

Gay Community Periodic Survey: Melbourne 2003

Author:

Van de Ven, Paul; Prestage, Garrett; Rawstorne, Patrick; Kippax, Susan; Horn, Gregory; Kennedy, Mike; Hussey, Guy; Batrouney, Colin

Publication details:

Report No. Monograph 7/2003
1875978658 (ISBN)

Publication Date:

2003

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.4225/53/5750D1CA6FCA7>

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/1959.4/10840> in <https://unsworks.unsw.edu.au> on 2024-04-20

gay community periodic survey

MELBOURNE 2003

Peter **HULL**
Paul **VAN DE VEN**
Garrett **PRESTAGE**
Patrick **RAWSTORNE**
Susan **KIPPAX**
Gregory **HORN**
Mike **KENNEDY**
Guy **HUSSEY**
Colin **BATROUNEY**



NATIONAL CENTRE IN HIV SOCIAL RESEARCH

NATIONAL CENTRE IN HIV EPIDEMIOLOGY AND CLINICAL
RESEARCH

VICTORIAN AIDS COUNCIL/GAY MEN'S HEALTH CENTRE

gay community periodic survey

MELBOURNE
2003

Peter **HULL**¹

Paul **VAN DE VEN**¹

Garrett **PRESTAGE**²

Patrick **RAWSTORNE**¹

Susan **KIPPAX**¹

Gregory **HORN**¹

Mike **KENNEDY**³

Guy **HUSSEY**³

Colin **BATROUNEY**³

¹ NATIONAL CENTRE IN HIV SOCIAL RESEARCH

² NATIONAL CENTRE IN HIV EPIDEMIOLOGY AND CLINICAL RESEARCH

³ VICTORIAN AIDS COUNCIL/GAY MEN'S HEALTH CENTRE

Monograph 7/2003

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
Website: nchsr.arts.unsw.edu.au

© National Centre in HIV Social Research 2003
ISBN 1-875978-65-8

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.

Hull, P., Van de Ven, P., Prestage, G., Rawstorne, P., Kippax, S., Horn, G., Kennedy, M., Hussey, G., & Batrouney, C. (2003). *Gay Community Periodic Survey: Melbourne 2003*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research, The University of New South Wales. <http://doi.org/10.4225/53/5750D1CA6FCA7>

CONTENTS

Contents	i
List of Tables	ii
DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY	1
SAMPLE AND RECRUITMENT	3
DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE	5
Geographic distribution	5
Age	6
Ethnicity	6
Occupation	6
Sexual relationships with men	7
ASSOCIATION WITH GAY COMMUNITY	9
Sexual identity	9
Gay community involvement	10
HIV TESTING AND STATUS	11
Time since most recent HIV-antibody test	11
Combination therapies	12
Regular partner's HIV-status	12
SEXUAL PRACTICE AND 'SAFE SEX'	14
Sexual behaviour between men	14
Overview of sexual practices with regular and casual partners	16
Sex with regular male partners	19
Condom Use	19
Agreements	23
Sex with casual male partners	24
Condom use	24
Serostatus	26
INFORMATION ABOUT HIV THERAPIES AND PEP	28
Post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP)	29
HEALTH & SEXUAL HEALTH	32
DRUG USE	35
DISCUSSION	37
REFERENCES	40
QUESTIONNAIRE	42

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.....	7
Table 6 :	Occupation.....	7
Table 7 :	Current relationships with men.....	8
Table 8 :	Length of relationships with men.....	8
Table 9 :	Sexual identity.....	9
Table 10 :	Gay friends.....	10
Table 11 :	Proportion of free time spent with gay men.....	10
Table 12 :	HIV test results.....	11
Table 13 :	Time since most recent HIV test.....	12
Table 14 :	Use of combination antiretroviral therapies.....	12
Table 15 :	HIV status of regular partners.....	13
Table 16 :	Match of HIV status in regular relationships.....	13
Table 17 :	Reported sex with male partners in previous six months.....	14
Table 18 :	Reported sex with male partners in previous six months by recruitment site.....	15
Table 19 :	Number of male sex partners in previous six months.....	15
Table 20 :	Sexual behaviour with regular male partners.....	17
Table 21 :	Sexual behaviour with casual male partners.....	18
Table 22 :	Condom use with regular partners.....	19
Table 23 :	Serostatus and condom use among regular partners.....	20
Table 24 :	Condom use and match of HIV serostatus in regular relationships.....	22
Table 25 :	Agreements with regular male partners about sex <i>within</i> the relationship.....	23
Table 26 :	Agreements with regular male partners about sex <i>outside</i> the relationship.....	23
Table 27 :	Condom use with casual partners.....	24
Table 28 :	Serostatus and condom use with casual partners.....	25
Table 29 :	Participants' disclosure of serostatus to casual partners.....	26
Table 30 :	Casual partners' disclosure of serostatus to participants.....	26
Table 31 :	Where men look for sex partners.....	27
Table 32 :	Responses to question about PEP.....	28
Table 33 :	Responses to question about PEP by serostatus.....	29
Table 34 :	Levels of knowledge about post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP).....	29
Table 35 :	Ever received post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP).....	30
Table 36 :	Knew of anyone who had received post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP).....	30
Table 37 :	Knowledge of post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP) and unprotected anal intercourse.....	31
Table 38 :	Self-rated health by HIV status.....	32
Table 39 :	Sexual health tests in last 12 months.....	33
Table 40 :	Place of sexual health check-ups in last 12 months.....	33
Table 41 :	Understanding of infections that can be present without symptoms.....	34
Table 42 :	Responses to the statement that 'Men who always use condoms for anal intercourse don't need to have regular sexual health check-ups'.....	34
Table 43 :	Drug use in previous six months.....	35
Table 44 :	Injecting drug use in previous six months.....	36

Description of the Study

The Melbourne Gay Community Periodic Survey is a cross-sectional survey of gay and homosexually active men recruited through a range of gay community sites in Melbourne. The project was funded by the Victorian Department of Human Services. The Periodic Survey provides a snapshot of sexual and HIV-related practices among gay and homosexually active men. This survey, the fifth in Melbourne, was administered in February 2003. The current report contains results of that survey and makes comparisons with data from the previous surveys conducted in February 1998 (Van de Ven et al., 1998), February 2000 (Aspin et al., 2000), February 2001 (Rawstone et al., 2001) and February 2002 (Hull et al., 2002).

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. With this in mind, men were recruited from a number of gay community venues. In 2003 seven sites were used for recruitment: the Midsumma Carnival and six gay community venues (one social venues, three sex-on-premises venues and two sexual health clinics). Trained recruiters carried out recruitment at these venues over a 1-week period.

The questionnaire used in this study is attached to this report. It is a short, self-administered instrument that typically takes 5 to 10 minutes to complete. Questions focus on anal intercourse and oral sex, the use of condoms, the nature of sexual relationships, HIV testing and serostatus, aspects of social attachment to gay community, recreational drug use, and a range of demographic items including sexual identity, age, occupation and ethnicity. In the main, the questions in the 2003 survey were the same as those in previous surveys. This ensures that direct comparisons across the four surveys are possible.

Nonetheless, some questions in the current survey were included for the first time this year while other questions that were included in previous surveys were removed.

Certain items were omitted from the current survey to make way for these new questions.

This report describes data from the fifth Melbourne Gay Community Periodic Survey in comparison with data from the four surveys preceding it. More detailed analyses of the data will continue and will be disseminated as they are 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 the Melbourne metropolitan area and at a large public gay community event (Midsumma Carnival). In comparison with the previous survey, in 2003 there was a slight increase in the proportion of men recruited at the Midsumma Carnival and a corresponding decrease in the recruitments from other venues (see Table 1). As in the four previous surveys, most of the sample was recruited from the Midsumma Carnival.

The implication of these subtle changes in sample composition is that in certain analyses, for example, unprotected anal intercourse (UAI), there may be a slight underestimation of the percentage engaging in UAI with casual partners (UAI-C) and a corresponding overestimation of the percentage engaging in UAI with regular partners (UAI-R). The basis for this estimation is that in previous surveys, men recruited at the Midsumma Carnival engaged in less UAI-C but more UAI-R than their counterparts who were recruited at sex-on-premises and social venues or clinics.

Table 1 : Source of recruitment

	1998	2000	2001	2002	2003
Sexual health centres	49 (2.6%)	60 (3.8%)	68 (3.7%)	82 (4.4%)	82 (4.0%)
Gay venues	657 (34.7%)	520 (33.0%)	481 (26.3%)	545 (29.0%)	553 (26.8%)
Midsumma Carnival	1185 (62.7%)	998 (63.2%)	1281 (70.0%)	1250 (66.6%)	1429 (69.2%)
Total	1891 (100%)	1578 (100%)	1830 (100%)	1877 (100%)	2064 (100%)

In 2003, 3115 men were asked to complete a questionnaire and 2064 did so. This represents a response rate of 66.3 per cent.

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 practice. For this reason some of the data on sexual practices are 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.

As indicated in previous Periodic Surveys (Van de Ven et al., 1997), men recruited from events such as the Midsumma Carnival 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 Melbourne gay men.

Demographic Profile

In terms of demographic variables, the participants in the five surveys from 1998 to 2003 were quite similar.

GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION

There was little variation in the geographic distribution of participants from 1998 to 2003. In all five surveys, the men came primarily from the Melbourne metropolitan area. A small percentage of men, who indicated that they participated regularly in Melbourne gay community, came from other parts of Victoria or from outside the State (see Table 2).

Table 2 : Residential location

	1998	2000	2001	2002	2003
Gay Melbourne	850 (44.9%)	659 (41.8%)	802 (43.8%)	753 (40.1%)	832 (40.3%)
Urban Victoria	845 (44.7%)	734 (46.5%)	816 (44.6%)	857 (45.7%)	950 (46.0%)
Rural Victoria	89 (4.7%)	92 (5.8%)	109 (6.0%)	124 (6.6%)	115 (5.6%)
Elsewhere	107 (5.7%)	93 (5.9%)	103 (5.6%)	143 (7.6%)	167 (8.1%)
Total	1891 (100%)	1578 (100%)	1830 (100%)	1877 (100%)	2064 (100%)

Note: The suburbs defined as 'Gay Melbourne' are the same as those defined as such in previous studies, eg Project Male Call (Crawford et al, 1998). 'Urban Victoria' included the rest of metropolitan Melbourne plus Geelong.

AGE

In the 2003 survey, the maximum age of respondents was 82, with a median age of 34. Age range and distribution were fairly similar to those observed in the previous four studies (see Table 3).

Table 3 : Age

	1998	2000	2001	2002	2003
Under 25	286 (15.5%)	223 (14.4%)	267 (15.0%)	307 (16.5%)	297 (14.9%)
25–29	371 (20.0%)	262 (16.9%)	289 (16.2%)	266 (14.3%)	304 (15.2%)
30–39	746 (40.3%)	572 (36.9%)	733 (41.1%)	728 (39.2%)	820 (41.1%)
40–49	319 (17.2%)	333 (21.4%)	347 (19.5%)	375 (20.2%)	401 (20.1%)
50 and over	129 (7.0%)	162 (10.4%)	147 (8.2%)	182 (9.8%)	172 (8.6%)
Total	1851 (100%)¹	1552 (100%)²	1783 (100%)³	1858 (100%)⁴	1994 (100%)⁵

¹ Missing data (n=40), ² Missing data (n=26), ³ Missing data (n=47), ⁴ Missing data (n=19), ⁵ Missing data (n=70)

ETHNICITY

As with the four previous surveys, the sample was predominantly ‘Anglo-Australian’ with no change in the proportion identifying as such in the current survey (see Table 4). Seventy men (3.5% of the total sample) reported being of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander origin which was a significant increase from the 2002 survey ($p < .05$).

Table 4 : Ethnicity

	1998	2000	2001	2002	2003
Anglo-Australian	1471 (77.8%)	1222 (77.4%)	1481 (80.9%)	1412 (75.2%)	1547 (75.0%)
European	212 (11.2%)	232 (14.7%)	215 (11.8%)	292 (15.6%)	277 (13.4%)
Other	208 (11.0%)	124 (7.9%)	134 (7.3%)	173 (9.2%)	240 (11.6%)
Total	1891 (100%)	1578 (100%)	1830 (100%)	1877 (100%)	2064 (100%)

OCCUPATION

The proportion of men who were not in the workforce was fairly high compared with the general population, and on par with the previous years (see Table 5). The figure is elevated because of the relatively high percentage of HIV-positive men who received some form of social security payment. Most of the sample was employed. There was no significant change from the previous year with 67% of all respondents being in full-time employment and 12% engaging in part-time work.

Table 5 : Employment status

	2000	2001	2002	2003
Full-time	1046 (68.0%)	1293 (72.3%)	1248 (68.5%)	1366 (67.2%)
Part-time	209 (13.6%)	190 (10.6%)	236 (13.0%)	249 (12.3%)
Unemployed/Other	283 (18.4%)	305 (17.1%)	338 (18.6%)	417 (20.5%)
Total	1538 (100%)¹	1788 (100%)²	1822 (100%)³	2032 (100%)

¹ Missing data (n=40), ² Missing data (n=42), ³ Missing data (n=55), ⁴ Missing data (n=32)

As in the previous four survey periods, and as in most studies of male homosexual populations, there was a substantial over-representation of professionals/managers and an under-representation of manual workers in comparison with the general population (Connell et al., 1991; Hood et al., 1994). Approximately 64% of respondents work in professional or managerial occupations and about 25% work in clerical or sales positions. There were slightly more respondents from blue collar occupations and slightly fewer participants from clerical and sales occupations in 2003 than in 2002 (see Table 6).

Table 6 : Occupation

	1998	2000	2001	2002	2003
Professional/Managerial					
Professional/ Managerial	568 (37.1%)	591 (46.0%)	792 (52.5%)	863 (56.0%)	803 (51.0%)
Paraprofessional	235 (15.3%)	111 (8.7%)	201 (13.3%)	121 (7.9%)	211 (13.4%)
White collar					
Clerical/Sales	495 (32.3%)	429 (33.4%)	386 (25.6%)	416 (27.0%)	368 (23.4%)
Blue collar					
Trades	147 (9.6%)	93 (7.2%)	75 (5.0%)	81 (5.3%)	102 (6.5%)
Plant operator/Labourer	87 (5.7%)	61 (4.7%)	56 (3.7%)	60 (3.9%)	90 (5.7%)
Total	1532 (100%)¹	1285 (100%)²	1510 (100%)³	1541 (100%)⁴	1574 (100%)⁵

Note : Missing data here is mainly N/A, ie. not currently employed.

¹ Missing data (n=359), ² Missing data (n=293), ³ Missing data (n=320), ⁴ Missing data (n=336), ⁵ Missing data (n=490)

SEXUAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH MEN

The majority of men in each of the five samples were in a regular sexual relationship with a man at the time of completing the survey (see Table 7). The proportion of men in regular relationships who also had sex with casual partners has increased significantly over the past two surveys to about 32% ($p < .05$). There was a corresponding decrease in the proportion of men in monogamous relationships to 28% of the study participants. In 2003 the percentage of men having sex with casual partners only was consistent with previous surveys. A small proportion of the men were not having sex with other men at the time of the survey and this has increased significantly, albeit slightly, over time

(Mantel-Haenszel, $p < .01$), most likely due to the smaller proportion of men recruited from gay social and sex-on-premises venues.

Table 7 : Current relationships with men

	1998	2000	2001	2002	2003
None	225 (12.2%)	197 (12.9%)	227 (13.7%)	248 (14.7%)	294 (15.6%)
Casual only	472 (25.6%)	374 (24.4%)	420 (25.3%)	449 (26.6%)	460 (24.4%)
Regular plus casual*	612 (33.1%)	537 (35.1%)	478 (28.8%)	493 (29.2%)	607 (32.2%)
Regular only (monogamous)	538 (29.1%)	422 (27.6%)	535 (32.2%)	501 (29.6%)	523 (27.8%)
Total	1847 (100%)¹	1530 (100%)²	1660 (100%)³	1691 (100%)⁴	1884 (100%)⁵

*This category may include either of the partners having casual sex, or both.

¹ Missing data (n=44), ² Missing data (n=48), ³ Missing data (n=170), ⁴ Missing data (n=186), ⁵ Missing data (n=180)

About two-thirds of men in a regular relationship had been in that relationship for at least one year, and that proportion has remained steady across the five time periods (see Table 8). Correspondingly, about one-third of the men have consistently reported being in a relationship for less than one year.

Table 8 : Length of relationships with men

	1998	2000	2001	2002	2003
Less than one year	364 (36.8%)	268 (31.8%)	363 (33.6%)	381 (35.8%)	389 (33.7%)
At least one year	626 (63.2%)	574 (68.1%)	718 (66.4%)	683 (64.2%)	767 (66.3%)
Total	990 (100%)	842 (100%)	1081 (100%)	1064 (100%)	1156 (100%)

Association with Gay Community

Similar in composition to the previous four surveys, and consistent with the recruitment strategies employed, the 2003 participants were highly gay-identified and gay-community-attached.

SEXUAL IDENTITY

The data in all five surveys show that the samples were composed predominantly of men who identified as gay or homosexual (see Table 9), and these percentages are comparable with similar surveys conducted elsewhere. There were relatively few men in each sample who identified as bisexual or heterosexual, and the proportions have been quite consistent across the five survey periods.

Table 9 : Sexual identity

	1998	2000	2001	2002	2003
Gay/homosexual/queer	1705 (91.3%)	1426 (91.0%)	1693 (93.1%)	1695 (91.2%)	1870 (91.4%)
Bisexual	119 (6.4%)	83 (5.3%)	84 (4.6%)	119 (6.4%)	123 (6.0%)
Heterosexual/other	43 (2.3%)	58 (3.7%)	41 (2.3%)	44 (2.4%)	52 (2.5%)
Total	1867 (100%)¹	1567 (100%)²	1818 (100%)³	1858 (100%)⁴	2045 (100%)⁵

¹ Missing data (n=24), ² Missing data (n=11), ³ Missing data (n=12), ⁴ Missing data (n=19), ⁵ Missing data (n=19)

GAY COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

As with the previous four surveys, men in the 2003 sample were highly socially involved with gay men (see Table 10). About half of the men in the sample said most or all of their friends were gay men and a similar proportion reported that some or a few of their friends were gay.

Table 10 : Gay friends

	1998	2000	2001	2002	2003
None	21 (1.1%)	17 (1.1%)	15 (0.8%)	25 (1.3%)	19 (0.9%)
Some or a few	882 (46.8%)	757 (48.1%)	919 (50.4%)	951 (50.7%)	1001 (48.5%)
Most or all	981 (52.1%)	800 (50.8%)	891 (48.8%)	898 (47.9%)	1043 (50.6%)
Total	1884 (100%)¹	1574 (100%)²	1825 (100%)³	1874 (100%)⁴	2063 (100%)⁵

¹ Missing data (n=7), ² Missing data (n=4), ³ Missing data (n=5), ⁴ Missing data (n=3), ⁵ Missing data (n=1)

Correspondingly, in all five surveys, about 85% of the men said they spent some or a lot of their free time with gay men (see Table 11).

Table 11 : Proportion of free time spent with gay men

	1998	2000	2001	2002	2003
None	8 (0.4%)	9 (0.6%)	13 (0.7%)	16 (0.9%)	16 (0.8%)
A little	222 (11.8%)	228 (14.5%)	212 (11.6%)	262 (14.0%)	295 (14.3%)
Some	728 (38.7%)	627 (39.8%)	718 (39.3%)	760 (40.6%)	842 (41.0%)
A lot	925 (49.1%)	711 (45.1%)	883 (48.4%)	832 (44.5%)	903 (43.9%)
Total	1883 (100%)¹	1575 (100%)²	1826 (100%)³	1870 (100%)⁴	2056 (100%)⁵

¹ Missing data (n=8), ² Missing data (n=3), ³ Missing data (n=4), ⁴ Missing data (n=7), ⁵ Missing data (n=8)

HIV Testing and Status

Most of the men in each of the samples had been tested for antibodies to HIV, and the status of these men is predominantly HIV-negative (see Table 12). The respective proportions of men in the sample who are HIV-positive or HIV-negative have remained steady across the five study periods. Also steady from 1998 to 2003 is the percentage of men who had not been tested or had not obtained their test results — about 15% in the most recent survey.

Table 12 : HIV test results

	1998	2000	2001	2002	2003
Not tested/No results	293 (16.1%)	232 (14.9%)	295 (16.5%)	281 (16.1%)	310 (15.4%)
HIV-negative	1371 (75.4%)	1180 (76.0%)	1347 (75.4%)	1313 (75.2%)	1526 (75.6%)
HIV-positive	154 (8.5%)	140 (9.0%)	145 (8.1%)	151 (8.7%)	182 (9.0%)
Total	1818 (100%)¹	1552 (100%)²	1787 (100%)³	1745 (100%)⁴	2018 (100%)

¹ Missing data (n=73), ² Missing data (n=26), ³ Missing data (n=43), ⁴ Missing data (n=132), ⁵ Missing data (n=46)

TIME SINCE MOST RECENT HIV-ANTIBODY TEST

Among the non HIV-positive men who had ‘ever’ had an HIV antibody test, the majority had at least done so within the previous 12 months and that proportion has remained steady across the five study periods (see Table 13). Recency of testing for the remaining men is equally distributed between the categories of 12-24 months and over 24 months, with about 20% of men in each category.

Table 13 : Time since most recent HIV test

	1998	2000	2001	2002	2003
Less than 6 months ago	632 (44.8%)	506 (42.0%)	571 (41.1%)	564 (41.9%)	686 (43.2%)
7–12 months ago	228 (16.1%)	246 (20.4%)	281 (20.2%)	264 (19.6%)	320 (20.1%)
1–2 years ago	296 (21.0%)	236 (19.6%)	259 (18.6%)	269 (20.0%)	284 (17.9%)
Over 2 years ago	256 (18.1%)	216 (18.0%)	279 (20.1%)	250 (18.6%)	299 (18.8%)
Total	1412 (100%)	1204 (100%)	1390 (100%)	1347 (100%)	1589 (100%)

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

COMBINATION THERAPIES

There was a significant decrease in the 2003 survey to 56% ($p < .01$) in the proportion of HIV-positive men who reported that they were taking combination therapies (see Table 14). Across the five time periods there has been a statistically significant downward trend in the proportion of HIV-positive men reporting that they are on combination antiviral therapy (Mantel-Haenszel, $p < .001$). This trend is consistent with that reported in HIV Futures 3, an Australian-wide survey, which found that there had been a decline in the number of people who were taking combination therapy (Grierson et al., 2002), and is consistent with what we found in our Queensland and Sydney surveys.

Table 14 : Use of combination antiretroviral therapies

	1998	2000	2001	2002	2003
Yes	128 (82.6%)	108 (78.3%)	101 (66.9%)	105 (70.0%)	99 (55.9%)
No	27 (17.4%)	30 (21.7%)	50 (33.1%)	45 (30.0%)	78 (44.1%)
Total	155 (100%)¹	138 (100%)²	151 (100%)³	150 (100%)⁴	177 (100%)

Note : Includes only HIV-positive men.

¹ Missing data (n=5), ² Missing data (n=3), ³ Missing data (n=3), ⁴ Missing data (n=3), ⁵ Missing data (n=9)

REGULAR PARTNER'S HIV-STATUS

In all five surveys, participants were asked about the serostatus of their current regular partner (see Table 15). As the question referred to current partners only, fewer men responded to this item than indicated sex with a regular partner during the previous six months. The majority (about 70%) of the men in a regular relationship reported having a partner who is HIV-negative and 10% were with partners of HIV-positive status. There was a slight decrease in the proportion of men who did not know the HIV status of their partner and a corresponding increase in the proportion with a HIV-negative partner in the 2003 survey ($p < .05$).

Table 15 : HIV status of regular partners

	1998	2000	2001	2002	2003
HIV-positive	106 (10.3%)	58 (7.7%)	84 (8.6%)	82 (8.9%)	101 (10.0%)
HIV-negative	640 (62.2%)	526 (70.0%)	669 (68.3%)	619 (67.4%)	711 (70.2%)
HIV status unknown	283 (27.5%)	167 (22.2%)	227 (23.2%)	218 (23.7%)	201 (19.8%)
Total	1029 (100%)	751 (100%)	980 (100%)	919 (100%)	1013 (100%)

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

The 2003 survey revealed no change in the percentages of HIV-positive men with HIV-negative, HIV-positive or unknown HIV status partners. In 2003, the percentage of HIV-positive respondents with HIV-positive partners was about 38% and the percentage of HIV-positive respondents with HIV-negative partners was about 53% (see Table 16). HIV-negative respondents are in relationships with predominantly other HIV-negative men and the proportion is similar to the previous year, as is the proportion of HIV-negative respondents with HIV-positive partners. As in the four previous surveys, men without knowledge of their own serostatus tended not to know the serostatus of their regular partners, or they had HIV-negative regular partners, however the proportion with HIV-positive partners has increased slightly to a level similar to 1998.

Table 16 : Match of HIV status in regular relationships

Serostatus of Regular Partner	Respondent's HIV status		
	HIV-Positive	HIV-Negative	Unknown
1998			
HIV-positive	45 (46.9%)	50 (6.3%)	10 (7.4%)
HIV-negative	39 (40.6%)	553 (69.7%)	45 (33.0%)
HIV status unknown	12 (12.5%)	190 (24.0%)	81 (59.6%)
Total (N = 1025)	96 (100%)	793 (100%)	136 (100%)
2000			
HIV-positive	25 (37.9%)	30 (5.0%)	2 (2.6%)
HIV-negative	37 (56.0%)	458 (75.9%)	29 (37.7%)
HIV status unknown	4 (6.1%)	115 (19.1%)	46 (59.7%)
Total (N = 746)	66 (100%)	603 (100%)	77 (100%)
2001			
HIV-positive	37 (45.1%)	44 (5.7%)	2 (1.8%)
HIV-negative	40 (48.8%)	578 (74.7%)	42 (37.8%)
HIV status unknown	5 (6.1%)	152 (19.6%)	67 (60.4%)
Total (N = 967)	82 (100%)	774 (100%)	111 (100%)
2002			
HIV-positive	30 (36.6%)	42 (5.9%)	7 (6.3%)
HIV-negative	43 (52.4%)	521 (73.6%)	42 (37.8%)
HIV status unknown	9 (11.0%)	145 (20.5%)	62 (55.9%)
Total (N = 919)	82 (100%)	708 (100%)	111 (100%)
2003			
HIV-positive	34 (38.2%)	57 (7.1%)	10 (8.4%)
HIV-negative	47 (52.8%)	617 (76.6%)	47 (39.5%)
HIV status unknown	8 (9.0%)	131 (16.3%)	62 (52.1%)
Total (N = 1013)	89 (100%)	805 (100%)	119 (100%)

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 (see Table 17). Based on the responses to the sexual behaviour items and the sort of sexual relationships with men indicated by the participants, about two-thirds of the men in all four surveys were classified as having had sex with a regular male partner and this proportion has been steady across the five study periods. Almost 70% was classified as having had sex with any casual male partners 'in the previous six months'. The results show increases in the last two surveys after a decrease to 66% in 2001. Further interpretation of these findings is reported on below.

Table 17 : Reported sex with male partners in previous six months

	1998	2000	2001	2002	2003
Any sexual contact with <i>regular</i> partners	1215 (64.3%)	1007 (63.8%)	1199 (65.5%)	1193 (63.6%)	1298 (62.9%)
Any sexual contact with <i>casual</i> partners	1362 (72.0%)	1123 (71.2%)	1209 (66.1%)	1268 (67.6%)	1429 (69.2%)
Total	1891	1578	1830	1877	2064

Note : These categories are not mutually exclusive

The result referred to in Table 18 ought to be interpreted in consideration of the slight differences in sample composition mentioned in the section entitled **Sample and Recruitment**. As in the previous four surveys, men recruited at the Midsumma Carnival were more likely to have had regular partners, and less likely to have had casual partners than their counterparts recruited at sex-on-premises and social venues or clinics

(see Table 18). Such a finding is not surprising as men attending the gay venues, particularly the sex-on-premises venues, often do so mainly to find casual sex partners.

Table 18 : Reported sex with male partners in previous six months by recruitment site

Serostatus of Regular Partner	Midsumma Carnival	Venues & Clinics
1998		
Any sexual contact with <i>regular</i> partners	815 (68.8%)	400 (56.7%)
Any sexual contact with <i>casual</i> partners	762 (64.3%)	600 (85.0%)
Total (N = 1891)	1185	706
2000		
Any sexual contact with <i>regular</i> partners	684 (68.5%)	323 (55.7%)
Any sexual contact with <i>casual</i> partners	618 (61.9%)	505 (87.1%)
Total (N = 1578)	998	580
2001		
Any sexual contact with <i>regular</i> partners	894 (69.8%)	305 (55.8%)
Any sexual contact with <i>casual</i> partners	780 (60.9%)	428 (78.2%)
Total (N=1830)	1281	547
2002		
Any sexual contact with <i>regular</i> partners	848 (67.8%)	345 (55.0%)
Any sexual contact with <i>casual</i> partners	768 (61.4%)	500 (79.7%)
Total (N=1877)	1250	627
2003		
Any sexual contact with <i>regular</i> partners	960 (67.2%)	338 (53.2%)
Any sexual contact with <i>casual</i> partners	762 (64.3%)	507 (79.8%)
Total (N=2064)	1429	635

Note : These categories are not mutually exclusive.

The proportion of men reporting that they had no sexual partners in the previous six months was slightly less than that reported in 2002 with a slightly greater percentage indicating they had between 2 and 10 partners (see Table 19). The majority of the men had engaged in sex with between 1 partner and 10 partners ‘in the previous six months’.

Table 19 : Number of male sex partners in previous six months

	1998	2000	2001	2002	2003
None	87 (4.6%)	99 (6.3%)	274 (15.1%)	279 (15.0%)	245 (12.1%)
One	427 (22.8%)	325 (20.7%)	339 (18.7%)	315 (16.9%)	360 (17.7%)
2–10	786 (41.9%)	611 (39.0%)	703 (38.7%)	685 (36.8%)	802 (39.5%)
11–50	454 (24.2%)	411 (26.2%)	388 (21.4%)	443 (23.8%)	465 (22.9%)
More than 50	122 (6.5%)	122 (7.8%)	111 (6.1%)	141 (7.6%)	159 (7.8%)
Total	1876 (100%)¹	1578 (100%)²	1815 (100%)³	1863 (100%)⁴	2031 (100%)⁵

¹ Missing data (n=15), ² Missing data (n=10), ³ Missing data (n=15), ⁴ Missing data (n=14), ⁵ Missing data (n=33)

OVERVIEW OF SEXUAL PRACTICES WITH 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 (see Table 20). This result is consistent across the five study periods. Over half of those with regular male partners engaged in any oral intercourse (receptive or insertive) with ejaculation with their partners.

Most respondents engaged in anal intercourse with their regular male partners and the percentage has remained steady across the five study periods. About 75% of the men with regular partners reported engaging in insertive anal intercourse while a slightly lower proportion, about 70%, reported engaging in receptive anal intercourse. This discrepancy in the proportions reporting insertive and receptive anal intercourse may suggest there is a slight bias to report being insertive rather than receptive.

Fewer respondents engaged in either oral intercourse with ejaculation or anal intercourse with casual male partners than with regular male partners (see Table 21). The percentage of men reporting receptive fellatio with ejaculation has increased in the last two surveys and is approaching the level reported in the 1998 survey. Three-quarters of the men who had sex with casual male partners engaged in anal intercourse with those partners, and again more usually in the insertive than the receptive role. These percentages have remained steady across the five study periods.

Table 20 : Sexual behaviour with regular male partners

	Total Sample	Those with regular partners
1998		
Any oral intercourse with ejaculation	803 (42.5%)	803 (66.1%)
Insertive fellatio with ejaculation	650 (34.4%)	650 (53.5%)
Receptive fellatio with ejaculation	652 (34.5%)	652 (53.7%)
Any anal intercourse	1047 (55.4%)	1047 (86.2%)
Insertive anal intercourse	923 (48.8%)	923 (76.0%)
Receptive anal intercourse	822 (43.5%)	822 (67.7%)
Base	1891	1215
2000		
Any oral intercourse with ejaculation	562 (35.6%)	562 (55.8%)
Insertive fellatio with ejaculation	450 (28.5%)	450 (44.7%)
Receptive fellatio with ejaculation	424 (26.9%)	424 (42.1%)
Any anal intercourse	894 (56.6%)	894 (88.7%)
Insertive anal intercourse	773 (49.0%)	773 (76.8%)
Receptive anal intercourse	710 (45.0%)	710 (70.5%)
Base	1578	1007
2001		
Any oral intercourse with ejaculation	721 (39.4%)	721 (60.1%)
Insertive fellatio with ejaculation	597 (32.6%)	597 (49.8%)
Receptive fellatio with ejaculation	589 (32.2%)	589 (49.1%)
Any anal intercourse	1015 (55.5%)	1015 (84.7%)
Insertive anal intercourse	886 (48.4%)	886 (73.9%)
Receptive anal intercourse	833 (45.5%)	833 (69.5%)
Base	1830	1199
2002		
Any oral intercourse with ejaculation	701 (37.3%)	701 (58.8%)
Insertive fellatio with ejaculation	571 (30.4%)	571 (47.9%)
Receptive fellatio with ejaculation	575 (30.6%)	575 (48.2%)
Any anal intercourse	1023 (54.5%)	1023 (85.8%)
Insertive anal intercourse	886 (47.2%)	886 (74.3%)
Receptive anal intercourse	820 (43.7%)	820 (68.7%)
Base	1877	1193
2003		
Any oral intercourse with ejaculation	772 (37.4%)	772 (59.5%)
Insertive fellatio with ejaculation	643 (31.2%)	643 (49.5%)
Receptive fellatio with ejaculation	615 (29.8%)	615 (47.4%)
Any anal intercourse	1127 (54.6%)	1127 (86.8%)
Insertive anal intercourse	1006 (48.7%)	1006 (77.5%)
Receptive anal intercourse	912 (44.2%)	912 (70.3%)
Base	2064	1298

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.

Table 21 : Sexual behaviour with casual male partners

	Total Sample	Those with casual partners
1998		
Any oral intercourse with ejaculation	624 (33.0%)	624 (45.8%)
Insertive fellatio with ejaculation	511 (27.0%)	511 (37.5%)
Receptive fellatio with ejaculation	436 (23.1%)	436 (32.0%)
Any anal intercourse	971 (51.3%)	971 (71.3%)
Insertive anal intercourse	870 (46.0%)	870 (63.9%)
Receptive anal intercourse	677 (35.8%)	677 (49.7%)
Base	1891	1362
2000		
Any oral intercourse with ejaculation	452 (28.6%)	452 (40.7%)
Insertive fellatio with ejaculation	389 (24.6%)	389 (35.0%)
Receptive fellatio with ejaculation	277 (17.5%)	277 (25.0%)
Any anal intercourse	832 (52.7%)	832 (75.0%)
Insertive anal intercourse	762 (48.3%)	762 (68.6%)
Receptive anal intercourse	612 (38.8%)	612 (55.1%)
Base	1578	1110
2001		
Any oral intercourse with ejaculation	488 (26.7%)	488 (40.4%)
Insertive fellatio with ejaculation	436 (23.8%)	436 (36.6%)
Receptive fellatio with ejaculation	320 (17.5%)	320 (26.5%)
Any anal intercourse	911 (49.8%)	911 (75.4%)
Insertive anal intercourse	829 (45.3%)	829 (68.6%)
Receptive anal intercourse	664 (36.3%)	664 (54.9%)
Base	1830	1209
2002		
Any oral intercourse with ejaculation	586 (31.2%)	586 (44.4%)
Insertive fellatio with ejaculation	507 (27.0%)	507 (38.4%)
Receptive fellatio with ejaculation	384 (20.5%)	384 (29.1%)
Any anal intercourse	971 (51.7%)	971 (73.5%)
Insertive anal intercourse	868 (46.2%)	868 (65.7%)
Receptive anal intercourse	730 (38.9%)	730 (55.3%)
Base	1877	1321
2003		
Any oral intercourse with ejaculation	660 (32.0%)	660 (44.9%)
Insertive fellatio with ejaculation	578 (28.0%)	578 (39.3%)
Receptive fellatio with ejaculation	441 (21.4%)	441 (30.0%)
Any anal intercourse	1120 (54.3%)	1120 (76.2%)
Insertive anal intercourse	1018 (49.3%)	1018 (69.3%)
Receptive anal intercourse	847 (41.0%)	847 (57.6%)
Base	2064	1470

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

The percentage of men engaging in any UAI with their regular male partners in the previous six months has decreased slightly to 53% after reaching 57% in 2001, (see Table 22). There has been a corresponding increase in the number of men who indicated that they always used condoms ($p < .001$). Remaining quite steady across the five study periods are the number of men reporting to have been in a regular relationship in the previous six months and the number of men who had a partner but did not engage in any anal intercourse.

Table 22 : Condom use with regular partners

	Total Sample	Those with regular partners
1998		
No regular partner	676 (35.7%)	—
No anal intercourse	168 (8.9%)	168 (13.8%)
Always uses condom	497 (26.3%)	497 (40.9%)
Sometimes does not use condom	550 (29.1%)	550 (45.3%)
Base	1891 (100%)	1215 (100%)
2000		
No regular partner	571 (36.2%)	—
No anal intercourse	113 (7.2%)	113 (11.2%)
Always uses condom	370 (23.4%)	370 (36.7%)
Sometimes does not use condom	524 (33.2%)	524 (52.0%)
Base	1578 (100%)	1007 (100%)
2001		
No regular partner	631 (34.5%)	—
No anal intercourse	184 (10.1%)	184 (15.3%)
Always uses condom	329 (18.0%)	329 (27.4%)
Sometimes does not use condom	686 (37.5%)	686 (57.2%)
Base	1830 (100%)	1199 (100%)
2002		
No regular partner	684 (36.4%)	—
No anal intercourse	170 (9.1%)	170 (14.2%)
Always uses condom	368 (19.6%)	368 (30.8%)
Sometimes does not use condom ¹	655 (34.9%)	655 (54.9%)
Base	1877 (100%)	1193 (100%)
2003		
No regular partner	766 (37.1%)	—
No anal intercourse	171 (8.3%)	171 (13.2%)
Always uses condom	437 (21.2%)	437 (33.7%)
Sometimes does not use condom ¹	690 (33.4%)	690 (53.2%)
Base	2064 (100%)	1298 (100%)

¹ Of the 690 men who engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with regular partners 'in the previous 6 months', 140 men only practised withdrawal prior to ejaculation, 184 consistently ejaculated inside, and 366 engaged in both withdrawal and ejaculation inside.

In 2003, HIV-negative and HIV-positive respondents were more likely to have UAI than men of unknown HIV status (see Table 23). In the 2003 survey, there was no difference between HIV-positive, HIV-negative men or men of unknown HIV status in the proportion who always use condoms when engaging in anal intercourse with regular partners. These findings should be treated cautiously as they are based on small numbers of HIV-positive men.

Table 23 : Serostatus and condom use among regular partners

	HIV-Positive	HIV-Negative	Unknown serostatus
1998			
No anal intercourse	12 (11.7%)	115 (12.5%)	40 (23.0%)
Always uses condom	45 (43.7%)	376 (40.9%)	70 (40.2%)
Sometimes does not use condom	46 (44.7%)	429 (46.6%)	64 (36.8%)
Total	103 (100%)	920 (100%)	174 (100%)
2000			
No anal intercourse	3 (3.4%)	92 (11.8%)	15 (11.7%)
Always uses condom	32 (36.4%)	281 (36.0%)	55 (43.0%)
Sometimes does not use condom	53 (60.2%)	408 (52.2%)	58 (45.3%)
Total	88 (100%)	781 (100%)	128 (100%)
2001			
No anal intercourse	12 (13.2%)	141 (15.1%)	26 (17.6%)
Always uses condom	32 (35.2%)	241 (25.7%)	49 (33.1%)
Sometimes does not use condom	47 (51.6%)	554 (59.2%)	73 (49.3%)
Total	91 (100%)	936 (100%)	148 (100%)
2002			
No anal intercourse	6 (6.5%)	128 (14.1%)	33 (20.2%)
Always uses condom	25 (26.9%)	286 (31.4%)	50 (30.7%)
Sometimes does not use condom	62 (66.7%)	496 (54.5%)	80 (49.1%)
Total	93 (100%)	910 (100%)	163 (100%)
2003			
No anal intercourse	13 (11.1%)	126 (12.4%)	32 (19.8%)
Always uses condom	41 (35.0%)	335 (32.9%)	61 (37.7%)
Sometimes does not use condom	63 (53.8%)	556 (54.7%)	69 (42.6%)
Total	117 (100%)	1017 (100%)	162 (100%)

In Table 24, 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.

HIV-positive men were less likely to have unprotected anal intercourse with negative or status unknown partners than with positive partners. HIV-negative men were more likely to have unprotected anal intercourse with negative partners than with positive partners or unknown status partners. The percentage of HIV-negative men having unprotected anal intercourse with unknown status partners has decreased in the latest survey, after increases in the previous three surveys, to be at a similar level reported in 1998. Whereas much of the unprotected anal intercourse was between seroconcordant (positive-positive or negative-negative) couples, 93 men in 2003 had unprotected anal intercourse in a relationship where seroconcordance was absent or in doubt. Separate analyses of these 93 men showed that 40 of them *never* used condoms for anal intercourse with their regular partners (ie. all anal intercourse with their regular partners was without condoms).

Table 24 : Condom use and match of HIV serostatus in regular relationships

Regular Partner's Serostatus	Anal intercourse	Participant's Serostatus		
		HIV-Positive	HIV-Negative	Unknown
1998				
HIV-Positive	No UAI	10 (34.5%)	14 (56.0%)	—
	Some UAI	19 (65.5%)	11 (44.0%)	2 (100.0%)
HIV-Negative	No UAI	13 (76.5%)	102 (29.7%)	9 (40.9%)
	Some UAI	4 (23.5%)	241 (70.3%)	13 (59.1%)
Unknown	No UAI	2 (50.0%)	29 (43.3%)	13 (34.2%)
	Some UAI	2 (50.0%)	38 (56.7%)	25 (65.8%)
Total		50	435	42
2000				
HIV-Positive	No UAI	1 (6.7%)	8 (40.0%)	—
	Some UAI	14 (93.3%)	12 (60.0%)	—
HIV-Negative	No UAI	10 (40.0%)	67 (23.5%)	5 (21.7%)
	Some UAI	15 (60.0%)	218 (76.5%)	18 (78.3%)
Unknown	No UAI	—	19 (38.0%)	6 (30.0%)
	Some UAI	—	31 (62.0%)	14 (70.0%)
Total		40	355	43
2001				
HIV-Positive	No UAI	4 (17.4%)	13 (44.8%)	—
	Some UAI	19 (82.6%)	16 (55.2%)	—
HIV-Negative	No UAI	16 (72.7%)	62 (15.8%)	10 (35.7%)
	Some UAI	6 (27.3%)	330 (84.2%)	18 (64.3%)
Unknown	No UAI	—	20 (29.4%)	7 (21.9%)
	Some UAI	2 (100.0%)	48 (70.6%)	25 (78.1%)
Total		47	489	60
2002				
HIV-Positive	No UAI	4 (16.0%)	14 (48.3%)	1 (25.0%)
	Some UAI	21 (84.0%)	15 (51.7%)	3 (75.0%)
HIV-Negative	No UAI	8 (30.8%)	86 (24.6%)	5 (23.8%)
	Some UAI	18 (69.2%)	263 (75.4%)	16 (76.2%)
Unknown	No UAI	—	12 (22.2%)	6 (20.7%)
	Some UAI	4 (100.0%)	42 (77.8%)	23 (79.3%)
Total		55	432	54
2003				
HIV-Positive	No UAI	3 (13%)	14 (43.8%)	4 (57.1%)
	Some UAI	20 (87.0%)	18 (56.3%)	3 (42.9%)
HIV-Negative	No UAI	19 (65.5%)	97 (24.1%)	5 (20.0%)
	Some UAI	10 (34.5%)	305 (75.9%)	20 (80.0%)
Unknown	No UAI	1 (33.3%)	23 (44.2%)	14 (56.0%)
	Some UAI	2 (66.7%)	29 (55.8%)	11 (44.0%)
Total		55	486	57

Note: UAI = unprotected anal intercourse. Includes only men who had anal intercourse with their 'current' regular partner 'in the previous six months'.

AGREEMENTS

Most participants who had a regular male partner (about 60% of men in the sample) also had an agreement with their partner about sex *within* the relationship (see Table 25). In 2003 there was no significant change in the proportions of men in each of the agreement categories. Approximately 37% of respondents have agreements allowing anal intercourse without condoms while about 32% only allow anal intercourse with condoms. The proportion of men who did not have agreements with regular partners had increased over the period from 1998 to 2002, however, in 2003 there was a significant decrease in the proportion of men without agreements ($p < .05$).

Table 25 : Agreements with regular male partners about sex *within* the relationship

	1998	2000	2001	2002	2003
No spoken agreement about anal intercourse	249 (23.7%)	209 (24.3%)	268 (25.5%)	281 (27.7%)	222 (22.3%)
No anal intercourse between regular partners	93 (8.9%)	71 (8.3%)	82 (7.8%)	72 (7.1%)	82 (8.2%)
Anal intercourse permitted only with condom	377 (35.9%)	247 (28.8%)	271 (25.8%)	305 (30.0%)	317 (31.9%)
Anal intercourse without condom is permitted	331 (31.5%)	332 (38.6%)	429 (40.9%)	357 (35.2%)	373 (37.5%)
Total	1050 (100%)	859 (100%)	1050 (100%)	1015 (100%)	994 (100%)

Note : Percentages are based on men who had a regular partner at the time of completing the survey

Most participants had made an agreement with their regular partner about sex with men *outside* the relationship (see Table 26). The majority of these agreements either specified no casual partners or allowed for there to be anal intercourse with casual partners on the proviso that condoms were used. Almost 30% of the men had no spoken agreement about sex outside the relationship. Except for an increase in 2003, in the proportion of men who allow their partners to have anal intercourse with condoms with casual partners ($p < .05$), across the five time periods there has been little change in the proportions of men in each of the agreement categories.

Table 26 : Agreements with regular male partners about sex *outside* the relationship

	1998	2000	2001	2002	2003
No spoken agreement about sex	329 (32.9%)	261 (32.7%)	303 (30.2%)	315 (32.6%)	279 (28.9%)
No sexual contact with casual partners is permitted	297 (29.7%)	226 (28.3%)	347 (34.6%)	312 (32.3%)	304 (31.5%)
No anal intercourse with casual partners is permitted	102 (10.2%)	57 (7.1%)	54 (5.4%)	72 (7.5%)	54 (5.6%)
Anal intercourse permitted only with condom	257 (25.7%)	229 (28.7%)	271 (27.0%)	234 (24.2%)	293 (30.4%)
Anal intercourse without condom is permitted	16 (1.6%)	25 (3.1%)	27 (2.7%)	33 (3.4%)	35 (3.6%)
Total	1001 (100%)	798 (100%)	1002 (100%)	966 (100%)	965 (100%)

Note : Percentages are based on men who had a regular partner at the time of completing the survey

SEX WITH CASUAL MALE PARTNERS

Condom use

Based on the entire sample, about 20% of the men who participated in the survey engaged in any unprotected anal intercourse with casual male partners 'in the previous six months' (see Table 27). The percentage is slightly higher than that of the previous year and there has been a significant increase in UAI-C across the five study periods ($p < .001$). A separate analysis revealed that of the 424 men who reported engaging in UAI-C, 213 had also engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with regular partners.

Table 27 : Condom use with casual partners

	Total Sample	Those with regular partners
1998		
No casual partner	529 (28.0%)	—
No anal intercourse	397 (21.0%)	397 (29.1%)
Always uses condom	712 (37.7%)	712 (52.3%)
Sometimes does not use condom	253 (13.4%)	253 (18.6%)
Base	1891 (100%)	1362 (100%)
2000		
No casual partner	468 (29.6%)	—
No anal intercourse	278 (17.6%)	278 (25.0%)
Always uses condom	570 (36.1%)	570 (51.3%)
Sometimes does not use condom	262 (16.6%)	262 (23.6%)
Base	1578 (100%)	1110 (100%)
2001		
No casual partner	621 (33.9%)	—
No anal intercourse	307 (16.8%)	307 (25.4%)
Always uses condom	591 (32.3%)	591 (48.9%)
Sometimes does not use condom	311 (17.0%)	311 (25.7%)
Base	1830 (100%)	1209 (100%)
2002		
No casual partner	609 (32.4%)	—
No anal intercourse	310 (16.5%)	310 (24.4%)
Always uses condom	599 (31.9%)	599 (47.2%)
Sometimes does not use condom	359 (19.1%)	359 (28.3%)
Base	1877 (100%)	1268 (100%)
2003		
No casual partner	635 (30.8%)	—
No anal intercourse	323 (15.6%)	323 (22.6%)
Always uses condom	682 (33.0%)	682 (47.7%)
Sometimes does not use condom ¹	424 (20.5%)	424 (29.7%)
Base	2064 (100%)	1429 (100%)

1 Of the 424 men who engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners 'in the previous six months', 162 only practised withdrawal prior to ejaculation, 40 consistently ejaculated inside, and 222 engaged in both withdrawal and ejaculation inside.

A comparison of the data in Tables 22 and 27 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.

As in the previous four surveys there were statistically significant differences between HIV-positive, HIV-negative and 'untested' men in their condom use with casual partners, ($p < .001$) (see Table 28). A higher proportion of HIV-positive men engaged in UAI-C in comparison with men of HIV-negative and HIV-unknown status. 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 28 : Serostatus and condom use with casual partners

	HIV-Positive	HIV-Negative	Unknown serostatus
1998			
No anal intercourse	25 (18.5%)	292 (28.7%)	72 (38.7%)
Always uses condom	65 (48.1%)	565 (55.4%)	73 (39.2%)
Sometimes does not use condom	45 (33.3%)	162 (15.9%)	41 (22.0%)
Total	135 (100%)	1019 (100%)	186 (100%)
2000			
No anal	14 (12.7%)	215 (24.9%)	56 (39.2%)
Always uses condom	56 (50.9%)	457 (52.9%)	58 (40.6%)
Sometimes does not use condom	40 (36.4%)	192 (22.2%)	29 (20.3%)
Total	110 (100%)	864 (100%)	143 (100%)
2001			
No anal	17 (14.8%)	231 (25.4%)	52 (31.7%)
Always uses condom	41 (35.7%)	469 (51.6%)	74 (45.1%)
Sometimes does not use condom	57 (49.6%)	209 (23.0%)	38 (23.2%)
Total	115 (100%)	909 (100%)	164 (100%)
2002			
No anal	13 (10.7%)	251 (25.8%)	44 (27.5%)
Always uses condom	39 (32.0%)	482 (49.6%)	72 (45.0%)
Sometimes does not use condom	70 (57.4%)	239 (24.6%)	44 (27.5%)
Total	122 (100%)	972 (100%)	160 (100%)
2003			
No anal	22 (13.9%)	248 (22.9%)	52 (27.8%)
Always uses condom	46 (29.1%)	548 (50.6%)	88 (47.1%)
Sometimes does not use condom	90 (57.0%)	287 (26.5%)	47 (25.1%)
Total	158 (100%)	1083 (100%)	187 (100%)

SEROSTATUS

Questions 32 and 33 were included in the questionnaire to obtain a sense of disclosure in the context of 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 majority of participants with casual partners (about 55% of the sample) did not disclose their serostatus to any of their casual partners. This proportion was quite steady across the previous four study periods, however, in 2003 there was a significant drop in the proportion of men who ‘told none’ of their casual partners their HIV status (see Table 29). Conversely, there was a significant increase in the proportion of men who told ‘some’ of their casual partners. Relatively few men disclosed to all casual partners, however, since 1998 there has been a significant increase over time in the proportion who told all casual partners their HIV status (Mantel-Haenszel, $p < .001$).

Table 29 : Participants’ disclosure of serostatus to casual partners

	1998	2000	2001	2002	2003
Told none	852 (63.3%)	699 (65.8%)	749 (61.8%)	845 (63.2%)	754 (54.6%)
Told some	308 (22.9%)	246 (23.1%)	288 (23.8%)	281 (21.0%)	374 (27.1%)
Told all	187 (13.9%)	118 (11.1%)	175 (14.4%)	210 (15.7%)	253 (18.3%)
Total	1347 (100%)	1063 (100%)	1212 (100%)	1336 (100%)	1381 (100%)

Over half of the men who had casual partners were not told the serostatus of those partners in the context of sex (see Table 30). The proportions in the disclosure categories had remained fairly constant across the four study periods from 1998 to 2002. However, in 2003 there was a significant drop in the proportion of respondents whose casual partners never disclosed their HIV status ($p < .01$). Conversely, there was a significant increase in the proportion of respondents who were sometimes told the HIV status of their casual partners ($p < .01$). Only about 10% of men (albeit a growing proportion) had the serostatus of their casual partners routinely disclosed to them.

Table 30 : Casual partners’ disclosure of serostatus to participants

	1998	2000	2001	2002	2003
Told by none	866 (63.4%)	691 (64.5%)	740 (61.0%)	833 (63.3%)	770 (56.2%)
Told by some	398 (29.2%)	308 (28.7%)	359 (29.6%)	359 (27.3%)	454 (33.1%)
Told by all	101 (7.4%)	73 (6.8%)	114 (9.4%)	123 (9.4%)	146 (10.7%)
Total	1365 (100%)	1072 (100%)	1213 (100%)	1315 (100%)	1370 (100%)

A question about where men look for male sex partners was added to the survey in 2002. Two places where few men often looked for sex partners were removed from the 2003 survey and an additional place added. When the total sample is examined around 70% of men look for partners in gay bars and 60% look in sex venues (see Table 31). In the 2003 survey the proportion of respondents who looked on the internet for sex partners has increased significantly to about 52% ($p < .01$). Of the men who answered the question and indicated that they have engaged in sex with casual partners in the last six months, around three-quarters of respondents look for partners in gay bars and sex venues while around 60% use the internet and about half use beats.

Table 31 : Where men look for sex partners

Venue	Year	Never	Occasionally	Often	Total
Internet	2002	778 (52.9%)	519 (35.3%)	174 (11.8%)	1471 (100%) ¹
	2003	755 (47.8%)	600 (38.0%)	225 (14.2%)	1580 (100%) ²
Gay bar	2002	495 (31.3%)	799 (50.5%)	288 (18.2%)	1582 (100%) ³
	2003	506 (29.9%)	885 (52.2%)	304 (17.9%)	1695 (100%) ⁴
Beat	2002	896 (60.3%)	432 (29.1%)	157 (10.6%)	1485 (100%) ⁵
	2003	959 (61.0%)	461 (29.3%)	151 (9.6%)	1571 (100%) ⁶
Sex venue	2002	645 (40.5%)	612 (38.4%)	335 (21.0%)	1592 (100%) ⁷
	2003	698 (40.2%)	665 (38.3%)	375 (21.6%)	1738 (100%) ⁸
Dance Party	2002	830 (54.0%)	543 (26.3%)	164 (10.7%)	1537 (100%) ⁹

¹ Missing data (n=406), ² Missing data (n=484), ³ Missing data (n=295), ⁴ Missing data (n=369), ⁵ Missing data (n=392), ⁶ Missing data (n=493), ⁷ Missing data (n=285), ⁸ Missing data (n=326), ⁹ Missing data (n=527)

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 (e.g., Crawford et al., 1998). Less well understood are beliefs in the context of advances in combination antiretroviral therapies for treatment and prevention of HIV/AIDS. While there was little change in the way men answered a question from 2000 to 2002, in the 2003 survey there was a significant increase in the proportion of men who either agreed or strongly agreed that the availability of PEP makes safe sex less important ($p < .001$) (see Table 32), although these were still a small minority of the total sample.

Table 32 : Responses to question about PEP

Item	Year	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
The availability of treatment (PEP) immediately after unsafe sex makes safe sex less important.	2000	846 (58.0%)	538 (36.9%)	48 (3.3%)	27 (1.9%)
	2001	973 (57.5%)	630 (37.2%)	61 (3.6%)	28 (1.7%)
	2002	878 (53.4%)	635 (38.6%)	104 (6.3%)	28 (1.7%)
	2003	900 (56.9%)	476 (30.1%)	132 (8.3%)	75 (4.7%)

The relationship between the item about PEP and safe sex, and the participant's serostatus (see Table 33), was similar to findings in other Australian cities. Most men's responses were generally in line with accepted wisdom. As with the previous surveys, there was no difference in 2003 between men of HIV-positive, HIV-negative and men of unknown serostatus in their attitudes to safe sex in the context of the availability of PEP.

Table 33 : Responses to question about PEP by serostatus

Serostatus	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
The availability of treatment (PEP) immediately after unsafe sex makes safe sex less important				
2000				
HIV-Positive	95 (69.3%)	37 (27.0%)	3 (2.2%)	2 (1.5%)
HIV-Negative	643 (57.8%)	419 (37.7%)	34 (3.1%)	16 (1.4%)
Unknown	105 (52.2%)	77 (38.3%)	10 (5.0%)	9 (4.5%)
2001				
HIV-Positive	88 (59.1%)	53 (35.6%)	6 (4.0%)	2 (1.3%)
HIV-Negative	746 (58.4%)	470 (36.8%)	41 (3.2%)	20 (1.6%)
Unknown	127 (51.2%)	103 (41.5%)	13 (5.2%)	5 (2.0%)
2002				
HIV-Positive	80 (54.4%)	58 (39.5%)	7 (4.8%)	2 (1.4%)
HIV-Negative	678 (54.6%)	473 (38.1%)	71 (5.7%)	20 (1.6%)
Unknown	110 (46.8%)	96 (40.9%)	23 (9.8%)	6 (2.6%)
2003				
HIV-Positive	84 (56.0%)	47 (31.3%)	12 (8.0%)	7 (4.7%)
HIV-Negative	704 (57.9%)	365 (30.0%)	92 (7.6%)	54 (4.4%)
Unknown	110 (51.2%)	64 (29.8%)	28 (13.0%)	13 (6.0%)

POST-EXPOSURE PROPHYLAXIS (PEP)

Three questions about post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP) were added to the survey in 2001. These questions were aimed at assessing knowledge, use of and 'proximity to' PEP.

About half of all respondents had never heard of PEP, which is significantly less than in 2002 ($p < .001$) (see Table 34). Recognition of the availability of PEP has increased over time from about 20% in 2001 to about 45% in 2003 (Mantel-Haenszel, $p < .001$). Five percent of respondents did not know of the current availability of PEP but believed it would be available in the future.

Table 34 : Levels of knowledge about post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP)

	2001	2002	2003
It's readily available now	317 (19.2%)	473 (26.8%)	859 (44.8%)
It will be available in the future	177 (10.7%)	112 (6.3%)	95 (5.0%)
I've never heard about it	1157 (70.1%)	1182 (66.9%)	962 (50.2%)
Total	1651 (100.0%)¹	1767 (100%)²	1916 (100%)³

¹ Missing data (n=179), ² Missing data (n=110), ³ Missing data (n=148)

Few men in the sample had ever received PEP and the proportion has not changed significantly since the question was first asked in 2001 (see Table 35).

Table 35 : Ever received post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP)

	2001	2002	2003
No	1649 (98.0%)	1690 (97.9%)	1881 (97.3%)
Yes	34 (2.0%)	37 (2.1%)	53 (2.7%)
Total	1683 (100.0%)¹	1727 (100%)²	1934 (100%)³

¹ Missing data (n = 147), ² Missing data (n = 150), ³ Missing data (n = 130),

Although there was a relatively small proportion of men who knew someone else who had taken PEP, the proportion is larger than for those who had ever taken PEP and has increased significantly since 2001 (Mantel-Haenszel, $p < .001$) (see Table 36).

Table 36 : Knew of anyone who had received post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP)

	2001	2002	2003
No	1542 (93.3%)	1597 (93.1%)	1697 (89.0%)
Yes	110 (6.7%)	119 (6.9%)	209 (11.0%)
Total	1652 (100.0%)¹	1716 (100%)²	1906 (100%)³

¹ Missing data (n = 178), ² Missing data (n = 161), ³ Missing data (n = 158),

Since 2001, among men who engaged in UAI-C, there has been a significant increase in the proportion who knew about PEP (Mantel-Haenszel, $p < .001$) (see Table 37). In 2003, about half of the men who engaged in UAI-C in the previous six months knew that PEP was available. Separate analyses indicated that there were 194 men who completed the survey in 2003 and engaged in UAI-C without knowledge that PEP was available.

Similarly, among men who had engaged in UAI-R in the previous six months there was a significant increase in the proportion who knew about PEP ($p < .001$). Separate analyses showed that in the 2003 sample there were 337 men who engaged in UAI-R in the preceding six months, some of whom were in sero-nonconcordant relationships, and who were unaware of the availability of PEP. It is, of course, possible that the men who engaged in UAI became aware of PEP as a consequence of discussing these issues with others subsequent to the incidents when UAI had occurred.

Table 37 : Knowledge of post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP) and unprotected anal intercourse

	Casual		Regular	
	Some UAI-C	No UAI-C	Some UAI-R	No UAI-R
2001				
It's readily available now	61 (21.9%)	256 (18.6%)	124 (19.9%)	193 (18.8%)
It will be available in the future	35 (12.6%)	142 (10.3%)	59 (9.5%)	118 (11.5%)
I've never heard of it	182 (65.5%)	975 (71.0%)	441 (70.7%)	716 (69.7%)
Total	278 (100%)	1373 (100%)	624 (100%)	(100%)
2002				
It's readily available now	111 (32.5%)	362 (25.4%)	169 (27.3%)	304 (26.5%)
It will be available in the future	22 (6.4%)	90 (6.3%)	46 (7.4%)	66 (5.7%)
I've never heard of it	209 (61.1%)	973 (68.3%)	404 (65.3%)	778 (67.8%)
Total	342 (100%)	1425 (100%)	619 (100%)	1148 (100%)
2003				
It's readily available now	193 (49.9%)	666 (43.6%)	300 (47.1%)	559 (43.7%)
It will be available in the future	15 (3.9%)	80 (5.2%)	31 (4.9%)	64 (5.0%)
I've never heard of it	179 (46.3%)	783 (51.2%)	306 (48.0%)	656 (51.3%)
Total	387 (100%)	1529 (100%)	637 (100%)	1279 (100%)

Health & Sexual Health

As expected there were fewer HIV-positive men reporting that their health is 'excellent' or 'very good' and more reporting 'fair' or 'poor' than non HIV-positive men. In 2003, approximately 67% of HIV-positive men reported their health to be either 'excellent' or 'good' compared with about 80% of non-HIV positive men (see Table 38). Conversely, very few non-HIV-positive men report their health to be either 'fair' or 'poor' compared with about 7% for HIV-positive men.

Table 38 : Self-rated health by HIV status

	2002 ¹	2003 ²
HIV-positive men		
Excellent	59 (38.3%)	52 (29.1%)
Very good	55 (35.7%)	67 (37.4%)
Good	31 (20.1%)	47 (26.3%)
Fair	7 (4.5%)	12 (6.7%)
Poor	2 (1.3%)	1 (0.6%)
Non HIV-positive men		
Excellent	729 (43.6%)	743 (40.2%)
Very good	638 (38.2%)	738 (40.0%)
Good	259 (15.5%)	322 (17.4%)
Fair	43 (2.6%)	37 (2.0%)
Poor	2 (0.1%)	7 (0.4%)

¹ Missing data (n = 25), ² Missing data (n = 35)

A question asking men which sexual health tests they had in the previous 12 months was added to the 2003 survey. Over half of the non HIV-positive respondents had blood tests for HIV and over half of all respondents had other blood tests (see Table 39). Approximately one-quarter had anal, throat and penile swabs while about one-third had a urine sample test in the previous 12 months.

Table 39 : Sexual health tests in last 12 months

	All sites	Sexual health centres
Anal swab ¹	486 (24.2%)	44 (54.3%)
Throat swab ²	574 (28.6%)	40 (50.0%)
Penile swab ³	475 (23.7%)	21 (26.6%)
Urine sample ⁴	726 (36.3%)	45 (55.6%)
Blood test for HIV* ⁵	1027 (56%)	37 (67.3%)
Other blood test ⁶	1055 (53.0%)	48 (60.0%)

¹ Missing data (n = 57), ² Missing data (n = 58), ³ Missing data (n = 63), ⁴ Missing data (n = 63), ⁵ Missing data (n = 52),

⁶ Missing data (n = 73)

* Includes non HIV-positive men only.

A question asking men where they go for sexual health check-ups was also added in the 2003 survey. Just over half of the men in the sample visited a GP / Doctor for a sexual health check-up in the previous 12 months (see Table 40). About 20% used a sexual health clinic and about 10% used the Centre clinic. Approximately one-quarter of respondents did not have a sexual health check-up in the previous 12 months.

Table 40 : Place of sexual health check-ups in last 12 months

	All sites	Sexual health centres
GP / Doctor ¹	1018 (54.1%)	34 (42.0%)
Sexual health clinic ²	366 (19.5%)	10 (12.3%)
Centre clinic ³	204 (10.9%)	44 (54.3%)
Other place ⁴	77 (4.1%)	2 (2.5%)
No check-up in last year	508 (24.6%)	10 (12.2%)

¹ Missing data (n = 184), ² Missing data (n = 189), ³ Missing data (n = 191), ⁴ Missing data (n = 193)

In 2003, respondents were asked about their understanding of infections that can be present without obvious symptoms. Approximately 55% of the men surveyed believe that gonorrhoea or syphilis cannot be present without symptoms while around one-half of respondents believe that Chlamydia and hepatitis A, B and C cannot be present without symptoms (see Table 41). There was a high proportion of missing data for this item which may indicate a lack of knowledge about these infections. It is possible that a large proportion who did not answer the question are not aware that these infections can be present without symptoms. If this is the case then the proportion who answered 'yes' would be considerably smaller.

Table 41 : Understanding of infections that can be present without symptoms

Can have without symptoms	Yes	No
Gonorrhoea ¹	759 (45.5%)	908 (54.5%)
Syphilis ²	725 (43.8%)	932 (56.2%)
Chlamydia ³	786 (48.1%)	848 (51.9%)
Hepatitis A ⁴	832 (50.5%)	816 (49.5%)
Hepatitis B ⁵	841 (51.2%)	802 (48.8%)
Hepatitis C ⁶	849 (51.5%)	798 (48.5%)

¹ Missing data (n = 397), ² Missing data (n = 407), ³ Missing data (n = 430), ⁴ Missing data (n = 416), ⁵ Missing data (n = 421), ⁶ Missing data (n = 417)

In 2003, men were asked to respond to the statement 'Men who always use condoms for anal intercourse don't need to have regular sexual health check-ups'. Most of the men surveyed appeared to be aware that condoms do not provide 100% protection against all sexually transmitted infections and either strongly disagreed or disagreed to the statement (see Table 42).

Table 42 : Responses to the statement that 'Men who always use condoms for anal intercourse don't need to have regular sexual health check-ups'

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
All sites	904 (44.8%)	912 (45.2%)	153 (7.6%)	48 (2.4%)
Sexual health centres	35 (42.7%)	39 (47.6%)	7 (8.5%)	1 (1.2%)

Missing data (n = 47)

Drug Use

In 2003, as in the previous four surveys, the most commonly used drugs were marijuana, amyl, ecstasy and speed (see Table 43). The proportions, using each particular drug, have been relatively steady since 2000. However, the use of crystal meth ($p < .001$) and Viagra (Mantel-Haenszel, $p < .001$) have increased significantly. Few respondents reported having used other drugs.

Table 43 : Drug use in previous six months

	2000	2001	2002	2003
Marijuana	606 (38.4%)	744 (40.7%)	715 (38.1%)	830 (40.2%)
Amyl/Poppers	633 (40.1%)	684 (37.4%)	677 (36.1%)	802 (38.9%)
Ecstasy	488 (30.9%)	593 (32.4%)	593 (31.6%)	745 (36.1%)
Speed	365 (23.1%)	423 (23.1%)	415 (22.1%)	526 (25.5%)
Crystal Meth	100 (6.3%)	-	-	264 (12.8%)
Cocaine	178 (11.3%)	201 (11.0%)	242 (12.9%)	246 (11.9%)
Viagra	-	116 (6.3%)	149 (7.9%)	263 (12.7%)
LSD/ trips	172 (12.1%)	-	-	151 (7.6%)
Steroids	23 (1.5%)	31 (1.7%)	35 (1.9%)	41 (2.0%)
Heroin	27 (1.7%)	25 (1.4%)	25 (1.3%)	25 (1.2%)
Any other drug	97 (6.1%)	192 (10.5%)	186 (9.9%)	229 (11.1%)

Note : Categories are not mutually exclusive.

A small number of men indicated that they had injected drugs/steroids 'in the past six months' (see Table 44). The most commonly injected drug in 2003 was speed, followed by crystal meth, of which injecting use has doubled in since 2000. There was a slight although significant decrease in the proportion of men who injected cocaine ($p < .01$) and steroids ($p < .05$) in the 2003 survey. Fifty men (2.3%) indicated that they had injected more than one drug 'in the past six months'. A total of 96 men (4.7%) had injected any drug/steroid in this period. (Questions about injecting drug use were not asked in the 1998 survey)

Table 44 : Injecting drug use in previous six months

	2000	2001	2002	2003
Speed	58 (3.7%)	50 (2.7%)	59 (3.1%)	65 (3.2%)
Ecstasy	12 (0.8%)	21 (1.1%)	22 (1.2%)	19 (0.9%)
Crystal meth	17 (1.1%)	-	-	45 (2.2%)
Cocaine	17 (1.1%)	10 (0.5%)	23 (1.2%)	13 (0.6%)
Steroids	10 (0.6%)	15 (0.8%)	19 (1.0%)	13 (0.6%)
Heroin	10 (0.6%)	16 (0.9%)	12 (0.6%)	7 (0.3%)
LSD / trips	2 (0.1%)	-	-	4 (0.2%)
Any other drug	9 (0.6%)	16 (0.9%)	21 (1.1%)	16 (0.8%)

Note : Categories are not mutually exclusive.

Discussion

The findings from the fifth Melbourne Gay Community Periodic Survey conducted during February 2003 provide an important update on the social and sexual lives of gay men in Melbourne. In the main, the findings are quite similar to (and thereby corroborate) the evidence from the four preceding surveys in 1998 (Van de Ven et al., 1998), 2000 (Aspin et al., 2000), 2001 (Rawstorne et al., 2001) and 2002 (Hull et al., 2002). Likewise, many of the results parallel findings from Gay Community Periodic Surveys in other Australian cities, for example Sydney (Prestage et al., 1996; Van de Ven et al., 1997; Hull et al., 2003), reinforcing the notion that in some respects the gay cultures of the capital cities in Australia are akin.

The 2064 participants were recruited at four gay venues, two sexual health centres and at the Midsumma Carnival. Most of the men lived in the Melbourne Metropolitan area. They were predominantly of 'Anglo-Australian' background and worked in professional/managerial or white-collar occupations.

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.

Similar to previous data, approximately 15% of the men had not been tested for HIV. The majority of those who had been tested for HIV had done so in the preceding 12 months. Overall, 9% of the men were HIV-positive; a percentage consistent with previous years.

Among the HIV-positive participants, use of combination antiretroviral therapies decreased significantly in 2003 after a slight increase in 2002. Over the five surveys, there has been a significant decline with about 56% of the HIV-positive men taking combination therapy at the time of the 2003 survey, compared with almost 83% in 1998.

Most men reported 'current' sexual contact with at least one other man: just over one-quarter of the men had a regular partner only; about one-third had a regular partner

with either or both partners also having casual partners; and approximately one-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 slightly higher proportion had sex with casual partners.

The 2003 survey confirms a continuing upward trend in UAI-C. Of the total 2003 sample and 'in the previous six months', 424 men (20.5%) had any unprotected anal intercourse with a casual partner. The rate of UAI-R was unchanged in 2003. Of the total sample, 690 men (33.4%) had any unprotected anal intercourse with a regular partner. Some of these men (213 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. Similarly, unprotected anal intercourse that involved ejaculation inside was much more likely to occur between regular than between casual partners.

The proportion of men who had an agreement with their partner about sex within the relationship had decreased over time from 1998 to 2002 but in the latest survey has risen to a level similar to 1998. The type of agreements that partners are reaching has changed slightly since 1998. Within relationships, in the last two surveys there has been an increase in the proportion of men who agreed to have anal intercourse only with a condom. The proportion who agreed to have unprotected anal intercourse within the relationship has changed little since 2000 as has the proportion who agreed to have no anal intercourse.

The proportion of men who had agreements about sex outside the relationship has remained quite steady since 1998 and there have been slight changes only in the types of agreements that partners have reached. The proportion who allows protected anal intercourse only with casual partners has increased since 1998 while there has been a corresponding decrease in the proportion who does not allow anal intercourse with casual partners.

The majority of the men surveyed did not routinely disclose their serostatus to casual partners. However, while this proportion had been quite steady from 1998 to 2002, in the latest survey the proportion who never disclosed their HIV status has fallen significantly. Just over half of the men never disclosed their serostatus to casual partners, and a similar proportion was never disclosed to by casual partners. There has been an increase over the five survey periods in the proportion who tell all casual partners their serostatus and a similar although smaller increase in the proportion of casual partners who always informed respondents of their HIV status.

Detailed analyses of risk reduction strategies such as positive-positive sex (Prestage et al, 1995) and strategic positioning (Van de Ven et al., 2002) have not been reported

here. However, interpretations of the findings in this report should bear in mind that some gay men's sex practices involve such risk reduction strategies.

Questions about PEP indicated that knowledge has increased significantly. Half of the men surveyed had heard of PEP (compared with 30% in 2001) yet 10% of these men were not aware it was available now. There were 194 men who had engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners in the preceding six months and who had never heard about PEP or who understood that PEP would only be available in the future.

Most of the men had not injected any recreational drugs/steroids 'in the past six months', while a total of 96 men (4.7%) indicated that they had injected at least one drug/steroid. About 40% of all respondents had used amyl nitrate and a similar proportion had used marijuana in the preceding six months. Less than one-third indicated that they had used ecstasy and just under a quarter indicated that they had used speed. The use of other drugs was uncommon.

In conclusion, the 2003 Melbourne Gay Community Periodic Survey was conducted very successfully and has provided evidence that can be used by community members, educators, policy makers and others in developing programs aimed at sustaining and improving gay men's sexual and social health. Recruitment at the Midsumma Carnival and the six diverse sites attracted a large sample of gay men from the Melbourne metropolitan area. Except where indicated, the resulting data are robust and comparisons with the data from the previous four surveys and other studies are suggestive of sound reliability.

References

- Aspin, C., Van de Ven, P., Prestage, G., Kippax, S., Knox, S., Horn, G. & Maddeddu, D. (2000). *Melbourne Gay Community Periodic Survey: February 2000*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research.
- 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.
- Grierson, J., Misson, S., McDonald, K., Pitts, M. & O'Brien, M. (2002). *HIV Futures 3: Positive Australians on Services, Health and Well-being*. Monograph Series No. 37. Melbourne: Australian Research Centre in Sex, Health and Society, La Trobe University.
- Hood, D., Prestage, G., Crawford, J., Sorrell, T. & O'Reilly, C. (1994). *Bisexual activity and non gay-attachment. A report on the BANGAR project*. Western Sydney Area Health Service.
- Hull, P., Van de Ven, P., Prestage, G., Rawstorne, P., Kippax, S., Horn, G., Kennedy, M., Hussey, G. & Batrouney, C. (2002). *Gay Community Periodic Survey: Melbourne 2002*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research.
- Hull, P., Van de Ven, P., Prestage, G., Rawstorne, P., Grulich, A., Crawford, J., Kippax, S., Maddeddu, D., McGuigan, D. & Nicholas A. (2003). *Gay Community Periodic Survey: Sydney 1996-2002*. 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.
- Prestage, G., Kippax, S., Van de Ven, P., French, J., Richters, J., Campbell, D., Crawford, J., Grulich, A., Kinder, P. & Kaldor, J. (1996). *Sydney Gay Community Periodic Survey: February 1996*. Sydney: HIV AIDS & Society Publications.

- Rawstorne, P., Van de Ven, P., Prestage, G., Kippax, S., Horn, G., Kennedy, M. & Voon, D. (2001). *Melbourne Gay Community Periodic Survey: February 2001*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research.
- Van de Ven, P., Crawford, J., Kippax, S., Knox, S., & Prestage, G. (2000). A scale of optimism-scepticism in the context of HIV treatments. *AIDS Care*, 12, 171-176.
- Van de Ven, P., Kippax, S., Crawford, J., French, J., Prestage, G., Grulich, A., Kaldor, J. & 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., Kippax, S., Crawford, J., Rawstorne, P., Prestage, G., Grulich, A., & Murphy, D. (2002). In a minority of gay men, sexual risk practice indicates strategic positioning for perceived risk reduction rather than unbridled sex. *AIDS Care*, 14, 471-480.
- Van de Ven, P., Prestage, G., Kippax, S., French, J., Horn, G. & Brotherton, A. (1998). *Melbourne Gay Community Periodic Survey: February 1998*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research.

Questionnaire

See next page.

Melbourne 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. 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.

4. Do you currently have sex with **casual** male partners?
No ☐ Yes ☐
5. Do you currently have sex with a **regular** male partner?
No ☐ Yes ☐
6. 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 ☐
7. If you are in a **regular** relationship with a man, for how long has
it been? Less than 6 months ☐
6–11 months ☐
1–2 years ☐
More than 2 years ☐
Not in a regular relationship with a man ☐

LAST SIX MONTHS

8. How many different **men** have you had sex with in the past
six months? None ☐ One ☐
2–5 men ☐ 6–10 men ☐
11–50 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 34.

↓
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 ☐

LAST SIX MONTHS

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 ☐

34. Where do you look for male sex partners?

- | | | | |
|-------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Internet | Never <input type="checkbox"/> | Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/> | Often <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Gay bar | Never <input type="checkbox"/> | Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/> | Often <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Dance party | Never <input type="checkbox"/> | Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/> | Often <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Beat | Never <input type="checkbox"/> | Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/> | Often <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Sex venue | Never <input type="checkbox"/> | Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/> | Often <input type="checkbox"/> |

Continues on other side

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

36. 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 ☐

37. Based on the results of your HIV antibody tests, what is your HIV status?
No test/Don't know ☐
Negative ☐
Positive ☐



If you are **HIV positive**, please complete the next two questions.

38. Are you on combination antiretroviral therapy?
No ☐ Yes ☐

39. Is your viral load?
Undetectable ☐
Detectable ☐
Don't know / unsure ☐

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

40. 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 ☐

41. 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 ☐

42. 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 ☐

43. How old are you? _____ years

44. What country were you born in? Australia ☐

Other (please specify) _____

45. Are you of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander origin?
No ☐ Yes ☐

46. What is your ethnic background? (e.g. Australian Aboriginal, Dutch, Greek, Vietnamese, Lebanese, Chinese)
Anglo-Australian only ☐ Other: _____

47. Are you: (tick one only)
Employed full-time ☐
Employed part-time ☐
Unemployed ☐
A student ☐
A pensioner or on social security benefits ☐
Other ☐

48. What is your occupation? _____

49. What is the highest level of education you have had?
Less than or up to 3 years of high school / Year 10 ☐
Year 12 / VCE / HSC ☐
Tertiary diploma or trade certificate / TAFE ☐
University or CAE ☐

50. Where do you live? Postcode

OR Suburb/Town: _____

51. In general, would you say your health is?
Excellent ☐ Very good ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor ☐

52. Which of these sexual health tests have you had *in the last 12 months*?

Anal swab No ☐ Yes ☐
Throat swab No ☐ Yes ☐
Penile swab No ☐ Yes ☐
Urine sample No ☐ Yes ☐
Blood test for HIV No ☐ Yes ☐
Other blood test No ☐ Yes ☐

53. Where did you have a **sexual health check-up** *in the last 12 months*?

GP/doctor No ☐ Yes ☐
Sexual health clinic No ☐ Yes ☐
HIM study No ☐ Yes ☐
Other place No ☐ Yes ☐

No sexual health check-up in the last 12 months ☐

54. Which of the following can you have **without any symptoms**?

Gonorrhoea No ☐ Yes ☐
Syphilis No ☐ Yes ☐
Chlamydia No ☐ Yes ☐
Hepatitis A No ☐ Yes ☐
Hepatitis B No ☐ Yes ☐
Hepatitis C No ☐ Yes ☐

55. Men who **always** use condoms for anal intercourse **don't** need to have regular sexual health check-ups.

strongly disagree ☐ disagree ☐ agree ☐ strongly agree ☐

56. 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 ☐

57. Have you received PEP *in the last 6 months*?
No ☐ Yes ☐

58. Do you know anyone who has received PEP?
No ☐ Yes ☐

59. The availability of treatment (PEP) immediately after unsafe sex makes safe sex less important.
strongly disagree ☐ disagree ☐ agree ☐ strongly agree ☐

60. Please look at the resource materials on the reverse side of the Information Sheet. Which ones have you **seen** before?

A: No ☐ Yes ☐ B: No ☐ Yes ☐
C: No ☐ Yes ☐ D: No ☐ Yes ☐

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

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