

## Gay Community Periodic Survey: Adelaide 2001

**Author:**

Rawstorne, Patrick; Van de Ven, Paul; Prestage, Garrett; Kippax, Susan; Ngo, Phillip; Brotherton, Alan; Petersen, Kim

**Publication details:**

Report No. NCHSR Monograph 4/2002  
1-875978-55-0 (ISBN)

**Publication Date:**

2002

**DOI:**

<https://doi.org/10.4225/53/5750E423EAB24>

**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/1959.4/51000> in <https://unsworks.unsw.edu.au> on 2024-03-29

# gay community periodic survey

ADELAIDE 2001

Patrick **RAWSTORNE**

Paul **VAN DE VEN**

Garret **PRESTAGE**

Susan **KIPPAX**

Phillip **NGO**

Alan **BROTHERTON**

Barry **HORWOOD**

Kim **PETERSEN**



**NCHSR**

NATIONAL CENTRE IN HIV SOCIAL RESEARCH

NATIONAL CENTRE IN HIV EPIDEMIOLOGY AND CLINICAL  
RESEARCH

AIDS COUNCIL OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES, SOUTH AUSTRALIA

# gay community periodic survey

ADELAIDE  
2001

Patrick **RAWSTORNE**<sup>1</sup>

Paul **VAN DE VEN**<sup>1</sup>

Garrett **PRESTAGE**<sup>2</sup>

Susan **KIPPAX**<sup>1</sup>

Phillip **NGO**<sup>1</sup>

Alan **BROTHERTON**<sup>3</sup>

Barry **HORWOOD**<sup>3</sup>

Kim **PETERSEN**<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> NATIONAL CENTRE IN HIV SOCIAL RESEARCH

<sup>2</sup> NATIONAL CENTRE IN HIV EPIDEMIOLOGY AND CLINICAL RESEARCH

<sup>3</sup> AIDS COUNCIL OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

<sup>4</sup> DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES, SOUTH AUSTRALIA

**Monograph 4/2002**

National Centre in HIV Social Research  
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences  
The University of New South Wales



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

National Centre in HIV Social Research  
Level 2, Webster Building  
The University of New South Wales  
Sydney NSW 2052 AUSTRALIA  
Telephone: (61 2) 9385 6776  
Fax: (61 2) 9385 6455  
Email: [nchsr@unsw.edu.au](mailto:nchsr@unsw.edu.au)  
Website: [nchsr.arts.unsw.edu.au](http://nchsr.arts.unsw.edu.au)

© National Centre in HIV Social Research 2002  
ISBN 1-875978-55-0

The National Centre in HIV Social Research is funded by the Commonwealth Department of Health and Ageing and is affiliated with the Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences at the University of New South Wales.

**Suggested citation:**

Rawstorne, P., Van de Ven, P., Prestage, G., Kippax, S., Ngo, P., Brotherton, A., Horwood, B., & Petersen, K. (2002). *Gay Community Periodic Survey: Adelaide 2001 (Monograph 4/2002)*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research, The University of New South Wales.  
<http://doi.org/10.4225/53/5750E423EAB24>

# CONTENTS

---

Acknowledgments	ii
List of Tables	iii
<b>DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>SAMPLE AND RECRUITMENT</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE</b>	<b>5</b>
Geographic distribution	5
Age	5
Ethnicity	6
Employment and occupation	6
Education	7
Sexual relationships with men	8
<b>ASSOCIATION WITH GAY COMMUNITY AND THE HIV EPIDEMIC</b>	<b>9</b>
Sexual identity	9
Gay community involvement	10
Looking for male sex partners	11
Contact with the HIV Epidemic	12
<b>HIV TESTING</b>	<b>13</b>
Time since most recent HIV-antibody test	13
Combination therapies	14
Regular partner's HIV-status	14
<b>SEXUAL PRACTICE AND 'SAFE SEX'</b>	<b>16</b>
Sexual behaviour between men	16
Overview of sexual practices with regular and casual partners	18
Sex with regular male partners	20
Condom Use	20
Agreements	22
Sex with casual male partners	23
Condom use	23
Disclosure of serostatus	26
Condom use with casual partners of known serostatus	27
<b>INFORMATION ABOUT HIV THERAPIES AND PEP</b>	<b>29</b>
Post-Exposure Prophylaxis (PEP)	30
<b>DRUG USE</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>APPENDIX</b>	<b>39</b>

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

---

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

### **FUNDING**

Department of Human Services, South Australia

### **STEERING COMMITTEE**

Alan Brotherton, Kim Petersen

### **RECRUITMENT**

Robert Carr-Angis, Chris Davey, Adrian Di Paolo, Paul Lewis, Gareth Little, Phillip Ngo, Andre Paparella, Michael Randall, Ben Saint, Sirote Santipattanachai, Ron Segebarth

### **AIDS COUNCIL OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

Alan Brotherton, Barry Horwood

### **NATIONAL CENTRE IN HIV SOCIAL RESEARCH**

Sahar Behman, June Crawford

### **NATIONAL CENTRE IN HIV EPIDEMIOLOGY AND CLINICAL RESEARCH**

Andrew Grulich, John Kaldor

### **SURVEY PARTICIPANTS**

The 565 men who gave 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 who assisted in the administration of the survey and gave generous permission for the survey to be conducted on their premises.

## LIST OF TABLES

---

Table 1 :	Source of recruitment.....	3
Table 2 :	Residential location.....	5
Table 3 :	Age.....	6
Table 4 :	Ethnicity.....	6
Table 5 :	Employment status.....	6
Table 6 :	Occupation.....	7
Table 7 :	Education.....	7
Table 8 :	Relationships with men.....	8
Table 9 :	Length of relationships with men.....	8
Table 10 :	Sexual identity.....	9
Table 11 :	Gay friends.....	10
Table 12 :	Proportion of free time spent with gay men.....	10
Table 13 :	Frequency of attendance at gay commercial venues.....	11
Table 14 :	Looking for male sex partners.....	11
Table 15 :	How many people do you know with HIV/AIDS?.....	12
Table 16 :	How many people do you know personally who have died from AIDS?.....	12
Table 17 :	HIV test results.....	13
Table 18 :	Time since most recent HIV test.....	13
Table 19 :	Use of combination antiretroviral therapies.....	14
Table 20 :	HIV status of regular partner.....	14
Table 21 :	Match of HIV status in regular relationships.....	15
Table 22 :	Reported sex with male partners in previous six months.....	16
Table 23 :	Reported sex with male partners in previous six months, by type of recruitment site.....	17
Table 24 :	Number of male sex partners in previous six months.....	17
Table 25 :	Sexual behaviour with regular male partners.....	18
Table 26 :	Sexual behaviour with casual male partners.....	19
Table 27 :	Condom use with regular male partners.....	20
Table 28 :	Serostatus and condom use among regular male partners.....	21
Table 29 :	Condom use and match of HIV serostatus in regular relationships.....	22
Table 30 :	Agreements with regular male partners about sex <i>within</i> relationship.....	23
Table 31 :	Agreements with regular male partners about sex <i>outside</i> relationship.....	23
Table 32 :	Condom use with casual male partners.....	24
Table 33 :	Serostatus and condom use with casual male partners.....	25
Table 34 :	Sites of unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners.....	25
Table 35 :	Participants' disclosure of serostatus to casual partners.....	26
Table 36 :	Casual partners' disclosure of serostatus to participants.....	26
Table 37 :	Use of condoms with HIV-positive casual partners, by serostatus of respondent.....	27
Table 38 :	Use of condoms with HIV-negative casual partners, by serostatus of respondent.....	28
Table 39 :	Use of condoms with HIV-unknown casual partners, by serostatus of respondent.....	28
Table 40 :	Responses to questions about viral load testing and combination therapy.....	29
Table 41 :	Responses to questions about viral load testing and combination therapy, by serostatus.....	30
Table 42 :	Sexual practice, HIV serostatus and mean optimism scale scores.....	30
Table 43 :	Awareness of the availability of post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP).....	31
Table 44 :	Drug use in the previous six months.....	32
Table 45 :	Injecting drug use in the previous six months.....	33



# Description of the study

The Adelaide Gay Community Periodic Survey is a cross-sectional survey of gay and homosexually active men recruited through a range of gay community sites in Adelaide. The project was funded by the Department of Human Services, South Australia. The Periodic Survey provides a snapshot of sexual and HIV-related practices among gay and other homosexually active men. This is the third time the survey has been conducted in Adelaide. Data from this survey may be used to make comparisons with the two previous surveys conducted in 1998 and 1999 (Van de Ven et al., 1999; Van de Ven et al., 2000).

The major aim of the 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. In 2001, seven sites were used for recruitment: the Picnic in the Park, five gay community venues/events (three social venues and two sex-on-premises venues) and one sexual health clinic. Trained personnel recruited participants and administered the questionnaire at each of these venues over a one-week period.

This latest study was conducted in November 2001. It is similar to the two previous surveys in that it was conducted at the same time of the year and employed the same recruitment strategies. This makes it possible to examine changes and practices over time.

The questionnaire (appended to this report) is a short, self-administered instrument that typically takes five to ten 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. In the main, the questions employed in 2001 were the same as those in the two previous surveys so as to facilitate as direct a comparison as possible. Some additional questions, however, were included in the 2001 survey to address the following aspects: frequency of attendance at gay commercial venues (q.3), places at

which unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners occurred (q.34), participants' knowledge of their casual partners HIV status (q.35, q.36, q.37), and any drug use and injecting drug use (q.58).

This report describes data from the third Adelaide Gay Community Periodic Survey and compares these with data from the two previous surveys. More detailed analyses of the data will continue and 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 six sites in Adelaide as well as at a large public gay community event, Picnic in the Park. In all, 810 men were asked to complete the questionnaire and 565 did so<sup>1</sup>. This represents a sound response rate of 70%, similar to the two previous surveys. In comparison with previous surveys, there were slightly more men who participated in 2001 than in 1999, but on par with 1998.

Similar to 1999, approximately half the men were recruited at the Picnic in the Park event, a smaller proportion than the two-thirds recruited there in 1998<sup>2</sup>. Almost half the men were recruited at gay venues, similar to 1999 and a higher proportion than in 1998. As in 1998, very few men were recruited at the sexual health clinic. Men were not recruited from a sexual health centre in 1999 (see Table 1).

**Table 1 : Source of recruitment**

	1998	1999	2001
Sexual health centre	13 (2.4%)	-	7 (1.2%)
Gay venues	181 (32.8%)	222 (47.9%)	251 (44.5%)
Picnic in the Park	358 (64.8%)	241 (52.1%)	307 (54.3%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>552 (100%)</b>	<b>463 (100%)</b>	<b>565 (100%)</b>

Previous studies such as 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.

<sup>1</sup> Although 569 men returned their questionnaire, 4 of these had to be discarded due to an extensive amount of missing data. This left 565 usable questionnaires.

<sup>2</sup> Picnic in the Park was held in a different location in 2001, which may have had an impact on recruitment numbers

Also, as indicated in previous Periodic Surveys, men recruited from events such as the Picnic in the Park are different in some respects from those recruited at 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 Adelaide gay men.

# Demographic Profile

In terms of demographic variables, the participants in the 1998, 1999, and 2001 surveys were remarkably similar.

## GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION

The men were living primarily in the Adelaide metropolitan area (see Table 2). Relatively few men — about 3% — who indicated that they participated regularly in Adelaide gay community, came from other parts of South Australia. About 7% of the sample came from outside the State.

**Table 2 : Residential location**

	1998	1999	2001
Adelaide Metropolitan Area	504 (91.3%)	420 (90.7%)	511 (90.4%)
Other SA	16 (2.9%)	16 (3.5%)	16 (2.8%)
Elsewhere	32 (5.8%)	27 (5.8%)	38 (6.8%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>552 (100%)</b>	<b>463 (100%)</b>	<b>565 (100%)</b>

## AGE

Respondents ranged in age from 16 to 77 years, with a median age of 34, on par with the previous survey. Although age range and distribution were relatively similar to the two previous surveys, there has been a significant upward trend since 1998 in the proportion of men over the age of 49 participating in the study (Mantel-Haenszel,  $p < .005$ ). In 2001, these older men comprised 16% of the sample, up from 10% in 1998 (see Table 3). Similar to 1998 and 1999, about half the men in the sample were aged between 30 and 49.

**Table 3 : Age**

	1998	1999	2001
Under 25	103 (19.0%)	74 (16.2%)	115 (20.6%)
25–29	88 (16.2%)	81 (17.8%)	70 (12.6%)
30–39	185 (34.1%)	158 (34.6%)	160 (28.7%)
40–49	115 (21.1%)	88 (19.3%)	123 (22.1%)
50 and over	52 (9.6%)	55 (12.1%)	89 (16.0%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>543<sup>1</sup> (100%)</b>	<b>456<sup>2</sup> (100%)</b>	<b>557<sup>3</sup> (100%)</b>

<sup>1</sup> Missing data (n=9), <sup>2</sup> Missing data (n=7), <sup>3</sup> Missing data (n=8)

## ETHNICITY

As in the previous two surveys, this was predominantly an ‘Anglo-Australian’ sample (based on responses to Question 47). In response to Question 46, 13 men (2.3%) indicated they were of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander origin. Only 4 of these men reported, in question 47, their ethnic background as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander (see Table 4).

**Table 4 : Ethnicity**

	1998	1999	2001
Anglo-Australian	391 (79.7%)	332 (82.2%)	434 (80.7%)
European	62 (12.6%)	49 (12.1%)	69 (12.8%)
Aboriginal/Torres Strait Islander	9 (1.8%)	9 (2.2%)	4 (0.7%)
Other	29 (5.9%)	14 (3.5%)	31 (5.8%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>491<sup>1</sup> (100%)</b>	<b>404<sup>2</sup> (100%)</b>	<b>538<sup>3</sup> (100%)</b>

<sup>1</sup> Missing data (n=61), <sup>2</sup> Missing data (n=59), <sup>3</sup> Missing data (n=27)

## EMPLOYMENT AND OCCUPATION

As in the two previous surveys, the sample was comprised of a larger proportion of men who were not in the work force compared with the general population. This was particularly true among HIV positive men, of whom a relatively high percentage were most likely in receipt of some form of social security payment. Similar to the surveys in 1998 and 1999, about half the men were in full-time paid employment (see Table 5).

**Table 5 : Employment status**

	1998	1999	2001
Full-time	275 (51.5%)	241 (53.1%)	287 (51.9%)
Part-time	97 (18.2%)	79 (17.4%)	110 (19.9%)
Unemployed/Other	162 (30.3%)	134 (29.5%)	156 (28.2%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>534<sup>1</sup> (100%)</b>	<b>454<sup>2</sup> (100%)</b>	<b>553<sup>3</sup> (100%)</b>

<sup>1</sup> Missing data (n=18), <sup>2</sup> Missing data (n=9), <sup>3</sup> Missing data (n= 12)

As in 1998, and as in most studies of male homosexual populations, there was a substantial overrepresentation of professionals/managers and an under-representation of manual workers in comparison with the general population (Connell et al., 1991; Hood et al., 1994). The proportion of men who were working in professional/managerial roles has increased since 1998 (Mantel-Haenszel,  $p < .001$ ), while there has been a corresponding decrease in paraprofessionals (Mantel-Haenszel,  $p < .001$ ). These changes may be related in part to the increase in the proportion of study participants over the age of 49 (refer to Table 3). In 2001, over half the men were working in roles that were either professional/managerial or paraprofessional (see Table 6).

**Table 6 : Occupation**

	1998	1999	2001
Professional/Managerial	122 (29.1%)	102 (30.5%)	192 (45.9%)
Paraprofessional	71 (16.9%)	39 (11.7%)	35 (8.4%)
Clerical/Sales	136 (32.5%)	154 (46.1%)	134 (32.1%)
Trades	53 (12.7%)	7 (2.1%)	24 (5.7%)
Plant operation/Labouring	37 (8.8%)	32 (9.6%)	33 (7.9%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>419 (100%)</b>	<b>334 (100%)</b>	<b>418 (100%)</b>

Note: Missing data here are mainly N/A (ie. not currently employed)

## EDUCATION

As in other gay-community-based studies, this sample was relatively well educated in comparison to the general population. About 60% of the men had received some post-secondary education and, for most, this included a university degree (see Table 7). The proportion of men in each of the education categories shown in Table 7 has been consistent across the three surveys.

**Table 7 : Education**

	1998	1999	2001
Up to 3 years of high school	111 (20.5%)	91 (20.0%)	93 (16.6%)
Up to Year 12/Senior Certificate	142 (26.2%)	127 (27.8%)	142 (25.4%)
Trade certificate or diploma	107 (19.8%)	89 (19.5%)	138 (24.7%)
University	181 (33.5%)	149 (32.7%)	186 (33.3%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>541<sup>1</sup> (100%)</b>	<b>456<sup>2</sup> (100%)</b>	<b>559<sup>3</sup> (100%)</b>

<sup>1</sup> Missing data (n=11), <sup>2</sup> Missing data (n=7), <sup>3</sup> Missing data (n=6)

## SEXUAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH MEN

As in previous Adelaide Periodic Surveys, about 60% of the men in the sample were in a regular sexual relationship with a man at the time of completing the survey (see Table 8). Twenty-eight percent of study participants were monogamous (ie. had sex only with a regular partner). Over half the men were 'currently' having sex with casual partners, while 15% had no sexual partners. These proportions have been consistent across the three surveys.

**Table 8 : Relationships with men**

	1998	1999	2001
None	70 (12.9%)	69 (15.2%)	85 (15.3%)
Casual only	109 (20.2%)	106 (23.3%)	144 (25.9%)
Regular plus casual	169 (31.2%)	120 (26.5%)	172 (30.8%)
Regular only (monogamous)	193 (35.7%)	159 (35.0%)	156 (28.0%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>541<sup>1</sup> (100%)</b>	<b>454<sup>2</sup> (100%)</b>	<b>557<sup>3</sup> (100%)</b>

<sup>1</sup> Missing data (n=11), <sup>2</sup> Missing data (n=9), <sup>3</sup> Missing data (n=8)

As in 1998 and 1999, about two-thirds of the men who were in a regular relationship had been in that relationship for at least one year (see Table 9).

**Table 9 : Length of relationships with men**

	1998	1999	2001
Less than one year	94 (30.7%)	79 (32.4%)	108 (34.5%)
At least one year	212 (69.3%)	165 (67.6%)	205 (65.5%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>306 (100%)</b>	<b>244 (100%)</b>	<b>313 (100%)</b>

Note: Includes only those men who answered Question 8 and had a regular partner at the time of the survey

# Association with Gay Community and the HIV Epidemic

In several respects, and not surprisingly given the recruitment strategies used in this study, this was a highly gay-identified and gay-community-attached sample. There are indications, however, that men in 2001 were less gay community attached than in earlier surveys and that they are less in contact with the HIV epidemic.

## SEXUAL IDENTITY

In 2001, as in the two previous surveys, most men identified as homosexual. Homosexual identification included 'gay/homosexual' as well as a small number of men who identified as 'queer'. The proportion of men who identified as homosexual is similar to that observed in other Periodic Surveys of gay men in Australia, including Queensland (Rawstorne et al., 2002), Melbourne (Rawstorne et al., 2001) and Canberra (Aspin et al., 2000). About 10% of the men identified as bisexual. Relatively few were heterosexual or 'other' identified (see Table 10). These proportions have been consistent since 1998.

**Table 10 : Sexual identity**

	1998	1999	2001
Gay/homosexual/queer	476 (86.7%)	382 (84.1%)	483 (86.9%)
Bisexual	57 (10.4%)	55 (12.2%)	58 (10.4%)
Heterosexual/other	16 (2.9%)	17 (3.7%)	15 (2.7%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>549<sup>1</sup> (100%)</b>	<b>454<sup>2</sup> (100%)</b>	<b>556<sup>3</sup> (100%)</b>

<sup>1</sup> Missing data (n=3), <sup>2</sup> Missing data (n=9), <sup>3</sup> Missing data (n=9)

## GAY COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

The men in this 2001 sample were quite socially involved with gay men, as were their 1998 and 1999 counterparts (see Table 11). Almost half of the men in the sample reported that 'most' or 'all' of their friends were gay men. Of the 13 men who had no gay friends, 11 of them identified as bisexual.

**Table 11 : Gay friends**

	1998	1999	2001
None	11 (2.0%)	16 (3.5%)	13 (2.3%)
Some or a few	265 (48.2%)	230 (49.7%)	303 (53.7%)
Most or all	274 (49.8%)	217 (46.8%)	248 (44.0%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>550<sup>1</sup> (100%)</b>	<b>463<sup>2</sup> (100%)</b>	<b>564<sup>3</sup> (100%)</b>

<sup>1</sup> Missing data (n=2), <sup>2</sup> No missing data, <sup>3</sup> Missing data (n=1)

Consistent with the percentages in table 11, about 80% of the men reported spending 'some' or 'a lot' of their free time with gay men (see Table 12). There has been a decrease over time in the proportion of men spending 'a lot' of their free time with gay men (Mantel-Haenszel,  $p < .05$ ) and a corresponding increase in those reporting 'a little' of their free time is spent with gay men (Mantel-Haenszel,  $p < .005$ ). Although statistically significant, these changes are only slight and not of a magnitude to indicate any dramatic shift in the social networks of these men.

**Table 12 : Proportion of free time spent with gay men**

	1998	1999	2001
None	8 (1.5%)	10 (2.2%)	6 (1.1%)
A little	80 (14.6%)	76 (16.5%)	122 (21.6%)
Some	218 (39.6%)	181 (39.1%)	221 (39.2%)
A lot	243 (44.3%)	195 (42.2%)	215 (38.1%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>549<sup>1</sup> (100%)</b>	<b>462<sup>2</sup> (100%)</b>	<b>564<sup>3</sup> (100%)</b>

<sup>1</sup> Missing data (n=3), <sup>2</sup> Missing data (n=1), <sup>3</sup> Missing data (n=1)

Over half the men reported attending gay commercial venues at least once a week (see Table 13). Very few men in the sample 'never' attend these venues. Separate analyses indicated that participants who were recruited from the 'Picnic in the Park' attended gay commercial venues less frequently than did men recruited elsewhere.

**Table 13 : Frequency of attendance at gay commercial venues**

	2001
Never	15 (2.7%)
Rarely	244 (43.3%)
About once a week	216 (38.4%)
More than once a week	88 (15.6%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>563<sup>1</sup> (100%)</b>

<sup>1</sup> Missing data (n=2)

## LOOKING FOR MALE SEX PARTNERS

As in 1998 and 1999, men used a variety of social, public and gay-specific places to look for sex partners, particularly gay bars, sex venues and their social networks (see Table 14). There has, nonetheless, been a significant decrease in the proportion of men using gay bars (Mantel-Haenszel,  $p<.005$ ) and social networks (Mantel-Haenszel,  $p<.005$ ) to find sex partners. Almost half the men had looked for sex partners at beats, while about 40% had used the Internet.

In separate analyses not presented here, men who had casual partners in the previous 6 months and who looked for sex partners over the internet, were significantly more likely to have had UAI-C than their counterparts who did not use the internet for that purpose ( $p<.05$ ). The use of all other sites and places listed in Table 14 to look for sex partners, were unrelated to having engaged in UAI-C.

**Table 14 : Looking for male sex partners**

	1998	1999	2001
Internet <sup>1</sup>	-	-	174 (41.4%)
Gay bar	346 (78.3%)	295 (78.4%)	313 (68.3%)
Beat	196 (48.2%)	170 (48.6%)	201 (45.0%)
Sex venue <sup>2</sup>	221 (53.4%)	224 (60.5%)	246 (53.1%)
Sex workers	36 (10.0%)	25 (8.0%)	26 (6.4%)
Social networks	252 (64.0%)	210 (61.9%)	237 (54.0%)
Backroom <sup>3</sup>	58 (16.4%)	66 (21.4%)	-
None of the above	110 (19.9%)	87 (18.8%)	111 (19.6%)

Note: These categories are not mutually exclusive and the denominators vary depending on the number of participants who answered each question

<sup>1</sup> This option was not included in the 1998 and 1999 surveys

<sup>2</sup> In the 1998 and 1999 surveys, this category was 'sauna' whereas in the 2001 survey it was broadened to 'sex venue'

<sup>3</sup> This option was not included in the 2001 survey

## CONTACT WITH THE HIV EPIDEMIC

Two-thirds of the men knew at least one person with HIV/AIDS; a significant downturn over the period of the three surveys (Mantel-Haenszel,  $p < .005$ ) (see Table 15).

**Table 15 : How many people do you know with HIV/AIDS?**

	1998	1999	2001
None	140 (26.2%)	131 (28.9%)	189 (34.2%)
1	49 (9.1%)	46 (10.2%)	62 (11.2%)
2 – 5	208 (39.0%)	161 (35.5%)	185 (33.6%)
6 – 10	56 (10.5%)	45 (9.9%)	51 (9.2%)
More than 10	81 (15.2%)	70 (15.5%)	65 (11.8%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>534<sup>1</sup> (100%)</b>	<b>453<sup>2</sup> (100%)</b>	<b>552<sup>3</sup> (100%)</b>

<sup>1</sup> Missing data (n=18), <sup>2</sup> Missing data (n=10), <sup>3</sup> Missing data (n=13)

Almost half of the men did not know anyone who had died from AIDS. This compares with about 40% in 1998 and 1999 (see Table 16). Indeed, across the period of the three surveys there has been a significant increase in the proportion of men who did not know anyone who had died from AIDS (Mantel-Haenszel,  $p < .005$ ). This result cannot be attributed to age, as the sample is no younger than in the two previous surveys (refer to Table 3). Rather, this finding most likely reflects the decrease in AIDS related deaths since the widespread use of antiretroviral therapy and the consequent diminishing visibility of AIDS in the lives of many gay men.

**Table 16 : How many people do you know personally who have died from AIDS?**

	1998	1999	2001
None	208 (39.1%)	181 (40.1%)	265 (47.7%)
1	81 (15.2%)	78 (17.3%)	77 (13.9%)
2 – 5	153 (28.7%)	118 (26.2%)	135 (24.4%)
6 – 10	36 (6.8%)	33 (7.3%)	30 (5.4%)
More than 10	54 (10.2%)	41 (9.1%)	48 (8.6%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>532<sup>1</sup> (100%)</b>	<b>451<sup>2</sup> (100%)</b>	<b>555<sup>3</sup> (100%)</b>

<sup>1</sup> Missing data (n=20), <sup>2</sup> Missing data (n=12), <sup>3</sup> Missing data (n=10)

# HIV Testing

Most of the men had been tested for antibodies to HIV (see Table 17). Of these men, the vast majority reported a negative result from their most recent HIV test. About 15% of the men had not been tested or had failed to obtain their test results. Few men in the sample, about six percent all up, reported being HIV positive. These proportions have been remarkably stable over the period of the three surveys.

**Table 17 : HIV test results**

	1998	1999	2001
Not tested/No results	80 (15.0%)	70 (15.3%)	85 (15.5%)
HIV negative	420 (78.6%)	353 (77.3%)	431 (78.3%)
HIV positive	34 (6.4%)	34 (7.4%)	34 (6.2%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>534<sup>1</sup> (100%)</b>	<b>457<sup>2</sup> (100%)</b>	<b>550<sup>3</sup> (100%)</b>

<sup>1</sup> Missing data (n=18), <sup>2</sup> Missing data (n=6), <sup>3</sup> Missing data (n=15)

## TIME SINCE MOST RECENT HIV-ANTIBODY TEST

Among the non-HIV positive men who had ever been tested for HIV, by far the majority had done so within the previous 12 months. About a third of the sample had not been tested for at least twelve months (see Table 18). These proportions have been relatively stable across the period of the three surveys.

**Table 18 : Time since most recent HIV test**

	1998	1999	2001
Less than 6 months ago	201 (47.4%)	157 (44.3%)	202 (46.9%)
7-12 months ago	71 (16.7%)	69 (19.5%)	89 (20.6%)
1-2 years ago	78 (18.4%)	64 (18.1%)	57 (13.2%)
Over 2 years ago	74 (17.5%)	64 (18.1%)	83 (19.3%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>424 (100%)</b>	<b>354 (100%)</b>	<b>431 (100%)</b>

Note: This table includes only non-HIV positive men who had ever been tested for HIV

## COMBINATION THERAPIES

About 60% of the men who indicated that they were HIV positive were on combination therapy (see Table 19). Although the proportion is lower than in the previous two surveys, both the comparison between years and the trend across time are non-significant. Although not statistically significant, this apparent decrease may indicate the beginning of a downward trend in the use of combination antiretroviral therapies, as seen among gay men in Sydney (Van de Ven, et al., 2002) and Melbourne (see Rawstorne et al., 2001). (Note: The Adelaide result is based on small numbers).

**Table 19 : Use of combination antiretroviral therapies**

	1998	1999	2001
Yes	22 (64.7%)	25 (73.5%)	19 (57.6%)
No	12 (35.3%)	9 (26.5%)	14 (42.4%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>34 (100%)</b>	<b>34 (100%)</b>	<b>33 (100%)</b>

Note: Includes only HIV positive men

## REGULAR PARTNER'S HIV-STATUS

Participants were asked about the serostatus of their current regular partner. As the question only referred to current partners, fewer men responded to this item than indicated sex with a regular partner during the previous six months. As in 1998 and 1999, about 70% of the men who were in a regular relationship at the time of the survey, had an HIV negative partner (see Table 20). Almost 20% had a regular partner whose serostatus they did not know.

**Table 20 : HIV status of regular partner**

	1998	1999	2001
HIV positive	18 (6.4%)	22 (9.1%)	31 (10.2%)
HIV negative	198 (70.7%)	162 (66.7%)	216 (71.3%)
HIV status unknown	64 (22.9%)	59 (24.2%)	56 (18.5%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>280 (100%)</b>	<b>243 (100%)</b>	<b>303 (100%)</b>

Note: Includes only those men who had a regular partner at the time of completing the survey

Similar to the 1998 and 1999 surveys, men were most likely to be in a regular relationship with another man of the same HIV status (Table 21). This applied to HIV positive, negative and unknown status men.

**Table 21 : Match of HIV status in regular relationships**

Serostatus of regular partner	Participant's Serostatus		
	HIV positive	HIV negative	Unknown
<b>1998</b>			
HIV positive	5 (35.7%)	11 (4.8%)	2 (6.5%)
HIV negative	7 (50.0%)	172 (75.4%)	15 (48.4%)
HIV status unknown	2 (14.3%)	45 (19.7%)	14 (45.2%)
<b>Total (N = 273)</b>	<b>14 (100%)</b>	<b>228 (100%)</b>	<b>31 (100%)</b>
<b>1999</b>			
HIV positive	9 (47.4%)	12 (6.2%)	1 (3.3%)
HIV negative	5 (26.3%)	146 (75.6%)	10 (33.3%)
HIV status unknown	5 (26.3%)	35 (18.1%)	19 (63.3%)
<b>Total (N = 242)</b>	<b>19 (100%)</b>	<b>193 (100%)</b>	<b>30 (100%)</b>
<b>2001</b>			
HIV positive	11 (50.0%)	19 (7.9%)	1 (3.0%)
HIV negative	9 (40.9%)	184 (77.0%)	15 (45.5%)
HIV status unknown	2 (9.1%)	36 (15.1%)	17 (51.5%)
<b>Total (N = 294)</b>	<b>22 (100%)</b>	<b>239 (100%)</b>	<b>33 (100%)</b>

Note: Includes only those men who had a regular partner at the time of completing the survey

# Sexual Practice and 'Safe Sex'

## SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR BETWEEN MEN

Participants were 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 and without ejaculation.

Based on the responses to the sexual behaviour questions and the type of sexual relationships with men indicated by the participants, in the six months prior to the survey, about two-thirds of the men had sexual contact with casual partners and a similar proportion had sex with regular partners (see Table 22). Over the period of the three surveys, there has been a significant upturn in the proportion of men who had sex with casual partners in the preceding six months (Mantel-Haenszel,  $p < .05$ ).

**Table 22 : Reported sex with male partners in previous six months**

	1998	1999	2001
Any sexual contact with regular partners	361 (65.4%)	294 (63.5%)	371 (65.7%)
Any sexual contact with casual partners	334 (60.5%)	286 (61.8%)	375 (66.4%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>552</b>	<b>463</b>	<b>565</b>

Note: These categories are not mutually exclusive

As in 1998 and 1999, in the six months preceding the survey, men recruited at Picnic in the Park were more likely to have had regular partners and less likely to have had casual partners than their counterparts recruited at the gay venues (see Table 23). These results are not altogether surprising, as men attending some of the gay venues, particularly the sex-on-premises venues, often do so to find casual partners.

**Table 23 : Reported sex with male partners in previous six months, by type of recruitment site**

	Picnic in the Park	Venues
<b>1998</b>		
Any sexual contact with regular partners	252 (70.4%)	109 (56.2%)
Any sexual contact with casual partners	192 (53.6%)	142 (73.2%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>194</b>
<b>1999</b>		
Any sexual contact with regular partners	176 (73.0%)	118 (53.2%)
Any sexual contact with casual partners	114 (47.3%)	172 (77.5%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>222</b>
<b>2001</b>		
Any sexual contact with regular partners	220 (71.7%)	151 (58.5%)
Any sexual contact with casual partners	173 (56.4%)	202 (78.3%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>258</b>

Note: These categories are not mutually exclusive

The majority of the men had engaged in sex with between one and 10 partners 'in the previous six months', while about 20% of the men reported having sex with more than 10 partners during that time (see Table 24). There has been a significant rise, over the period of the three surveys, in the proportion of men who reported having had sex with no 'different men' in the six months prior to the survey (Mantel-Haenszel,  $p < .005$ ).

**Table 24 : Number of male sex partners in previous six months**

	1998	1999	2001
None	40 (7.3%)	46 (10.0%)	70 (12.6%)
One	166 (30.2%)	121 (26.2%)	117 (21.1%)
2 – 10	225 (41.0%)	209 (45.3%)	253 (45.7%)
11 – 50	101 (18.4%)	70 (15.2%)	95 (17.1%)
More than 50	17 (3.1%)	15 (3.3%)	19 (3.4%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>549<sup>1</sup> (100%)</b>	<b>461<sup>2</sup> (100%)</b>	<b>554<sup>3</sup> (100%)</b>

<sup>1</sup> Missing data (n=3), <sup>2</sup> Missing data (n=2), <sup>3</sup> Missing data (n=11)

## OVERVIEW OF SEXUAL PRACTICES WITH REGULAR AND CASUAL PARTNERS

About two-thirds of the men with regular male partners engaged in oral intercourse with ejaculation with their partners and were equally likely to do so in the insertive as in the receptive position (Table 25). This pattern has been relatively steady across the three survey periods.

The vast majority (about 85%) of men with a regular male partner had engaged in anal intercourse with their partners. In 2001, about three-quarters of the men with regular partners had engaged in insertive anal intercourse, while a similar proportion had engaged in receptive anal intercourse. These percentages are on par with the two previous surveys.

**Table 25 : Sexual behaviour with regular male partners**

	Total Sample	Those with Regular Partners
<b>1998</b>	<b>N = 552</b>	<b>N = 361</b>
Any oral intercourse with ejaculation	255 (46.2%)	255 (70.6%)
Insertive fellatio with ejaculation	213 (38.6%)	213 (59.0%)
Receptive fellatio with ejaculation	215 (38.9%)	215 (59.6%)
Any anal intercourse	306 (55.4%)	306 (84.8%)
Insertive anal intercourse	259 (46.9%)	259 (71.7%)
Receptive anal intercourse	250 (45.3%)	250 (69.3%)
<b>1999</b>	<b>N = 463</b>	<b>N = 294</b>
Any oral intercourse with ejaculation	162 (35.0%)	162 (55.1%)
Insertive fellatio with ejaculation	135 (29.2%)	135 (45.9%)
Receptive fellatio with ejaculation	123 (26.6%)	123 (41.8%)
Any anal intercourse	254 (54.9%)	254 (86.4%)
Insertive anal intercourse	223 (48.2%)	223 (75.9%)
Receptive anal intercourse	197 (42.5%)	197 (67.0%)
<b>2001</b>	<b>N = 565</b>	<b>N = 371</b>
Any oral intercourse with ejaculation	237 (41.9%)	237 (63.9%)
Insertive fellatio with ejaculation	199 (35.2%)	199 (53.6%)
Receptive fellatio with ejaculation	190 (33.6%)	190 (51.2%)
Any anal intercourse	316 (55.9%)	316 (85.2%)
Insertive anal intercourse	278 (49.2%)	278 (74.9%)
Receptive anal intercourse	260 (46.0%)	260 (70.1%)

Note: These items are not mutually exclusive. The percentages do not sum to 100 percent 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 (see Table 26). Slightly fewer than half of the men who had casual partners engaged in oral intercourse with ejaculation, more commonly in the insertive position. These results have been relatively stable across time.

About three-quarters of those who had sex with casual male partners engaged in anal intercourse with those partners, again more usually in the insertive position. As with oral intercourse, there has not been a significant change in these proportions across time.

**Table 26 : Sexual behaviour with casual male partners**

	Total Sample	Those with Casual Partners
<b>1998</b>	<b>N = 552</b>	<b>n = 334</b>
Any oral intercourse with ejaculation	175 (31.7%)	175 (52.4%)
Insertive fellatio with ejaculation	149 (27.0%)	149 (44.6%)
Receptive fellatio with ejaculation	124 (22.5%)	124 (37.1%)
Any anal intercourse	236 (42.8%)	236 (70.7%)
Insertive anal intercourse	204 (37.0%)	204 (61.1%)
Receptive anal intercourse	171 (31.0%)	171 (51.2%)
<b>1999</b>	<b>N = 463</b>	<b>n = 286</b>
Any oral intercourse with ejaculation	117 (25.3%)	117 (40.9%)
Insertive fellatio with ejaculation	97 (21.0%)	97 (33.9%)
Receptive fellatio with ejaculation	83 (17.9%)	83 (29.0%)
Any anal intercourse	207 (44.7%)	207 (72.4%)
Insertive anal intercourse	175 (37.8%)	175 (61.2%)
Receptive anal intercourse	158 (34.1%)	158 (55.2%)
<b>2001</b>	<b>N = 565</b>	<b>n = 375</b>
Any oral intercourse with ejaculation	174 (30.8%)	173 (46.1%)
Insertive fellatio with ejaculation	151 (26.7%)	151 (40.3%)
Receptive fellatio with ejaculation	117 (20.7%)	117 (31.2%)
Any anal intercourse	277 (49.0%)	277 (73.9%)
Insertive anal intercourse	246 (43.5%)	246 (65.6%)
Receptive anal intercourse	208 (36.8%)	208 (55.5%)

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

## SEX WITH REGULAR MALE PARTNERS

### Condom Use

Based on the entire sample, slightly more than one-third of the men who participated in the survey engaged in any unprotected anal intercourse with regular male partners ('UAI-R') in the six months prior to the survey (See Table 27). Of the men with regular partners, about 53% had engaged in UAI-R with their partner in the previous six months.

**Table 27 : Condom use with regular male partners**

	Total Sample	Those with Regular Partners
<b>1998</b>		
No regular partner	191 (34.6%)	-
No anal intercourse	55 (10.0%)	55 (15.2%)
Always uses condom	116 (21.0%)	116 (32.1%)
Sometimes does not use condom	190 (34.4%)	190 (52.6%)
<b>Base</b>	<b>552 (100%)</b>	<b>361 (100%)</b>
<b>1999</b>		
No regular partner	169 (36.5%)	-
No anal intercourse	40 (8.6%)	40 (13.6%)
Always uses condom	101 (21.8%)	101 (34.4%)
Sometimes does not use condom	153 (33.0%)	153 (52.0%)
<b>Base</b>	<b>463 (100%)</b>	<b>294 (100%)</b>
<b>2001</b>		
No regular partner	194 (34.3%)	-
No anal intercourse	55 (9.7%)	55 (14.8%)
Always uses condom	120 (21.2%)	120 (32.3%)
Sometimes does not use condom <sup>1</sup>	196 (34.7%)	196 (52.8%)
<b>Base</b>	<b>565 (100%)</b>	<b>371 (100%)</b>

<sup>1</sup> Of the 196 men who engaged in UAI-R 'in the previous six months', 47 (24.0%) practised only withdrawal prior to ejaculation, 60 (30.6%) practised only ejaculation inside, and 89 (45.4%) engaged in both withdrawal and ejaculation inside.

In 2001, 63% of HIV positive men in regular relationships reported UAI-R in the previous six months. Although this proportion appears slightly higher than for HIV negative and HIV unknown men, the result is not statistically significant (see Table 28). For a break down of condom use by match of serostatus among regular partners, refer to Table 29.

**Table 28 : Serostatus and condom use among regular male partners**

	HIV positive	HIV negative	Unknown
<b>1998 (ns)</b>			
No Anal	1 (5.6%)	41 (14.3%)	7 (15.6%)
Always uses condom	8 (44.4%)	89 (31.1%)	17 (37.8%)
Sometimes does not use condom	9 (50.0%)	156 (54.5%)	21 (46.7%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>18 (100%)</b>	<b>286 (100%)</b>	<b>45 (100%)</b>
<b>1999 (ns)</b>			
No Anal	2 (9.5%)	28 (12.0%)	10 (27.0%)
Always uses condom	11 (52.4%)	79 (33.9%)	9 (24.3%)
Sometimes does not use condom	8 (38.1%)	126 (54.1%)	18 (48.6%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>21 (100%)</b>	<b>233 (100%)</b>	<b>37 (100%)</b>
<b>2001 (ns)</b>			
No Anal	2 (9.1%)	45 (15.5%)	3 (9.4%)
Always uses condom	6 (27.3%)	90 (31.1%)	12 (37.5%)
Sometimes does not use condom	14 (63.6%)	155 (53.4%)	17 (53.1%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>22 (100%)</b>	<b>290 (100%)</b>	<b>32 (100%)</b>

Note: Includes only those men who had a regular partner 'in the previous six months'.

In the following table, the serostatus of each of the participants who had anal intercourse with a regular partner 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'. The numbers overall are small and these figures should be treated cautiously (ie. not be interpreted as significant trends).

HIV positive men were *more* likely to have unprotected anal intercourse with positive partners than with negative partners. HIV negative men were slightly *more* likely to have unprotected anal intercourse with negative and status unknown partners than with positive partners. Those who did not know their own status were *more* likely to have unprotected anal intercourse with partners whose status they also did not know than with either positive or negative men.

In 2001, most of the unprotected anal intercourse within regular relationships of six months or more was between seroconcordant (positive-positive or negative-negative) couples. However, 33 men engaged in unprotected anal intercourse in a relationship where seroconcordance was absent or in doubt<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> It is possible that these figures slightly overestimate the actual number of relationships for which seroconcordance was in doubt at the time couples were engaging in UAI-R. This doubt exists because questions about sexual practice were asked in the context of the preceding six months, whereas knowledge of a partner's HIV status was at the time of completing the survey. Hence, some couples may have engaged in UAI-R when serostatus of both partners was known but subsequently stopped engaging in the practice if the serostatus of one or both became uncertain.

**Table 29 : Condom use and match of HIV serostatus in regular relationships**

Partner's Serostatus		Participant's Serostatus		
		HIV positive	HIV negative	Unknown serostatus
<b>1998</b>				
HIV positive	No UAI	2 (40.0%)	6 (75.0%)	-
	Some UAI	3 (60.0%)	2 (25.0%)	1 (100.0%)
HIV negative	No UAI	3 (60.0%)	27 (21.6%)	5 (50.0%)
	Some UAI	2 (40.0%)	98 (78.4%)	5 (50.0%)
Unknown	No UAI	-	7 (29.2%)	2 (28.6%)
	Some UAI	1 (100.0%)	17 (70.8%)	5 (71.4%)
<b>Total</b>		<b>11</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>1999</b>				
HIV positive	No UAI	2 (33.3%)	4 (66.7%)	-
	Some UAI	4 (66.7%)	2 (33.3%)	-
HIV negative	No UAI	1 (50.0%)	27 (29.0%)	2 (33.3%)
	Some UAI	1 (50.0%)	66 (71.0%)	4 (66.7%)
Unknown	No UAI	2 (100.0%)	1 (8.3%)	4 (33.3%)
	Some UAI	-	11 (91.7%)	8 (66.7%)
<b>Total</b>		<b>10</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>2001</b>				
HIV positive	No UAI	-	7 (58.3%)	-
	Some UAI	8 (100.0%)	5 (41.7%)	-
HIV negative	No UAI	5 (71.4%)	33 (28.2%)	4 (44.4%)
	Some UAI	2 (28.6%)	84 (71.8%)	5 (55.6%)
Unknown	No UAI	-	4 (23.5%)	1 (14.3%)
	Some UAI	2 (100.0%)	13 (76.5%)	6 (85.7%)
<b>Total</b>		<b>17</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>16</b>

Note: UAI = unprotected anal intercourse. This analysis includes only men who had anal intercourse with their 'current' regular partner 'in the previous six months' and had been in that relationship for at least six months

## AGREEMENTS

Most participants with regular male partners at the time of completing the survey had agreements with their partners about sex within the relationship (see Table 30). Nonetheless, the proportion of men who reported having such an agreement has significantly decreased across the period of the three surveys (Mantel-Haenszel,  $p < .01$ ). About 41% of the men in relationships agreed to anal intercourse without a condom. Of these 123 men, the majority were in a seroconcordant (positive-positive or negative-negative) relationship, while a relatively small number, 28 all up, were in a relationship where seroconcordance was absent or in doubt.

**Table 30 : Agreements with regular male partners about sex *within* relationship**

	1998	1999	2001
No spoken agreement about anal intercourse	46 (16.5%)	58 (24.4%)	78 (25.9%)
No anal intercourse between regular partners is permitted	22 (7.9%)	23 (9.7%)	22 (7.3%)
Anal intercourse permitted only with condom	80 (28.8%)	77 (32.4%)	78 (25.9%)
Anal intercourse without condom is permitted	130 (46.8%)	80 (33.6%)	123 (40.9%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>278 (100%)</b>	<b>238 (100%)</b>	<b>301 (100%)</b>

Note: Based on the responses of men who had a regular partner at the time of the survey.

In 2001, similar to the two previous surveys, about a third of the men in a 'current' relationship had no spoken agreement with their partner about sex outside the relationship (see Table 31). Where couples did have an agreement, very few permitted unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners.

**Table 31 : Agreements with regular male partners about sex *outside* relationship**

	1998	1999	2001
No spoken agreement about sex	84(32.2%)	60 (25.8%)	97 (33.7%)
No sexual contact with casual partners is permitted	92 (34.1%)	95 (40.8%)	85 (29.5%)
No anal intercourse with casual partners is permitted	20 (7.4%)	17 (7.3%)	28 (9.7%)
Anal intercourse permitted only with condom	64 (23.7%)	60 (25.8%)	67 (23.3%)
Anal intercourse without condom is permitted	7 (2.6%)	1 (0.4%)	11 (3.8%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>270 (100%)</b>	<b>233 (100%)</b>	<b>288 (100%)</b>

Note: Based on the responses of men who had a regular partner at the time of the survey.

## SEX WITH CASUAL MALE PARTNERS

### Condom use

Based on the entire sample, 90 (15.9%) of the men who participated in the 2001 survey engaged in any unprotected anal intercourse with their casual male partners ('UAI-C') 'in the previous six months' (see Table 32). A separate analysis revealed that 49 of these 90 men also had unprotected anal intercourse with a regular partner during that time<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> It is not possible to determine within the 6 month period the proximity in time of the UAI-C and UAI-R occurrences, nor the level of risk, if any, posed to regular partners by the UAI-C. This is because some men may not have been in a regular relationship at the time they had UAI-C, and/or UAI-C may have been with seroconcordant partners.

**Table 32 : Condom use with casual male partners**

	Total Sample	Those with Casual Partners
<b>1998</b>		
No casual partner	218 (39.5%)	-
No anal intercourse	99 (17.9%)	99 (29.6%)
Always uses condom	157 (28.4%)	157 (47.0%)
Sometimes does not use condom	78 (14.1%)	78 (23.4%)
<b>Base</b>	<b>1341 (100%)</b>	<b>334 (100%)</b>
<b>1999</b>		
No casual partner	177 (38.2%)	-
No anal intercourse	81 (17.5%)	81 (28.3%)
Always uses condom	149 (32.2%)	149 (52.1%)
Sometimes does not use condom	56 (12.1%)	56 (19.6%)
<b>Base</b>	<b>1225 (100%)</b>	<b>286 (100%)</b>
<b>2001</b>		
No casual partner	190 (33.6%)	-
No anal intercourse	101 (17.9%)	101 (26.9%)
Always uses condom	184 (32.6%)	184 (49.1%)
Sometimes does not use condom	90 (15.9%)	90 (24.0%)
<b>Base</b>	<b>565 (100%)</b>	<b>375 (100%)</b>

<sup>1</sup> Of the 90 men who engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners 'in the previous six months', 35 (38.9%) practised only withdrawal prior to ejaculation, 15 (16.7%) practised only ejaculation inside, and 40 (44.4%) engaged in both withdrawal and ejaculation inside.

A comparison of data in Tables 27 and 32 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 (see footnotes to both tables).

In 2001, as in 1998 and 1999, it appears that a higher proportion of HIV positive men, than HIV negative and 'untested' men, engaged in UAI-C. This apparent difference, however, does not reach statistical significance (see Table 33). Some of the HIV positive men's unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners may be explained by positive-positive sex (Prestage et al., 1995), which poses no risk of seroconversion *per se*.

**Table 33 : Serostatus and condom use with casual male partners**

	HIV positive	HIV negative	Unknown
<b>1998 (ns)</b>			
No Anal	5 (17.9%)	78 (30.0%)	10 (29.4%)
Always uses condom	11 (39.3%)	128 (49.2%)	14 (41.2%)
Sometimes does not use condom	12 (42.9%)	54 (20.8%)	10 (29.4%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>28 (100%)</b>	<b>260 (100%)</b>	<b>34 (100%)</b>
<b>1999 (ns)</b>			
No Anal	4 (16.0%)	61 (28.2%)	15 (35.7%)
Always uses condom	13 (52.0%)	115 (53.2%)	19 (45.2%)
Sometimes does not use condom	8 (32.0%)	40 (18.5%)	8 (19.0%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>25 (100%)</b>	<b>216 (100%)</b>	<b>42 (100%)</b>
<b>2001 (ns)</b>			
No Anal	3 (12.5%)	85 (29.0%)	13 (23.6%)
Always uses condom	11 (45.8%)	138 (47.1%)	33 (60.0%)
Sometimes does not use condom	10 (41.7%)	70 (23.9%)	9 (16.4%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>24 (100%)</b>	<b>293 (100%)</b>	<b>55 (100%)</b>

Note: Includes only those men who had any casual partners 'in the previous six months'.

In 2001, participants were asked to indicate the sites at which they had engaged in any unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners in the previous six months. This question was not asked in the two previous surveys. Most of the respondents who had engaged in UAI-C had done so in a private home (see Table 34). About a third of the men who had engaged in UAI-C reported having UAI-C at a local sex venue, while a quarter had UAI-C at a beat. Although fewer men reported UAI-C at either an interstate sex party or dance party, the proportions are not inconsequential given the relative proximity and access to these sites/events.

**Table 34 : Sites of unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners**

	<b>2001 (N=90)</b>
Private home <sup>1</sup>	55 (61.1%)
Local sex venue <sup>2</sup>	32 (35.6%)
Interstate sex party <sup>3</sup>	14 (15.6%)
Interstate dance party <sup>4</sup>	11 (12.2%)
Beat <sup>5</sup>	23 (25.6%)

Note: These categories are not mutually exclusive. Percentages are calculated on only those men who had UAI-C in the preceding six months.

<sup>1</sup> Missing data (n=8), <sup>2</sup> Missing data (n=10), <sup>3</sup> Missing data (n=21), <sup>4</sup> Missing data (n=22), <sup>5</sup> Missing data (n=14)

## DISCLOSURE OF SEROSTATUS

Questions 32 and 33 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—well 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.

The rates of disclosure have been remarkably stable across the three surveys. About 61% of the men who reported having had casual sex in the previous six months did not disclose their serostatus to any of their casual partners<sup>5</sup> (see Table 35). A small proportion of men disclosed to all of their casual partners.

**Table 35 : Participants' disclosure of serostatus to casual partners**

	1998	1999	2001
Told none	175 (59.9%)	141 (53.6%)	211 (60.6%)
Told some	67 (22.9%)	74 (28.1%)	79 (22.7%)
Told all	50 (17.1%)	48 (18.3%)	58 (16.7%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>292 (100%)</b>	<b>263 (100%)</b>	<b>348 (100%)</b>

Note: Includes only those men who had casual partners in the preceding six months.

Similarly, almost two-thirds of participants were not told the serostatus of their casual partners (see Table 36). About 10% of respondents were disclosed to by all of their casual partners. Overall rates of disclosure have not changed over the period of the three surveys.

**Table 36 : Casual partners' disclosure of serostatus to participants**

	1998	1999	2001
Told by none	178 (60.3%)	148 (56.9%)	220 (62.7%)
Told by some	85 (28.8%)	83 (31.9%)	97 (27.6%)
Told by all	32 (10.8%)	29 (11.2%)	34 (9.7%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>295 (100%)</b>	<b>260 (100%)</b>	<b>351 (100%)</b>

Note: Includes only those men who had casual partners in the preceding six months.

<sup>5</sup> Please note that questions 32 and 33 do not distinguish the type of sex related to HIV disclosure.

## CONDOM USE WITH CASUAL PARTNERS OF KNOWN SEROSTATUS

Three additional questions were included in the questionnaire to address the use of condoms with casual partners whose HIV status was understood by the respondent to be positive, negative, or unknown, respectively. Although the use of just three questions to address these issues may invite some level of error, it was not feasible in the context of a short survey to expand beyond the three questions<sup>6</sup>. As might be expected, a higher proportion of HIV negative and unknown men, than positive men, indicated that they had experienced 'no such occasions' when they knew that any of their casual partners were HIV positive. Of the men who did have casual partners who were HIV positive, negative men were the most likely to 'always' wear condoms, while the HIV unknown men were the most likely to 'never' wear condoms (although the small numbers need to be taken into account).

**Table 37 : Use of condoms with HIV-positive casual partners, by serostatus of respondent**

	HIV-positive	HIV-negative	HIV-unknown
<b>All men who had sex with casual partners**</b>			
No such occasions	9 (42.9%)	184 (71.6%)	38 (80.9%)
Never	4 (19.0%)	20 (7.8%)	5 (10.6%)
Sometimes	3 (14.3%)	4 (1.6%)	-
Always	5 (23.8%)	49 (19.1%)	4 (8.5%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>21 (100%)</b>	<b>257 (100%)</b>	<b>47 (100%)</b>
<b>Men who had sex with HIV-positive casual partners*</b>			
Never	4 (33.3%)	20 (27.4%)	5 (55.6%)
Sometimes	3 (25.0%)	4 (5.5%)	-
Always	5 (41.7%)	49 (67.1%)	4 (44.4%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>12 (100%)</b>	<b>73 (100%)</b>	<b>9 (100%)</b>

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .001$

Note: These analyses are based on very small numbers of HIV positive and unknown men

Similarly, a higher proportion of HIV negative and unknown men reported having 'no such occasions' of sex with a casual partner who they knew to be HIV negative (see Table 38). Although, from looking at table 38, it appears that HIV negative men are more likely than HIV positive and unknown men to wear condoms when they know their casual partner is negative, the difference is not statistically significant.

<sup>6</sup> Please note that questions 35, 36, and 37 do not distinguish the type of sex related to condom use.

**Table 38 : Use of condoms with HIV-negative casual partners, by serostatus of respondent**

	HIV-positive	HIV-negative	HIV-unknown
<b>All men who had sex with casual partners*</b>			
No such occasions	5 (23.8%)	133 (52.4%)	34 (73.9%)
Never	4 (19.0%)	17 (6.7%)	5 (10.9%)
Sometimes	3 (14.3%)	31 (12.2%)	1 (2.2%)
Always	9 (42.9%)	73 (28.7%)	6 (13.0%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>21 (100%)</b>	<b>254 (100%)</b>	<b>46 (100%)</b>
<b>Men who had sex with HIV-negative casual partners</b>			
Never	4 (25.0%)	17 (14.0%)	5 (41.7%)
Sometimes	3 (18.8%)	31 (25.6%)	1 (8.3%)
Always	9 (56.3%)	73 (60.3%)	6 (50.0%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>12 (100%)</b>	<b>121 (100%)</b>	<b>12 (100%)</b>

\* $p < .005$

Note: These analyses are based on very small numbers of HIV positive and unknown men

HIV positive men were more likely than negative and unknown men to report casual partners whose HIV status they did not know (see Table 39). Relatively few men, regardless of serostatus, 'never' used condoms with casual partners whose HIV status they did not know.

**Table 39 : Use of condoms with HIV-unknown casual partners, by serostatus of respondent**

	HIV-positive	HIV-negative	HIV-unknown
<b>All men who had sex with casual partners*</b>			
No such occasions	2 (10.0%)	76 (30.2%)	19 (40.4%)
Never	3 (15.0%)	19 (7.5%)	5 (10.6%)
Sometimes	8 (40.0%)	38 (15.1%)	6 (12.8%)
Always	7 (35.0%)	119 (47.2%)	17 (36.2%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>20 (100%)</b>	<b>252 (100%)</b>	<b>47 (100%)</b>
<b>Men who had sex with HIV-unknown casual partners</b>			
Never	3 (16.7%)	19 (10.8%)	5 (17.9%)
Sometimes	8 (44.4%)	38 (21.6%)	6 (21.4%)
Always	7 (38.9%)	119 (67.6%)	17 (60.7%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>18 (100%)</b>	<b>176 (100%)</b>	<b>28 (100%)</b>

\* $p < .05$

Note: These analyses are based on very small numbers of HIV positive and unknown men

# Information about HIV Therapies and PEP

Several studies have demonstrated that men in Australian gay communities are on the whole well informed about HIV/AIDS (eg. Crawford et al., 1998). Less well understood are beliefs in the context of advances in viral load testing and combination antiretroviral therapies. In 2001, three questions addressed this issue (Questions 53 to 55). Similar to data from periodic surveys in other Australian cities, responses tended to be toward the sceptical end of the scale (See Table 40). For example, most men were not overly optimistic that HIV is a less serious threat in the context of new treatments.

**Table 40 : Responses to questions about viral load testing and combination therapy**

	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Total</b>
New HIV treatments will take the worry out of sex.	212 (40.5%)	229 (43.7%)	59 (11.3%)	24 (4.6%)	<b>524 (100.0%)</b>
HIV is less of a threat because the epidemic is on the decline.	284 (54.3%)	199 (38.0%)	29 (5.5%)	11 (2.1%)	<b>523 (100.0%)</b>
HIV/AIDS is a less serious threat than it used to be because of new treatments.	262 (50.7%)	185 (35.8%)	57 (11.0%)	13 (2.5%)	<b>517 (100.0%)</b>

The relationship between the questions about viral load testing/combination therapies and participant serostatus indicates that, regardless of HIV serostatus, the majority of men responded in line with accepted wisdom and towards the sceptical end of the scale (see Table 41). The three questions can be combined into a scale, with a score ranging from 1 (most sceptical) to 4 (most optimistic). On this scale, men who did not know their HIV status were significantly more optimistic (mean = 1.86) than their HIV positive (mean = 1.47) and HIV negative (mean = 1.65) counterparts ( $p < .01$ ).

**Table 41 : Responses to questions about viral load testing and combination therapy, by serostatus**

Serostatus	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
<b>New HIV treatments will take the worry out of sex (ns)</b>					
HIV positive	19 (55.9%)	13 (38.2%)	1 (2.9%)	1 (2.9%)	34 (100.0%)
HIV negative	170 (41.7%)	176 (43.1%)	44 (10.8%)	18 (4.4%)	408 (100.0%)
Unknown	20 (27.0%)	37 (50.0%)	13 (17.6%)	4 (5.4%)	74 (100.0%)
<b>HIV is less of a threat because the epidemic is on the decline (ns)</b>					
HIV positive	25 (73.5%)	8 (23.5%)	1 (2.9%)	-	34 (100.0%)
HIV negative	221 (54.2%)	160 (39.2%)	19 (4.7%)	8 (2.0%)	408 (100.0%)
Unknown	35 (47.9%)	28 (38.4%)	8 (11.0%)	2 (2.7%)	73 (100.0%)
<b>HIV/AIDS is a less serious threat than it used to be because of new treatments (<math>p&lt;.05</math>)</b>					
HIV positive	19 (59.4%)	8 (25.0%)	5 (15.6%)	-	32 (100.0%)
HIV negative	212 (52.5%)	147 (36.4%)	35 (8.7%)	10 (2.5%)	404 (100.0%)
Unknown	28 (38.4%)	28 (38.4%)	15 (20.5%)	2 (2.7%)	73 (100.0%)

Optimism scores were analysed with sexual practice and HIV serostatus (see Table 42). Although not statistically significant, generally, optimism scores appeared slightly higher among men who had unprotected anal intercourse with regular partners, or with casual partners.

**Table 42 : Sexual practice, HIV serostatus and mean optimism scale scores**

Sexual practice	HIV Serostatus		
	Positive	Negative	Unknown
<b>Regular partners</b>			
No anal intercourse	1.00	1.54	1.44
100% protected	1.33	1.64	1.89
Some UAI	1.56	1.73	1.62
<b>Casual partners</b>			
No anal intercourse	1.33	1.69	2.00
100% protected	1.44	1.55	1.81
Some UAI	1.43	1.89	1.88

## POST-EXPOSURE PROPHYLAXIS (PEP)

A question was included in the 2001 questionnaire to assess levels of awareness of post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP). The majority of men had not heard about PEP, while slightly more than 15% thought that PEP was readily available (see Table 43). Relatively few men reported a belief that PEP would be available in the future. These results suggest low levels of awareness about PEP and its availability.

**Table 43 : Awareness of the availability of post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP)**

<b>Level of awareness</b>	<b>n (%)</b>
It's readily available now	89 (17.0%)
It will be available in the future	27 (5.1%)
I've never heard about it	409 (77.9%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>525 (100.0%)</b>

Missing data (n = 40)

# Drug Use

Based on responses to Question 58, slightly more than 50% of the men in the sample had, during the preceding six months, used one or more of the drugs listed in the question. The most commonly used drugs were marijuana, amyl/poppers, speed and ecstasy, with about 40% of the total sample saying that they had used marijuana in the preceding six months (see Table 44). About 10% of the sample reported using drugs in addition to those listed in Question 58. As in other Australian cities, relatively few men reported using heroin.

**Table 44 : Drug use in the previous six months**

	N (%)
Amyl/Poppers	131 (23.2%)
Marijuana	225 (39.8%)
Viagra	44 (7.8%)
Ecstasy	97 (17.2%)
Speed	104 (18.4%)
Cocaine	41 (7.3%)
LSD / trips	40 (7.1%)
Heroin	11 (1.9%)
Any other drug	54 (9.6%)
Any of the above	310 (54.9%)

Note: Percentages are based on the total sample (N=565).

Note: Responses are not mutually exclusive.

As in other Australian cities, relatively few men indicated that they had injected drugs/steroids 'in the past six months' (see Table 45). The most commonly injected drug was speed (3.5%) with very small numbers indicating that they injected heroin, ecstasy or cocaine (1.6%, 1.4% and 1.1%, respectively).

**Table 45 : Injecting drug use in the previous six months**

	n (%)
Ecstasy	8 (1.4%)
Speed	20 (3.5%)
Cocaine	6 (1.1%)
LSD / trips	2 (0.4%)
Heroin	9 (1.6%)
Any other drug	4 (0.7%)
Any of the above	23 (4.1%)

Note: Percentages are based on the total sample (N=565).

Note: Responses are not mutually exclusive.

# Discussion

The findings from the third Adelaide Gay Community Periodic Survey provide an important snapshot of the social and sexual lives of gay men in Adelaide. In the main, the findings are quite similar to (and thereby corroborate) the evidence from the two previous surveys (Van de Ven et al., 1998; Van de Ven et al., 1999). Furthermore, many of the results reported here parallel findings from Gay Community Periodic Surveys in other Australian cities, such as Sydney (Prestage et al., 1999), Melbourne (Rawstorne et al., 2001) and Queensland (Rawstorne et al., 2002), reinforcing the notion that in some respects the gay cultures of the capital cities in Australia are similar.

The 565 participants were recruited at six gay community venues in Adelaide and at Picnic in the Park. Most of these men lived in the Adelaide Metropolitan area. 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. 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. However, there has been a slight decrease across the period of the three surveys in the amount of time participants spend with other gay men. Furthermore, there appears to have been a decline in the level of contact men have with the HIV epidemic; the proportion of men who knew at least one person with HIV/AIDS, has fallen, while there has been an increase in the number of men who reported not to have personally known anyone who has died from AIDS.

On par with the two previous surveys, approximately 15% of the men had not been tested for HIV. The majority of those who had been tested for HIV had done so 'within the past year'. Overall, 6.2% of the men were HIV positive, a similar proportion to the two previous surveys. Although most of the men in regular relationships were aware of their partners HIV status, this was not the case for 20% of men.

Among the HIV positive participants, approximately 60% were using combination antiretroviral therapies. Although there would appear to be a downward trend in the proportion of men using combination antiretroviral therapies, the apparent difference is non-significant. Nonetheless, the direction of this decline is similar to that observed in

Queensland (Rawstorne et al., 2002), Melbourne (Rawstorne et al., 2001) and Sydney (Van de Ven et al., 2002).

Most men reported 'current' sexual contact with at least one other man: about 28% of the men had a regular partner only; 31% had a regular partner and either or both partners also had casual partners; and approximately a quarter of the men had casual partners only. In the six months prior to the survey, about two-thirds of the men had sex with regular partners and a similar proportion had sex with casual partners. Over the period of the three surveys there has been a significant upturn in the proportion of men who reported sex with casual partners during the preceding six months.

Of the total sample and 'in the previous six months', 196 men (34.7%) had any unprotected anal intercourse with regular partners and 90 men (15.9%) had any unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners. Some of these men (49 all told) had unprotected anal intercourse with both regular and casual partners. In total, 237 men reported engaging in UAI-R or UAI-C or both. The remainder of the men in the overall sample — 328 men — indicated no unprotected anal intercourse with either regular or casual partners. In Adelaide, unlike other cities in Australia, there has not been a statistically significant increase in unprotected anal intercourse with regular or casual partners over time.

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. Approximately three-quarters of the men with regular partners had agreements about sex within their relationship and two thirds had agreements about sex outside their relationship. Across the period of the three surveys there has been a significant decrease in the proportion of men who had an agreement with their regular partner about sex within the relationship. This apparent shift has occurred in the context of a relatively high proportion of men in 1998, about 83%, who did have agreements within their relationship. The current levels (ie those who have agreements about sex within their relationship) are on par with other parts of Australia, including Melbourne (Rawstorne et al., 2001) and Queensland (Rawstorne et al., 2002). Whereas about 41% of these agreements permitted unprotected anal intercourse within the relationship, unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners was almost never allowed.

Although the numbers overall were small (and the figures must be treated cautiously), HIV positive men were less likely to have unprotected anal intercourse with negative or status unknown partners than with positive partners. HIV negative men and men who did not know their HIV status, were more likely to have unprotected anal intercourse with negative or unknown status partners than with positive partners. Among those with regular partners of more than six months, 33 men most likely had unprotected anal intercourse in a relationship where seroconcordance was absence or in doubt.

Despite being a relatively new technology, 40% of the men use the Internet to look for sex partners and it is likely that this proportion will increase. Fewer men than in

earlier surveys are looking for sex partners in gay bars or social networks, though the proportions that do are still relatively high, 68% and 54% respectively.

The private home was by far and away the most likely place for unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners to occur. Although fewer men reported UAI-C at either an interstate sex party or dance party, the proportions are not inconsequential given the relative proximity and access to these sites/events. It suggests that many of the men are mobile, have sex during their travels, and often that sex includes unprotected anal intercourse.

In general, 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 61% of the men never disclosed their serostatus to casual partners and a similar proportion (63%) were never disclosed to by casual partners. Overall, rates of disclosure in 'casual' contexts were stable over time.

There is generally a low level of awareness of post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP), its availability and what it is, among the men.

Whereas 45% of the men had used recreational drugs in the previous six months, as previously, almost all of the men (96%) had not injected any recreational drugs/steroids during that time.

In conclusion, these data provide evidence of a sustaining safe sex culture among gay community attached men in Adelaide. The 2001 Adelaide Gay Community Periodic Survey was conducted very successfully. Recruitment at the seven diverse sites attracted a sufficient sample of gay men from the Adelaide metropolitan area. The resulting data are robust and comparisons with the 1998 and 1999 data and other studies are suggestive of sound reliability. The findings from this survey continue to provide hard evidence that community members, educators, policy planners and the like can use to tailor programs which aim to sustain and improve gay men's sexual and social health.

# References

- Aspin, C. Van de Ven, P., Prestage, G., Kippax, S., Schamburg, K. & Coase, D. (2001). *Gay Community Periodic Survey: Canberra 2000*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research. The University of New South Wales.
- Connell, R., Dowsett, G., Rodden, P. & 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. & 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. & O'Reilly, C. (1994). *Bisexual activity and non gay-attachment. A report on the BANGAR project*. Sydney: Western Sydney Area Health Service.
- Prestage, G., Van de Ven, P., Knox, S., Grulich, A., Kippax, S. & Crawford, J. (1999). *The Sydney Gay Community Periodic Surveys: 1996-1999*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research.
- Prestage, G., Kippax, S., Noble, J., Crawford, J., Baxter, D. & 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.
- Rawstorne, P., Van de Ven, P., Prestage, G., Kippax, S., Horn, G., Kennedy, M. & Voon, D. (2001). *Gay Community Periodic Survey: Melbourne 2001*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research, The University of New South Wales.
- Rawstorne, P., Van de Ven, P., Prestage, G., Kippax, S., Walton, J., Lewis, C., Tunley, F. & Clementson, C. (2002). *Gay Community Periodic Survey: Queensland 2001*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research, The University of New South Wales.
- Van de Ven, P., Prestage, G., Kippax, S., French, J., Bonello, J. & Kay, P. (1999). *Adelaide Gay Community Periodic Survey: November 1998*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research, The University of New South Wales.
- Van de Ven, P., Prestage, G., Kippax, S., Knox, S., Nicholas, G., Horwood, B. & Petersen, K. (2000). *Adelaide Gay Community Periodic Survey: November 1999*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research, The University of New South Wales.

Van de Ven, P., Rawstorne, P. & Treloar, C. (eds) (2002). *HIV/AIDS, Hepatitis C and Related Diseases in Australia: Annual Report of Behaviour*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research, The University of New South Wales.

# Appendix

## Adelaide Gay Community Periodic Survey

This survey is for men who have had sex with another man in the past five years.

PLEASE DO NOT COMPLETE IF YOU HAVE  
ALREADY DONE SO THIS WEEK.

For each question, please TICK one box only.

1. How many of your friends are gay or homosexual men?  
None ☐ A few ☐ Some ☐ Most ☐ All ☐
2. How much of your free time is spent with gay or homosexual men?  
None ☐ A little ☐ Some ☐ A lot ☐
3. How often do you attend gay commercial venues?  
Never ☐ About once a week ☐  
Rarely ☐ More than once a week ☐
4. Do you think of yourself as: Gay/homosexual ☐  
Bisexual ☐  
Heterosexual ☐  
Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

In this survey we distinguish between **REGULAR** (boyfriend/lover) and **CASUAL** partners.

5. Do you currently have sex with **casual** male partners?  
No ☐ Yes ☐
6. Do you currently have sex with a **regular** male partner?  
No ☐ Yes ☐
7. How would you describe your sexual relationship with your **current regular** male partner? (*tick one*)  
*we are monogamous – neither of us has casual sex* ☐  
*both my partner and I have casual sex with other men* ☐  
*I have casual sex with other men but my partner does not* ☐  
*my partner has casual sex with other men but I do not* ☐  
*I have several regular male partners* ☐  
*no current regular male partner* ☐

8. If you are in a **regular** relationship with a man, for how long has it been?  
Less than 6 months ☐ 1–2 years ☐  
6–11 months ☐ More than 2 years ☐  
Not in a regular relationship with a man ☐

9. How many different **men** have you had sex with in the **past six months**?  
None ☐ 6–10 men ☐  
One ☐ 11–50 men ☐  
2–5 men ☐ More than 50 men ☐

### Regular male partners — last 6 months

10. Have you had sex with regular male partner/s **in the last six months**? Yes ☐ No ☐ Go directly to Question 21.

↓  
In the past **SIX MONTHS** which of the following have you done with your **REGULAR** male partner/s?

11. **Oral sex:** I sucked his cock but he did NOT come in my mouth  
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
12. **Oral sex:** He sucked my cock but I did NOT come in his mouth  
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
13. **Oral sex:** I sucked his cock and he came in my mouth  
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
14. **Oral sex:** He sucked my cock and I came in his mouth  
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐

### Anal sex

15. I fucked him **with a condom**  
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
16. He fucked me **with a condom**  
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
17. I fucked him **without a condom** but pulled out before I came  
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
18. He fucked me **without a condom** but pulled out before he came  
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
19. I fucked him **without a condom** and came inside him  
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
20. He fucked me **without a condom** and came inside me  
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐

### Casual male partners — last 6 months

21. Have you had sex with casual male partner/s **in the last six months**? Yes ☐ No ☐ Go directly to Question 38.

↓  
In the past **SIX MONTHS** which of the following have you done with any of your **CASUAL** male partners?

22. **Oral sex:** I sucked his cock but he did NOT come in my mouth  
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
23. **Oral sex:** He sucked my cock but I did NOT come in his mouth  
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
24. **Oral sex:** I sucked his cock and he came in my mouth  
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
25. **Oral sex:** He sucked my cock and I came in his mouth  
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐

### Anal sex

26. I fucked him **with a condom**  
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
27. He fucked me **with a condom**  
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
28. I fucked him **without a condom** but pulled out before I came  
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
29. He fucked me **without a condom** but pulled out before he came  
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
30. I fucked him **without a condom** and came inside him  
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
31. He fucked me **without a condom** and came inside me  
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
32. How many of your **casual** partners in the last 6 months did you tell your **HIV status**? None ☐ Some ☐ All ☐
33. How many of your **casual** partners in the last 6 months told you **their HIV status**? None ☐ Some ☐ All ☐

Continues on other side

34. In the last 6 months, with a **casual** partner, have you fucked or been fucked **without** a condom at . . .

*Private home* Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐  
*Local sex venue* Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐  
*Interstate sex venue* Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐  
*Interstate dance party* Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐  
*Beat* Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐

#### LAST SIX MONTHS . . .

35. On those occasions I knew my **casual** partner was HIV positive, I used condoms:

*No such occasions* ☐ Never ☐ Sometimes ☐ Always ☐

36. On those occasions I knew my **casual** partner was HIV negative, I used condoms:

*No such occasions* ☐ Never ☐ Sometimes ☐ Always ☐

37. On those occasions I didn't know the HIV status of my **casual** partner, I used condoms:

*No such occasions* ☐ Never ☐ Sometimes ☐ Always ☐

38. Where do you look for male sex partners?

*Internet* Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐  
*Gay bar* Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐  
*Beat* Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐  
*Sex venue* Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐  
*Sex workers* Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐  
*Social networks* Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐

39. Have you ever had an HIV antibody test? No ☐ Yes ☐

40. When were you last tested for HIV antibodies?

Less than a week ago ☐ 7–12 months ago ☐  
1–4 weeks ago ☐ 1–2 years ago ☐  
1–6 months ago ☐ 2–4 years ago ☐  
More than 4 years ago ☐

41. Based on the results of your HIV antibody tests, what is your HIV status?

No test/Don't know ☐  
Negative ☐  
Positive ☐



If **positive**, are you on combination antiviral therapy?

No ☐ Yes ☐

IF you are in a **regular relationship with a man** at present, please complete the next three questions.

42. Do you know the result of your regular partner's HIV antibody test?

Yes—Positive ☐

Yes—Negative ☐

I don't know/He hasn't had a test ☐

43. 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 ☐

Agreement: All anal sex is with a condom ☐

Agreement: Anal sex can be without a condom ☐

44. Do you have a **clear (spoken) agreement** with your regular partner about sex with casual partners?

No agreement ☐

Agreement: No sex at all ☐

Agreement: No anal sex at all ☐

Agreement: All anal sex is with a condom ☐

Agreement: Anal sex can be without a condom ☐

45. How old are you? \_\_\_\_\_ years

46. Are you of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander origin?

No ☐ Yes ☐

47. What is your ethnic background? (*e.g. Australian Aboriginal, Dutch, Greek, Vietnamese, Lebanese, Chinese*)

Anglo-Australian only ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

48. Are you: (tick one only) Employed full-time ☐

Employed part-time ☐

Unemployed ☐

A student ☐

A pensioner or on social security benefits ☐

Other ☐

49. What is your occupation? \_\_\_\_\_

50. What is the highest level of education you have had?

Less than or up to 3 years of high school / Year 10 ☐

Year 12 / SACE ☐

Tertiary diploma or trade certificate / TAFE ☐

University or CAE ☐

51. Where do you live? Postcode

**OR** Suburb/Town: \_\_\_\_\_

52. What do you know about post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP)?

It's readily available now ☐

It will be available in the future ☐

I've never heard about it ☐

The following statements are about viral load testing and new treatments for HIV. For each question, please tick one box only . . .  
**if you are unsure please give your best guess.**

53. New HIV treatments will take the worry out of sex.

*strongly disagree* ☐ *disagree* ☐ *agree* ☐ *strongly agree* ☐

54. HIV is less of a threat because the epidemic is on the decline.

*strongly disagree* ☐ *disagree* ☐ *agree* ☐ *strongly agree* ☐

55. HIV/AIDS is a less serious threat than it used to be because of new treatments.

*strongly disagree* ☐ *disagree* ☐ *agree* ☐ *strongly agree* ☐

56. How many people do you know who have **HIV** infection or the illness **AIDS**?

None ☐

3–5 ☐

One ☐

6–10 ☐

Two ☐

More than 10 ☐

57. How many people do you know personally who have **died from AIDS**?

None ☐

3–5 ☐

One ☐

6–10 ☐

Two ☐

More than 10 ☐

58. Which of these drugs have you **used** or **injected** in the past **six months**?

	Used		Injected	
<i>Amyl/Poppers</i>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>		
<i>Marijuana</i>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>		
<i>Viagra</i>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>		
<i>Ecstasy</i>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Speed</i>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Cocaine</i>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>LSD / trips</i>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Heroin</i>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Any other drug</i>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME

1-2001/7