

South East Queensland Gay Community Periodic Survey: June 1998

Author:

Van de Ven, Paul; Prestage, Garrett; Kippax, Susan; Benzie, Tim; Clementson, Chris

Publication details:

Report No. Monograph 4/1998 1875978143 (ISBN)

Publication Date:

1998

DOI:

https://doi.org/10.4225/53/5750E7F24E650

License:

https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/au/ Link to license to see what you are allowed to do with this resource.

Downloaded from http://hdl.handle.net/1959.4/51806 in https://unsworks.unsw.edu.au on 2024-04-23



South East Queensland Gay Community Periodic Survey: June 1998

Paul Van de Ven Garrett Prestage

Susan Kippax

Judy French

Tim Benzie

Chris Clementson

Monograph 4/1998

National Centre in HIV Social Research
National Centre in HIV Epidemiology
and Clinical Research
Queensland AIDS Council
Queensland Positive People
Queensland Intravenous AIDS Association



South East Queensland Gay Community Periodic Survey: June 1998

Paul Van de Ven

National Centre in HIV Social Research, Macquarie University

Garrett Prestage

National Centre in HIV Epidemiology and Clinical Research, University of New South Wales

Susan Kippax

National Centre in HIV Social Research, Macquarie University

Judy French

National Centre in HIV Social Research, Macquarie University

Tim Benzie

National Centre in HIV Social Research, Macquarie University

Chris Clementson

Queensland AIDS Council

Principal Investigators

Paul Van de Ven Garrett Prestage

Other Investigators

Susan Kippax June Crawford Judy French Andrew Grulich John Kaldor

Coordinator

Tim Benzie

Copies of this monograph or any other publication from this project may be obtained by contacting:

National Centre in HIV Social Research School of Behavioural Sciences Macquarie University Sydney, NSW 2109 AUSTRALIA

Telephone: (61 2) 9850 8046

Fax: (61 2) 9850 8112

email: nat.centre.hiv@mq.edu.au

WWW: http://www.bhs.mq.edu.au/nchsr/

© National Centre in HIV Social Research 1998

ISBN 1-875978-14-3

http://doi.org/i0.4225/53/5750E7F24E650

Contents

	Page
Description of the Study	4
Sample and Recruitment	5
Demographic Profile	6
Association with Gay Community	10
HIV Testing	12
Sexual Practice and 'Safe Sex'	15
Drug Use	23
Discussion	25
References	27
Acknowledgments	28
Questionnaire	20

Description of the Study

HE South East Queensland Gay Community Periodic Survey is a cross-sectional survey of gay and homosexually active men recruited through a range of sites in Brisbane, the Gold Coast and the Sunshine Coast. The project was funded by Queensland Health. The Periodic Survey provides a snapshot of sexual and HIV-related practices among gay and homosexually active men. These data can be compared with those obtained from other studies such as the Brisbane Region and Sexual Health (BRASH) study (Prestage et al. 1996a), Male Call 96 (Crawford et al. 1998) and the Sydney Gay Community Periodic Survey (Prestage et al. 1996b; Van de Ven et al. 1997).

The major aim of the South East Queensland Periodic Survey is to provide data on levels of safe and unsafe sexual practice in a broad cross-sectional sample of gay and homosexually active men. To this end, men were recruited from a number of gay-community venues and sexual health clinics.

This study, the initial South East Queensland Periodic Survey, was conducted in June 1998. If similar surveys are conducted in June each year and employ the same recruitment strategies, it will be possible to examine changes in practice over time, albeit from cross-sectional samples.

Eight sites were chosen for the study: one sexual health clinic, five gay-community venues in Brisbane and one each in the Gold Coast and Sunshine Coast respectively. Recruitment in these venues was conducted by trained recruiters over a one-week period. Men were also recruited at the Pride Fair Day.

The questionnaire (appended to this report) is a short, self-administered instrument that typically takes five to 10 minutes to complete. Questions focus on anal intercourse and oral sex, the use of condoms, the nature of sexual relationships, HIV testing practice and serostatus, aspects of social attachment to gay community, recreational drug use, and a range of demographic items including sexual identity, age, education, occupation and ethnicity. Questions were designed to maximise comparability with Sydney Periodic Surveys and other studies.

This report describes the data from the initial South East Queensland Gay Community Periodic Survey (June 1998). More detailed analysis of the data will continue and will be disseminated as it is completed. As with any data analysis, further examination may necessitate minor reinterpretation of the findings.

Sample and Recruitment

Respondents were recruited through eight sites in the Brisbane, Gold Coast and Sunshine Coast areas and at a large public gay-community event (Pride Fair Day). Just under two fifths of the men were recruited at the Pride Fair Day. At the Gold Coast and Sunshine Coast venues, 120 and 96 men respectively were recruited.

TABLE 1 SOURCE OF RECRUITMENT		
Sexual health centre	116 (8.7%)	
Gay venues	712 (53.1%)	
Pride Fair Day	513 (38.3%)	
TOTAL	1341 (100%)	

In all, 1607 men were asked to complete a questionnaire and 1341 did so. This represents a very acceptable response rate of 83.4%.

In many ways this sample is similar to earlier gay-community-based samples, including that recruited for the Sydney Gay Community Periodic Survey in February 1998. However, one key difference is that a smaller proportion of men was recruited at the Fair Day in Brisbane. This is mainly attributable to the broader reach of the current survey beyond the Brisbane metropolitan area. It could also be attributed to the smaller nature of the Fair Day in Brisbane and the time of year it is held.

Previous studies such as BRASH and SMASH (Prestage *et al.* 1995) have demonstrated that HIV serostatus is an important distinguishing feature among gay men, particularly with regard to sexual behaviour. For this reason some of the data on sexual practices have been reported separately for men who are HIV-positive, those who are HIV-negative, and those who have not been tested or do not know their serostatus.

Also, as indicated in the Sydney Periodic Surveys, men recruited from events such as the Fair Day are different in some respects from those recruited from clinics and gay venues. Nonetheless, most of the data reported here are for the sample as a whole, giving an account of practices drawn from a *broad* cross-sectional sample of South East Queensland gay men.

Seventy nine men indicated that they had participated in the Male Call 96 survey and 124 said they had participated in the BRASH study. In most respects, the men who said they had participated in Male Call 96 and in BRASH were no different from the rest of the sample on key demographic and behavioural variables.

