

Gay Community Periodic Survey: Melbourne 2002

Author:

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

Publication details:

Report No. NCHSR Monograph 5/2002
1875978569 (ISBN)

Publication Date:

2002

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.4225/53/5750DAB22754A>

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/1959.4/50920> in <https://unsworks.unsw.edu.au> on 2024-04-24

gay community periodic survey

MELBOURNE 2002

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
2002

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 5/2002

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



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

National Centre in HIV Social Research

Level 2, Webster Building
The University of New South Wales
Sydney NSW 2052 AUSTRALIA
Telephone (61 2) 9385 6776
Fax (61 2) 9385 6455
Email: nchsr@unsw.edu.au
Website: nchsr.arts.unsw.edu.au

© National Centre in HIV Social Research 2002
ISBN 1-875978-56-9

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

Suggested citation:

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*. (Monograph 5/2002). Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research, The University of New South Wales.
<http://doi.org/10.4225/53/5750DAB22754A>

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	ii
List of Tables	iii
DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY	1
SAMPLE AND RECRUITMENT	3
DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE	5
Geographic distribution	5
Age	6
Ethnicity	6
Occupation	6
Sexual relationships with women	7
Sexual relationships with men	8
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	22
Sex with casual male partners	23
Condom use	23
Serostatus	25
INFORMATION ABOUT HIV THERAPIES AND PEP	27
Post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP)	29
DRUG USE	32
DISCUSSION	34
REFERENCES	37
QUESTIONNAIRE	39

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

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

FUNDING

Department of Human Services, Victoria

VICTORIAN AIDS COUNCIL/GAY MEN'S HEALTH CENTRE

Colin Batrouney, Chris Clementson, Guy Hussey, Mike Kennedy, D P Tex McKenzie, Kenton Miller, Vic Perri, Asvin Phorugngam, Stephen Scott

RECRUITMENT

Greg Adkins, John Baird, Jarrod Benson, Amanda Bivolcheff, Lou Di Giandomenico, James Fitzgerald, Stephen Ford, Gregory Horn, Robert Jackett, Seng Lim, Suzy Malhotra, Karalyn McDonald, Kieran McGregor, Robert McMillan, Max Niggel, Kirk Peterson, Damian Quittner, Matt Rice, Mark Saunders, Paul Schembri, Stephen Scott, Art Shotimaneerattanasiri, Ashleigh Taylor, Nicola Thompson, David Votsis, Russell Walsh, Malcolm Warner, Nathan Warner, Gary Warren, Luke Williams

NATIONAL CENTRE IN HIV SOCIAL RESEARCH

Sahar Behman, June Crawford, Joseph Lopes, Limin Mao, Dean Murphy, Judi Rainbow

NATIONAL CENTRE IN HIV EPIDEMIOLOGY AND CLINICAL RESEARCH

Andrew Grulich, John Kaldor

SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

The 1877 men who gave their time to ensure that the study was fully inclusive of their particular circumstances.

VENUES

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

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 :	Source of recruitment	3
Table 2 :	Residential location	5
Table 3 :	Age	6
Table 4 :	Ethnicity	6
Table 5 :	Employment status	7
Table 6 :	Occupation	7
Table 7 :	Sex with women in the previous six months.....	7
Table 8 :	Current relationships with men	8
Table 9 :	Length of relationships with men	8
Table 10 :	Sexual identity	9
Table 11 :	Gay friends	10
Table 12 :	Proportion of free time spent with gay men	10
Table 13 :	HIV test results	11
Table 14 :	Time since most recent HIV test.....	12
Table 15 :	Use of combination antiretroviral therapies	12
Table 16 :	HIV status of regular partners.....	13
Table 17 :	Match of HIV status in regular relationships	13
Table 18 :	Reported sex with male partners in previous six months	14
Table 19 :	Reported sex with male partners in previous six months by recruitment site.....	15
Table 20 :	Number of male sex partners in previous six months.....	15
Table 21 :	Sexual behaviour with regular male partners	17
Table 22 :	Sexual behaviour with casual male partners	18
Table 23 :	Condom use with regular partners	19
Table 24 :	Serostatus and condom use among regular partners	20
Table 25 :	Condom use and match of HIV serostatus in regular relationships	21
Table 26 :	Agreements with regular male partners about sex <i>within</i> the relationship	22
Table 27 :	Agreements with regular male partners about sex <i>outside</i> the relationship	23
Table 28 :	Condom use with casual partners	24
Table 29 :	Serostatus and condom use with casual partners.....	25
Table 30 :	Participants' disclosure of serostatus to casual partners.....	26
Table 31 :	Casual partners' disclosure of serostatus to participants	26
Table 32 :	Where men look for sex partners	26
Table 33 :	Responses to questions about combination therapy.....	27
Table 34 :	Responses to questions about combination therapy by serostatus	28
Table 35 :	Sexual practice, HIV serostatus and mean optimism scale scores.....	29
Table 36 :	Levels of knowledge about post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP)	30
Table 37 :	Ever received post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP)	30
Table 38 :	Knowledge of anyone who had received post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP)	30
Table 39 :	Knowledge of post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP) and unprotected anal intercourse	31
Table 40 :	Drug use in previous six months	32
Table 41 :	Injecting drug use in previous six months.....	33

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 fourth in Melbourne, was administered in February 2002. 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) and February 2001 (Rawstone et al., 2001).

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 2002 seven sites were used for recruitment: the Midsumma Carnival and six gay community venues (one social venue, 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 2002 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 fourth Melbourne Gay Community Periodic Survey in comparison with data from the three 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 five sites in the Melbourne metropolitan area and at a large public gay community event (Midsumma Carnival). In comparison with the previous survey, in 2002 there was a slight decrease in the proportion of men recruited at the Midsumma Carnival and a corresponding increase in the recruitments from other venues (see Table 1). As in the three 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
Sexual health centres	49 (2.6%)	60 (3.8%)	68 (3.7%)	82 (4.4%)
Gay venues	657 (34.7%)	520 (33.0%)	481 (26.3%)	545 (29.0%)
Midsumma Carnival	1185 (62.7%)	998 (63.2%)	1281 (70.0%)	1250 (66.6%)
Total	1891 (100%)	1578 (100%)	1830 (100%)	1877 (100%)

In 2002, 2336 men were asked to complete a questionnaire and 1877 did so. This represents a sound response rate of 80 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 1998, 2000, 2001 and 2002 surveys were quite similar.

GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION

There was little variation in the geographic distribution of participants from 1998 to 2002. In all four 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
Gay Melbourne	850 (44.9%)	659 (41.8%)	802 (43.8%)	753 (40.1%)
Urban Victoria	845 (44.7%)	734 (46.5%)	816 (44.6%)	857 (45.7%)
Rural Victoria	89 (4.7%)	92 (5.8%)	109 (6.0%)	124 (6.6%)
Elsewhere	107 (5.7%)	93 (5.9%)	103 (5.6%)	143 (7.6%)
Total	1891 (100%)	1578 (100%)	1830 (100%)	1877 (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 2002 survey, the maximum age of respondents was 76, with a median age of 34. Age range and distribution were fairly similar to those observed in the previous three studies (see Table 3).

Table 3 : Age

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

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

ETHNICITY

As with the three previous surveys, the sample was predominantly ‘Anglo-Australian’ with a slightly lower proportion identifying as such in the current survey (see Table 4). Forty-five men (2.5% of the total sample) reported being of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander origin.

Table 4 : Ethnicity

	1998	2000	2001	2002
Anglo-Australian	1471 (77.8%)	1222 (77.4%)	1481 (80.9%)	1412 (75.2%)
European	212 (11.2%)	232 (14.7%)	215 (11.8%)	292 (15.6%)
Other	208 (11.0%)	124 (7.9%)	134 (7.3%)	173 (9.2%)
Total	1891 (100%)	1578 (100%)	1830 (100%)	1877(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, with 68% of all respondents being in full-time employment, a slight decrease from the previous year. In 2002, there was a correspondingly larger proportion of participants in part-time work than in 2001.

Table 5 : Employment status

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

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

As in 1998, 2000 and 2001, 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). The 2002 data show a greater number of professionals and a corresponding decrease in paraprofessionals than in 2001 (see Table 6).

Table 6 : Occupation

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

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)

SEXUAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH WOMEN

As in 1998, 2000 and 2001, few men had had sex with women in the previous six months, and these percentages are remarkably stable across the four survey periods (see Table 7).

Table 7 : Sex with women in the previous six months

	1998	2000	2001	2002
No female partners	1670 (93.0%)	1454(94.0%)	1539 (94.3%)	1602 (93.8%)
One female partner	78 (4.3%)	48 (3.1%)	50 (3.1%)	48 (2.8%)
More than one female partner	48 (2.7%)	44 (2.9%)	42 (2.6%)	58 (3.4%)
Total	1796 (100%)¹	1546 (100%)²	1631 (100%)³	1708 (100%)⁴

¹ Missing data (n=95), ² Missing data (n=32), ³ Missing data (n=199), ⁴ Missing data (n=169)

SEXUAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH MEN

The majority of men in each of the four samples were in a regular sexual relationship with a man at the time of completing the survey (see Table 8). Consistent with 2001, the 2002 data show a smaller proportion of men in regular relationships who also had sex with casual partners than in 2000 and 1998. About 29% of the study participants in 2002 were in a monogamous relationship, slightly lower than in 2001. In 2002 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 remained steady over time.

Table 8 : Current relationships with men

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

*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)

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 four time periods (see Table 9). Correspondingly, about one-third of the men have consistently reported being in a relationship for less than one year.

Table 9 : Length of relationships with men

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

Association with Gay Community

Similar in composition to 1998, 2000 and 2001, and consistent with the recruitment strategies employed, the 2002 participants were highly gay-identified and gay-community-attached.

SEXUAL IDENTITY

The data in all four surveys show that the samples were composed predominantly of men who identified as gay or homosexual (see Table 10), 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 four survey periods.

Table 10 : Sexual identity

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

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

GAY COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

As with the 1998, 2000 and 2001 surveys, men in the 2002 sample were highly socially involved with gay men (see Table 11). 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 11 : Gay friends

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

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

Correspondingly, in all four surveys, about 85% of the men said they spent some or a lot of their free time with gay men (see Table 12).

Table 12 : Proportion of free time spent with gay men

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

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

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 13). The respective proportions of men in the sample who are HIV-positive or HIV-negative have remained steady across the four study periods. Also steady from 1998 to 2002 is the percentage of men who had not been tested or had not obtained their test results — about 16% in the most recent survey.

Table 13 : HIV test results

	1998	2000	2001	2002
Not tested/No results	285 (15.7%)	224 (14.5%)	274 (15.5%)	271 (15.6%)
HIV-negative	1371 (75.7%)	1180 (76.4%)	1347 (76.3%)	1313 (75.7%)
HIV-positive	154 (8.5%)	140 (9.1%)	145 (8.2%)	151 (8.7%)
Total	1855 (100%)¹	1563 (100%)²	1792 (100%)³	1735 (100%)⁴

¹ Missing data (n=81), ² Missing data (n=34), ³ Missing data (n=64), ⁴ Missing data (n=142)

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 four study periods (see Table 14). 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 14 : Time since most recent HIV test

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

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

COMBINATION THERAPIES

70% of the men who reported that they were HIV-positive were taking combination therapies at the time of the most recent survey (Table 15). Although this percentage is higher than 2001 it is not significantly different, however across the four 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 ($p < .01$). 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).

Table 15 : Use of combination antiretroviral therapies

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

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)

REGULAR PARTNER'S HIV-STATUS

In all four surveys, participants were asked about the serostatus of their current regular partner (see Table 16). 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 almost 10% were with partners of HIV-positive status. When viewed across the four study periods, the proportions of men in a relationship with a partner who is HIV-positive, HIV-negative, or HIV-unknown, have remained quite steady.

Table 16 : HIV status of regular partners

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

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

The survey in 2001 revealed a downturn in the percentage of HIV-positive men with an HIV-negative partner and a corresponding upturn in the percentage of HIV-positive men with an HIV-positive partner. In 2002, the percentage of HIV-positive respondents with HIV-positive partners has decreased to a level on par with that seen in 2000 and the percentage of HIV positive respondents with HIV-negative partners has risen to above 50%, but not to the levels of 2000 (see Table 17). 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 three 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. The proportion of men who did not know the serostatus of their partner decreased in the period 1998 to 2000, but has since remained quite steady.

Table 17 : 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%)

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 18). 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 four study periods. A similar proportion was classified as having had sex with any casual male partners 'in the previous six months', and this represents a significant downturn from 72% in 1998 ($p < .001$) although the results from the current survey are similar to the data from 2001. Further interpretation of these findings is reported on below.

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

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

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 1998, 2000 and 2001, 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 19). Such a finding is not surprising as men attending the gay venues, particularly the sex-on-premises venues, do so mainly to find casual partners.

Table 19 : 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

Note : These categories are not mutually exclusive.

The number of men reporting that they had no sexual partners in the previous six months is the same as 2001 with slightly more indicating they had at least 10 partners (see Table 20). This result may be partly attributable to the slight differences in sample composition in comparison to previous surveys. The majority of the men had engaged in sex with between 1 partner and 10 partners 'in the previous six months'.

Table 20 : Number of male sex partners in previous six months

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

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

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 21). This result is consistent across the four 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 four study periods. About 75% of the men with regular partners reported engaging in insertive anal intercourse while a slightly lower proportion, in the vicinity of two-thirds, 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.

Table 21 : 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

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 (see Table 22). In the 2002 survey there was an increase in the number men with casual partners who engaged in oral intercourse with ejaculation than in 2001, with this being slightly more common in the insertive rather than the receptive role. There has been a significant reduction in the percentage of men reporting receptive fellatio with ejaculation across

the three study periods to 2001 ($p < .01$). However, the 2002 data shows an increase from 2001 which approaches significance ($p = .053$)

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 four study periods.

Table 22 : 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

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 UAI has decreased slightly from 2001 with a corresponding increase in the number of men who always used condoms. However, across the four study periods there has been a significant increase in the percentage of men engaging in any UAI with regular male partners in the previous six months ($p < .001$) (see Table 23). There has been a corresponding decrease in the number of men who indicated that they always used condoms ($p < .001$). It is possible that the reduction in UAI-R reported in 2002 may be due to changes in sample composition from 2001.

Remaining quite steady across the four 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 23 : 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%)

¹ Of the 655 men who engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with regular partners 'in the previous 6 months', 161 men only practised withdrawal prior to ejaculation, 195 consistently ejaculated inside, and 299 engaged in both withdrawal and ejaculation inside.

In 1998, there were no statistically significant differences between HIV-negative, HIV-positive and 'untested' men in their condom use with regular partners (see Table 24). However, in 2000, there was a trend in the direction of a higher percentage of HIV-positive men having unprotected anal intercourse with their regular partners, especially when compared with men of unknown serostatus. These findings should be treated cautiously as they are based on small numbers of HIV-positive men. Although not statistically significant, and in contrast to results from 2001, data from 2002 suggest that a greater proportion of HIV-positive men had UAI with regular partners than the men of either HIV-negative status or of unknown HIV status.

Table 24 : 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	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	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	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%)

In Table 25, 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 or unknown status partners than with positive partners. The percentage of HIV-negative men having unprotected anal intercourse with unknown status partners has increased to be on par with the percentage having UAI with HIV-negative men. Whereas much of the unprotected anal intercourse was between seroconcordant (positive-positive or negative-negative) couples, 121 men in 2002 had unprotected anal intercourse in a relationship where seroconcordance was absent or in doubt. Separate analyses of these 121 men showed that 64 of them *never* used condoms for anal intercourse with their regular partners (ie. all anal intercourse with their regular partners was without condoms).

Table 25 : 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

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 55% of men in the sample) also had an agreement with their partner about sex *within* the relationship (see Table 26). This proportion has remained steady across the four study periods. From 1998 to 2001 there had been a shift in the type of agreement struck between partners; the proportion agreeing to anal intercourse with a condom had reduced whereas there was a corresponding increase in the proportion of men agreeing to have unprotected anal intercourse. In 2002, the proportion agreeing to unprotected anal intercourse decreased with a corresponding increase in agreements for anal intercourse only with a condom.

A separate analysis (not presented in this report) was conducted to determine whether these changes in the type of agreements occurring within relationships might be a function of a corresponding change in the HIV seroconcordance of partners. The rationale being that such an increase may not represent more risk as there may have been a corresponding increase in the number of seroconcordant regular relationships, and/or the increases in such agreements may have occurred predominantly amongst men in seroconcordant relationships. This thesis does not hold, however, as there has been no significant change in the proportion of regular relationships where the partners are seroconcordant, serodiscordant, or of unknown seroconcordance. Furthermore, the changes in agreements have occurred quite similarly across relationships where the partners are concordant, discordant or of unknown concordance.

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

	1998	2000	2001	2002
No spoken agreement about anal intercourse	249 (23.7%)	209 (24.3%)	268 (25.5%)	281 (27.7%)
No anal intercourse between regular partners	93 (8.9%)	71 (8.3%)	82 (7.8%)	72 (7.1%)
Anal intercourse permitted only with condom	377 (35.9%)	247 (28.8%)	271 (25.8%)	305 (30.0%)
Anal intercourse without condom is permitted	331 (31.5%)	332 (38.6%)	429 (40.9%)	357 (35.2%)
Total	1050 (100%)	859 (100%)	1050 (100%)	1015 (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 27). 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. About one-third of the men had no spoken agreement about sex outside the relationship. Across the four time periods there has been no change in the proportions of men in each of the agreement categories.

Table 27 : Agreements with regular male partners about sex *outside* the relationship

	1998	2000	2001	2002
No spoken agreement about sex	329 (32.9%)	261 (32.7%)	303 (30.2%)	315 (32.6%)
No sexual contact with casual partners is permitted	297 (29.7%)	226 (28.3%)	347 (34.6%)	312 (32.3%)
No anal intercourse with casual partners is permitted	102 (10.2%)	57 (7.1%)	54 (5.4%)	72 (7.5%)
Anal intercourse permitted only with condom	257 (25.7%)	229 (28.7%)	271 (27.0%)	234 (24.2%)
Anal intercourse without condom is permitted	16 (1.6%)	25 (3.1%)	27 (2.7%)	33 (3.4%)
Total	1001 (100%)	798 (100%)	1002 (100%)	966 (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 19% 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 28). The percentage is slightly higher than that of the previous year and there has been a significant upturn in UAI-C across the four study periods ($p < .001$). A separate analysis revealed that of the 359 men who reported engaging in UAI-C, 147 had also engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with regular partners.

Table 28 : Condom use with casual partners

	Total Sample	Those with casual 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 ¹	359 (19.1%)	359 (28.3%)
Base	1877 (100%)	1268 (100%)

¹ Of the 359 men who engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners 'in the previous six months', 140 only practised withdrawal prior to ejaculation, 45 consistently ejaculated inside, and 174 engaged in both withdrawal and ejaculation inside.

A comparison of the data in Tables 23 and 28 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 1998, 2000 and 2001 there were differences between HIV-positive, HIV-negative and 'untested' men in their condom use with casual partners, and these differences were statistically significant ($p < .001$) (see Table 29). 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 29 : 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%)

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 two-thirds of the sample) did not disclose their serostatus to any of their casual partners and this proportion has been quite steady across the four study periods (see Table 30). Relatively few men disclosed to all casual partners. Overall rates of disclosure have not changed over time.

Table 30 : Participants' disclosure of serostatus to casual partners

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

Most of the men who had casual partners were not told the serostatus of those partners in the context of sex (see Table 31). These proportions have remained fairly constant across the four study periods. Relatively few men had the serostatus of their casual partners routinely disclosed to them.

Table 31 : Casual partners' disclosure of serostatus to participants

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

A question about where men look for male sex partners was added to the survey in 2002. Based on the responses, around 70% of men look for partners in gay bars and 60% look in sex venues. Nearly half of those who responded used the internet to find a partner.

Table 32 : Where men look for sex partners

	Never	Occasionally	Often	Total
Internet	778 (52.9%)	519 (35.3%)	174 (11.8%)	1471 (100%) ¹
Gay bar	495 (31.3%)	799 (50.5%)	288 (18.2%)	1582 (100%) ²
Beat	896 (60.3%)	432 (29.1%)	157 (10.6%)	1485 (100%) ³
Sex venue	645 (40.5%)	612 (38.4%)	335 (21.0%)	1592 (100%) ⁴
Gym	1144 (81.3%)	222 (15.8%)	42 (3.0%)	1408 (100%) ⁵
Pool	1142 (81.1%)	230 (16.3%)	36 (2.6%)	1408 (100%) ⁶

¹ Missing data (n=406), ² Missing data (n=295), ³ Missing data (n=392), ⁴ Missing data (n=285), ⁵ Missing data (n=469)

⁶ Missing data (n=469)

The data in Table 32 are based on those who answered the question. (Note that many participants skipped the question or parts of it for reasons unknown, although an assumption could be made that those who did not respond *did not* look for partners at the places listed. Were such respondents included in the 'never' category, 'occasionally' or 'often' figures would be reduced.)

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. Four questions addressed this issue (questions 56 - 59), these questions being different from those that were asked in 1998 but the same as those included in the 2000 and 2001 surveys. Where men gave responses, these were generally in accordance with recognised medical opinion and erring on the side of caution (see Table 33). There was little change in the way men answered these questions in 2000, 2001 and 2002. These four items form a reliable scale (Van de Ven et al., 2000) on which the mean score for the entire sample was 1.60 (scale range 1-4, with higher scores indicating greater optimism).

Table 33 : Responses to questions about combination therapy

Item	Year	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
New HIV treatments will take the worry out of sex.	2000	610 (41.2%)	647 (43.7%)	162 (10.9%)	63 (4.3%)
	2001	720 (41.9%)	697 (40.6%)	224 (13.0%)	77 (4.5%)
	2002	719 (41.4%)	771 (44.4%)	201 (11.6%)	45 (2.6%)
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%)
HIV is less of a threat because the epidemic is on the decline.	2000	949 (64.7%)	444 (30.3%)	48 (3.3%)	26 (1.8%)
	2001	1095 (64.4%)	533 (31.4%)	52 (3.1%)	19 (1.1%)
	2002	1091 (63.4%)	545 (31.7%)	62 (3.6%)	22 (1.3%)
HIV/AIDS is a less serious threat than it used to be because of new treatments.	2000	836 (56.9%)	471 (32.0%)	140 (9.5%)	23 (1.6%)
	2001	940 (55.5%)	581 (34.3%)	151 (8.9%)	23 (1.4%)
	2002	923 (53.7%)	565 (32.8%)	207 (12.0%)	25 (1.5%)

The relationship between the items about combination therapies and the participant's serostatus (see Table 34) was similar to findings in other Australian cities. Most men's responses were generally in line with accepted wisdom. In 2002, men who did not know their serostatus were significantly more 'optimistic' (scale average = 1.70) than their HIV-positive or negative counterparts (1.60 and 1.58, respectively, $p < .05$).

Table 34 : Responses to questions about combination therapy by serostatus

Serostatus	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
New HIV treatments will take the worry out of sex				
2000				
HIV-Positive	60 (43.2%)	57 (41.0%)	15 (10.8%)	7 (5.0%)
HIV-Negative	479 (42.4%)	496 (43.9%)	114 (10.1%)	41 (3.6%)
Unknown	69 (33.8%)	89 (43.6%)	31 (15.2%)	15 (7.4%)
2001				
HIV-Positive	70 (47.0%)	56 (37.6%)	19 (12.8%)	4 (2.7%)
HIV-Negative	552 (42.7%)	524 (40.6%)	163 (12.6%)	53 (4.1%)
Unknown	90 (35.3%)	107 (42.0%)	40 (15.7%)	18 (7.1%)
2002				
HIV-Positive	62 (40.8%)	72 (47.4%)	13 (8.6%)	5 (3.3%)
HIV-Negative	556 (42.3%)	585 (44.5%)	145 (11.0%)	29 (2.2%)
Unknown	92 (37.4%)	106 (43.1%)	38 (15.4%)	10 (4.1%)
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%)
HIV is less of a threat because the epidemic is on the decline				
2000				
HIV-Positive	92 (67.2%)	41 (29.9%)	2 (1.5%)	2 (1.5%)
HIV-Negative	732 (65.4%)	334 (29.8%)	36 (3.2%)	18 (1.6%)
Unknown	121 (59.9%)	65 (32.2%)	10 (5.0%)	6 (3.0%)
2001				
HIV-Positive	100 (66.7%)	44 (29.3%)	5 (3.3%)	1 (0.7%)
HIV-Negative	835 (65.2%)	397 (31.0%)	36 (2.8%)	13 (1.0%)
Unknown	147 (58.8%)	87 (34.8%)	11 (4.4%)	5 (2.0%)
2002				
HIV-Positive	98 (65.3%)	49(32.7%)	-	3 (2.0%)
HIV-Negative	845 (64.7%)	401 (30.7%)	47 (3.6%)	14 (1.1%)
Unknown	136 (56.4%)	86 (35.7%)	14 (5.8%)	5 (2.1%)
HIV/AIDS is a less serious threat than it used to be because of new treatments				
2000				
HIV-Positive	77 (55.8%)	34 (24.6%)	25 (18.1%)	2 (1.4%)
HIV-Negative	645 (57.5%)	367 (32.7%)	96 (8.6%)	14 (1.2%)
Unknown	112 (55.7%)	64 (31.8%)	18 (9.0%)	7 (3.5%)
2001				
HIV-Positive	81 (53.6%)	44 (29.1%)	25 (16.6%)	1 (0.7%)
HIV-Negative	715 (56.0%)	441 (34.5%)	105 (8.2%)	16 (1.3%)
Unknown	131 (52.6%)	92 (36.9%)	20 (8.0%)	6 (2.4%)
2002				
HIV-Positive	72 (48.0%)	51 (34.0%)	23 (15.3%)	4 (2.7%)
HIV-Negative	719 (55.0%)	425 (32.5%)	148 (11.3%)	15 (1.1%)
Unknown	124 (51.7%)	78 (32.5%)	33 (13.8%)	5 (2.1%)

In Table 35, mean optimism scale scores are reported against sexual practice and serostatus. Generally, higher mean scores (ie. higher levels of optimism) were associated with men who reported unprotected anal intercourse with regular partners, and with casual partners.

Table 35 : Sexual practice, HIV serostatus and mean optimism scale scores

Sexual practice	HIV Serostatus		
	Positive	Negative	Unknown
Regular partner			
2000			
No anal intercourse	1.00	1.42	1.69
100% protected	1.44	1.54	1.64
Some UAI	1.62	1.58	1.59
2001			
No anal intercourse	1.46	1.47	1.43
100% protected	1.53	1.51	1.66
Some UAI	1.50	1.59	1.77
2002			
No anal intercourse	1.33	1.54	1.66
100% protected	1.67	1.57	1.58
Some UAI	1.55	1.58	1.82
Casual partner			
2000			
No anal intercourse	1.00	1.48	1.50
100% protected	1.47	1.54	1.75
Some UAI	1.63	1.56	1.59
2001			
No anal intercourse	1.57	1.50	1.32
100% protected	1.61	1.48	1.68
Some UAI	1.52	1.66	1.86
2002			
No anal intercourse	1.50	1.58	1.59
100% protected	1.73	1.59	1.60
Some UAI	1.58	1.51	1.79

Note : UAI = unprotected anal intercourse.

POST-EXPOSURE PROPHYLAXIS (PEP)

Three questions about post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP) were added to the survey in 2001 and retained in 2002. These questions were aimed at assessing knowledge, use of and 'proximity to' PEP.

The majority of respondents had never heard of PEP. However, this proportion has decreased significantly ($p < .05$) (see Table 36) since 2001. About 27% of the sample knew about the availability of PEP and about 6% believed that PEP would be available in the future.

Table 36 : Levels of knowledge about post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP)

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

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

Few men in the sample had ever received PEP (see Table 37). Similar to the question reported above, and indicative of low knowledge about PEP, there was a sizeable proportion of missing data.

Table 37 : Ever received post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP)

	2001	2002
No	1649 (98.0%)	1690 (97.9%)
Yes	34 (2.0%)	37 (2.1%)
Total	1683 (100.0%)¹	1727 (100%)²

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

Although there was a low percentage of men who knew someone else who had taken PEP, the proportion is higher than for those who had ever taken PEP (see Table 38).

Table 38 : Knowledge of anyone who had received post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP)

	2001	2002
No	1542 (93.3%)	1597 (93.1%)
Yes	110 (6.7%)	119 (6.9%)
Total	1652 (100.0%)¹	1716 (100%)²

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

In 2002 there was an increase in the proportion of men who engaged in UAI-C who knew about PEP (see Table 39). About 23% of the men who had heard of PEP engaged in UAI-C in the previous six months. Separate analyses indicated that there were 231 men who completed the survey in 2002 and engaged in UAI-C without knowledge that PEP was available.

In contrast, there was a decrease in 2002 in the proportion of men who engaged in UAI-R who knew about PEP. Separate analyses showed that in the 2002 sample there were 450 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.

Table 39 : Knowledge of post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP) and unprotected anal intercourse

	It's readily available now	It will be available in the future	I've never heard about it
Unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners			
2001			
Some UAI-C	61 (19.2%)	35 (19.8%)	182 (15.7%)
No UAI-C	256 (80.8%)	142 (80.2%)	975 (84.3%)
Total	317 (100.0%)	177 (100.0%)	1157 (100.0%)
2002			
Some UAI-C	111 (23.5%)	22 (19.6%)	209 (17.7%)
No UAI-C	362 (76.5%)	90 (80.4%)	973 (82.3%)
Total	473 (100%)	112 (100%)	1182 (100%)
Unprotected anal intercourse with regular partners			
2001			
Some UAI-R	124 (39.1%)	59 (33.3%)	441 (38.1%)
No UAI-R	193 (60.9%)	118 (66.7%)	716 (61.9%)
Total	317 (100.0%)	177 (100.0%)	1157 (100.0%)
2002			
Some UAI-R	169 (35.7%)	46 (41.1%)	404 (34.2%)
No UAI-R	304 (64.3%)	66 (58.9%)	778 (65.8%)
Total	473 (100%)	112 (100%)	1182 (100%)

Drug Use

In 2002, similar to 2000 and 2001, the most commonly used drugs were marijuana, amyl, ecstasy and speed (see Table 40). Few respondents reported having used other drugs.

Table 40 : Drug use in previous six months

	2000	2001	2002
Marijuana	606 (38.4%)	744 (40.7%)	715 (38.1%)
Amyl/Poppers	633 (40.1%)	684 (37.4%)	677 (36.1%)
Ecstasy	488 (30.9%)	593 (32.4%)	593 (31.6%)
Speed	365 (23.1%)	423 (23.1%)	415 (22.1%)
Cocaine	178 (11.3%)	201 (11.0%)	242 (12.9%)
Viagra		116 (6.3%)	149 (7.9%)
Steroids	23 (1.5%)	31 (1.7%)	35 (1.9%)
Heroin	27 (1.7%)	25 (1.4%)	25 (1.3%)
Any other drug	97 (6.1%)	192 (10.5%)	186 (9.9%)

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 41). The most commonly injected drug in 2002 was speed, followed by ecstasy and cocaine. Twenty-seven men (2.5%) indicated that they had injected more than one drug 'in the past six months'. A total of 90 men (4.0%) had injected any drug/steroid in this period. (Questions about injecting drug use were not asked in the 1998 survey)

Table 41 : Injecting drug use in previous six months

	2000	2001	2002
Speed	58 (3.7%)	50 (2.7%)	59 (3.1%)
Ecstasy	12 (0.8%)	21 (1.1%)	22 (1.2%)
Cocaine	17 (1.1%)	10 (0.5%)	23 (1.2%)
Steroids	10 (0.6%)	15 (0.8%)	19 (1.0%)
Heroin	10 (0.6%)	16 (0.9%)	12 (0.6%)
Any other drug	9 (0.6%)	16 (0.9%)	21 (1.1%)

Note : Categories are not mutually exclusive.

Discussion

The findings from the fourth Melbourne Gay Community Periodic Survey conducted during February 2002 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 two preceding surveys in 1998 (Van de Ven et al., 1998), 2000 (Aspin et al., 2000) and 2001 (Rawstorne et al., 2001). 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), reinforcing the notion that in some respects the gay cultures of the capital cities in Australia are akin.

The 1877 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. Correspondingly, most had sex with men only, reflected in the finding that 94% 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.

Similar to previous data, approximately 16% 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, about 9% of the men were HIV-positive; a percentage consistent with previous years.

Among the HIV-positive participants, use of combination antiretroviral therapies increased slightly in 2002 following a significant decline across the three previous time periods – about 70% of the HIV-positive men were taking a combination therapy at the time of the 2002 survey, compared to almost 83% in 1998. However, over the four survey periods use of antiretroviral therapy decreased significantly.

Most men reported 'current' sexual contact with at least one other man: just under one-third of the men had a regular partner only; a similar proportion 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 the same proportion had sex with casual partners.

The 2002 survey confirms a continuing upward trend in UAI-R and UAI-C. Of the total 2002 sample and 'in the previous six months', 655 men (34.9%) had any unprotected anal intercourse with a regular partner and 359 men (19.1%) had any unprotected anal intercourse with a casual partner. Some of these men (147 all told) had unprotected anal intercourse with both regular and casual partners. The remainder of the men in the overall sample—far and away the majority—indicated no unprotected anal intercourse with either regular or casual partners.

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

Although the proportion of men who had an agreement with their partner about sex within the relationship has altered very little since 1998, the type of agreements that partners are reaching has changed slightly. Within relationships, there has been a downturn since 1998 in the proportion of men who agreed to have anal intercourse only with a condom, and a corresponding increase in the proportion who agreed to have unprotected anal intercourse within the relationship. The increase in agreements to have UAI-R cannot be attributed solely to men in seroconcordant relationships.

In general, and consistent with previous surveys, the men did not routinely disclose their serostatus to casual partners. About two-thirds of the men never disclosed their serostatus to casual partners, and a similar proportion of respondent's casual partners never disclosed their serostatus.

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 do involve such risk reduction strategies.

Questions about PEP indicated that knowledge about it is still not widespread. Amongst those who had heard of PEP, about one-third understood that it will be available in the future. There were 231 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 90 men (4.0%) indicated that they had injected at least one drug/steroid. About 35% 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 2002 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 1998, 2000 and 2001 and other studies are suggestive of sound reliability.

References

- Aspin, C., Van de Ven, P., Prestage, G., Kippax, S., Knox, S., Horn, G. & 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.
- 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.
- 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

Melbourne 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) _____

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 ☐
9. 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 ☐

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 ☐

Continues on other side

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?

- | | | | |
|------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <i>Internet</i> | Never <input type="checkbox"/> | Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/> | Often <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <i>Gay bar</i> | Never <input type="checkbox"/> | Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/> | Often <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <i>Bea</i> | Never <input type="checkbox"/> | Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/> | Often <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <i>Sex venue</i> | Never <input type="checkbox"/> | Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/> | Often <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <i>Gym</i> | Never <input type="checkbox"/> | Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/> | Often <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <i>Pool</i> | Never <input type="checkbox"/> | Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/> | Often <input type="checkbox"/> |

35. Apart from HIV, when were you last tested for an STI (eg gonorrhoea, hepatitis)?

- 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 ☐

36. Have you ever had an HIV antibody test?

- No ☐ Yes ☐

37. 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 ☐

38. 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 antiretroviral therapy?

- No ☐ Yes ☐

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

39. 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 ☐

40. 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 ☐

41. 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 ☐

42. How old are you? _____ years

43. What country were you born in? Australia ☐

Other (please specify) _____

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

- No ☐ Yes ☐

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

Anglo-Australian only ☐ Other: _____

46. Are you: (tick one only)

- Employed full-time ☐
Employed part-time ☐
Unemployed ☐
A student ☐
A pensioner or on social security benefits ☐
Other ☐

47. What is your occupation? _____

48. 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 ☐

49. Where do you live? Postcode _____

OR Suburb/Town: _____

50. In general, would you say your health is?

- Excellent ☐ Very good ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor ☐

51. 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 ☐

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

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

54. 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 ☐

55. Have you **read** resource material D? No ☐ Yes ☐

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.

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

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

57. The availability of treatment (PEP) immediately after unsafe sex makes safe sex less important.

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

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

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

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

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

60. 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"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
Marijuana	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
Viagra	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	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"/>
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"/>