**TABLE 2. Odds ratios from logistic regression analysis assessing associations between selected variables and consumers' use of the female condom in the past 12 months, by gender and model**

| Variable | Male | | Female | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Unadjusted (N=860) | Adjusted (N=815) | Unadjusted (N=745) | Adjusted (N=711) |
| **Perceptions of female condom** | | | | |
| Effective for STI/HIV prevention | 1.18 | 0.90 | 2.44** | 1.60 |
| Effective for pregnancy prevention | 2.83** | 2.85** | 1.88* | 1.89 |
| Affordable | 3.06** | 4.17** | 3.98** | 3.64** |
| Easy to use | 4.74** | 6.07** | 1.98** | 3.15** |
| Reusable | 2.11* | 1.77 | 1.76 | 1.23 |
| **Fertility preference/family status** | | | | |
| Does not want child in next 24 mos. | na | 1.08 | na | 0.64 |
| Currently married | na | 1.08 | na | 0.44** |
| **Risk behavior/perception** | | | | |
| ≥2 partners in past 12 mos. | na | 0.49* | na | 0.70 |
| Low perceived HIV risk | na | 2.23* | na | 1.43 |
| **Prior use of male condom** | | | | |
| Any use in past 12 mos. | na | 30.29** | na | 8.35** |
| **Background characteristics** | | | | |
| Age | na | 1.05* | na | 1.03 |
| ≥secondary school education | na | 0.57 | na | 1.01 |
| Socioeconomic status | | | | |
| Low (ref) | na | 1.00 | na | 1.00 |
| Medium | na | 2.24* | na | 1.79 |
| High | na | 1.87 | na | 1.58 |
| Harare residence | na | 1.36 | na | 1.04 |
| Log likelihood | −74.25 | −58.67 | −80.01 | −62.20 |

*p<.05. **p<.01. *Notes:* na=not applicable. ref=reference group.