Demographic Profile

In terms of demographic variables, the participants in this study were quite similar to those recruited in other gay-community-based studies.

Geographic distribution

The men came primarily from the Brisbane metropolitan area or from other parts of Queensland. A small percentage of men, who indicated that they participated regularly in South East Queensland gay community, came from outside the State.

TABLE 2 RESIDENTIAL LOCATION			
Brisbane Metropolitan Area	957	(71.3%)	
Gold Coast	114	(8.5%)	
Sunshine Coast	108	(8.1%)	
Other Queensland	56	(4.2%)	
Elsewhere	106	(7.9%)	
TOTAL	1341	(100%)	

Age

Respondents ranged between 16 and 72 years of age, with a median of 33. Age range and distribution were similar to those observed in previous studies (eg Prestage *et al*, 1996b).

	TABLE 3 AGE	
Under 25	224 (17.2%)	
25-29	252 (19.3%)	-4
30-39	477 (36.5%)	
40-49	226 (17.3%)	
50 and over	127 (9.7%)	
TOTAL	1306 (100%)	

Data were missing on this item for 35 men.

Ethnicity

This was predominantly an 'Anglo-Australian' sample.

TABLE 4 ETHNICITY			
Anglo-Australian	973	(84.1%)	
European	87	(7.5%)	
Aboriginal/Torres Strait Islander	20	(1.7%)	
Other	77	(6.7%)	
TOTAL	1157	(100%)	

Data were missing on this item for 184 men.

Employment and occupation

The proportion of men who were not in the work force was fairly high compared with the general population. This was particularly true of HIV-positive men, probably due to the relatively high percentage who were in receipt of some form of social security payment.

TABLE 5 EMPLOYMENT STATUS		
Full-time	798 (61.9%)	
Part-time	192 (14.9%)	
Unemployed/Other	300 (23.3%)	
TOTAL	1290 (100%)	

Data were missing on this item for 51 men.

As in most studies of male homosexual populations, there was a substantial overrepresentation of professionals/managers and underrepresentation of manual workers (Connell *et al*, 1991; Hood *et al*, 1994).

	TABLE 6 OCCUPATION
PROFESSIONAL/MANAGERIAL	
Professional/ Managerial	357 (33.6%)
Paraprofessional	153 (14.4%)
WHITE COLLAR	
Clerical/ Sales	347 (32.6%)
BLUE COLLAR	
Trades	133 (12.5%)
Plant operator/Labourer	72 (6.7%)
TOTAL	1062 (100%)

¹Includes all men who specified their occupation, whether currently employed or not.

Education

As in other gay-community-based studies, this sample was relatively well educated; almost three fifths of the men had received some postsecondary education and almost two fifths had some university education.

TABLE 7 EDUCATION		
Up to 3 years of high school	232 (17.9%)	
Up to Year 12/Senior Certificate	299 (23.1%)	
Trade certificate or diploma	267 (20.6%)	
University	498 (38.4%)	
TOTAL	1296 (100%)	

^{&#}x27;Data were missing on this item for 45 men.

Sexual relationships with women

Few men had had sex with a woman in the previous six months.

TABLE 8 SEX	WITH WOMEN IN PREVIOUS SIX MONTHS	
No female partners	1128 (87.9%)	
One female partner	90 (7.0%)	
More than one female partner	66 (5.1%)	
TOTAL	1284 (100%)	

Data were missing on this item for 57 men.

Sexual relationships with men

Well over half the men in the sample were currently in a regular sexual relationship with a man. Slightly less than one in three study participants was monogamous (ie had sex only with a regular partner). Over half the men had sex with casual partners and one in six men was 'currently' not having sex with men at all.

Table 9 Relationships with Men		
None	215 (16.4%)	
Casual only	278 (21.2%)	
Regular plus casual	454 (34.7%)	
Regular only (monogamous)	363 (27.7%)	
TOTAL	1310 (100%)	

^{&#}x27;Data were missing on this item for 31 men.

Among those men who were in a regular relationship, almost three in five of the relationships had lasted for more than a year.

Table 10 Length of Relationships with Men		
Less than one year	283 (40.1%)	
At least one year	422 (59.9%)	
TOTAL	705 (100%)	

^{&#}x27;Includes only those men who 'currently' had a regular partner and answered Question 8.

Association with Gay Community

In several respects, this was a highly gay-identified and gay-community-attached sample.

Sexual identity and sexual relations

The men in the sample were mostly homosexually identified, although somewhat less so than their counterparts in similar surveys in Sydney (Prestage et al, 1996b) or Melbourne (Van de Ven et al, 1998). Homosexual identification included 'gay/homosexual' as well as eight men who thought of themselves as 'queer'. Nonhomosexual identification included 'bisexual' and 'heterosexual'.

Y	TABLE II SEXUAL IDENTITY	
Homosexually identified	1115 (84.3%)	
Not homosexually identified	207 (15.7%)	
TOTAL	1322 (100%)	

^{&#}x27;Data were missing on this item for 19 men.

Furthermore, few men said they enjoyed having sex mostly with women or with men and women equally. Typically, the men enjoyed having sex with men only or mostly men.

TABLE 12 SEXUAL PREFERENCE		
Men only	1006 (75.5%)	
Mostly men	219 (16.4%)	
Other ⁱ	107 (8.1%)	
TOTAL ²	1332 (100%)	

^{&#}x27;Includes 'Men and women equally', 'Mostly women', 'Women only' and 'No-one'.

Gay community involvement

The men in this sample were quite socially involved with gay men. Over half of the men in the sample said most or all of their friends were gay men.

	TABLE 13	GAY FRIENDS	
None	24	(1.8%)	
Some or a few	619	(46.3%)	
Most or all	698	(51.9%)	
TOTAL ¹	1337	(100%)	

Data were missing on this item for 4 men.

²Data were missing on this item for 9 men.

Correspondingly, almost half of the men said they spent a lot of their free time with gay men.

Table 14 Proportion of Free Time Spent with Gay Men		
None	16 (1.2%)	
A little	211 (15.8%)	
Some	506 (37.9%)	
A lot	603 (45.1%)	
TOTAL	1336 (100%)	

Data were missing on this item for 5 men.

HIV Testing

Most of the men had already been tested for antibodies to HIV. Almost one man in seven had not been tested or had failed to obtain the test results, and a further 30 men did not respond to this question. Less than 10% of the men were HIV-positive.

TABLE 15 HIV TEST RESULTS		
Not tested/No results	177 (13.5%)	
HIV-negative	1021 (77.9%)	
HIV-positive	113 (8.6%)	
TOTAL ¹	1311 (100%)	

Data were missing on this item for 30 men.

The following table shows HIV-test results from two earlier studies: BRASH, conducted in 1995–96 (Prestage *et al*, 1996a) and Male Call 96 (Crawford *et al*, 1998). The Male Call 96 data are drawn from the responses of 249 gay-community-attached men who lived in the Brisbane, Gold Coast or Sunshine Coast regions. (Seventy men, who lived in these areas but who were classified as non-gay-community-attached, were excluded. Hence the cross-study comparisons presented here are of like with like.)

In both BRASH and the current survey, a greater proportion of the men had been tested for HIV than in the Male Call 96 study. Proportionately, there were more HIV-positive men in the BRASH sample and fewer HIV-positive men in the Male Call 96 sample.

TABLE	6 HIV Test Results: Other Studies	
	BRASH	MALE CALL 96
Not tested/No results	39 (13.1%)	44 (17.7%)
HIV-negative	223 (74.8%)	189 (75.9%)
HIV-positive	36 (12.1%)	16 (6.4%)
TOTAL	298 (100%)	249 (100%)

Time since most recent HIV-antibody test

Among those men who had had tests for HIV, the majority had done so within the previous year. Relatively few men reported infrequent testing.

TABI	E 17 TIME SINCE MOST RECENT HIV TEST	
Less than 6 months ago	599 (53.1%)	
7—12 months ago	177 (15.7%)	
1-2 years ago	175 (15.5%)	
Over 2 years ago	178 (15.8%)	
TOTAL	1129 (100%)	

Note: This table includes only those men who had been tested for HIV.

The pattern of time since most recent test was highly similar to that recorded in the BRASH study. In Male Call 96, however, more men reported that they had been tested for HIV recently than in the current study.

TABLE 18 TIME SINCE MOST RECENT HIV TEST: OTHER STUDIES			
	BRASH	MALE CALL 96	
Less than 6 months ago	145 (53.9%)	146 (69.9%)	
7-12 months ago	50 (18.6%)	29 (13.9%)	
1-2 years ago	34 (12.6%)	11 (5.3%)	
Over 2 years ago	40 (14.9%)	23 (11.0%)	
TOTAL	269 (100%)	209 (100%)	

Combination therapies

Of the men who indicated that they were HIV-positive, almost seven in ten were taking combination therapy.

TABLE 19 USE OF COMBINATION ANTIRETROVIRAL THERAPIES		
Yes	77 (68.8%)	
No	35 (31.3%)	
TOTAL	112 (100%)	

Data were missing on this item for I man.

Regular partner's HIV-status

Participants were asked about the serostatus of their current regular partners. As the question referred to their current partner, fewer men responded to this item than indicated sex with a regular partner during the previous six months. About two thirds had an HIV-negative regular partner, while one in 12 had an HIV-positive regular partner and one in four of the men had a regular partner whose serostatus they did not know.

	TABLE 20 HIV STATUS OF REGULAR PARTNERS	
HIV-positive	61 (8.3%)	
HIV-negative	486 (66.3%)	
HIV status unknown	186 (25.4%)	
TOTAL	733 (100%)	

Note: includes only those men who 'currently' had a regular partner.

Half the HIV-positive men had an HIV-negative regular partner and less than one third had an HIV-positive regular partner. HIV-negative men tended to have HIV-negative regular partners. Men who did not know their own serostatus tended not to know the serostatus of their regular partners.

TABLE 21 MATCH OF HIV STATUS IN REGULAR RELATIONSHIPS				
SEROSTATUS OF REGULAR PARTNER	HIV-POSITIVE	HIV-NEGATIVE	UNKNOWN	
HIV-positive	20 (30.8%)	34 (5.9%)	5 (6.0%)	
HIV-negative	33 (50.8%)	426 (74.1%)	22 (26.2%)	
HIV status unknown	12 (18.5%)	190 (20.0%)	57 (67.9%)	
TOTAL (N= 724)	65 (100%)	575 (100%)	84 (100%)	

^{&#}x27;Includes only those men who 'currently' had a regular partner.

Sexual Practice and 'Safe Sex'

Sexual behaviour between men

Participants were only asked to report on a limited range of sexual practices (separately for regular and casual partners): anal intercourse with and without ejaculation; and oral intercourse with ejaculation. These practices were selected for their possible association with HIV transmission. Based on the responses to the sexual behaviour items and the sort of sexual relationships with men indicated by the participants, approximately six in 10 of the men were classified as having had sex with a regular male partner and approximately seven in 10 of the men were classified as having had sex with a casual male partner 'in the previous six months'.

TABLE 22 REPORTED SEX WITH MALE PART	NERS IN PREVIOUS SIX MONTHS	
Any sexual contact with regular partners	826 (61.6%)	
Any sexual contact with casual partners	962 (71.7%)	
TOTAL	1341	

Note: These categories are not mutually exclusive.

Men recruited at the Pride Fair Day were more likely to have had regular partners, and less likely to have had casual partners, than their counterparts recruited at venues or clinics.

TABLE 23 REPORTED SEX WITH MALE PARTNERS IN PREVIOUS SIX MONTHS BY RECRUITMENT SITE			
	PRIDE FAIR DAY	VENUES/CLINICS	
Any sexual contact with regular partners	360 (70.2%)	466 (56.3%)	
Any sexual contact with casual partners	338 (65.9%)	624 (75.4%)	
TOTAL	513	828	

Note: These categories are not mutually exclusive.

The majority of the men had engaged in sex with between i and io partners 'in the previous six months', although more than a quarter of the men had more than io partners.

TABLE 24 NUMBER OF MALE PARTNERS IN PREVIOUS SIX MONTHS		
None	97 (7.3%)	
One	282 (21.2%)	
2-10	610 (45.9%)	
11-50	268 (20.1%)	
More than 50	74 (5.6%)	
TOTAL	1331 (100%)	

Data were missing on this item for 10 men.

The frequencies for number of male partners 'in the previous six months' were fairly similar to those pertaining to South East Queensland men who participated in previous studies.

TABLE 25 NUMBER OF MALE PARTNERS IN PREVIOUS SIX MONTHS: OTHER STUDIES		
	BRASH	MALE CALL 96
None	9 (3.0%)	9 (3.6%)
One	42 (14.1%)	76 (30.5%)
2-10	146 (49.0%)	107 (43.0%)
11-50	71 (23.8%)	47 (18.9%)
More than 50	30 (10.1%)	10 (4.0%)
TOTAL	406 (100%)	249 (100%)

Comparison of sexual practices between regular and casual partners

Not all participants engaged in oral intercourse with ejaculation with their regular male partners, but those who did were equally likely to do so in the insertive as in the receptive role. Almost two thirds of those with regular male partners engaged in oral intercourse with ejaculation with their partners.

Most participants engaged in anal intercourse with their regular male partners. About three quarters of those with regular partners engaged in insertive anal intercourse; slightly fewer engaged in receptive anal intercourse.

TABLE 26 SEXUAL BEH	TABLE 26 SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR WITH REGULAR MALE PARTNERS		
SEX PRACTICES	TOTAL SAMPLE	THOSE WITH REGULAR PARTNE	
	N= 1341	n= 826	
Any oral intercourse with ejaculation	523 (39.0%)	523 (63.3%)	
Insertive fellatio with ejaculation	417 (31.1%)	417 (51.9%)	
Receptive fellatio with ejaculation	427 (31.8%)	427 (53.5%)	
Any anal intercourse	725 (54.1%)	725 (87.8%)	
Insertive anal intercourse	628 (46.8%)	628 (76.0%)	
Receptive anal intercourse	592 (44.1%)	592 (71.7%)	

Note: These items are not mutually exclusive. The percentages do not sum to 100% as some men engaged in more than one of these practices and some in none of these practices.

Fewer respondents engaged in either oral intercourse with ejaculation or anal intercourse with casual male partners than with regular male partners. Almost half of the men with casual partners engaged in oral intercourse with ejaculation, more commonly in the insertive role. Almost three quarters of those who had sex with casual male partners engaged in anal intercourse with those partners, again more usually in the insertive role.

TABLE 27 SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR WITH CASUAL MALE PARTNERS			
SEX PRACTICES	TOTAL SAMPLE	THOSE WITH CASUAL PARTNERS	
	N= 1341	n= 962	
Any oral intercourse with ejaculation	424 (31.6%)	424 (44.1%)	
Insertive fellatio with ejaculation	351 (26.2%)	351 (40.0%)	
Receptive fellatio with ejaculation	274 (20.4%)	274 (31.0%)	
Any anal intercourse	673 (50.2%)	673 (70.0%)	
Insertive anal intercourse	597 (44.5%)	597 (62.1%)	
Receptive anal intercourse	486 (36.2%)	486 (50.5%)	

Note: These items are not mutually exclusive.

Sex with regular male partners

Condom Use

Based on the entire sample, a little less than one third of the men who participated in the survey engaged in any unprotected anal intercourse with regular male partners 'in the previous six months'.

TABLE 28 C	Table 28 Condom Use with Regular Partners		
	TOTAL SAMPLE	THOSE WITH REGULAR PARTNERS	
No regular partner	515 (38.4%)		
No anal intercourse	101 (7.5%)	101 (12.2%)	
Always uses condom	314 (23.4%)	314 (38.0%)	
Sometimes does not use condom'	411 (30.6%)	411 (49.8%)	
BASE	1341 (100%)	826 (100%)	

'Of the 411 men who engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with regular partners 'in the previous six months', 104 (7.8% of the total sample) practised only withdrawal prior to ejaculation, 145 (10.8%) practised only ejaculation inside, and 162 (12.1%) engaged in both withdrawal and ejaculation inside.

Patterns of anal intercourse and condom use in the current sample were quite similar to previous South East Queensland findings. An exception was that men who participated in the BRASH study were less likely to have had regular partners.

TABLE 29 CONDOM USE WITH REGULAR PARTNERS: OTHER STUDIES			
	BRASH	MALE CALL 96	
No regular partner	148 (49.5%)	86 (34.5%)	
No anal intercourse	24 (8.0%)	21 (8.4%)	
Always uses condom	48 (16.1%)	52 (20.9%)	
Sometimes does not use condom	79 (26.4%)	90 (36.1%)	
TOTAL	299 (100%)	249 (100%)	

Note: These figures should be compared with those in the Total Sample column of Table 28.

There were differences between HIV-negative and HIV-positive men in their condom use with regular partners. HIV-negative men were more likely to have any unprotected anal intercourse. Respondents whose serostatus was unknown were less likely to engage in anal intercourse with their regular male partners but where they did they were quite likely to have unprotected anal intercourse.

TABLE 30 SEROSTAT	rus and Condom Us	e among Regular Pai	RINERS
	HIV-POSITIVE	HIV-NEGATIVE	UNKNOWN SEROSTATUS
No Anal	6 (9.1%)	68 (10.6%)	25 (25.5%)
Always uses condom	33 (50.0%)	249 (38.7%)	26 (26.5%)
Sometimes does not use condom	27 (40.9%)	321 (50.8%)	47 (48.0%)
TOTAL ¹	66 (100%)	644 (100%)	98 (100%)

'Includes only those men who had a regular partner 'in the previous six months'. p < .001

These findings should be interpreted in light of the serostatus of the participants' regular partners. In the following table, the serostatus of each of the participants has been compared with that of his regular partner. For each of the nine serostatus combinations, sexual practice has been divided into 'no unprotected anal intercourse' versus 'some unprotected anal intercourse'. Although the numbers are small, HIV-positive men were equally likely to engage in unprotected anal intercourse with regular partners who were also HIV-positive as they were with regular partners who were HIV-negative or of unknown serostatus. Most of the unprotected anal intercourse with regular partners involving participants who were HIV-negative occurred in relationships where both partners were known to be HIV-negative or where the other partner's status was unknown. Again, the numbers are small, but participants of unknown serostatus were roughly as likely to have unprotected anal intercourse with HIV-negative partners as they were with HIV-positive or status-unknown partners.

