel efforts, rates among this population group have remained unchanged over the last four years ( $35 \%$ in 2006 and $35 \%$ in 2010 ).

- The rate of smoking among $L B Q$ women is twice the rate of women in the general population; this demands urgen public health attention.
- Detailed exploration is required to understand why progressively successful anti-smoking campaigns and programs are not proving successful within this group of women. Targeted interventions to prevent young LB taking up smoking may be needed.
- Examination of the role and efficacy of smoking cessation programs for LBQ women is necessary


### 5.2. Alcohol use

The vast majority of LBQ women drank alcohol, most doing so frequently. Four and half times as many LBQ women ( $56 \%$ of women) drank at levels that put them at a lifetime risk of alcohol-related disease or injury, compared to women in the general population. ${ }^{(4)}$ Among younger women, two thirds drank at this risky level. Our urban sample of same-sex-attracted women reported higher levels of risky drinking than the 2010 National Drug Strategy Household Survey (NDSHS) reported among all gay respondents in their sample. ${ }^{(4)}$ However, the NDSHS reports its findings by sexuality without a breakdown for gender; we think it more meaningful to compare LBQ women with other women

One in five women - 24\% of drinkers - drank at levels tha put them at risk of alcohol-related injury on a sinǵle drinking occasion (more than four standard drinks). This is a lower proportion of women than in the general population ( $30 \%$ of whom reported drinking at risky levels in the preceding 12 months). ${ }^{(4)}$ However 2.5 times as many LBQ women in our sample reported drinking at these risky levels daily or weekly compared to women in the general population. ${ }^{(4)}$ While risky drinking was high among all women, it was particularly concerning among younger women. Two thirds of young women reported drinking more than two standards drinks on a typical day when they drank and the same proportion had drunk more than five standard drinks more than twice in the preceding six months.

- LBQ women are at a higher risk of lifetime risk of alcoho related disease or injury than women in the general community, and are more often drinking at levels that put them at risk of alcohol-related injury on a single drinking occasion.
- Further research is needed to understand the social and cultural context of alcohol use among LBQ women; this knowledge can inform targeted interventions.
- Levels of risky drinking amonǵ younger LBQ women demonstrate an urgent need for early interventions. Messages about responsible drinking should be integrated into existing proǵrams delivered by LGBTQ community
organisations, while IGBTQ community organisations need to consider the role of a acohol sponsorship of community events
- SWASH only reports on alcohol use; there is an urgent need for research on alcohol-related harms and the utilisation of treatment programs among this group.


### 5.3. Illicit drug use

Use of illicit drugs was several times higher among LBQ women than in the general community, and some of this drug use may be problematic. ${ }^{(44)}$ In the 2010 National Drus Strategy Household Survey, gay people had the highhest rate of recent drug use ( $36 \%$ ) among all subpopulation groups ${ }^{(14)}$ The Australian Longitudinal Survey of Women's Heath found that compared to heterosexual women, LBQ women were more ikely to have used lilicit drugs (41\% vs. 10\%) and to have ever injected drugs ( $(11 \% \text { vs. } 1 \%)^{(2)}$. A recent international meta analysis of 18 studies of sexual orientation and adolescent substance use found the odds of substance use by young LBQ women was four times higher than that of heterosexual young women. ${ }^{(22)}$ To contextualise this, the authors note that LBO women report illicit druśs use at a similar level to that of young heterosexual men. Despite stark evidence that a lesbian, bisexual or queer identity appears predictive of drus use, harm eduction efforts have largely focused on gay men.

- LBQ women are using illicit drugss at rates several times higher than women in the general community demonstrating an urgent need to interventions targeted to LBQ women.
- Without a sophisticated understanding of the drivers of illicit drug use in LBQ women, and the conditions under which these practices become problematic, interventions are unlikely to succeed.
- Research is needed to understand LBQ women's utilisation of and satisfaction with drug treatment programs, as well as treatment outcomes.


### 5.4. Sexual health

Of the 964 women in this report, $75 \%$ identified as lesbian. Younger women under 25 were more likely to regard themselves as bisexual than the older age groups. Sexua attraction roughly corresponded to identity for most women. Exclusive attraction to women was not the majority experience ( $36 \%$ ), even among these highly communityattached women, the majority of whom (78\%) had been sexually active with a woman in the preceding six months. Indeed, over half ( $59 \%$ ) of the sample had had sex with a ma at some time in their lives, and $10 \%$ had had sex with a man in the preceding six months. This fact is perhaps familiar and unremarkable to LGBTQ community members, but needs to be better understood by health service providers and policy makers, who often assume that all women who have sex with women are lesbians and that all lesbians are attracted only to women and never have sex with men. Sexual attraction, like sexual identity (with which it is highly correlated), is also agerelated, with younger women more likely to report attraction to both men and women.

Our findings on unprotected sex echo international research that condom use by LBQ women during sex with men is low. ${ }^{(1,2,2,24)}$ One in five women had ever had sex with a man they believed to be gay or bisexual, raising the issue of possible exposure to Sils, incluaing HV, that are more common among gay and bisexual men. While few women reported sex with gay or bisexual men, these women were more likely to report unprotected vaginal or anal intercourse. We did not ask about unintended pregnancy but Australian research suggests that unplanned pregnancy among younger same-sex-attracted women is much higher than among their heterosexua peers, ${ }^{(25,26)}$ a disparity echoed by international research. ${ }^{(2,28)}$ The nature of $L B Q$ women's sexual relationships with men is not well understood, and high rates of unprotected sex may suggest sex is unplanned and that LBQ women may not have the necessary negotiation skills to protect themselves against STIs in these situations.

- Those designing STI prevention programs need to be aware that a significant proportion of women who do not identify as heterosexual are having sex with men and
consider the reach of their programs; LBO women may not respond to health promotion campaigns directed at assumed heterosexual audiences.
- STI prevention programs need to address skill development among LBQ women to support successful negotiation of safe and satisfying sexual relationships with all sexual partners.


### 5.5 Prevention-related screening

A quarter of women were overdue for cervical cancer screening. Low screening in LBQ women may be due to a belief that lesbian women are at lower risk of cervical cancer, ${ }^{(29)}$ a perception that has been reported among Australian healthcare providers. ${ }^{(30)}$ This is despite HPV transmission only requiring skin-to-skin contact ${ }^{(\text {to })}$ and Australian research demonstrating that the prevalence of genita warts in women with a sexual history with women is similar to that of exclusively heterosexual women. ${ }^{(23)}$ The decreasing number of women who are overdue for screening - down to $26 \%$ from $31 \%$ - may be indicative of a trend but the need for education remains. Two and a half times as many women who had never had sex with a man had never been screened, compared to women who had had sex with men. Among women that had ever had sex with a man, bisexual women were consistently more likely to have never been screened (more than $30 \%$ of bisexul women were overdu for screexin over the thre iterations of SWASH) Helthe romion Carer Conncil oflictrias Lromotion canpais designed to raise awareness among the LGBTQ community and the professionals caring for their health need to continue.

Half of the women in our sample had been tested for an SII other than Hiv. Rates of testing appear steady, with bisexual and queer women - especially younger ones - more ikely to report recent testing. However, testing for HIV has bee dropping since 2006, from $59 \%$ to $43 \%$ in 2010 . Knowledge about STls was high, but 16\% of women did not know that someone with a cold sore could transmit herpes to the genitals through oral sex.
-Efforts to raise awareness of cervical cancer and the need for all women to have Pap screening regularly must continue. The message that a history of sex with men is not a prerequisite for a Pap screen is particularly important.

- STI testing campaigns and resources targéting LBQ women about their sexual health, risks and the need for testing are required.
- The need continues for the development of education and capacity building strategies targeting primary healthcare providers that focus on building their understanding of the screenings needs of LBQ women. This must also include information on creating culturally sensitive environments that encourage open dialogue around sexual health and behaviour, including same-sex-attracted women's sexual activities with men.


### 5.6. Health indicators

Levels of overweight and obesity were similar in LBQ women and women in the general population, ${ }^{(1)}$ yet no public health campaigns have targeted the LBW community. There is understandable concern among members of the LGBTQ community about a focus on body weight, and in particular on using normative ideals of body shape. This issue does pose a challenge for our communities: Levels of overweight and obesity put women at increased risk of heart and lung disease, joint problems, and diabetes. ${ }^{(32355)}$ More broadly, international research suggests that lesbian and bisexual women have an above-average prevalence of known risk factors for breast and óvnaecolosical cancers including having no children or heing

 obestan of risk fact thors present for foral community

- Public health programs on weight, exercise and diet need to target and be accessible to LBQ women, and sensitively engage with LGBTQ communities around the heath
impacts of these issues.


### 5.7. Mental Health

There are reasons to be concerned about the mental health of some within this group of women. While only 8\% of women reported high levels of non-specific psychological distress, this tose to $12 \%$ of younger. An increase in the proportion of highly distressed lesbian women since 2006 is also concerning, especially when taken together with a decrease in self-reported general health over the same period. There s consistent and persuasive international vvidence that OBTA populations experience higher rates of mental heal th on and suicidal bohaviou than hoterosevil nealt ${ }_{(8,43)}{ }^{(8,4)}$ )
 at higher rates of chressive syn pum and mental healt (h) eterosexual peers. ${ }^{(44)}$ This is borne out by the Australian Longitudinal Study of Women's Heatth: younger LBQ women were signnificantly more likely to exhibit poorer mental heath and exhibited significantly higher levels of self-harm than exclusively heterosexual women ( $17 \%$ vs. $3 \%$ ). ${ }^{(45)}$ The Austratian Pivvate Lives survey found 15\% of LBQ women reported that in the preceding two weeks they had felt they would be better off dead, with $80 \%$ reporting a history of feeling depressed. In that study, one in three had seen a counsellor or psychiatrist in the previous five years, mostly for anxiety or depression. ${ }^{(8)}$

The high levels of distress among these LBQ women are reflected in the high proportion of women who accessed nental health services in the preceding five years ( $51 \%$ ) or who self-reported a menta lillness diagnosis in the preceding five years (33\%). The considerable increase in ecent access and diagnoses may be due in part to the Australian government's Better Access profram, which since 2006 has provided intensive, short-term Medicaresubsidised mental heath services. A 2005 national survey of say and lesbian wellbeing ${ }^{(8)}$ ) found that $62 \%$ of women had accessed counselling or psychological between 20002005, suggesting use of these services may always have been high in this population. The work of ACON's Counselling services suggests that demand is increasing for LGB-specific counselling. Regardless of whether access has increased or was always high, these findinǵs demonstrate very clearly a
considerable demand for services. We do not know how this demand is being met, or by which professionals. Nor do we know whether women are satisfied with the services they know whether women are satisfied with the services the
are receiving. While LGBTQ specific services are important, it is also important that general mental health services and individual professionals are able to provide culturally appropriate services to LGBTQ women.

- There is a clear need to assist young women who are disproportionately represented in the high rates of drinking, smoking, illicit drug use and mental health distress within this sample. Programs aimed at improving the social and emotional wellbeing of this group, including strategies around 'coming out and self-acceptance, may well prove important to an eventual decline in rates of behaviours that present a health risk.
- Further investigation is requirea to understand the utilisation of mental health services in this group of women: Who is providing these services? Are women receiving the services they desire? What are the outcomes of treatment for LBQ women?


### 5.8. Experiences of abuse and violence

A number of campaigns over recent years have addressed violence and abuse of LGBTQ people; this includes raising awareness of the impact of homophobic harassment. Campaigns such as ACON's This Is Oz are clearly valuable and must continue; it is unacceptable that a third of LBQ women experienced some type of homophobic abuse - one in ten being physically intimidated - in the preceding year. While the decline in verbal abuse and harassment is encouraging, there was no concomitant decrease in other types of abuse and violence.
Our findings suggest that there may be some evidence of the effectiveness of the work of ACON, the Inner City Legal Centre, and the LGBTIQ Domestic and Family Violence Interagency and other campaign agencies and networks work on LGBTQ domestic violence (DV) in relation to the increased number of women reporting having experienced domestic violence. While caution needs to be applied to this interpretation, campaigns that have targeted messages to the LGBTQ community (e.g.
the nature of domestic violence or where to get support) may be having a positive effect by providing a language for talking about domestic violence and encourage reporting. Regardless, that 29\% of LBQ women reported experiencing same-sex domestic violence is a finding that demands a response. Ther are very few programs for LBQ women on developing and sustaining healthy and respectful relationships.

- Increased capacity is required in the provision of support services around domestic violence to respond to LBQ women and to understand their crisis and longer term needs. This includes support to report to law enforcement agencies
- Campaiśns that raise awareness of domestic violence in lesbian relationships are still needed.
- Further research is required to better understand the dynamics of lesbian relationships and the contexts of domestic violence in order to inform culturally appropriat and sensitive responses.


### 5.9. Engaging with LBQ women around health

This study of women in contact with the LQBTQ community showed them to be a fairly well-educated group on average, though not universally - $14 \%$ had education only to Year 10 (School Certificate) equivalent or tess. The majority were in their 20s and 30 s and lived in inner Sydney suburbs. The relative population density of this sample - half lived in the city, inner west or eastern suburbs - presents an opportunity for targeted engagement strategies in the delivery of health and wellbeing programs.

This was a highly community connected sample - 96\% of women had LGBTQ friends and over half reported feeling mostly or very connected to an LGBTQ community in their everyday lives. While the sense of connection appears stable, the mode of engagement appears to be changing. Fewer women are physically attending LGBTQ events and venues, and fewer women are reading community street press. This presents challenges for health services wishing to to engage with this group. Previous strategies for delivering heath promotion often relied on women physically congregating at
events or venues or reading community street press. A lot of women told us about websites they visited for LGBTQ content, but we don't know how this mode of engagement contributes to women's sense of community connection or how it may be productive for health promotion

- We need to know more about the patterns of engagement among LBQ women and with the wider LGBTQ communities. In particular, how is community connection generated, what accounts for the feeling of high connection in the context of reduced face-to-face engagement in LOBTU spaces and how important is community connection for heathl and wellbeing?
- As 'E-health' gains more prominence, it is important to know more about how LBQ women access information online, particularly in regions that do have the population to sustain dedicated physical spaces for LBQ women. This information will improve the future effectiveness of health promotion, prevention messages or early interventions to this group.


### 5.10. SWASH limitations

Since 2006, SWASH has expanded to include general health questions and issues of concern to the LGBTQ community Despite this, we are not collecting information on health issues that affect all women, such as exercise, diet or health service utilisation. Our findings suggest there are worrying levels of psychological distress among young LBQ women and high numbers of LBQ women accessing psychological services. We do not know about the use of prescribed medication or about markers of psychological distress such as self-harm or suicidality. Nor do we collect adequate information on which mental health or physical health services women access or their experiences of these 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 Mard Gras Fair Day, where over two thirds of our respondents were recruited, for social reasons, not because they have health or other problems. This means that the sample is not skewed
owards people with high rates of health difficulties or risk actors. On the other hand, a survey of this sort is not likely to clude people with same-sex desires about which they are very uneasy or who do not wish to associate with the LGBTU community or are not drawn to the activities or events on offer during Mardi Gras season. The results reflect the features of generally younger mettopolitan community-atlached group LBQ women, rather than a sample of women who have had sexual experiences with women.

## 5.1ו. Conclusion

SWASH has highlighted several areas of physical and mental health concern for LBQ women engaged with the LGBTQ community in Sydney. The lack of health promotion, prevention and intervention programs that specifically address these health issues for LBO women is disappointing. The consistent messages from national and community-based research is that the health outcome gains being made in the general population are not being replicated for this group of LBQ sustralian women; it is time for action.
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BUILDING OUR COMMUNITY'S HEALTH \& WELLBEING
ACON: AIDS Council of New South Wales
UNSW Schoo of Pubbicheoeth hand Communtin Medicie
National Centre in HIV Epidemiology and Clinical Research Sydney Women and Sexual Health
Brief Survey 2008 How many of your friends are lesbians?
None $\square 1 \quad \mathrm{~A}$ few $\square 2$ Some $\square 3$ Most $\square 4$ All $\square 5$
How many of your friends are gay or homosexual men? 2. How many of your friends are gay or homosexual men?
None $\square 1$ few $\square 2$ Some $\square 3$ Most $\square 4$ All $\square 5$










2. Have you ever experienced domestic violence in a
relationship?
Never $\square_{1}$ Yes, with a man $\square_{2}$ Yes, with a woman $\square_{3}$ Never $\square 1$ Yes, with a man $\square_{2}$ Yes, with a whan
33. If yes, did you talk to someone else about it or seek help?
No $\square 1$ Yes $\square 2$
 Other $\square 1$ please state
In general, would you say your health is-
Excellent $\square 1$ Very good $\square 2$ 36. Are you out to your doctor about your sexuality?
No $\square 1$ Yes $\square 2$ Don't have a regular doctor $\square 1$

ACON: AIDS Council of New South Wales National Centre in HIV Social Research
National Centrit in HIV Epidemiology and Clinical Research
University of New South Wales

Sydney Women and Sexual Health
Brief Survey 2006
 How many of your friends are gay or homosexual men?
None $\square 1$ A few $\square 2$ Some $\square 3$ Most $\square 4$ All $\square 5$








