

Table 4. Odds ratios from logistic regression analysis of any condom use and multinomial regression analyses of condom use only and condom use with a systemic method, 1995

Characteristic	Any condom use†	Use of condom only‡	Use of condom plus systemic method‡
Age at interview			
<18	1.644	1.483	6.842**
18–19	1.386	1.226	4.644**
20–24	1.076	0.945	3.496**
25–29	1.103	0.994	3.224**
30–34	1.098	1.000	3.048**
35–39	1.267*	1.231	2.003
40–44 (ref)	1.000	1.000	1.000
Union status			
Currently married (ref)	1.000	1.000	1.000
Cohabiting	1.071	1.001	2.854**
Formerly married	1.395*	1.136	7.246***
Never-married	1.730***	1.459**	7.454***
Race/ethnicity			
White non-Hispanic (ref)	1.000	1.000	1.000
Black non-Hispanic	1.428***	1.349**	1.740**
Hispanic	1.008	1.084	0.364*
Other	1.999***	2.045***	1.553
Education			
<high school	0.950	1.023	0.526*
High school (ref)	1.000	1.000	1.000
Some college	1.156	1.168	1.100
College graduate/higher	1.473***	1.473***	1.496
Religion			
None	1.122	1.189	0.766
Protestant (ref)	1.000	1.000	1.000
Catholic	1.325**	1.349**	1.177
Jewish/other	1.884***	1.923***	1.596
Income (as % of poverty level)			
0–99	0.714**	0.698**	0.820
100–249	0.804*	0.801*	0.865
250–449	0.911	0.873	1.354
≥450 (ref)	1.000	1.000	1.000
Preference for more children			
Wants more	2.898***	3.098***	1.793**
Wants no more (ref)	1.000	1.000	1.000
No. of partners in last 3 months			
1 (ref)	1.000	1.000	1.000
≥2	1.671***	1.661***	1.654*
No response	2.328*	1.977	27.909**
Duration of current relationship (in months)			
<6	1.526**	1.274	2.840***
6–17	1.054	1.019	1.340
18–59	0.933	0.916	1.145
≥60 (ref)	1.000	1.000	1.000
No response	0.544	0.620	0.057**

*Significantly different from reference category at $p < .05$. **Significantly different from reference category at $p < .01$. ***Significantly different from reference category at $p < .001$. †Versus nonuse of the condom. ‡Versus use of any method other than the condom. Notes: Unweighted N is 6,729. ref=reference category.