		PAR	TICIPANT'S SEROSTA	TUS
REGULAR PARTNER'S SEROSTATUS	Anal Intercourse	HIV-POSITIVE	HIV-NEGATIVE	UNKNOWN
HIV-positive	No UAI	6 (42.9%)	18 (69.2%)	4 (50.0%)
	Some UAI	8 (57.1%)	8 (30.8%)	4 (50.0%)
HIV-negative	No UAI	10 (38.5%)	117 (34.6%)	35 (44.3%)
	Some UAI	16 (61.5%)	221 (65.4%)	44 (55.7%)
HIV-unknown	No UAI	1 (50.0%)	3 (18.8%)	14 (41.2%)
	Some UAI	1 (50.0%)	13 (81.2%)	20 (58.8%)
TOTAL		42	380	121

Note: UAI - unprotected anal intercourse.

'Includes only men who had anal intercourse with their 'current' regular partner 'in the previous six months'.

Whereas much of the unprotected anal intercourse was between seroconcordant (positive-positive or negative-negative) couples, 106 men in the above table had unprotected anal intercourse in a relationship where seroconcordance was in doubt.

Agreements

Most participants with regular male partners had agreements with their partners about sex within the relationship.

TABLE 32 ACREEMENTS WITH REGULAR MALE PARTNERS ABOUT S	EX WITHIN RELATIONSHIP
No spoken agreement about anal intercourse	178 (24.9%)
No anal intercourse between regular partners is permitted	46 (6.4%)
Anal intercourse permitted only with condom	243 (34.0%)
Anal intercourse without condom is permitted	247 (34.6%)
TOTAL*	714 (100%)

^{&#}x27;Based on the responses of men who 'currently' had a regular partner.

The types of agreements that the men had were largely similar to those reported from previous studies of South East Queensland gay men. An exception was that participants in the current study were slightly less likely to have struck an agreement to have unprotected anal intercourse with their regular partners.

TABLE 33 AGREEMENTS WITH REGULAR MAI	E PARTNERS ABOUT SEX WITH	HIN RELATIONSHIP: OTHER STUDIES
	BRASH	MALE CALL 96
No spoken agreement	29 (19.2%)	32 (19.7%)
No anal intercourse	10 (6.6%)	14 (8.6%)
Anal intercourse only with condom	52 (34.4%)	55 (33.7%)
Anal intercourse without condom	60 (39.7%)	62 (38.0%)
TOTAL	151 (100%)	163 (100%)

Most participants had made an agreement with their regular partner about sexual interactions outside the relationship. Where men did make such an agreement, very few permitted unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners.

TABLE 34 AGREEMENTS WITH REGULAR MALE PARTNERS ABOUT SEX OUTSIDE RELATIONSHIP		
No spoken agreement about anal intercourse	214 (29.9%)	
No sexual contact with casual partners is permitted	213 (29.8%)	
No anal intercourse with casual partners is permitted	56 (7.8%)	
Anal intercourse permitted only with condom	217 (30.3%)	
Anal intercourse without condom is permitted	15 (2.1%)	
TOTAL ¹	715 (100%)	

Based on the responses of men who currently had a regular partner.

The types of agreements that the men had were broadly in line with those reported from previous Brisbane studies. However, the participants in the current study and in the Male Call 96 survey were more likely to have sanctioned protected anal intercourse with casual partners, and less likely to have agreed to no sex with casual partners, than their BRASH counterparts

	BRASH	MAIE CALL 96
No spoken agreement	38 (29.0%)	44 (27.0%)
No sex with casual partners	52 (39.7%)	56 (34.4%)
No anal intercourse	15 (11.4%)	14 (8.6%)
Anal intercourse only with condom	26 (19.9%)	48 (29.4%)
Anal intercourse without condom	0 (-)	1 (0.6%)
TOTAL	131 (100%)	163 (100%)

Sex with casual male partners

Condom use

Based on the entire sample, 14% of the men who participated in the survey engaged in any unprotected anal intercourse with their casual male partners 'in the previous six months'. A separate analysis revealed that of these 188 men, 85 also had unprotected anal intercourse with regular partners.

TABLE 36 CONDOM USE WITH CASUAL PARTNERS		
	TOTAL SAMPLE	THOSE WITH CASUAL PARTNER
No casual partner	379 (28.3%)	
No anal intercourse	289 (21.6%)	289 (30.0%)
Always uses condom	485 (36.2%)	485 (50.4%)
Sometimes does not use condom	188 (14.0%)	188 (19.5%)
BASE	1341 (100%)	962 (100%)

'Of the 188 men who engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners 'in the previous six months', 78 (5.8% of the total sample) practised only withdrawal prior to ejaculation, 37 (2.8%) practised only ejaculation inside, and 73 (5.4%) engaged in both withdrawal and ejaculation inside.

A comparison of the data in Tables 28 and 36 confirms that more men had unprotected anal intercourse with regular than with casual partners. Furthermore, unprotected anal intercourse with ejaculation inside was more common within regular relationships than between casual partners.

Patterns of anal intercourse and condom use in the current sample were somewhat different from earlier South East Queensland findings. Male Call 96 participants were less likely to report no anal intercourse than either their Periodic Survey or BRASH counterparts. BRASH participants were more likely to have had casual partners *per se* and more likely to have had unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners.

TABLE 37 CONDOM	Use with Casual Partner	S: OTHER STUDIES	
	BRASH	MALE CALL 96	
No casual partner	49 (16.4%)	80 (32.1%)	
No anal intercourse	77 (25.8%)	37 (14.9%)	
Always uses condom	116 (38.8%)	92 (36.9%)	
Sometimes does not use condom	57 (19.1%)	40 (16.1%)	
TOTAL	299 (100%)	249 (100%)	

Note: These figures should be compared with those in the Total Sample column of Table 36.

HIV-positive men were the most likely to have any unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners. HIV-negative men were most likely only to have protected anal intercourse whereas men of unknown serostatus were the most likely not to have anal intercourse. Some of these differences may be explained by positive—positive sex (Prestage *et al*, 1995).

TABLE 38 SEROS	TATUS AND CONDOM U	SE WITH CASUAL PARTNERS	
	HIV-POSITIVE	HIV-NECATIVE	Unknown
No anal intercourse	18 (20.9%)	219 (29.8%)	47 (37.9%)
Always uses condom	42 (48.8%)	387 (52.7%)	50 (40.3%)
Sometimes does not use condom	26 (30.2%)	129 (17.6%)	27 (21.8%)
TOTAL	86 (100%)	1019 (100%)	186 (100%)

'Includes only those men who had casual partners.

p . . 005

Serostatus

Two questions (ie 27 and 28) addressed disclosure of serostatus among casual partners. These questions were included in the questionnaire to obtain a sense of disclosure and sex between casual partners. Many more questions — beyond the scope of the brief questionnaire used here — would need to be asked to fully understand the issue. Furthermore, the inclusion of the two questions was *not* intended to endorse sexual negotiation between casual partners.

Approximately three in five of the participants with casual partners did not disclose their serostatus to any of their casual partners. Relatively few men disclosed to all casual partners.

TABLE 39 P	articipants' Disclosure of Serostatus to Casual Partners
Told none	568 (60.5%)
Told some	198 (21.1%)
Told all	173 (18.4%)
TOTAL	939 (100%)

Likewise, approximately three in five of the participants with casual partners were not told the serostatus of their casual partners. Relatively few men were routinely disclosed to by casual partners.

TABLE 40 CASUAL PARTNERS' DISCLOSURE OF SEROSTATUS TO PARTICIPANTS	
Told by none	586 (62.1%)
Told by some	255 (27.1%)
Told by all	102 (10.8%)
TOTAL	943 (100%)

Drug Use

Alcohol

About a quarter of the men (based on self-assessment) never got drunk 'in the previous six months'. One third got drunk once or twice only. About one in six men got drunk on at least a weekly basis.

TABLE 41 FREQUENCY OF	HAVING GOT DRUNK IN PREVIOUS SIX MONTHS	
Never	352 (26.8%)	
Once or twice only	429 (32.7%)	
Less than once a week	314 (23.9%)	
More than once a week	217 (16.6%)	
TOTAL	1312 (100%)	

^{&#}x27;Data were missing for 29 men.

Recreational drugs

The most commonly used recreational drugs were marijuana, amyl/poppers, speed and ecstasy. Relatively few men used tranquillisers, LSD, cocaine or heroin. In all, 831 men used any of the drugs listed in Question 43.

TABLE 42	DRUG USE IN THE PREVIOUS SIX MONTHS
Amyl/Poppers	467 (34.8%)
Marijuana	618 (46.1%)
Tranquillisers	134 (10.0%)
Ecstasy	262 (19.5%)
Speed	325 (24.2%)
LSD	125 (9.3%)
Cocaine	81 (6.0%)
Heroin	42 (3.1%)
ANY OF THE ABOVE	831 (62.0%)

Note: Percentages are based on the total sample of 1341 men, although not all men responded to these items. Items are not mutually exclusive.

Altogether, 116 men (8.7% of the sample) had injected drugs 'in the previous six months', most commonly speed. Only 10 men reported having injected steroids.

TABLE 43 INJECTING DRUG USE IN THE PREVIOUS SIX MONTHS	
Speed	88 (6.6%)
Cocaine	16 (1.2%)
Heroin	39 (2.9%)
Steroids	10 (0.7%)
Any other drug	28 (2.1%)
ANY OF THE ABOVE	116 (8.7%)

Note: Percentages are based on the total sample of 1341 men, although not all men responded to these items. Items are not mutually exclusive.

Of the men who had injected drugs, approximately two fifths had done so only once or twice 'in the previous six months'. About a quarter of the injecting drug users injected on at least a weekly basis.

TABLE 44 FREQUEN	ICY OF INJECTION IN PREVIOUS SIX MONTHS
Once or twice only	46 (43.0%)
Less than once a week	34 (31.8%)
More than once a week	27 (25.2%)
TOTAL	107 (100%)

Data were inconsistent or missing for 9 men.

Of the II6 injecting drug users, only seven had ever shared a needle/syringe 'in the previous six months'. Twenty one men had shared other injecting equipment 'in the previous six months'.

Discussion

The findings from the initial South East Queensland Gay Community Periodic Survey provide a snapshot of the social and sexual lives of gay men in Brisbane, the Gold Coast and the Sunshine Coast. In the main, the findings are quite similar to (and thereby corroborate) the evidence from the earlier BRASH (Prestage *et al*, 1996a) and Male Call 96 (Crawford *et al*, 1998) studies. Similarly, many of the results parallel findings from the Sydney Gay Community Periodic Surveys (Prestage *et al*, 1996b; Van de Ven *et al*, 1997) and Melbourne Gay Community Periodic Survey (Van de Ven *et al*, 1998), indicating that in some respects the gay cultures of the three large cities in eastern Australia are akin.

The 1341 participants were recruited at seven gay venues, at a sexual-health centre, and at the Pride Fair Day. Most of these men lived in the Brisbane Metropolitan or the Gold and Sunshine Coast areas. They were predominantly of 'Anglo-Australian' background, in professional/managerial or white-collar occupations, and well educated.

Most of the participants identified as gay or homosexual. Correspondingly, most preferred to have sex with men only, reflected in the finding that almost 88% had not had sex with any women 'in the previous six months'. As a whole, the sample was quite involved socially in gay community with high levels of gay friendships and with much free time spent with gay men.

Approximately 13% of the men had not been tested for HIV, a similar proportion to their counterparts in BRASH but lower than in Male Call 96. The majority of those who had been tested for HIV had done so 'within the past year'. Overall, 8.6% of the men were HIV-positive; a smaller percentage than in BRASH but a greater percentage than among their Male Call 96 counterparts.

Among the HIV-positive participants, use of combination antiretroviral therapies was the norm—68.8% of the HIV-positive men were taking a combination therapy at the time of the survey. Nonetheless, uptake of combination therapies is less than recorded elsewhere, for example in the recent Melbourne Gay Community Periodic Survey (82.6%—Van de Ven et al, 1998).

Most men reported 'current' sexual contact with at least one other man: about a third of the men only had a regular partner; another third had a regular partner and either or both partners also had casual partners; and approximately one fifth of the men only had casual partners. In the six months prior to the survey, approximately 60% of the men had sex with regular partners and approximately 70% of the men had sex with casual partners.

Of the *total* sample and 'in the previous six months', 411 men (30.6%) had any unprotected anal intercourse with a regular partner and 188 men (14.0%) had any unprotected anal intercourse with a casual partner. Some of these men (85 all told) had unprotected anal intercourse with both regular and casual partners. The remainder of the men in the overall sample—far and away the majority—indicated no unprotected anal intercourse with either regular or casual partners.

Not unexpectedly, more men had unprotected anal intercourse with regular than with casual partners. As well, unprotected anal intercourse that involved ejaculation inside was much more likely to occur between regular than between casual partners.

Most of the men with regular partners had agreements about sex within and outside of their relationship. Whereas approximately one third of these agreements permitted unprotected anal intercourse within the relationship, unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners was rarely allowed.

The numbers were small, but HIV-positive men tended to be as likely to engage in unprotected anal intercourse with HIV-positive regular partners as they were with HIV-negative or 'status unknown' regular partners. HIV-negative men were more likely to engage in unprotected anal intercourse with HIV-negative or 'status unknown' regular partners than with HIV-positive regular partners. Much of the unprotected anal intercourse within regular relationships occurred between seroconcordant (positive-positive or negative-negative) couples. Nonetheless, of those who had anal intercourse with their 'current' regular partner, 106 men had unprotected anal intercourse in a relationship that was not understood to be seroconcordant.

The men did not routinely disclose their serostatus to casual partners. Similarly, they most commonly did not know the serostatus of their casual partners. About 60% of men never disclosed their serostatus to casual partners and about 60% of men were never disclosed to by casual partners.

About three-quarters of the men got drunk 'in the previous six months'. About one in six men got drunk on at least a weekly basis.

Almost two-thirds of the men used recreational drugs, most commonly marijuana, amyl/poppers, speed and ecstasy. Altogether, 116 men (8.7% of the sample) had injected drugs 'in the previous six months', speed being the most likely drug to be injected. A small number of men (n = 27) injected on at least a weekly basis.

In conclusion, the initial South East Queensland Gay Community Periodic Survey was conducted very successfully. Recruitment at diverse sites attracted a large sample of gay men from the Brisbane—Gold Coast—Sunshine Coast region. The resulting data are robust and comparisons with data from the BRASH and Male Call 96 studies are suggestive of sound reliability. The findings provide an indispensable baseline against which future cross-sectional data—collected at yearly intervals—can be compared.

References

- Connell, R, Dowsett, G, Rodden, P and Davis, M (1991). Social class, gay men and AIDS prevention.

 Australian Journal of Public Health 15: 178–189.
- Crawford, J, Kippax, S, Rodden, P, Donohoe, S and Van de Ven, P (1998). *Male Call 96: National telephone survey of men who have sex with men.* Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research.
- Hood, D, Prestage, G, Crawford, J, Sorrell, T and O'Reilly, C (1994). Bisexual activity and non gayattachment. A report on the BANGAR project. Western Sydney Area Health Service.
- Kippax, S, Crawford, J, Rodden, P and Benton, K (1994). Report on Project Male-Call: National telephone survey of men who have sex with men. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Prestage, G, Kippax, S, Noble, J, Crawford, J, Baxter, D and Cooper, D (1995). A demographic, behavioural and clinical profile of HIV-positive men in a sample of homosexually active men in Sydney, Australia. Sydney: HIV, AIDS & Society Publications.
- Prestage, G, Kippax, S, Mahat, M, French, J, Knox, S and Van de Ven, P. (1996a). A demographic and behavioural comparison by age in a sample of homosexually active men in Brisbane, Australia. Sydney: HIV AIDS & Society Publications.
- Prestage, G, Kippax, S, Van de Ven, P, French, J, Richters, J, Campbell, D, Crawford, J, Grulich, A, Kinder, P and Kaldor, J. (1996b). *Sydney gay community periodic survey: February 1996*. Sydney: HIV AIDS & Society Publications.
- Van de Ven, P, Kippax, S, Crawford, J, French, J, Prestage, G, Grulich, A, Kaldor, J and Kinder, P (1997). Sexual practices in a broad cross-sectional sample of Sydney gay men. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health 21, 762–766.
- Van de Ven, P, Prestage, G, Kippax, S, French, J, Horn, G and Brotherton, A (1998). Melbourne Gay Community Periodic Survey: February 1998. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research.

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge the following individuals and organisations for their contributions to the success of this project.

Funding

Queensland Health

Steering Group

Phil Carswell, Chris Clementson, Mark Counter, Jeff Delandelles, James Eggmolesse, Margo Eyeson Annan, Malcolm McCamish, Simon O'Connor, Bernie Pearce

Recruitment

Andrew Baker, Colin Browne, Darlene Corry, Mark Eades, Michael Fletcher, Rob Frewin, Fiona Gillen, Peter Goodwin, Nathan Goss, Stephen Griffiths, Keiran Henry, Stephen Jones, Terry Kirk, Gai Lemon, Stephen Lewis, Deb Murphy, Patrick O'Duffy, Christopher Powell, David Sills, Michael Smith, Jacinta Toomey, Phillip Twadell, Jody Walton, Louise Wilson

Queensland AIDS Council

Rosz Craig, Stephen Gallagher, Helen Hirt, Darryl Kosch, Adrian Lovney, David Rowley, Peter Shuttlewood

National Centre in HIV Social Research

June Crawford, Stephanie Knox, Kim Meyer, Pamela Rodden, Janet Rutkauskas

National Centre in HIV Epidemiology and Clinical Research

Andrew Grulich, John Kaldor

Survey participants

The 1341 men who donated their time to ensure that the study was fully inclusive of their particular circumstances.

Venues

The management and staff of the various gay community venues and medical practices who assisted in the administration of the survey and gave generous permission for the survey to be administered on their premises.

National Centre in HIV Social Research MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY

National Centre in HIV Epidemiology & Clinical Research
THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES

QUAC QPP QUIVAA

SE Qld Gay Community Periodic Survey

	SE Qiu day community remodic durvey
1	This survey is for men who have had sex with another man in the past five years. Your responses are very important to us.
	그는 그는 그렇게 뭐야한물건 나면 하셔요 사람이 가려워지었다면서 하는 때
	PLEASE DO NOT COMPLETE IF YOU HAVE ALREADY DONE SO THIS WEEK.
	For each question, please TICK one box only,

	ALREADY DONE	SO THIS WEEK.
1.	How many of your friends ar	e gay or homosexual men?
	None □ A few □ So	me Most All
2.	How much of your free time men?	is spent with gay or homosexual
	None □ A little	□ Some □ A lot □
3.	Do you think of yourself as:	Gay/homosexual □
		Bisexual □
		Heterosexual □
	Other (please specify	()
4.	Do you enjoy having sex wit	h men, women or both?
		Men and women equally □
		Mostly men □
		Men only □
		Mostly women □
		Women only □
		No one □
5.	How many different men ha six months?	ve you had sex with in the past
	None 🗆	One 🗆
	2-5 men 🗆	6–10 men □
	11–50 men □	More than 50 men □
6.	How many different women six months?	have you had sex with in the pas None □
	One 🗆	2–5 women □
	6–10 women □	More than 10 women □

In this survey we distinguish band CASUAL partners.	elween REGULAR	(boyfriend/lover)
7. How would you describe y men at present?	our sexual relation	ships with
1	lo sex with men at	present
	elationship (one ma	n only)
Regular relationship plus.		
both my partner and I have		
	casual sex with oth	
my partner has	casual sex with oth	er men 🗆
All my s	tionships with sever sex with men is cast	
Other (please spec	cify)	
If you are in a regular relations it been?	Less than 6 6–11 1– More than	months months very sears ve
Not in a regu	lar relationship with	a man 🗀
Regular male partners—l	ast 6 months	
 Have you had sex with remonths? Yes □ 	gular male partner/s No □ Go dire	
In the past <u>SIX MONTHS</u> wh with your <u>REGULAR</u> male pa	ich of the following artner/s?	have you done
10. Oral sex: I sucked his coo	ck and he came in r	ny mouth
	Occasionally	
11. Oral sex: He sucked my	oock and I came in I	hie mouth
	Occasionally	
Anal sex		
12. I fucked him with a cond		00
Never L	Occasionally	Often Li
13. He fucked me with a con	dom	
THE THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY O	aom	
	Occasionally	Often 🗆

14. I fucked him without a condom but pulled out before I came

Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐

came	Never □	ondom but pulled Occasionally □	
16. I fucked him	without a co	ndom and came in	side
	Never □	Occasionally	Often 🗆
17. He fucked r		condom and came Occasionally □	
Casual male	partners—la	st 6 months	
	ad any sex with	h any casual male No □ Go dire	
In the past SIX with ANY of you	MONTHS whi	ich of the following ale partners?	have you do
19. Oral sex: I	sucked his coo	ck and he came in r	ny mouth
	Never □	Occasionally	Often 🗆
20. Oral sex: H	le sucked my d	cock and I came in I	his mouth
		Occasionally	
Anal sex			
21. I fucked him	with a condo	om	
	Never □	Occasionally	Often 🗆
22. He fucked r	ne with a con	dom	
	Never □	Occasionally	Often 🗆
23. I fucked him	without a co	ndom but pulled ou	ut before I ca
		Occasionally	
24. He fucked r	ne without a c	ondom but pulled	out before h
came		Occasionally	
25. I fucked him	without a co	ndom and came in	side
	Never □	Occasionally	Often 🗆
			States.
26. He fucked r	ne without a c	condom and came	inside

Continues on other side

27. How many of your casual partners in the last 6 months did you tell your HIV status? None □ Some □ All □ 28. How many of your casual partners in the last 6 months told you their HIV status? None □ Some □ All □	34. Do you have a clear (spoken) agreement with your regular partner about sex <u>with casual partners</u> ? No agreement □ Agreement: No sex at all □ Agreement: No anal sex at all □ Agreement: All anal sex is with a condom □	42. How often did you get drunk/pissed in the past six months? Never □ Once or twice only □ Less than once a week □ More than once a week □
29. Have you ever had an HIV antibody test? No □ Yes □	Agreement: Anal sex can be without a condom	43. Which of these drugs have you used in the past six months? Amyl/Poppers No□ Yes□ Marijuana No□ Yes□ Tranquillisers No□ Yes□
30. When were you last tested for HIV antibodies? Less than a week ago □ 1–4 weeks ago □ 1–6 months ago □ 7–12 months ago □	35. How old are you?	Ecstasy No □ Yes □ Speed No □ Yes □ LSD No □ Yes □ Cocaine No □ Yes □ Heroin No □ Yes □
1–2 years ago □ 2–4 years ago □ More than 4 years ago □	 What is your ethnic background? (eg Australian Aboriginal, Torres Strait Islander, Dutch, Greek, Vietnamese, Lebanese, Chinese) 	44. Which of these drugs have you injected in the past six months? Speed No □ Yes □
31. Based on the results of your HIV antibody tests, what is your HIV status? No test/Don't know □	Anglo-Australian only ☐ Other (please specify)	Cocaine No □ Yes □ Heroin No □ Yes □ Steroids No □ Yes □
Negative □ Positive □ If positive, are you on combination antiviral therapy? No □ Yes □	38. Are you: (tick one only) Employed full-time Employed part-time Unemployed A student A pensioner or on social security benefits Other	Any other drug No ☐ Yes ☐ 45. How often did you inject in the past six months? Never ☐ Once or twice only ☐ Less than once a week ☐
IF you are in a regular relationship with a man at present, please complete the next three questions.	39. What is your occupation? (eg bartender, teacher, welder) (please specify)	More than once a week □ 46. In the past six months, did you ever share a needle/syringe with someone else? No □ Yes □
32. Do you know the result of your regular partner's HIV antibody test? Yes—Positive □	40. Where do you live? Postcode	47. In the past six months, did you ever share any other injecting equipment with someone else? No □ Yes □
Yes—Negative □ I don't know/He hasn't had a test □	OR Suburb/Town:	48. Were you interviewed for the Brisbane Region Men and Sexual
33. Do you have a clear (spoken) agreement with your regular partner about anal sex (fucking) within your relationship? No agreement □ Agreement: No anal sex at all □	41. What is the highest level of education you have had? Primary school only □ Up to 3 years of high school/Year 10 □ Up to Year 12/Senior Certificate □	Health (BRASH) study? No ☐ Yes ☐ 49. Were you interviewed for the Male Call '96 telephone survey? No ☐ Yes ☐
Agreement: All anal sex is with a condom ☐ Agreement: Anal sex can be without a condom ☐	Tertiary diploma or trade certificate □ University or CAE □	THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME