

Queensland Gay Community Periodic Survey: June 2000

Author:

Aspin, Clive; Van de Ven, Paul; Prestage, Garrett; Kippax, Susan; Mason, Drew; Lewis, Craig; Gallagher, Stephen

Publication details:

Report No. NCHSR Monograph 6/2000
1875978372 (ISBN)

Publication Date:

2000

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.4225/53/5750D8C715566>

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/1959.4/50913> in <https://unsworks.unsw.edu.au> on 2024-04-18

Queensland Gay Community Periodic Survey

June 2000

Clive Aspin

Paul Van de Ven

Garrett Prestage

Susan Kippax

Drew Mason

Craig Lewis

Stephen Gallagher

National Centre in **HIV** Social Research

National Centre in **HIV** Epidemiology and Clinical Research

Queensland AIDS Council

Queensland Positive People

Principal Investigators

Paul Van de Ven
Garrett Prestage

Other Investigators

Susan Kippax
June Crawford
Andrew Grulich
John Kaldor

Coordinators

Drew Mason
Craig Lewis

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 6676
Fax: (61 2) 9385 6455
nchsr@unsw.edu.au
www.arts.unsw.edu.au/nchsr/

ISBN 1-875978-37-2

© National Centre in HIV Social Research 2000

Suggested citation:

Aspin, C., Van de Ven, P., Prestage, G., Kippax, S., Mason, D., Lewis, C., & Gallagher, S. (2000). *Queensland Gay Community Periodic Survey: June 2000*. (Monograph 6/2000). Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research, The University of New South Wales. <http://doi.org/10.4225/53/5750D8C715566>

Queensland Gay Community Periodic Survey

June 2000

Clive Aspin

National Centre in HIV Social Research, The University of New South Wales

Paul Van de Ven

National Centre in HIV Social Research, The University of New South Wales

Garrett Prestage

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

Susan Kippax

National Centre in HIV Social Research, The University of New South Wales

Drew Mason

National Centre in HIV Social Research, The University of New South Wales

Craig Lewis

National Centre in HIV Social Research, The University of New South Wales

Stephen Gallagher

Queensland AIDS Council

Monograph 6/2000



National Centre in HIV Social Research

The National Centre in HIV Social Research is funded by the Commonwealth Department of Health and Aged Care through the Australian National Council on AIDS, Hepatitis C and Related Diseases (ANCAHRD) and is affiliated with the Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences at The University of New South Wales.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

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

Funding

Queensland Health

Steering Committee

Stephen Gallagher, Christopher Macaulay, Malcolm McCamish

Recruitment

Craig Benfield, Ruth Bridgstock, Michelle Dick, Darren Gill, Deirdre Gillen, Siobhan Gillen, Kim Greathead, Keryn Henry, Greg Hinwood, Grant Kennett, Malcolm Knight, Drew Mason, Tanya Mayfield, Peter Mitchell, Patrick O'Duffy, Shannon Tsiantopoulos, Jodie Walton, Paul Walton

Queensland AIDS Council

Chris Clementson, Stephen Gallagher, Alan Hough, Malcolm McCamish

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 1285 men who donated their time to ensure that the study was fully inclusive of their particular circumstances.

Venues

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

CONTENTS

Description of the study	5
Sample and recruitment	6
Demographic profile	7
Association with gay community and the HIV epidemic	12
HIV testing	14
Sexual practice and 'safe sex'	17
Information about HIV therapies	31
Drug use	33
Discussion	35
References	37
Questionnaire	38

DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY

The Queensland Gay Community Periodic Survey is a cross-sectional survey of gay men recruited through a range of gay community sites in Queensland. The project was funded by Queensland Health. The Periodic Survey provides a snapshot of sexual and HIV-related practices among gay men. This is the third survey to be conducted in Queensland. Data from this survey can be used to make comparisons with the two previous surveys which were conducted in 1998 and 1999 (Van de Ven *et al*, 1998; Van de Ven *et al*, 1999).

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

This study was conducted in June, 2000. 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. As such, this makes it possible to examine changes and practices over time.

In 2000, thirteen sites were used for recruitment: the Pride Fair Day, ten gay community venues (seven social venues and three sex-on-premises venues) and two sexual health clinics. Recruitment in all of these venues was conducted by trained recruiters over a one-week period.

The questionnaire (appended to this report) is a short, self-administered instrument that typically takes five to 10 minutes to complete. Questions focus on anal intercourse and oral sex, the use of condoms, the nature of sexual relationships, HIV testing practice and serostatus, aspects of social attachment to gay community, recreational drug use, and a range of demographic items including sexual identity, age, education, occupation and ethnicity. In the main, the questions employed in 2000 were the same as those from 1998 and 1999 in order to facilitate as direct a comparison as possible.

This report describes the data from the third Queensland Gay Community Periodic Survey and compares them with the previous data sets. More detailed analysis of the data will continue and will be disseminated as it is completed. As with any data analysis, further examination may necessitate minor reinterpretation of the findings.

SAMPLE AND RECRUITMENT

Respondents were recruited through twelve sites in Queensland as well as at a large public gay community event, Pride Fair Day. Similar to 1999, approximately a quarter of the men were recruited at the Pride Fair Day (but less than 1998 when Fair Day recruitment preceded recruitment at other sites rather than vice versa). Also, a smaller proportion of men were recruited at sexual health clinics this year than in previous years, largely due to less recruiting time spent at the clinics. Nearly three quarters of all respondents were recruited at gay venues.

Table 1 Source of recruitment

	1998	1999	2000
Sexual health centres	116 (8.7%)	109 (8.9%)	43 (3.3%)
Gay venues	712 (53.1%)	808 (66.0%)	942 (73.0%)
Pride Fair Day	513 (38.3%)	308 (25.1%)	300 (23.3%)
Total	1341 (100%)	1225 (100%)	1285 (100%)

In all, 1498 men were asked to complete a questionnaire and 1285 did so. This represents a sound response rate of 85.8 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 behaviour. For this reason, some of the data on sexual practices have been reported separately for men who are HIV positive, those who are HIV negative, and those who have not been tested or do not know their serostatus.

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

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

In terms of demographic variables, the participants in the 1998, 1999 and 2000 surveys were quite similar.

Geographic distribution

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

Table 2 Residential location

	1998	1999	2000
Brisbane Metropolitan Area	957 (71.3%)	850 (69.4%)	885 (68.9%)
Gold Coast	114 (8.5%)	102 (8.3%)	96 (7.5%)
Sunshine Coast	108 (8.1%)	74 (6.1%)	39 (3.0%)
Cairns/Townsville	—	37 (3.0%)	74 (5.8%)
Other Queensland	56 (4.2%)	72 (5.9%)	43 (3.3%)
Elsewhere	106 (7.9%)	90 (7.3%)	148 (11.5%)
Total	1341 (100%)	1225 (100%)	1285 (100%)

Age

Respondents ranged between 16 and 80 years of age, with a median of 33. Age range and distribution were quite similar to those observed in previous surveys.

Table 3 Age

	1998	1999	2000 ¹
Under 25	224 (17.2%)	212 (19.0%)	291(23.6%)
25–29	252 (19.3%)	189 (16.9%)	238 (19.3%)
30–39	477 (36.5%)	429 (38.5%)	403 (32.6%)
40–49	226 (17.3%)	175 (15.7%)	200 (16.2%)
50 and over	127 (9.7%)	110 (9.9%)	103 (8.3%)
Total	1306 (100%)	1115 (100%)	1235 (100%)

¹ Data were missing on this item for 50 men.

Ethnicity

As in the previous two surveys, this was predominantly an ‘Anglo-Australian’ sample (based on responses to Question 44). In response to Question 43, 117 men (9.1%) indicated they were of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander origin.

Table 4 Ethnicity

	1998	1999	2000
Anglo-Australian	973 (84.1%)	945 (84.1%)	1077 (83.8%)
European	87 (7.5%)	103 (9.2%)	162 (12.6%)
Aboriginal/Torres Strait Islander	20 (1.7%)	21 (1.8%)	5 (0.4%)
Other	77 (6.7%)	54 (4.9%)	41 (3.2%)
Total	1157 (100%)	1123 (100%)	1285 (100%)

Employment and occupation

As in previous years, the proportion of men who were not in the work force was fairly high compared with the general population. This was particularly true of HIV positive men, probably due to the relatively high percentage who were in receipt of some form of social security payment. The proportion of men in full-time employment was higher in 2000 than in previous years (partly attributable to fewer HIV positive men in the sample).

Table 5 Employment status

	1998	1999	2000 ¹
Full-time	798 (61.9%)	728 (61.0%)	801 (65.0%)
Part-time	192 (14.9%)	170 (14.3%)	175 (14.2%)
Unemployed/Other	300 (23.3%)	295 (24.7%)	256 (20.8%)
Total	1290 (100%)	1193 (100%)	1232 (100%)

¹ Data were missing on this item for 53 men.

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 (Connell et al, 1991; Hood et al, 1994). There were some differences in occupation between the Queensland samples, notably fewer tradesmen, and more professionals and clerks/salesmen, in the follow-up survey.

Table 6 Occupation

	1998	1999	2000 ¹
Professional/Managerial	357 (33.6%)	253 (26.6%)	351 (35.3%)
Paraprofessional	153 (14.4%)	203 (21.3%)	141 (14.2%)
Clerical/Sales	347 (32.6%)	346 (36.3%)	411 (41.3%)
Trades	133 (12.5%)	70 (7.3%)	24 (2.4%)
Plant operation/Labouring	72 (6.7%)	81 (8.5%)	67 (6.7%)
Total	1062 (100%)	953 (100%)	994 (100%)

¹ Data were missing on this item for 291 men.

Education

As in other gay-community-based studies, this sample was relatively well educated. Over half of the men had received some post-secondary education, including one-third who had attended university.

Table 7 Education

	1998	1999	2000 ¹
Up to 3 years of high school	232 (17.9%)	198 (16.6%)	185 (15.3%)
Up to Year 12/Senior Certificate	299 (23.1%)	269 (22.6%)	288 (23.9%)
Trade certificate or diploma	267 (20.6%)	245 (20.6%)	286 (23.7%)
University	498 (38.4%)	478 (40.2%)	447 (37.1%)
Total	1296 (100%)	1190 (100%)	1206 (100%)

¹ Data were missing on this item for 79 men.

Sexual relationships with women

As in 1998 and 1999, few men had had sex with a woman in the previous six months.

Table 8 Sex with women in previous six months

	1998	1999	2000 ¹
No female partner	1128 (87.9%)	1064 (89.7%)	1080 (88.3%)
One female partner	90 (7.0%)	71 (6.0%)	80 (6.5%)
More than one female partner	66 (5.1%)	51 (4.3%)	63 (5.2%)
Total	1062 (100%)	953 (100%)	1223 (100%)

¹ Data were missing on this item for 62 men.

Sexual relationships with men

As in previous years, almost two-thirds of the men in the sample were currently in a regular sexual relationship with a man. Approximately one-third of the study participants were monogamous (i.e. had sex only with a regular partner). Just over half the men had sex with casual partners and just under one-fifth of the men were ‘currently’ not having sex with men at all. The data for the three surveys were fairly consistent.

Table 9 Relationships with men

	1998	1999	2000 ¹
None	215 (16.4%)	218 (18.1%)	223 (17.8%)
Casual only	278 (21.2%)	289 (24.1%)	265 (21.2%)
Regular plus casual	454 (34.7%)	404 (33.6%)	397 (31.7%)
Regular only (monogamous)	363 (27.7%)	291 (24.2%)	366 (29.3%)
Total	1310 (100%)	1202 (100%)	1251 (100%)

¹ Data were missing on this item for 34 men.

As in 1998 and 1999, among those men who were in a regular relationship, just under two-thirds of the relationships had lasted for more than a year.

Table 10 Length of relationships with men

	1998	1999	2000
Less than one year	283 (40.1%)	230 (37.5%)	258 (40.2%)
At least one year	422 (59.9%)	384 (62.5%)	384 (59.8%)
Total	705 (100%)	614 (100%)	642 (100%)

Note: Includes only those men who 'currently' had a regular partner and answered Question 8.

ASSOCIATION WITH GAY COMMUNITY

AND THE HIV EPIDEMIC

In several respects, and not surprisingly given the recruitment strategies, this was a highly gay-identified and gay-community-attached sample.

Sexual identity

As in the previous surveys, the men in the 2000 survey were mostly homosexually identified. Homosexual identification included ‘gay/homosexual’ as well as a small number of men who thought of themselves as ‘queer’. Non-homosexual identification included ‘bisexual’ and ‘heterosexual’.

Table 11 Sexual identity

	1998	1999	2000 ¹
Homosexually identified	1115 (84.3%)	1050 (86.4%)	1093 (86.3%)
Not homosexually identified	207 (15.7%)	165 (13.6%)	174 (13.7%)
Total	1322 (100%)	1215 (100%)	1267 (100%)

¹ Data were missing on this item for 18 men.

As in past years, few men said that they enjoyed having sex mostly with women or with men and women equally. Consistent with preferences indicated in 1998 and 1999, respondents enjoyed having sex with men only or mostly men.

Table 12 Sexual preference

	1998	1999	2000 ¹
Men only	1006 (75.5%)	936 (76.8%)	997 (78.0%)
Mostly men	219 (16.4%)	200 (16.4%)	226 (17.7%)
Other	107 (8.1%)	83 (6.8%)	55 (4.3%)
Total	1332 (100%)	1219 (100%)	1278 (100%)

¹ Data were missing on this item for 7 men.

Gay community involvement

The men in this 2000 sample were quite socially involved with gay men, as were their 1998 and 1999 counterparts. Almost half of the men in the sample said most or all of their friends were gay men.

Table 13 Gay friends

	1998	1999	2000 ¹
None	24 (1.8%)	16 (1.3%)	23 (1.8%)
Some or a few	619 (46.3%)	590 (48.3%)	644 (50.3%)
Most or all	698 (51.9%)	617 (50.4%)	613 (47.9%)
Total	1337 (100%)	1223 (100%)	1280 (100%)

¹ Data were missing on this item for 5 men.

Correspondingly, over three-quarters of the men said they spent some or a lot of their free time with gay men.

Table 14 Proportion of free time spent with gay men

	1998	1999	2000 ¹
None	16 (1.2%)	8 (0.7%)	11 (0.9%)
A little	211 (15.8%)	207 (16.9%)	223 (17.4%)
Some	506 (37.9%)	475 (38.8%)	503 (39.3%)
A lot	603 (45.1%)	533 (43.6%)	543 (42.4%)
Total	1336 (100%)	1223 (100%)	1280 (100%)

¹ Data were missing on this item for 5 men.

HIV TESTING

Most of the men had already been tested for antibodies to HIV, and mostly with an HIV negative result. One man in seven had not been tested or had failed to obtain the test results, and a further forty-six men did not respond to this question. Just under seven per cent of the men were HIV positive, slightly fewer than in 1998 and 1999 (mainly due to fewer men having been recruited at the sexual health centres).

Table 15 HIV test results

	1998	1999	2000 ¹
Not tested/No results	177 (13.5%)	168 (13.9%)	173 (13.9%)
HIV negative	1021 (77.9%)	942 (77.8%)	981 (79.2%)
HIV positive	113 (8.6%)	101 (8.3%)	85 (6.9%)
Total	1311 (100%)	1211 (100%)	1239 (100%)

¹ Data were missing on this item for 46 men.

Time since most recent HIV-antibody test

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

Table 16 Time since most recent HIV test

	1998	1999	2000
Less than 6 months ago	599 (53.1%)	553 (52.7%)	578 (52.0%)
7-12 months ago	177 (15.7%)	169 (16.1%)	189 (17.0%)
1-2 years ago	175 (15.5%)	170 (16.2%)	163 (14.7%)
Over 2 years ago	178 (15.8%)	158 (15.0%)	181 (16.3%)
Total	1129 (100%)	1050 (100%)	1111 (100%)

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

Combination therapies

Of the men who indicated that they were HIV positive, two-thirds were taking combination therapy, a similar proportion to those of previous surveys. (Note: This finding is based on small numbers.)

Table 17 Use of combination antiretroviral therapies

	1998	1999	2000
Yes	77 (68.8%)	67 (67.0%)	51 (66.2%)
No	35 (31.3%)	33 (33.0%)	26 (33.8%)
Total	112 (100%)	100 (100%)	77 (100%)

Regular partner's HIV-status

Participants were asked about the serostatus of their current regular partners. 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. Just under two-thirds of the men had an HIV negative regular partner, while less than 10 per cent had an HIV positive regular partner. Consistent with the 1998 and 1999 data, slightly over a quarter of the men had a regular partner whose serostatus they did not know.

Table 18 HIV status of regular partner

	1998	1999	2000
HIV positive	61 (8.3%)	63 (9.1%)	63 (8.5%)
HIV negative	486 (66.3%)	442 (64.2%)	462 (62.6%)
HIV status unknown	186 (25.4%)	184 (26.7%)	213 (28.9%)
Total	733 (100%)	689 (100%)	738 (100%)

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

In 2000, one third of the HIV positive men had a seroconcordant regular partner and approximately one-third had an HIV negative regular partner. (These proportions differ somewhat from 1998 and 1999 but the numbers are small.) HIV negative men tended to have

HIV negative regular partners. Men who did not know their own serostatus tended not to know the serostatus of their regular partners, or they had HIV negative regular partners.

Table 19 Match of HIV status in regular relationships

Serostatus of Regular Partner	Participant's Serostatus		
	HIV positive	HIV negative	Unknown
1998			
HIV positive	20 (30.8%)	34 (5.9%)	5 (6.0%)
HIV negative	33 (50.8%)	426 (74.1%)	22 (26.2%)
HIV status unknown	12 (18.5%)	190 (20.0%)	57 (67.9%)
Total (N = 724)	65 (100%)	575 (100%)	84 (100%)
1999			
HIV positive	25 (38.5%)	34 (6.3%)	4 (5.1%)
HIV negative	32 (49.2%)	386 (71.3%)	20 (25.7%)
HIV status unknown	8 (12.3%)	121 (22.4%)	54 (69.2%)
Total (N = 684)	65 (100%)	541 (100%)	78 (100%)
2000			
HIV positive	18 (33.3%)	40 (6.9%)	2 (2.4%)
HIV negative	20 (37.0%)	404 (69.3%)	23 (28.0%)
HIV status unknown	16 (29.6%)	139 (23.8%)	57 (69.5%)
Total (N = 719)	54 (100%)	583 (100%)	82 (100%)

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

SEXUAL PRACTICE AND ‘SAFE SEX’

Sexual behaviour between men

Participants were only asked to report on a limited range of sexual practices (separately for regular and casual partners): anal intercourse with and without ejaculation, and oral intercourse with and without ejaculation.

Based on the responses to the sexual behaviour items and the sort of sexual relationships with men indicated by the participants, just under two-thirds of the men were classified as having had sex with a regular male partner and just over two-thirds of the men were classified as having had sex with a casual male partner ‘in the previous six months’. The data from the three surveys were fairly similar.

Table 20 Reported sex with male partners in previous six months

	1998	1999	2000
Any sexual contact with <i>regular</i> partners	826 (61.6%)	762 (62.2%)	803 (62.5%)
Any sexual contact with <i>casual</i> partners	962 (71.7%)	901 (73.6%)	908 (70.7%)
Total	1341 (100%)	1225 (100%)	1285 (100%)

Note: These categories are not mutually exclusive.

As in 1998 and 1999, men recruited at the Pride Fair Day were more likely to have had regular partners, and less likely to have had casual partners, than their counterparts recruited at the gay venues, although this difference was less marked than in previous years. This is not surprising as men attending some of the gay venues, particularly the sex-on-premises venues, do so to find casual partners.

**Table 21 Reported sex with male partners in previous six months
by recruitment site**

	Pride Fair Day	Venues
1998		
Any sexual contact with <i>regular</i> partners	360 (70.2%)	466 (56.3%)
Any sexual contact with <i>casual</i> partners	338 (65.9%)	624 (75.4%)
Total	513	828
1999		
Any sexual contact with <i>regular</i> partners	202 (65.6%)	560 (61.1%)
Any sexual contact with <i>casual</i> partners	196 (63.6%)	705 (76.9%)
Total	308	917
2000		
Any sexual contact with <i>regular</i> partners	193 (64.3%)	610 (62.0%)
Any sexual contact with <i>casual</i> partners	189 (63.0%)	719 (73.0%)
Total	300	985

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', although just over one-fifth of the men had more than 10 partners.

Table 22 Number of male partners in previous six months

	1998	1999	2000 ¹
None	97 (7.3%)	67 (5.5%)	74 (5.8%)
One	282 (21.2%)	250 (20.5%)	282 (22.2%)
2 – 10	610 (45.9%)	574 (47.1%)	636 (50.0%)
11 – 50	268 (20.1%)	266 (21.9%)	227 (17.9%)
More than 50	74 (5.6%)	61 (5.0%)	52 (4.1%)
Total	1331 (100%)	1218 (100%)	1271 (100%)

¹ Data were missing on this item for 14 men.

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. Over half of those with regular male partners engaged in oral intercourse with ejaculation with their partners.

Most participants engaged in anal intercourse with their regular male partners. Just over three-quarters of those with regular partners engaged in insertive anal intercourse and slightly more than two-thirds in receptive anal intercourse.

Table 23 Sexual behaviour with regular male partners

	Total Sample	Those with Regular Partners
1998	N = 1341	n = 826
Any oral intercourse with ejaculation	523 (39.0%)	523 (63.3%)
Insertive fellatio with ejaculation	417 (31.1%)	417 (51.9%)
Receptive fellatio with ejaculation	427 (31.8%)	427 (53.5%)
Any anal intercourse	725 (54.1%)	725 (87.8%)
Insertive anal intercourse	628 (46.8%)	628 (76.0%)
Receptive anal intercourse	592 (44.1%)	592 (71.7%)
1999	N = 1225	n = 762
Any oral intercourse with ejaculation	497 (40.6%)	497 (65.2%)
Insertive fellatio with ejaculation	403 (32.9%)	403 (52.9%)
Receptive fellatio with ejaculation	409 (33.4%)	409 (53.7%)
Any anal intercourse	674 (55.0%)	674 (88.5%)
Insertive anal intercourse	592 (48.3%)	592 (77.7%)
Receptive anal intercourse	533 (43.5%)	533 (69.9%)
2000	N = 1285	n = 803
Any oral intercourse with ejaculation	566 (44.0%)	566 (70.1%)
Insertive fellatio with ejaculation	466 (36.3%)	466 (58.0%)
Receptive fellatio with ejaculation	466 (36.3%)	466 (58.0%)
Any anal intercourse	708 (55.1%)	708 (88.2%)
Insertive anal intercourse	633 (49.3%)	633 (78.8%)
Receptive anal intercourse	573 (44.6%)	573 (71.3%)

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.

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

Table 24 Sexual behaviour with casual male partners

	Total Sample	Those with Casual Partners
1998	N = 1341	n = 962
Any oral intercourse with ejaculation	424 (31.6%)	424 (44.1%)
Insertive fellatio with ejaculation	351 (26.2%)	351 (40.0%)
Receptive fellatio with ejaculation	274 (20.4%)	274 (31.0%)
Any anal intercourse	673 (50.2%)	673 (70.0%)
Insertive anal intercourse	597 (44.5%)	597 (62.1%)
Receptive anal intercourse	486 (36.2%)	486 (50.5%)
1999	N = 1225	n = 901
Any oral intercourse with ejaculation	391 (31.9%)	391 (43.4%)
Insertive fellatio with ejaculation	332 (27.1%)	332 (36.8%)
Receptive fellatio with ejaculation	260 (21.2%)	260 (28.9%)
Any anal intercourse	660 (53.9%)	660 (73.3%)
Insertive anal intercourse	585 (47.8%)	585 (64.9%)
Receptive anal intercourse	483 (39.4%)	483 (53.6%)
2000	N = 1285	n = 908
Any oral intercourse with ejaculation	449 (34.9%)	449 (49.4%)
Insertive fellatio with ejaculation	385 (30.0%)	385 (42.4%)
Receptive fellatio with ejaculation	294 (22.9%)	294 (32.4%)
Any anal intercourse	672 (52.3%)	672 (74.0%)
Insertive anal intercourse	605 (47.1%)	605 (66.6%)
Receptive anal intercourse	521 (40.5%)	521 (57.4%)

Note: These items are not mutually exclusive.

Sex with regular male partners

Condom Use

Based on the entire sample, one-third of the men who participated in the survey engaged in any unprotected anal intercourse with regular male partners ‘in the previous six months’. The 1998 and 1999 data were remarkably consistent.

Table 25 Condom use with regular partners

	Total Sample	Those with Regular Partners
1998		
No regular partner	515 (38.4%)	—
No anal intercourse	101 (7.5%)	101 (12.2%)
Always uses condom	314 (23.4%)	314 (38.0%)
Sometimes does not use condom	411 (30.6%)	411 (49.8%)
Base	1341 (100%)	826 (100%)
1999		
No regular partner	463 (37.8%)	—
No anal intercourse	88 (7.2%)	88 (11.6%)
Always uses condom	308 (25.1%)	308 (40.4%)
Sometimes does not use condom	366 (29.9%)	366 (48.0%)
Base	1341 (100%)	762 (100%)
2000		
No regular partner	482 (37.5%)	—
No anal intercourse	88 (6.8%)	95 (11.8%)
Always uses condom	268 (20.8%)	268 (33.4%)
Sometimes does not use condom ¹	440 (34.2%)	440 (54.8%)
Base	1285 (100%)	803 (100%)

¹ Of the 440 men who engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with regular partners ‘in the previous six months’, 102 practised only withdrawal prior to ejaculation, 105 practised only ejaculation inside, and 208 engaged in both withdrawal and ejaculation inside. (Missing data for 25 men.)

In 2000, as in 1998, there were significant differences between HIV positive, HIV negative and status unknown men in their sexual practices with regular partners. The differences were

largely attributable to status unknown men, who were much more likely *not* to engages in anal intercourse than were either HIV positive or HIV negative men.

Table 26 Serostatus and condom use among regular partners

	HIV positive	HIV negative	Unknown Serostatus
1998 (<i>p</i> < .001)			
No Anal	6 (9.1%)	68 (10.6%)	25 (25.5%)
Always uses condom	33 (50.0%)	249 (38.7%)	26 (26.5%)
Sometimes does not use condom	27 (40.9%)	321 (50.8%)	47 (48.0%)
Total	66 (100%)	644 (100%)	98 (100%)
1999 (<i>ns</i>)			
No Anal	3 (4.6%)	70 (11.7%)	14 (15.7%)
Always uses condom	34 (52.3%)	231 (38.6%)	39 (43.8%)
Sometimes does not use condom	28 (43.1%)	297 (49.7%)	36 (40.5%)
Total	65 (100%)	598 (100%)	89 (100%)
2000 (<i>p</i> < .005)			
No Anal	4 (6.9%)	71 (11.4%)	17 (18.9%)
Always uses condom	21 (36.2%)	214 (34.2%)	21 (23.3%)
Sometimes does not use condom	33 (56.9%)	340 (54.4%)	52 (57.8%)
Total	58 (100%)	625 (100%)	90 (100%)

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 *less* likely to have unprotected anal intercourse with negative partners than with positive or status unknown partners. HIV negative men were *more* likely to have unprotected anal intercourse with negative partners than with positive or status unknown partners. Those who did not know their status were likely to have unprotected anal intercourse with their regular partners of either negative or unknown serostatus.

Table 27 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	6 (42.9%)	10 (38.5%)	1 (50.0%)
	Some UAI	8 (57.1%)	16 (61.5%)	1 (50.0%)
HIV negative	No UAI	18 (69.2%)	117 (34.6%)	3 (18.7%)
	Some UAI	8 (30.8%)	221 (65.4%)	13 (81.3%)
Unknown	No UAI	4 (50.0%)	35 (44.3%)	14 (41.2%)
	Some UAI	4 (50.0%)	44 (55.7%)	20 (58.8%)
Total		48	443	52
1999				
HIV positive	No UAI	6 (26.1%)	21 (72.4%)	1 (33.3%)
	Some UAI	17 (73.9%)	8 (27.6%)	2 (66.7%)
HIV negative	No UAI	17 (70.8%)	103 (33.6%)	7 (43.7%)
	Some UAI	7 (29.2%)	204 (66.4%)	9 (56.3%)
Unknown	No UAI	4 (80.0%)	42 (60.0%)	19 (52.8%)
	Some UAI	1 (20.0%)	28 (40.0%)	17 (47.2%)
Total		52	406	55
2000				
HIV positive	No UAI	6 (37.5%)	19 (54.3%)	—
	Some UAI	10 (62.5%)	16 (45.7%)	1 (100%)
HIV negative	No UAI	10 (52.6%)	136 (39.0%)	6 (19.4%)
	Some UAI	9 (47.4%)	213 (61.0%)	25 (80.6%)
Unknown	No UAI	4 (36.4%)	53 (51.5%)	9 (20.5%)
	Some UAI	7 (63.6%)	50 (48.5%)	35 (79.5%)
Total		46	487	76

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

Whereas much of the unprotected anal intercourse in 2000 was between seroconcordant (positive-positive or negative-negative) couples, 143 of the 609 men in the above table had unprotected anal intercourse in a relationship where seroconcordance was absent or in doubt.

Agreements

Most participants with regular male partners had agreements with their partners about sex *within* the relationship. As in previous years, about a third of the men in relationships agreed to anal intercourse without a condom.

Table 28 Agreements with regular male partners about sex *within* relationship

	1998	1999	2000
No spoken agreement about anal intercourse	178 (24.9%)	155 (22.9%)	189 (26.0%)
No anal intercourse between regular partners is permitted	46 (6.4%)	61 (9.0%)	61 (8.4%)
Anal intercourse permitted only with condom	243 (34.0%)	253 (37.3%)	231 (31.8%)
Anal intercourse without condom is permitted	247 (34.6%)	209 (30.8%)	246 (33.8%)
Total	714 (100%)	678 (100%)	727 (100%)

Note: Based on the responses of men who ‘currently’ had a regular partner.

In 2000, slightly fewer men in relationships had an agreement with their regular partner about sex outside the relationship. Where couples did have an agreement, very few permitted unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners.

Table 29 Agreements with regular male partners about sex *outside* relationship

	1998	1999	2000
No spoken agreement about anal intercourse	214 (29.9%)	195 (29.1%)	248 (34.4%)
No sexual contact with casual partners is permitted	213 (29.8%)	199 (29.6%)	216 (30.0%)
No anal intercourse between regular partners is permitted	56 (7.8%)	50 (7.5%)	42 (5.8%)
Anal intercourse permitted only with condom	217 (30.3%)	215 (32.0%)	199 (27.6%)
Anal intercourse without condom is permitted	15 (2.1%)	12 (1.8%)	16 (2.2%)
Total	715 (100%)	671 (100%)	721 (100%)

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

Sex with casual male partners

Condom use

Based on the entire sample, 236 (18.4%) of the men who participated in the 2000 survey engaged in any unprotected anal intercourse with their casual male partners ‘in the previous six months’. A separate analysis revealed that of these 236 men, 111 also had unprotected anal intercourse with regular partners. Over the period 1998 to 2000, there was a significant upward trend in rates of unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners (p < .01).

Table 30 Condom use with casual partners

	Total Sample	Those with Casual Partners
1998		
No casual partner	379 (28.3%)	—
No anal intercourse	289 (21.6%)	289 (30.0%)
Always uses condom	485 (36.2%)	485 (50.4%)
Sometimes does not use condom	188 (14.0%)	188 (19.5%)
Base	1341 (100%)	962 (100%)
1999		
No casual partner	324 (26.4%)	—
No anal intercourse	241 (19.7%)	241 (26.7%)
Always uses condom	480 (39.2%)	480 (53.3%)
Sometimes does not use condom	180 (14.7%)	180 (20.0%)
Base	1225 (100%)	901 (100%)
2000		
No casual partner	377 (29.3%)	—
No anal intercourse	236 (18.4%)	236 (26.0%)
Always uses condom	436 (33.9%)	436 (48.0%)
Sometimes does not use condom ¹	236 (18.4%)	236 (26.0%)
Base	1285 (100%)	908 (100%)

¹ Of the 236 men who engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners ‘in the previous six months’, 92 practised only withdrawal prior to ejaculation, 38 practised only ejaculation inside, and 102 engaged in both withdrawal and ejaculation inside. (Missing data for 4 men.)

A comparison of the data in Tables 25 and 30 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.

In 2000, as in 1998 (but unlike 1999), there were significant differences between HIV positive, HIV negative and 'untested' men in their condom use with casual partners. Serostatus unknown men were *more* likely not to engage in anal intercourse with casual partners. HIV negative and status unknown men were *less* likely to have unprotected anal intercourse than their HIV positive counterparts. 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 31 Serostatus and condom use with casual partners

	HIV positive	HIV negative	Unknown Serostatus
1998 ($p < .005$)			
No Anal	18 (20.9%)	219 (29.8%)	47 (37.9%)
Always uses condom	42 (48.8%)	387 (52.7%)	50 (40.3%)
Sometimes does not use condom	26 (30.2%)	129 (17.6%)	27 (21.8%)
Total	86 (100%)	1019 (100%)	186 (100%)
1999 (ns)			
No Anal	12 (16.2%)	187 (26.9%)	37 (30.1%)
Always uses condom	42 (56.8%)	373 (53.6%)	62 (50.4%)
Sometimes does not use condom	20 (27.0%)	136 (19.5%)	24 (19.5%)
Total	74 (100%)	696 (100%)	123 (100%)
2000 ($p = .01$)			
No Anal	12 (17.6%)	177 (25.4%)	41 (32.5%)
Always uses condom	27 (39.7%)	346 (49.7%)	56 (44.4%)
Sometimes does not use condom	29 (42.6%)	173 (24.9%)	29 (23.1%)
Total	68 (100%)	696 (100%)	126 (100%)

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

In the 2000 survey participants were asked to indicate the sites at which they had had any unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners (see Question 29). This question was not asked in previous surveys. The sites at which this was most likely to occur were the respondent's home and his casual partner's home followed by sex venues/saunas and beats.

Table 32 Sites of unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners

	2000
Respondent's home	183 (14.2%)
Casual partner's home	143 (11.1%)
Sex venue/sauna	129 (10.0%)
Beat	61 (4.7%)
Elsewhere	82 (6.4%)

Note: These categories are not mutually exclusive.

Serostatus

Two questions (ie 27 and 28) addressed disclosure of serostatus among casual partners. These questions were included in the questionnaire to obtain a sense of disclosure and sex between casual partners. Many more questions—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 were very similar to those in the previous two surveys. Almost two-thirds of participants with casual partners did not disclose their serostatus to any of their casual partners. A small proportion of men disclosed to all of their casual partners.

Table 33 Participants' disclosure of serostatus to casual partners

	1998	1999	2000
Told none	568 (60.5%)	517 (61.6%)	540 (63.3%)
Told some	198 (21.1%)	171 (20.4%)	182 (21.3%)
Told all	173 (18.4%)	149 (17.8%)	131 (15.4%)
Total	939 (100%)	837 (100%)	853 (100%)

Similarly, almost two-thirds of participants were not told the serostatus of their casual partners. Less than one in ten respondents were disclosed to by their casual partners. Again, the data for 2000 were very similar to those of previous years.

Table 34 Casual partners’ disclosure of serostatus to participants

	1998	1999	2000
Told by none	586 (62.1%)	534 (63.4%)	543 (63.4%)
Told by some	255 (27.1%)	217 (25.8%)	242 (28.2%)
Told by all	102 (10.8%)	91 (10.8%)	72 (8.4%)
Total	943 (100%)	842 (100%)	857 (100%)

INFORMATION ABOUT HIV THERAPIES

Several studies have demonstrated that men in the gay community are on the whole well informed about HIV/AIDS (e.g., Crawford et al, 1998). Less well understood are beliefs in the context of recent advances in viral load testing and combination antiretroviral therapies. In 2000, six questions addressed this issue (Questions 36 to 41). As with the data from previous surveys, responses tended to be toward the sceptical end of the scale. That is, most men were not overly optimistic about HIV therapies 'reducing infectivity'.

Table 35 Responses to questions about viral load testing and combination therapy

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
New HIV treatments will take the worry out of sex	502 (43.1%)	497 (42.6%)	122 (10.5%)	45 (3.9%)
If every HIV positive person took the new treatments, the AIDS epidemic would be over	579 (50.0%)	504 (43.6%)	55 (4.8%)	19 (1.6%)
People with undetectable viral load do not need to worry so much about infecting others with HIV	678 (58.9%)	420 (36.5%)	45 (3.9%)	9 (0.8%)
The availability of treatment (PEP) immediately after unsafe sex makes safe sex less important	655 (57.3%)	436 (33.9%)	41 (3.6%)	12 (1.0%)
HIV is less of a threat because the epidemic is on the decline	686 (59.7%)	413 (35.9%)	40 (3.5%)	10 (0.9%)
HIV/AIDS is a less serious threat than it used to be because of new treatments	629 (48.9%)	399 (31.1%)	105 (9.2%)	14 (1.2%)

The relationship between the items about viral load testing/combination therapies and the participant's serostatus was fairly consistent across serostatus categories. That is, HIV positive, HIV negative and status unknown men all tended toward the sceptical end of the scale.

Table 36 Responses to questions about viral load testing and combination therapy by serostatus

Serostatus	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
• New HIV treatments will take the worry out of sex				
HIV positive	35 (44.3%)	36 (45.6%)	6 (7.6%)	2 (2.5%)
HIV negative	412 (45.6%)	376 (41.6%)	85 (9.4%)	30 (3.3%)
Unknown	47 (29.2%)	76 (47.2%)	27 (16.8%)	11 (6.8%)
• If every HIV positive person took the new treatments, the AIDS epidemic would be over				
HIV positive	45 (57.0%)	32 (40.5%)	1 (1.3%)	1 (1.3%)
HIV negative	465 (51.9%)	386 (43.1%)	32 (3.6%)	13 (1.5%)
Unknown	59 (37.1%)	78 (49.1%)	19 (11.9%)	3 (1.9%)
• People with undetectable viral load do not need to worry so much about infecting others with HIV				
HIV positive	44 (55.7%)	31 (39.2%)	3 (3.8%)	1 (1.3%)
HIV negative	542 (60.8%)	317 (35.5%)	28 (3.1%)	5 (0.6%)
Unknown	81 (51.3%)	64 (40.5%)	12 (7.6%)	1 (0.6%)
• The availability of treatment (PEP) immediately after unsafe sex makes safe sex less important				
HIV positive	37 (48.1%)	39 (50.96%)	—	1 (1.3%)
HIV negative	532 (59.9%)	319 (35.9%)	30 (3.4%)	7 (0.8%)
Unknown	74 (47.4%)	71 (45.5%)	9 (5.8%)	2 (1.3%)
• HIV is less of a threat because the epidemic is on the decline				
HIV positive	41 (52.6%)	33 (42.3%)	4 (5.1%)	—
HIV negative	557 (62.5%)	304 (34.1%)	24 (2.7%)	6 (0.7%)
Unknown	75 (47.8%)	71 (45.2%)	10 (6.4%)	1 (0.6%)
• HIV/AIDS is a less serious threat than it used to be because of new treatments				
HIV positive	30 (38.5%)	30 (38.5%)	16 (20.5%)	2 (2.6%)
HIV negative	512 (57.6%)	299 (33.6%)	71 (8.0%)	7 (0.8%)
Unknown	75 (47.8%)	63 (40.1%)	16 (10.2%)	3 (1.9%)

DRUG USE

Based on responses to Question 49, most of the men had not used recreational drugs/steroids 'in the past six months'. Among those who had, the most commonly used drug was speed, with just over a quarter of respondents saying that they had used this drug at least once in the past six months.

Table 37 Drug use in the previous six months

	1998	1999	2000
Speed	325 (24.2%)	323 (26.4%)	345 (26.8%)
Cocaine	81 (6.0%)	87 (7.1%)	81 (6.3%)
Heroin	42 (3.1%)	33 (2.7%)	30 (2.3%)
Steroids	—	30 (2.4%)	23 (1.8%)
Any other drug	—	443 (36.2%)	403 (31.4%)

Note: Percentages are based on the total samples (1341, 1225 and 1285 in 1998, 1999 and 2000 respectively), although not all men responded to these items. Items are not mutually exclusive.

As in the previous surveys, very small numbers of men indicated that they had injected drugs/steroids 'in the past six months'. The most commonly injected drug was speed (7%) with very small numbers indicating that they injected heroin, cocaine or any other drug (1.9%, 0.8% and 1.3% respectively). Only 14 respondents (1.1%) indicated that they had injected steroids. Of the 110 respondents who indicated that they had injected drugs, only 10 had ever shared a needle or syringe in the last six months.

Table 38 Injecting drug use in the previous six months

	1998	1999	2000
Speed	88 (6.6%)	90 (7.3%)	90 (7.0%)
Cocaine	16 (1.2%)	17 (1.4%)	11 (0.8%)
Heroin	39 (2.9%)	27 (2.2%)	24 (1.9%)
Steroids	10 (0.7%)	12 (1.0%)	14 (1.1%)
Any other drug	28 (2.1%)	35 (2.9%)	17 (1.3%)
Any of the above	116 (8.7%)	111 (9.1%)	110 (8.6%)

Most men who used/injected drugs ‘within the previous six months’ did so infrequently, ie, 1-5 times only. Men who used/injected heroin and steroids tended to do so on a more frequent basis.

Table 39 Frequency of drug use and injection in the previous six months

	n ¹	1-5 times	6-10 times	> 10 times
Drug use				
Ecstasy	336	263	27	46
Speed	345	238	35	72
Cocaine	81	59	9	13
Heroin	30	16	2	12
Steroids	23	15	3	5
Any other drug	403	163	51	189
Drug injection				
Ecstasy	21	13	2	6
Speed	90	52	12	26
Cocaine	11	8	1	2
Heroin	24	11	—	13
Steroids	14	6	4	4
Any other drug	17	6	1	10

¹ n = number of participants who used/injected drugs.

DISCUSSION

The findings from the third Queensland Gay Community Periodic Survey provide an important snapshot of the social and sexual lives of gay men in Queensland. In the main, the findings are quite similar to (and thereby corroborate) the evidence from the first two 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) and Melbourne (Aspin et al, 2000), reinforcing the notion that in some respects the gay cultures of the capital cities in Australia are similar.

The 1285 participants were recruited at twelve gay community venues throughout Queensland and at the Pride Fair Day. Most of these men lived in the Brisbane 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. Also, most preferred to have sex with men only, reflected in the finding that 88% had not had sex with any women 'in the previous six months'. As a whole, the sample was quite involved socially in gay community with high levels of gay friendships and with much free time spent with gay men.

As in the data from the previous surveys, approximately 14% 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, 6.9% of the men were HIV positive—a percentage slightly lower than that recorded in the previous two surveys.

Among the HIV positive participants, two thirds (66.2%) were using combination antiretroviral therapies—similar to 1998 and 1999 findings.

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

Of the total sample and 'in the previous six months', 440 men (34.2%) had any unprotected anal intercourse with a regular partner and 236 men (18.4%) had any unprotected anal intercourse with a casual partner. Some of these men (111 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. Although there was a small and statistically significant increase in

unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners, the data provide evidence of a sustaining safe sex culture among gay men in Queensland.

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. Whereas one-third of these agreements permitted unprotected anal intercourse within the relationship, unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners was almost never allowed.

The numbers overall were small (and the figures must be treated cautiously), but 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 or status unknown partners. Those who did not know their status were likely to have unprotected anal intercourse with their regular partners of both negative and unknown serostatus. Of those who had any anal intercourse with their 'current' regular partner, only 143 men had unprotected anal intercourse in a relationship that was not understood to be seroconcordant.

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

As previously, most of the men (91%) had not injected any recreational drugs/steroids 'in the past six months'. Of those who had, frequent injecting drug use was quite rare.

In conclusion, the 2000 Queensland Gay Community Periodic Survey was conducted very successfully. Recruitment at the thirteen diverse sites attracted a large sample of gay men from Brisbane, Gold and Sunshine Coasts, and Cairns. 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., Knox, S., Horn, G. and Madeddu, 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.
- 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.
- Prestage, G., Van de Ven, P., Knox, S., Grulich, A., Kippax, S. and 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.
- Van de Ven, P., Prestage, G., Kippax, S., French, J., Benzie, T. and Clementson, C. (1998). *South East Queensland Gay Community Periodic Survey: November 1998*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research, Macquarie University.
- Van de Ven, P., Prestage, G., Kippax, S., Knox, S., Benzie, T., Sorrentino, J. and Gallagher, S. (1999). *Queensland Gay Community Periodic Survey: June 1999*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research, The University of New South Wales.

Qld Gay Community Periodic Survey

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

Your responses are very important to us.

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) _____
4. Do you enjoy having sex with men, women or both?
Men and women equally ☐
Mostly men ☐
Men only ☐
Mostly women ☐
Women only ☐
No one ☐
5. 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 ☐
6. How many different women have you had sex with in the past six months? None ☐
One ☐ 2-5 women ☐
6-10 women ☐ More than 10 women ☐

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

7. How would you describe your sexual relationships with men at present?
No sex with men at present ☐
Monogamous relationship (one man only) ☐
Regular relationship plus . . .
both my partner and I have casual sex with other men ☐
I have casual sex with other men ☐
my partner has casual sex with other men ☐
Regular relationships with several men ☐
All my sex with men is casual only ☐
Other (please specify) _____
8. 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 ☐

Regular male partners—last 6 months

9. Have you had sex with regular male partner/s in the last six months? Yes ☐ No ☐ Go directly to Q. 18

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

10. **Oral sex:** I sucked his cock and he came in my mouth
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
11. **Oral sex:** He sucked my cock and I came in his mouth
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐

Anal sex

12. I fucked him **with a condom**
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
13. He fucked me **with a condom**
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
14. I fucked him **without a condom** but pulled out before I came
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
15. He fucked me **without a condom** but pulled out before he came
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐

16. I fucked him **without a condom** and came inside
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
17. He fucked me **without a condom** and came inside
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐

➔ **Casual male partners—last 6 months**

18. Have you had any sex with any casual male partner/s in the last six months? Yes ☐ No ☐ Go directly to Q. 30 ➔

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

19. **Oral sex:** I sucked his cock and he came in my mouth
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
20. **Oral sex:** He sucked my cock and I came in his mouth
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐

Anal sex

21. I fucked him **with a condom**
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
22. He fucked me **with a condom**
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
23. I fucked him **without a condom** but pulled out before I came
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
24. He fucked me **without a condom** but pulled out before he came
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
25. I fucked him **without a condom** and came inside
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
26. He fucked me **without a condom** and came inside
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐

Whatever your HIV status . . .

27. How many of your *casual* partners in the last 6 months did you tell your HIV status? None ☐ Some ☐ All ☐
28. How many of your *casual* partners in the last 6 months told you their HIV status? None ☐ Some ☐ All ☐

Continues on other side

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

<i>your place</i>	Never <input type="checkbox"/>	Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/>	Often <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>his place</i>	Never <input type="checkbox"/>	Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/>	Often <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>sex venue/sauna</i>	Never <input type="checkbox"/>	Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/>	Often <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>beat</i>	Never <input type="checkbox"/>	Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/>	Often <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>anywhere else</i>	Never <input type="checkbox"/>	Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/>	Often <input type="checkbox"/>

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

31. When were you last tested for HIV antibodies?
Less than a week ago ☐
1-4 weeks ago ☐
1-6 months ago ☐
7-12 months ago ☐
1-2 years ago ☐
2-4 years ago ☐
More than 4 years ago ☐

32. 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.

33. 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 ☐

34. 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 ☐

35. 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 ☐

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.

36. New HIV treatments will take the worry out of sex.
strongly disagree ☐ *disagree* ☐ *agree* ☐ *strongly agree* ☐

37. If every HIV-positive person took the new treatments, the AIDS
epidemic would be over.
strongly disagree ☐ *disagree* ☐ *agree* ☐ *strongly agree* ☐

38. People with undetectable viral load do not need to worry so
much about infecting others with HIV.
strongly disagree ☐ *disagree* ☐ *agree* ☐ *strongly agree* ☐

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

40. HIV is less of a threat because the epidemic is on the decline.
strongly disagree ☐ *disagree* ☐ *agree* ☐ *strongly agree* ☐

41. HIV/AIDS is a less serious threat than it used to be because of
new treatments.
strongly disagree ☐ *disagree* ☐ *agree* ☐ *strongly agree* ☐

42. How old are you? years

43. Are you an Australian Aborigine or Torres Strait
Islander? No ☐ Yes ☐

44. What is your ethnic background? (eg *Australian Aboriginal*,
Torres Strait Islander, *Dutch*, *Greek*, *Vietnamese*, *Lebanese*)
Anglo-Australian only ☐

Other (please specify) _____

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

46. What is your occupation? (eg *Lawyer*, *Teacher*, *Writer*,
(please specify) _____

47. Where do you live? Postcode
OR Suburb/Town: _____

48. What is the highest level of education you have had?
Primary school only ☐
Up to 3 years of high school/Year 10 ☐
Up to Year 12/Senior Certificate ☐
Tertiary diploma or trade certificate ☐
University or CAE ☐

49. How often have you **used** these drugs in the past **6 months**?

	Never	1-5 times	6-10 times	More than 10 times
<i>Ecstasy</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Speed</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Cocaine</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Heroin</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Steroids</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Any other drug</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

50. How often have you **injected** these drugs in the past **6 mths**?

	Never	1-5 times	6-10 times	More than 10 times
<i>Ecstasy</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Speed</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Cocaine</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Heroin</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Steroids</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Any other drug</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

51. In the past six months, did you ever share a needle/syringe
with someone else? No ☐ Yes ☐

52. Please look at the campaign 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 ☐

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME