

# Facts & Figures

## 2000 Male Out Survey

Paul **VAN DE VEN**  
Patrick **RAWSTORNE**  
June **CRAWFORD**  
Susan **KIPPAX**

MONOGRAPH 2/2001

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  
nchsr@unsw.edu.au  
[www.arts.unsw.edu.au/nchsr/](http://www.arts.unsw.edu.au/nchsr/)

© National Centre in HIV Social Research 2001  
ISBN 1-875978-44-5

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.

# CONTENTS

---

List of Tables	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
<b><u>INTRODUCTION</u></b>	<b>1</b>
<b><u>METHOD</u></b>	<b>4</b>
<u>Questionnaire</u>	4
<u>Procedure</u>	4
<u>Sample</u>	4
<u>Data analysis and presentation</u>	5
<u>Scales</u>	6
<b><u>DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES</u></b>	<b>7</b>
<u>Age</u>	7
<u>Country of birth</u>	7
<u>Education</u>	8
<u>Labour force status</u>	8
<u>Occupation</u>	9
<u>State</u>	9
<u>Area of residence</u>	10
<u>Living situation</u>	10
<b><u>MILIEU VARIABLES</u></b>	<b>12</b>
<u>Sexual identity</u>	12
<u>Gay identity disclosure</u>	12
<u>Contact with the HIV epidemic</u>	13
<u>Social engagement with gay community</u>	14
<u>Gay community attachment</u>	15
<u>HIV status</u>	16
<u>Recency of HIV testing</u>	17
<b><u>SEXUAL RELATIONSHIPS AND SEXUAL PRACTICES</u></b>	<b>19</b>
<u>Number of sexual partners</u>	19
<u>Sexual relationships with men</u>	21
<u>Sexual practices</u>	22
<u>Sex with female partners</u>	24
<u>Condom use with female partners</u>	24
<u>Anal intercourse with women</u>	25
<b><u>CONDOM USE</u></b>	<b>26</b>
<u>Types of male sexual partners</u>	26
<u>Regular partners</u>	26
<u>Regional differences</u>	29
<u>Agreements</u>	30
<u>Casual partners</u>	31
<u>Regional differences</u>	33
<u>Beats, saunas, sex clubs</u>	34
<u>Attitudes toward condoms</u>	35
<u>Avoidance and expectations</u>	35
<b><u>DRUG USE</u></b>	<b>37</b>
<b><u>HIV OPTIMISM</u></b>	<b>39</b>
<b><u>CONCLUSIONS</u></b>	<b>40</b>
<b><u>REFERENCES</u></b>	<b>44</b>
<b><u>APPENDIX</u></b>	<b>47</b>

# LIST OF TABLES

---

Table 1 :	<a href="#">Age bands</a>	7
Table 2 :	<a href="#">Country of birth</a>	8
Table 3 :	<a href="#">Education level</a>	8
Table 4 :	<a href="#">Labour force status</a>	9
Table 5 :	<a href="#">Occupation</a>	9
Table 6 :	<a href="#">State of residence</a>	10
Table 7 :	<a href="#">Area of residence</a>	10
Table 8 :	<a href="#">Living situation</a>	11
Table 9 :	<a href="#">Sexual identity</a>	12
Table 10 :	<a href="#">Gay identity disclosure</a>	13
Table 11 :	<a href="#">Contact with the HIV epidemic</a>	14
Table 12 :	<a href="#">Social engagement with gay community</a>	15
Table 13 :	<a href="#">Gay community attachment</a>	15
Table 14 :	<a href="#">HIV status</a>	16
Table 15 :	<a href="#">HIV status by gay community attachment</a>	16
Table 16 :	<a href="#">Men without HIV test results by age category</a>	17
Table 17 :	<a href="#">Time of most recent HIV test</a>	17
Table 18 :	<a href="#">Time of most recent HIV test by gay community attachment</a>	18
Table 19 :	<a href="#">Number of male and female sexual partners in previous six months</a>	19
Table 20 :	<a href="#">Number of male sexual partners in previous six months by gay community attachment</a>	20
Table 21 :	<a href="#">Number of female partners in previous six months by gay community attachment</a>	20
Table 22 :	<a href="#">Current sexual relationships with men</a>	21
Table 23 :	<a href="#">Current sexual relationships with men by gay community attachment</a>	21
Table 24 :	<a href="#">Sexual practices with regular partners 'in the previous six months' by gay community attachment: includes only those men with regular partners</a>	22
Table 25 :	<a href="#">Sexual practices with casual partners 'in the previous six months' by gay community attachment: includes only those men with casual partners</a>	23
Table 26 :	<a href="#">Sexual practices ('occasionally' or 'often') with regular or casual male partners in past six months</a>	23
Table 27 :	<a href="#">Female sexual partners in the previous six months</a>	24
Table 28 :	<a href="#">Condom use with female partners in the six previous months</a>	25
Table 29 :	<a href="#">Anal intercourse with women</a>	25
Table 30 :	<a href="#">Types of male sexual partners in the six months prior to the survey</a>	26
Table 31 :	<a href="#">Anal intercourse with regular partners</a>	27
Table 32 :	<a href="#">Anal intercourse with regular partners by gay community attachment</a>	28
Table 33 :	<a href="#">Anal intercourse with regular partners by HIV serostatus</a>	29
Table 34 :	<a href="#">Anal intercourse with regular partners by State—2000 data</a>	29
Table 35 :	<a href="#">Anal intercourse with regular partners by area of residence—2000 data</a>	30
Table 36 :	<a href="#">Type of agreement with regular partner about anal sex <i>within the relationship</i></a>	30
Table 37 :	<a href="#">Type of agreement with regular partner about sexual interactions <i>with casual partners</i></a>	31
Table 38 :	<a href="#">Anal intercourse with casual partners</a>	31
Table 39 :	<a href="#">Anal intercourse with casual partners by gay community attachment</a>	32
Table 40 :	<a href="#">Anal intercourse with casual partners by HIV serostatus</a>	33
Table 41 :	<a href="#">Anal intercourse with casual partners by State—2000 data</a>	33
Table 42 :	<a href="#">Anal intercourse with casual partners by area of residence—2000 data</a>	34
Table 43 :	<a href="#">Unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners (UAIC) in the six months prior to the survey among men who reported having sex at a Beat, Sauna or Sex club</a>	34
Table 44 :	<a href="#">Attitudes toward Condoms scale, total sample and by gay community attachment</a>	35
Table 45 :	<a href="#">Extent to which men reported avoiding having sex with people they think have HIV, by gay community attachment and HIV serostatus</a>	35
Table 46 :	<a href="#">Expectations that an HIV positive man would disclose his status prior to sex, by gay community attachment and HIV serostatus</a>	36
Table 47 :	<a href="#">Drug use in the six months prior to the survey</a>	37
Table 48 :	<a href="#">Drug use in the six months prior to the survey by gay community attachment</a>	38
Table 49 :	<a href="#">Injecting drug use, ever</a>	38
Table 50 :	<a href="#">HIV Optimism scale scores, by HIV serostatus and unprotected anal intercourse with casual (UAIC) and regular (UAIR) partners—2000 data</a>	39

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

---

## **FUNDING:**

Commonwealth Department of Health and Aged Care

## **CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS:**

Clive Aspin (NCHSR), Paul Lehmann and Roger Nixon (DHAC), Garrett Prestage (NCHECR), Russell Westacott (AFAO/NAPWA)

## **QUESTIONNAIRE DISTRIBUTION:**

The late Gerry Hercus of Champions Video of Australia who generously distributed the questionnaires without charge.

## **DATA CODING:**

Limin Mao (NCHSR)

## **DATA ENTRY:**

Janice Bull (Bull Consulting)

## **LAYOUT & DESIGN:**

Judi Rainbow (NCHSR)

## **PARTICIPANTS:**

The 1832 men who completed and returned a questionnaire and thereby allowed us to document some of the intimate details of their lives.



---

## Executive Summary

The key findings of the 2000 Male Out Survey are presented in dot point form in the Conclusions section of this report.

---

# Introduction

An integral part of Australia's response to the HIV/AIDS epidemic has been a program of behavioural and epidemiological research for the purpose of informing, implementing and evaluating education and prevention programs. The first Project Male Call survey of homosexually active men<sup>1</sup>, conducted in 1992 within the context of evaluation of the first National HIV/AIDS Strategy, was part of that behavioural research program (Kippax et al., 1994).

Following the evaluation of the second National HIV/AIDS Strategy (Feachem, 1996), the then Commonwealth Department of Health and Family Services commissioned the National Centre in HIV Social Research to provide an update to and a comparison with the 1992 survey. That survey was known as Male Call 96 (Crawford et al., 1998).

At this stage of the HIV/AIDS epidemic in Australia, the vast majority of cases of AIDS, people infected with HIV and new transmissions of HIV continue to be found among homosexually active men. In Australia, data on new HIV infections have been reported since 1995. In the period from 1 January 1995 to 30 September 2000, 82 per cent of new diagnoses of HIV infection were attributed to 'male homosexual/bisexual contact' or 'male homosexual/bisexual contact and injecting drug use' (National Centre in HIV Epidemiology & Clinical Research, 2001).

Against this background, large national surveys such as Project Male Call in 1992 and Male Call 96 are important. To be of use to evaluators, policy makers and educators, such surveys must be conducted, analysed and reported with appropriate academic rigour. It is important to obtain information from a wide variety of homosexually active men, including men who also have sex with women. A large sample, which contains men from a wide spectrum of society—in terms of age, social class, geographic area, and degree of gay

community attachment—is needed in order to provide a credible snapshot of sexual practice among homosexually active men at a particular point in time.

This is an important juncture in the HIV epidemic, as Australia moves into a phase of direct involvement in HIV vaccine trials. In terms of documenting gay men's sexual and other behaviours, policy makers and educators across Australia are well-served by various studies which are in place or about to start. The Positive Health (pH) Cohort Study in Sydney and Melbourne (Prestage et al., 2000), and the national HIV Futures surveys (Grierson et al., 2000), provide detailed information on the lives of HIV positive people. The forthcoming Health in Men (HIM) open cohort study of HIV negative men in Sydney will provide rich data in the context of HIV vaccine initiatives. In addition, Gay Community Periodic Surveys are now conducted in Sydney (Prestage et al., 1999), Melbourne (Aspin et al., 2000a), Queensland (Aspin et al., 2000b), Perth (Van de Ven et al., 1999), Adelaide (Van de Ven et al., 2000b) and Canberra (Aspin et al., 2001). These periodic surveys provide regular and timely data based on large samples of gay men in Australia's principal cities.

Since Project Male Call in 1992 and Male Call 96, there is one important group of homosexually active men about which there are few new data. This is the group of men who have sex with men but who at the same time are not gay community attached, often do not identify as gay, are likely to have sex with women as well as men and are likely to live outside the larger cities with recognisable gay communities. Very few of these sorts of men are ever recruited into cohort studies or into periodic surveys conducted largely within gay communities. It remains important to document these men's sexual and other behaviours at this point in the epidemic.

To this end, we initiated the 2000 Male Out Survey as part of the four-year cycle of national surveys of Australian homosexually active men. In both Project Male Call (n=2583) and the Male Call 96 survey (n=3039), large numbers of men were recruited through leaflets inserted in the direct marketing campaigns of a mail-order pornographic video distributor. This distributor has an extensive mailing list which covers every part of Australia. Of the 534 and 588 men, respectively, recruited into Project Male Call and Male Call 96 through this strategy, approximately 47% of the men were defined as non gay community attached. This strategy had been shown to be an effective and cost efficient way of recruiting such men.

With the cooperation of the mail-order pornographic video distributor, the same recruitment strategy was adapted for the 2000 Male Out Survey. The method involved a self-complete questionnaire along the lines of those used successfully in the Gay Community Periodic Surveys which we conduct in collaboration with the National Centre in HIV Epidemiology and Clinical Research. The questionnaires were distributed with the

---

<sup>1</sup> The 'term homosexually active men' is used to include all men who have sex with men; from time to time we use the term 'gay and homosexually active men' to emphasise that both gay-identified men and those not so identified are included.

pornographic video catalogues and returned to the National Centre in HIV Social Research via a reply-paid service.

# Method

Project Male Call in 1992 and Male Call 96 recruited homosexually active men through a variety of sources which included advertisements in gay and mainstream media, pamphlets and posters, and pornographic video catalogues. For the 2000 Male Out Survey, only pornographic video catalogues were used.

## QUESTIONNAIRE

A copy of the questionnaire is provided in the Appendix. The interview schedules for Project Male Call in 1992 and Male Call 96 contained approximately 150 questions, many requesting detailed responses to a large number of items. It is not feasible to ask so many questions in such detail in a self-complete instrument. Hence, the 2000 Male Out questionnaire contained only 62 relatively short questions.

Areas covered in the questionnaire included: sexual identity and disclosure; sexual relationships with men and with women; sexual practices with men; agreements with regular male partners; sexual intercourse with women; gay community attachment; HIV testing; contact with the HIV epidemic; attitudes toward condoms; HIV optimism; drug use; demographic characteristics.

## PROCEDURE

Questionnaires were distributed through the two pornographic video catalogues used for recruitment into Project Male Call in 1992 and Male Call 96. A questionnaire was distributed with 120,000 'straight' catalogues (which contained a very small selection of homosexual and bisexual products at the end of the catalogue) in August 2000. Likewise, 15,000 questionnaires were distributed with a 'gay' catalogue in September 2000.

As previously, only men who had had sex with another man in the past five years were eligible. Participation was voluntary and anonymous, and men returned questionnaires to the National Centre in HIV Social Research via a reply-paid service.

## SAMPLE

Within a month or two of the distribution, 1832 completed questionnaires were returned. A small number of incomplete questionnaires—as well as those which contained obscenities only, typically homophobic—were discarded.

Naturally, there is no way of determining response rate. No doubt, most of questionnaires were delivered to people ineligible to participate in the survey. It must be said, however, that the overall response was very pleasing and far exceeded our initial expectations of 700 participants. This estimate was based on frequency of recruitment through this strategy into the 1992 and 1996 Male Call surveys as well as simplified method (i.e. short self-complete questionnaire to be completed at any time versus lengthy telephone interview at designated times).

Unlike for Project Male Call in 1992 and Male Call 96, no competing recruitment strategies were employed. When asked where they heard about these previous surveys, men may have nominated one of the other strategies even though they may have at some time also received a leaflet through a pornographic video catalogue. This is a likely explanation for the greater proportion of gay identified and gay community attached men who participated in the current survey (see below).

## DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION

In this report, the 2000 Male Out Survey data are presented and compared (wherever possible) with *comparable* data from Project Male Call (1992) and Male Call 96, i.e. with earlier data from those participants who were recruited through brochures distributed with pornographic video catalogues ( $n=534$  and  $588$ , respectively).

The data are presented for the sample as a whole. As well, the findings are (where relevant) broken down by HIV serostatus, by locality, and most importantly by degree of gay community attachment, gay community attached (GCA) versus non-gay community attached (NGCA). In 2000, these gay community attachment binary categories were derived from the total scale score for Community Attachment (or Social Engagement as it is sometimes referred to) that, itself, was calculated from the sum of the scores on the two items measuring the amount of free time spent with gay men and number of gay friends (see questions 33 and 34, Appendix). Scores on the scale range from 0 to 6, with a score of 2 or greater used as the indicator of gay community attachment. In 1992 and 1996 this scale was calculated with the addition of variables that measured where the respondent went with gay male friends (gay bars, discos, parties, pool/beach, meetings/organisations). This latter information was not asked of respondents in 2000 and its omission has made very little difference to the scale score. For example, there is a strong correlation between the previously calculated measure (including social places) and the newly calculated measure (omitting social places),  $r_{(n=5618)} = 0.86$ ,  $p < 0.01$ .

The data are presented mainly as counts and frequencies. For these mostly categorical variables,  $\chi^2$  tests of association were used to examine statistical significances. F- and t-tests were used to determine statistical significances among scale means.

As with other large datasets, analysis of the 2000 Male Out Survey data will continue and new findings may necessitate some reinterpretation of those reported here.

## **SCALES**

The *Attitudes toward Condoms* scale was formed, as in previous years, from three items (see Question 39, Appendix): I can't be bothered using condoms all the time because they are a nuisance; Condoms reduce sensitivity; Condoms can be fun and erotic. Items were coded so that high scores on the scale indicate a positive attitude to condoms. Scores on this scale range from 3 to 12. Coefficient alpha in the Male Call 96 sample was .52 and in 2000 was .66.

The *HIV Optimism* scale was based on three items (see Question 48, Appendix) from a larger 12-item scale (Van de Ven et al., 2000a) which forms the basis of the International Collaboration on HIV Optimism with research partners in Australia, Canada, England, France, the Netherlands and Scotland. Items were coded so that high scores on the scale reflect a greater degree of optimism in light of the changed HIV therapeutic environment which began around 1996. Scores on this scale range from 4 to 12. Coefficient alpha in this sample was .85.

# Demographic variables

## AGE

The men were aged between 16 and 82 (median = 38 years). As shown in Table 1, there were fewer men in the 20–24 and 25–29 age bands, and more in the 40–49 and > 50 age bands, than in previous surveys.

**Table 1 : Age bands**

	1992		1996		2000	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
< 18	1	0.2	2	0.3	7	0.4
18 – 19	2	0.4	9	1.5	27	1.5
20 – 24	55	10.3	75	12.8	102	5.6
25 – 29	89	16.7	84	14.3	188	10.3
30 – 39	167	31.3	196	33.3	565	30.8
40 – 49	126	23.6	118	20.1	460	25.1
> 50	92	17.2	104	17.7	415	22.7
NR	2	0.4	–	–	68	3.7
TOTAL	534	100	588	100	1832	100

$p < .001$

NR = No response (Note: Non response was greater in 2000 than in previous years, as was expected with a self-complete questionnaire rather than a telephone interview.)

## COUNTRY OF BIRTH

As shown in Table 2, and consistent with previous surveys, most of the men were born in Australia or New Zealand. The 2000 Male Out Survey recruited a smaller proportion of men born in the UK or Ireland and a greater proportion of men born in an Asian country, reflecting general population trends.

**Table 2 : Country of birth**

	1992		1996		2000	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Australia / NZ						
Non-indigenous	445	83.3	488	83.0	1497	81.7
Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander	5	0.9	13	2.2	25	1.4
USA / Canada	9	1.7	6	1.0	33	1.8
UK / Ireland	44	8.2	50	8.5	99	5.4
Other Europe	16	3.0	15	2.6	45	2.5
Asia	6	1.1	4	0.7	43	2.3
Central or Sth. America	4	0.7	2	0.3	7	0.4
Africa	4	0.7	4	0.7	14	0.8
Oceania	1	0.2	6	1.0	–	–
NR	–	–	–	–	69	3.8
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>534</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>588</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1832</b>	<b>100</b>

$p < .001$

NR = No response

## EDUCATION

As in other surveys of homosexually active men, there was an over-representation of men with post-secondary qualifications (see Table 3). This was more marked in 2000 than in previous years.

**Table 3 : Education level**

	1992		1996		2000	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Primary only	8	1.5	8	1.4	29	1.6
Intermediate	66	12.4	43	7.3	150	8.2
School Certificate	97	18.2	118	20.1	313	17.1
HSC or equivalent	140	26.2	151	25.7	338	18.4
Diploma / Trade	92	17.2	123	20.9	344	18.8
Tertiary	130	24.3	143	24.3	649	35.4
NR	1	0.2	2	0.3	9	0.5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>534</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>588</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1832</b>	<b>100</b>

$p < .001$

NR = No response

## LABOUR FORCE STATUS

As shown in Table 4, the majority of the men were in some form of full-time employment, although less so in 2000 than in previous years. Part-time employment has remained fairly steady. Unemployed status has declined over the years whereas receipt of other social security benefits has gradually increased.

**Table 4 : Labour force status**

	1992		1996		2000	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Wage-salary / Self-employed / Employer</b>						
Full-time employment	373	69.9	389	66.2	1114	60.8
Part-time employment	51	9.6	66	11.2	202	11.0
Unemployed	52	9.7	49	8.3	78	4.3
Student	13	2.4	27	4.6	58	3.2
Social security	29	5.4	49	8.3	195	10.6
Other / NR	16	3.0	8	1.4	185	10.1
TOTAL	534	100	588	100	1832	100
<i>p</i> < .001						

NR = No response

## OCCUPATION

As in previous surveys of homosexually active men, there was an over-representation of men in managerial and professional roles (see Table 5). The 2000 survey attracted a smaller proportion of tradesmen and labourers and a greater proportion of men in clerical and sales/service positions than previous surveys.

**Table 5 : Occupation**

	1992		1996		2000	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Manager	66	12.4	45	7.7	214	11.7
Professional	131	24.5	134	22.8	440	24.0
Paraprofessional	34	6.4	35	6.0	99	5.4
Trade	39	7.3	61	10.4	40	2.2
Clerical	46	8.6	51	8.7	214	11.7
Sales / service	59	11.0	73	12.4	363	19.8
Machinist	24	4.5	18	3.1	64	3.5
Labourer	42	7.9	47	8.0	61	3.3
NA / NR	93	17.4	124	21.1	337	18.4
TOTAL	534	100	588	100	1832	100
<i>p</i> < .001						

NA = Not Applicable, NR = No response

## STATE

As anticipated, the 2000 survey recruited men roughly in proportion to the overall size of the population of the States (see Table 6). The recruitment strategy utilising questionnaires sent out with pornographic video catalogues is effective at attracting participants from the States with a smaller population base. Whereas the small numbers preclude detailed

analyses on a State-by-State basis, it is important that men from all parts of Australia are represented in this national snapshot.

**Table 6 : State of residence**

	1992		1996		2000	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
ACT	6	1.1	10	1.7	31	1.7
NSW	168	31.5	188	32.0	526	28.7
VIC	137	25.7	147	25.0	493	26.9
QLD	114	21.3	132	22.4	359	19.6
WA	32	6.0	39	6.6	184	10.0
SA	52	9.7	44	7.5	163	8.9
TAS	17	3.2	10	1.7	46	2.5
NT	1	0.2	6	1.0	22	1.2
NR	7	1.3	12	2.0	8	0.4
TOTAL	534	100	588	100	1832	100
<i>p</i> < .01						

NR = No response

## AREA OF RESIDENCE

Table 7 presents data based on Question 60 (see Appendix) which was not included in previous surveys. Consistent with Australia's urbanised population, and gay and homosexually active men's tendency to migrate to urban areas, most of the participants lived in capital or major cities.

**Table 7 : Area of residence**

	2000	
	n	%
Capital city	1144	62.4
Major regional centre	328	17.9
Smaller city / town	251	13.7
Rural / remote area	100	5.5
NR	9	0.5
TOTAL	1832	100

NR = No response

## LIVING SITUATION

The most common living arrangement remained for the men to live alone (see Table 8). Other categories were reasonably consistent over time with the exception of living with a female sexual partner (much smaller proportion in 2000) and living with a male sexual partner (much greater proportion in 2000). These differences are largely reflective of the more strongly gay-identified sample recruited in 2000 (as discussed below).

**Table 8 : Living situation**

	1992		1996		2000	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Alone	202	37.8	233	39.6	719	39.2
Female sexual partner	94	17.6	121	20.6	148	8.1
Male sexual partner	107	20.0	97	16.5	555	30.3
Parents / relatives	47	8.8	41	7.0	130	7.1
Friends (incl. sex ptrnr)	12	2.2	15	2.6	76	4.1
Friends (excl. sex ptrnr)	61	11.4	64	10.9	180	9.8
Other	11	2.1	17	2.9	15	0.8
NR	–	–	–	–	9	0.5
TOTAL	534	100	588	100	1832	100

$p < .001$

NR = No response

# Milieu variables

## SEXUAL IDENTITY

There were significant differences in terms of the sexual identification of the men in the samples over time, and it will be important to take these variations into account in interpreting the findings. As shown in Table 9, a smaller proportion of the men in the 2000 sample identified as heterosexual or bisexual, and a correspondingly greater proportion identified as gay.

Separate analyses revealed, in line with expectations, an association between sexual identity and gay community attachment. GCA men identified more strongly as gay or homosexual than their NGCA counterparts.

**Table 9 : Sexual identity**

	1992		1996		2000	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Straight / Heterosexual	27	5.1	32	5.4	45	2.5
Bisexual	160	30.0	242	41.2	357	19.5
Gay	214	40.1	207	35.2	1022	55.8
Homosexual	108	20.2	76	12.9	343	18.7
Other	25	4.7	31	5.3	43	2.3
NR	–	–	–	–	22	1.2
TOTAL	534	100	588	100	1832	100

$p < .01$

NR = No response

## GAY IDENTITY DISCLOSURE

As in previous years, relatively few men had told no-one that they were sexually attracted to men (see Table 10). Most commonly, the men had disclosed to gay friends, straight friends and workmates. As always, mothers were a more suitable person for disclosure than fathers, yet fully half these men's mothers and nearly two-thirds of their fathers had *not* been told.

The relatively greater degree of disclosure in 2000 than in previous years was attributable to the greater proportion of gay identified men in the latest survey. Separate analyses revealed, not unexpectedly, an association between gay identity disclosure and gay community attachment. In 2000, for example, less than four per cent of GCA men had

told no one of their sexual attraction to men compared to almost 23 per cent of their NGCA counterparts.

**Table 10 : Gay identity disclosure**

Who has been told <sup>a</sup>	1992 (n=534)		1996 (n=588)		2000 (n=1832)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
No-one	75	14.0	82	13.9	186	10.2
Mother	174	32.6	184	31.3	903	49.3
Father	134	25.1	139	23.6	712	38.9
Children	35	6.6	36	6.1	113	6.2
Female ptnr / ex-ptnr	188	35.2	239	40.6	380	20.7
Other relatives	241	45.1	237	40.3	924	50.4
Gay friends	400	74.9	440	74.8	1505	82.2
Straight friends	333	62.4	348	59.2	1259	68.7
Workmates	229	42.9	223	37.9	971	53.0
Neighbours	121	22.7	141	24.0	539	29.4
Other	68	12.7	101	17.2	471	25.7

<sup>a</sup> Categories are not mutually exclusive

## CONTACT WITH THE HIV EPIDEMIC

Both indicators of contact with the HIV epidemic—knowing people with HIV/AIDS *and* having personally known people who died following AIDS—show a significant increase in 2000 over the previous surveys (see Table 11). Again, this is largely attributable to the greater proportion of gay identified and gay community attached men in the latest sample. (Separate analyses revealed that GCA men were more likely to know people with HIV/AIDS, *and* to have personally known people who died following AIDS, than their NGCA counterparts.) Interestingly, however, a fairly large percentage of the men know no HIV positive people and have never personally known anyone who died from AIDS providing evidence that for a sizeable proportion of the homosexually active male population the HIV epidemic has not been as closely experienced as it has been for others.

**Table 11 : Contact with the HIV epidemic**

	1992		1996		2000	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Knows how many people with HIV/AIDS</b>						
None	245	45.9	281	47.8	663	36.2
One	203	38.0	225	38.3	204	11.1
Two or more	82	15.4	68	11.6	905	49.4
NR	4	0.7	14	2.4	60	3.3
TOTAL	534	100	588	100	1832	100
<i>p</i> < .001						
<b>Knows anyone who has died from AIDS</b>						
Yes	268	50.2	279	47.4	982	53.6
No	266	49.8	298	50.7	794	43.3
NR	–	–	11	1.8	56	3.1
TOTAL	534	100	588	100	1832	100
<i>p</i> < .001						

NR = No response

## SOCIAL ENGAGEMENT WITH GAY COMMUNITY

Commensurate with the greater degree of gay identification in 2000 compared with previous years, there was an upturn in two indicators of social engagement in gay community. As shown in Table 12, the participants in 2000 were more likely to have spent 'some'/'a lot' of free time with gay men than their counterparts in previous surveys. Correspondingly, and on the whole, the men recruited in 2000 tended to have more gay friends than the men recruited in previous years.

**Table 12 : Social engagement with gay community**

	1992		1996		2000	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Free time spent with gay men</b>						
None	48	9.0	65	11.1	141	7.7
A little	195	36.5	226	38.4	429	23.4
Some	117	21.9	142	24.1	708	38.6
A lot	170	31.8	153	26.0	532	29.0
NR	4	0.7	2	0.3	22	1.2
TOTAL	534	100	588	100	1832	100
$p < .001$						
<b>Friends who are gay men</b>						
None	73	13.7	95	16.2	141	7.7
A few	177	33.1	190	32.3	521	28.4
Some	99	18.5	131	22.3	621	33.9
Most	167	31.3	146	24.8	494	27.0
All	9	1.7	16	2.7	32	1.7
NR	9	1.7	10	1.7	23	1.3
TOTAL	534	100	588	100	1832	100
$p < .001$						

NR = No response

## GAY COMMUNITY ATTACHMENT

For Project Male Call in 1992 and for Male Call 96, approximately half the men in the samples were classified as gay community attached (see Table 13). For the 2000 Male Out Survey there was a significant increase in the proportion of gay community attached men with almost two-thirds so classified. As discussed above, this would be largely attributable to the absence of competing recruitment strategies. In previous surveys some men in close proximity to gay communities would have been recruited through a range of strategies deployed in such communities *before* they may have come across the leaflets distributed with pornographic video catalogues. Nonetheless, the current survey attracted 651 non gay community attached men which greatly exceeded expectations. This finding, importantly, highlights the utility and cost effectiveness of the pornographic video catalogue recruitment strategy in reaching these otherwise hard-to-reach homosexually active men.

**Table 13 : Gay community attachment**

	1992		1996		2000	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Gay community attached (GCA)	288	53.9	305	51.9	1181	64.5
Non gay community attached (NGCA)	246	46.1	283	48.1	651	35.5
TOTAL	534	100	588	100	1832	100
$p < .001$						

## HIV STATUS

The men recruited in 2000 were significantly more likely to know their HIV status than those who participated in the previous years (see Table 14). Hence, a greater proportion reported being either HIV negative or HIV positive. In all, only 86 men reported positive HIV serostatus.

The proportion of men without HIV test results (22%) is approximately double that for men who participate in Gay Community Periodic Surveys conducted in the major capital cities of Australia (Van de Ven et al., 2000c).

**Table 14 : HIV status**

	1992		1996		2000	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
No test / No result / NR	143	26.8	170	28.9	403	22.0
HIV negative	379	71.0	400	68.0	1343	73.3
HIV positive	12	2.2	18	3.1	86	4.7
TOTAL	534	100	588	100	1832	100

$p < .001$

NR = No response

Knowledge of HIV status varied by degree of gay community attachment, as shown in Table 15. Non gay community attached men were approximately twice as likely as their gay community attached counterparts to be without HIV test results.

Among the gay community attached men there were no significant differences in HIV status over time. Among the non gay community attached men there was a trend over the years toward a smaller proportion without HIV test results.

Of the 86 HIV positive participants in the 2000 Male Out Survey, 75 were gay community attached men and 11 were non gay community attached men.

**Table 15 : HIV status by gay community attachment**

	GCA <sup>1</sup>			NGCA <sup>2</sup>		
	1992 n=288 %	1996 n=305 %	2000 n=1181 %	1992 n=246 %	1996 n=283 %	2000 n=651 %
No test / No result / NR	14.2	17.0	15.4	41.5	41.7	33.9
HIV negative	81.9	77.4	78.2	58.1	58.0	64.4
HIV positive	3.8	5.6	6.4	0.4	0.4	1.7
TOTAL	100	100	100	100	100	100

NR = No response

<sup>1</sup> ns, <sup>2</sup>  $p < .05$

Having HIV test results is a factor of age (see Table 16). In 2000, as in 1996, younger (<25 years) and older (50+ years) men were less likely to have HIV results than men aged between 25 and 49 years.

Also shown in Table 16, younger (<25 years) and older (50+ years) men were significantly less likely in 2000 to have HIV test results than in previous years. The reverse trend applied to men in the 30–39 and 40–49 age brackets, with these men significantly more likely to have HIV results at this time.

**Table 16 : Men without HIV test results by age category**

	1992		1996		2000		Trend p
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
<25	12	21.8	29	33.7	54	40.3	.02
25 – 29	19	21.8	20	24.4	41	22.8	.92
30 – 39	46	27.9	53	28.5	83	15.6	.00
40 – 49	32	26.2	28	25.2	78	17.8	.02
50 +	36	60.0	69	68.3	293	73.3	.01

Note: HIV positive men excluded.

## REGENCY OF HIV TESTING

As noted above—and shown in Table 17—a smaller proportion of the non HIV positive participants in 2000 were without HIV test results. Nonetheless, there was a marked downward trend in recency of HIV testing. For example, the proportion of men who had had an HIV test in the last year declined from approximately 56% in 1992, to approximately 51% in 1996, to approximately 45% in 2000.

**Table 17 : Time of most recent HIV test**

	1992		1996		2000	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
< 1 week	10	1.9	2	0.4	24	1.4
1 – 4 weeks	36	6.9	28	4.9	81	4.6
1 – 6 months	179	34.3	190	33.3	413	23.7
7 – 12 months	66	12.6	72	12.6	260	14.9
1 – 2 years	49	9.4	57	10.0	253	14.5
2 – 4 years	29	5.6	27	4.7	162	9.3
> 4 years	13	2.5	28	4.9	163	9.3
NR / Not tested	140	26.8	166	29.1	390	22.3
TOTAL	522	100	570	100	1746	100
p < .001						

Note: HIV positive men excluded. NR = No response

Although gay community attached men were more likely as a group to have HIV test results, the significant downward trend in recency of HIV testing applied to gay community

attached and non gay community attached men alike (see Table 18). Among gay community attached men, the proportion who had had an HIV test in the last year declined from approximately 66% in 1992, to approximately 64% in 1996, to approximately 51% in 2000. Among non gay community attached men, the proportion who had had an HIV test in the last year declined from approximately 44% in 1992, to approximately 38% in 1996, to approximately 34% in 2000.

**Table 18 : Time of most recent HIV test by gay community attachment**

	GCA <sup>1</sup>			NGCA <sup>2</sup>		
	1992 n=277 %	1996 n=288 %	2000 n=1106 %	1992 n=245 %	1996 n=282 %	2000 n=640 %
< 1 week	3.2	0.3	1.6	0.4	0.4	0.9
1 – 4 weeks	6.9	8.0	5.1	6.9	1.8	3.9
1 – 6 months	40.8	40.6	27.3	26.9	25.9	17.3
7 – 12 months	15.5	14.9	16.8	9.4	10.3	11.6
1 – 2 years	10.5	9.4	14.9	8.2	10.6	13.8
2 – 4 years	6.9	5.2	10.0	4.1	4.3	8.0
> 4 years	2.2	4.2	8.6	2.9	5.7	10.6
NR/ Not tested	14.1	17.4	15.6	41.2	41.1	33.9
TOTAL	100	100	100	100	100	100

Note: HIV positive men excluded. NR = No response

<sup>1</sup>  $p < .001$ , <sup>2</sup>  $p < .001$

# Sexual relationships and sexual practices

## NUMBER OF SEXUAL PARTNERS

Most commonly, the men had between two and 10 male sexual partners in the six months prior to the 2000 Male Out Survey, consistent with previous years (see Table 19). In 2000, a smaller proportion of the men had a single partner and a greater proportion than in previous surveys were at the extremities with no male sexual partners or with more than 50. (Note: There were slight changes in 2000 to the wording of the items on which this finding was based which may have attributed somewhat to this difference.)

Reflective of the greater degree of gay identification and gay community attachment in 2000, a much larger proportion of the men recruited in 2000 had no female sexual partners (over 80 per cent).

**Table 19 : Number of male and female sexual partners in previous six months**

	1992		1996		2000	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Male partners</b>						
None	35	6.6	37	6.3	224	12.2
1	170	31.8	156	26.5	361	19.7
2 – 10	225	42.1	281	47.8	820	44.8
11 – 50	91	17.0	103	17.5	334	18.2
> 50	13	2.4	11	1.9	69	3.8
NR	–	–	–	–	24	1.3
TOTAL	534	100	588	100	1832	100
<i>p</i> < .001						
<b>Female partners</b>						
None	345	64.6	326	55.4	1469	80.2
1	90	16.9	122	20.7	144	7.9
2 – 10	57	10.7	80	13.6	174	9.5
> 10	41	7.7	59	10.0	25	1.4
NR	1	0.2	1	0.2	20	1.1
TOTAL	534	100	588	100	1832	100
<i>p</i> < .001						

NR = No response

There were changes over time in number of male sexual partners in the previous six months for both gay community attached and non gay community attached men (see Table 20). For both groups, a greater proportion of the 2000 participants had no male partners compared with previous surveys. Not unexpectedly, and consistent with the earlier data,

gay community attached men were more likely to have male sexual partners per se and more likely to have a greater number of partners.

**Table 20 : Number of male sexual partners in previous six months by gay community attachment**

	GCA <sup>1</sup>			NGCA <sup>2</sup>		
	1992 n=288 %	1996 n=305 %	2000 n=1181 %	1992 n=246 %	1996 n=283 %	2000 n=651 %
None	3.5	3.0	10.3	10.2	9.9	15.7
1	26.0	20.3	19.2	38.6	33.2	20.6
2 – 10	42.4	46.9	42.8	41.9	48.8	48.4
11 – 50	24.7	26.2	22.0	8.1	8.1	11.4
> 50	3.5	3.6	5.2	1.2	0.0	1.1
NR	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	2.9
TOTAL	100	100	100	100	100	100

NR = No response

<sup>1</sup>  $p < .001$ , <sup>2</sup>  $p < .001$

As shown in Table 21, there were significant changes over time in number of female sexual partners in the previous six months for both gay community attached and non gay community attached men. The trend among both categories of men in the 2000 Male Out Survey was toward no female sexual partners at all, although non gay community attached men were much more likely to have had any female sexual partners in the previous six months. Interestingly, the sharp drop in the proportion of men with greater than 10 female partners was applicable to gay community attached men and non gay community attached men alike.

Further findings about sex with female partners are presented at the end of this section (see Tables 27–29).

**Table 21 : Number of female partners in previous six months by gay community attachment**

	GCA <sup>1</sup>			NGCA <sup>2</sup>		
	1992 n=288 %	1996 n=305 %	2000 n=1181 %	1992 n=246 %	1996 n=283 %	2000 n=651 %
None	85.4	75.4	88.0	40.2	33.9	66.1
1	6.9	7.5	4.6	28.5	35.0	13.8
2 – 10	4.9	10.8	5.9	17.5	16.6	16.0
> 10	2.8	6.2	1.3	13.4	14.1	1.5
NR	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.4	0.4	2.6
TOTAL	100	100	100	100	100	100

NR = No response

<sup>1</sup>  $p < .001$ , <sup>2</sup>  $p < .001$

## SEXUAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH MEN

As shown in Table 22, there were significant changes over time in the men's 'current' sexual relationships with men. The most notable change was in the smaller proportion of men in the 2000 Male Out Survey having casual sex only at the time of the survey. The switch was towards a larger proportion of men who had a regular partner plus casual sex.

**Table 22 : Current sexual relationships with men**

Type of relationship	1992		1996		2000	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
None	57	10.7	84	14.3	191	10.5
Monogamous	119	22.3	102	17.3	456	25.0
Regular plus casual	88	16.5	116	19.7	542	29.7
Several regular	22	4.1	18	3.1	106	5.8
Casual sex only	248	46.4	268	45.6	528	29.0
TOTAL	534	100	588	100	1823*	100

$p < .001$

\* Missing data (n=9)

The change in relationship patterns—from casual sex only, to regular partner plus casual sex—applied to both gay community attached and non gay community attached men, although gay community attached men remained much more likely to be in a 'regular plus casual' relationship than their non gay community attached counterparts (see Table 23). Of note, non gay community attached men were three times as likely as gay community attached men to report no sexual relationships with men at the time of the 2000 survey.

**Table 23 : Current sexual relationships with men by gay community attachment**

	GCA <sup>1</sup>			NGCA <sup>2</sup>		
	1992 n=288 %	1996 n=305 %	2000 n=1173* %	1992 n=246 %	1996 n=283 %	2000 n=650** %
None	6.9	9.8	6.0	15.0	19.1	18.6
Monogamous	25.0	19.0	25.7	19.1	15.5	23.8
Regular plus casual	21.9	27.5	34.5	10.2	11.3	21.1
Several regular	4.5	4.3	6.8	3.7	1.8	4.0
Casual sex only	41.7	39.3	27.0	52.0	52.3	32.5
TOTAL	100	100	100	100	100	100

\* Missing data (n=8) \*\* Missing data (n=1)

<sup>1</sup>  $p < .001$ , <sup>2</sup>  $p < .001$

## SEXUAL PRACTICES

Table 24 shows trends for a range of oral and anal sexual practices with regular partners. Oral-genital sex with ejaculation became more commonly practised, particularly among gay community attached men. Insertive and receptive anal intercourse, including the practice of withdrawal prior to ejaculation, also became more widely practised regardless of degree of gay community attachment. These trends should be examined in light of the greater proportion of gay identified men in the 2000 sample, although it is clear that many of the upward tendencies were evident in 1996.

**Table 24 : Sexual practices with regular partners 'in the previous six months' by gay community attachment: includes only those men with regular partners**

	GCA (N=1211 – 1225) <sup>a</sup>			NGCA (N=590 – 597) <sup>a</sup>		
	1992 n=149 <sup>a</sup> %	1996 n=184 <sup>a</sup> %	2000 n=893 <sup>a</sup> %	1992 n=81 %	1996 n=107 <sup>a</sup> %	2000 n=409 <sup>a</sup> %
Insertive oral-genital, no ejaculation	89.3	90.2	87.1	84.0	85.0	82.4
Receptive oral-genital, no ejaculation	90.6	93.4	87.8	86.4	85.0	87.6
Insertive oral-genital, with ejaculation	<b>43.6</b>	<b>60.1</b>	<b>63.0</b>	49.4	63.6	60.9
Receptive oral-genital, with ejaculation	<b>49.0</b>	<b>55.2</b>	<b>67.1</b>	<b>37.0</b>	<b>46.7</b>	<b>63.3</b>
Insertive anal intercourse	<b>57.7</b>	<b>68.5</b>	<b>72.3</b>	54.3	63.6	66.8
Receptive anal intercourse	<b>53.0</b>	<b>66.3</b>	<b>72.2</b>	53.1	64.5	66.3
Insertive anal, withdrawal	<b>24.2</b>	<b>21.7</b>	<b>37.8</b>	21.0	18.7	32.3
Receptive anal, withdrawal	<b>20.1</b>	<b>24.5</b>	<b>36.9</b>	19.8	15.1	33.3

Note: Sexual practice categories are not mutually exclusive

<sup>a</sup> Fluctuations in *N* due to missing data

Percentages in **bold** indicate that between 1992, 1996 and 2000 there was a significant trend  $p < 0.001$

Percentages in *italics* indicate that between 1992, 1996 and 2000 there was a significant trend  $p < 0.05$

Interestingly, similar trends in oral and anal sexual practices were documented for casual partners (see Table 25). Oral-genital sex with ejaculation was more commonly reported, particularly among gay community attached men. Insertive and receptive anal intercourse, including the practice of withdrawal prior to ejaculation, also became more prevalent among both gay and non gay community attached men. Again, these trends should be considered in light of the larger proportion of gay identified men in the 2000 sample, although it is clear that many of the upward tendencies were evident in 1996.

**Table 25 : Sexual practices with casual partners 'in the previous six months' by gay community attachment: includes only those men with casual partners**

	GCA (N=1236 – 1253) <sup>a</sup>			NGCA (N=756 – 762) <sup>a</sup>		
	1992 n =199 <sup>a</sup>	1996 n=227 <sup>a</sup>	2000 n=838 <sup>a</sup>	1992 n=152 <sup>a</sup>	1996 n=189 <sup>a</sup>	2000 n=422 <sup>a</sup>
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Insertive oral-genital, no ejaculation	88.9	88.4	90.0	79.5	82.5	84.9
Receptive oral-genital, no ejaculation	90.9	89.4	89.0	82.8	83.6	83.3
Insertive oral-genital, with ejaculation	<b>36.4</b>	<b>55.1</b>	<b>56.6</b>	47.7	54.5	56.6
Receptive oral-genital, with ejaculation	<b>27.8</b>	<b>39.1</b>	<b>49.5</b>	<b>27.2</b>	<b>34.4</b>	<b>48.3</b>
Insertive anal intercourse	<b>40.7</b>	<b>59.5</b>	<b>70.1</b>	<b>46.7</b>	<b>42.9</b>	<b>61.3</b>
Receptive anal intercourse	<b>36.2</b>	<b>58.1</b>	<b>62.0</b>	<b>40.8</b>	<b>47.6</b>	<b>59.9</b>
Insertive anal, withdrawal	<b>13.1</b>	<b>10.6</b>	<b>24.5</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>10.6</b>	<b>22.6</b>
Receptive anal, withdrawal	<b>7.0</b>	<b>9.7</b>	<b>22.2</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>10.1</b>	<b>19.8</b>

Note: Sexual practice categories are not mutually exclusive

<sup>a</sup> Fluctuations in N due to missing data

Percentages in **bold** indicate that between 1992, 1996 and 2000 there was a significant trend  $p < 0.001$ .

Question 28 in the 2000 Male Out questionnaire (see Appendix) asked about a limited range of 'esoteric' sexual practices with regular or casual male partners. The resultant frequency data (see Table 26) were compared with those from previous surveys, where available.

Rimming was more frequently reported, particularly since 1992 ( $p < .001$ ), and likewise fisting ( $p < .001$ ). Comparing the 2000 with the 1996 data, a larger proportion of men practised SM or B&D ( $p < .01$ ). No doubt some of these changes were due to differences in the samples, especially the larger proportion of gay identified men in the 2000 sample.

There were no significant changes over time in group sex, that which involved men only or otherwise.

**Table 26 : Sexual practices ('occasionally' or 'often') with regular or casual male partners in past six months**

	1992 (n=498)		1996 (n=549)		2000 (n=1753)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Rimming	281	56.4	362	65.9	1164	66.4
Fisting	33	6.6	70	12.8	309	18.4
SM or B&D*	–	–	86	15.7	348	20.9
Group sex (men only)*	–	–	209	38.1	717	42.2
Other group sex*	–	–	89	16.4	239	15.0

Note: Categories are not mutually exclusive

\* Questions about these practices were not asked of respondents in Project Male Call in 1992.

## SEX WITH FEMALE PARTNERS

Unlike Project Male Call in 1992 and Male Call 96, the 2000 Male Out Survey could include only a limited number of questions about sex with female partners (see Questions 35–38, Appendix). There were minor inconsistencies in the men’s responses to these questions resulting in slight discrepancies in *n* in the following tables.

As noted previously, most of the men recruited in 2000—a significantly greater proportion than in previous years—had had no sex with women in the six months prior to the survey (see Table 27). Of those who had in 2000, they were distributed fairly evenly among the three categories of female partnerships: regular only; casual only; regular plus casual. This was a departure from the previous surveys where ‘regular female partner only’ was much more common than other arrangements. This change was largely attributable to the greater proportion of gay community attached men in the 2000 sample, as evidenced by the separate finding that GCA men are much less likely to have regular female partners only (approximately three per cent) than NGCA men (approximately 13 per cent). Moreover, GCA men are much more likely to have no female sexual partners (approximately 88%) than their NGCA counterparts (approximately 68%).

**Table 27 : Female sexual partners in the previous six months**

	1992		1996		2000	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
No sex with women / NR	360	67.4	340	57.8	1486	81.1
Sex with <i>regular</i> female partner but no casual female sex	83	15.5	104	17.7	121	6.6
Sex with <i>casual</i> female partner(s) but no sex with regular female partners	44	8.2	62	10.5	105	5.7
Sex with <i>regular and casual</i> female partners	47	8.8	82	13.9	120	6.6
TOTAL	534	100	588	100	1832	100
<i>p</i> < .001						

## CONDOM USE WITH FEMALE PARTNERS

As in previous years, the men who had female partners were more likely to ‘never’ use condoms with regular than with casual female partners (see Table 28). However, over time there was a significant upward trend the men’s reporting of ‘sometimes’/‘always’ having used a condom with regular female partners. With casual female partners there was a significant trend in the opposite direction.

**Table 28 : Condom use with female partners in the six previous months**

	1992		1996		2000	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Regular partners</b>						
Never use condom with regular female partner	95	73.1	113	61.1	161	58.3
Sometimes / always use condom with regular female partner	35	26.9	72	38.9	115	41.7
TOTAL*	130	100	185	100	276	100
<i>p</i> < .01						
<b>Casual partners</b>						
Never use condom with casual female partner	20	22.0	25	17.4	79	32.6
Sometimes / always use condom with casual female partner	71	78.0	119	82.6	163	67.4
TOTAL*	91	100	144	100	242	100
<i>p</i> < .01						

\* Based on those men who had sex with female partners in the past 6 months and who also responded to Question 37.

## ANAL INTERCOURSE WITH WOMEN

As shown in Table 29, there was a significant upward trend in the practice of anal intercourse with women, such that of the men who had female partners almost 58 per cent engaged in some anal intercourse with women. This finding cannot be attributed solely to the nature of the 2000 sample as the trend was an extension of a 'cultural' shift first noticed in 1996.

**Table 29 : Anal intercourse with women**

	1992		1996		2000	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
No anal intercourse	118	67.4	126	51.2	148	42.3
Some anal intercourse	57	32.6	120	48.8	202	57.7
TOTAL*	175	100	246	100	350	100
<i>p</i> < .001						

\* Based only on men who responded to Question 38.

# Condom use

## TYPES OF MALE SEXUAL PARTNERS

As shown in Table 30, approximately 70 per cent of the men in the 2000 Male Out Survey reported sexual contact with regular male partners and approximately 70 per cent reported sexual contact with casual male partners, in the six months prior to the survey. There was a significant upward trend with respect to regular partners and a slight downward trend for casual partners. Caution needs to be exercised in interpreting these trends as some of the differences are no doubt due to variations in the samples, especially the larger proportion of gay identified men in the 2000 sample.

**Table 30 : Types of male sexual partners in the six months prior to the survey**

	1992 (n=534)		1996 (n=588)		2000 (n=1832)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Any sexual contact with <i>regular</i> partners <sup>1</sup>	232	43.4	297	50.5	1312	71.6
Any sexual contact with <i>casual</i> partners <sup>2</sup>	384	71.9	457	77.7	1277	69.7

Note: These categories are not mutually exclusive

<sup>1</sup>  $p < .001$ , <sup>2</sup>  $p < .05$

## REGULAR PARTNERS

In the overall sample, there was a significant change in sex with regular partners (see Table 31). A smaller proportion of the 2000 participants had no regular partners and a larger proportion had any unprotected anal intercourse with regular partners in the six months prior to the survey. The proportionate increase in any unprotected anal intercourse with regular partners remains if the trends are examined only among the men who had regular partners (see lower half of Table 31).

**Table 31 : Anal intercourse with regular partners**

	1992		1996		2000	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Total sample</b>						
No regular partners	302	56.6	291	49.5	520	28.4
No anal intercourse	53	9.9	38	6.5	152	8.3
Always protected	64	12.0	114	19.4	310	16.9
Any unprotected	115	21.5	145	24.7	850	46.4
TOTAL	534	100	588	100	1832	100
<i>p</i> < .001						
<b>Men who had regular partners</b>						
No anal intercourse	53	22.8	38	12.8	152	11.6
Always protected	64	27.6	114	38.4	310	23.6
Any unprotected	115	49.6	145	48.8	850	64.8
TOTAL	232	100	297	100	1312	100
<i>p</i> < .001						

The increase in the proportion of men who reported any unprotected anal intercourse with regular partners applied to gay community attached and non gay community attached men alike (see Table 32). Whereas gay community attached men were more likely than their non gay community attached counterparts to have had regular partners and more likely to have had any unprotected anal intercourse with regular partners, both groups were more likely to have had any unprotected anal intercourse in 2000 than in previous years. Moreover, these upward trends remained when the analyses were based only on those men who had regular partners (see lower half of Table 32).

**Table 32 : Anal intercourse with regular partners by gay community attachment**

	1992		1996		2000	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>GCA</b>						
<b>Total sample<sup>1</sup></b>						
No regular partners	137	47.6	118	38.7	283	24.0
No anal intercourse	33	11.5	20	6.6	89	7.5
Always protected	40	13.9	68	22.3	222	18.8
Any unprotected	78	27.1	99	32.5	587	49.7
TOTAL	288	100	305	100	1181	100
<b>Men who had regular partners<sup>2</sup></b>						
No anal intercourse	33	21.9	20	10.7	89	9.9
Always protected	40	26.5	68	36.4	222	24.7
Any unprotected	78	51.7	99	52.9	587	65.4
TOTAL	151	100	187	100	898	100
<b>NGCA</b>						
<b>Total sample<sup>3</sup></b>						
No regular partners	165	67.1	173	61.1	237	36.4
No anal intercourse	20	8.1	18	6.4	63	9.7
Always protected	24	9.8	46	16.3	88	13.5
Any unprotected	37	15.0	46	16.3	263	40.4
TOTAL	246	100	283	100	651	100
<b>Men who had regular partners<sup>4</sup></b>						
No anal intercourse	20	24.7	18	16.4	63	15.2
Always protected	24	29.6	46	41.8	88	21.3
Any unprotected	37	45.7	46	41.8	263	63.5
TOTAL	81	100	110	100	414	100

<sup>1,2,3,4</sup>  $p < .001$

Table 33 presents data on condom use with regular partners—among those men who had regular partners—stratified by HIV status. Among HIV negative men and those of unknown serostatus there was a significant upward trend in any instance of unprotected anal intercourse in the six months prior to each survey. There were too few HIV positive men in 1992/96 to determine statistically significant change over time.

**Table 33 : Anal intercourse with regular partners by HIV serostatus**

	1992		1996		2000	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>HIV negative<sup>1</sup></b>						
No anal	33	18.5	27	11.9	110	11.0
Always protected	48	27.0	81	35.8	234	23.5
Any unprotected	97	54.5	118	52.2	652	65.5
TOTAL	178	100	226	100	996	100
<b>HIV positive<sup>2</sup></b>						
No anal	–	–	–	–	4	6.1
Always protected	–	–	–	–	17	25.8
Any unprotected	–	–	–	–	45	68.2
TOTAL	6		12		66	100
<b>Unknown serostatus<sup>3</sup></b>						
No anal	20	41.7	9	15.3	38	15.2
Always protected	12	25.0	28	47.5	59	23.6
Any unprotected	16	33.3	22	37.3	153	61.2
TOTAL	48	100	59	100	250	100

<sup>1</sup> $p < .001$ , <sup>3</sup> $p < .001$

<sup>2</sup>Numbers for 1992/96 too small to determine trend.

## Regional differences

There were sufficient participants in the 2000 Male Out Survey to analyse possible differences among the larger States. Table 34 presents data on sexual practices with regular partners in the overall sample and in the reduced base of men with regular partners. As shown, there were no significant variations among the various areas.

**Table 34 : Anal intercourse with regular partners by State—2000 data**

	NSW		VIC		QLD		Other states	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Total sample<sup>1</sup></b>								
No regular partners	150	28.5	130	26.4	113	31.5	124	27.8
No anal	45	8.6	38	7.7	34	9.5	34	7.6
Always protected	94	17.9	97	19.7	45	12.5	74	16.6
Any unprotected	237	45.1	228	46.2	167	46.5	214	48.0
TOTAL	526	100	493	100	359	100	446	100
<b>Men who had regular partners<sup>2</sup></b>								
No anal	45	12.0	38	10.5	34	13.8	34	10.6
Always protected	94	25.0	97	26.7	45	18.3	74	23.0
Any unprotected	237	63.0	228	62.8	167	67.9	214	66.5
TOTAL	376	100	363	100	246	100	322	100

<sup>1,2</sup> ns

Table 35 presents data on sexual practices with regular partners in the overall sample and in the subset of men with regular partners, based on area of residence (see Question 60, Appendix). There was an overall trend: men living in a capital city were less likely to have engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with a regular partner than men living in a major regional centre who in turn were less likely to have engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with a regular partner than their counterparts living in smaller cities and towns or rural/remote areas.

**Table 35 : Anal intercourse with regular partners by area of residence—2000 data**

	Capital city		Major regional centre		Smaller city / town / rural / remote	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Total sample<sup>1</sup></b>						
No regular partners	318	27.8	97	29.6	101	28.8
No anal intercourse	103	9.0	29	8.8	19	5.4
Always protected	218	19.1	45	13.7	47	13.4
Any unprotected	505	44.1	157	47.9	184	52.4
TOTAL	1144	100	328	100	351	100
<b>Men who had regular partners<sup>2</sup></b>						
No anal intercourse	103	12.5	29	12.6	19	7.6
Always protected	218	26.4	45	19.5	47	18.8
Any unprotected	505	61.1	157	68.0	184	73.6
TOTAL	826	100	231	100	250	100

<sup>1,2</sup>  $p < .05$

## Agreements

Questions 44 and 45 (see Appendix) collected data on agreements between regular partners about sexual interactions within and outside the relationship. Over time, proportionately fewer couples had an agreement about sex within the relationship yet a greater proportion of couples agreed that anal intercourse within the relationship could be without a condom (see Table 36).

**Table 36 : Type of agreement with regular partner about anal sex *within the relationship***

	1992		1996		2000	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Men who had regular partners</b>						
No agreement	36	17.1	56	19.2	262	23.6
Agreement: No anal sex at all	32	15.2	27	9.2	84	7.6
Agreement: Always a condom	67	31.8	107	36.6	267	24.1
Agreement: Anal without condom	76	36.0	102	34.9	496	44.7
TOTAL	211	100	292	100	1109	100
$p < .001$						

1996 and 2000 data were available on agreements about sexual interactions with casual partners. The data over time were quite consistent with no statistically significant differences. Approximately one-third of couples had no agreement about casual interactions. Approximately a quarter of couples agreed not to have casual partners.

**Table 37 : Type of agreement with regular partner about sexual interactions with casual partners**

	1996		2000	
	n	%	n	%
<b>Men who had regular partners</b>				
No agreement	97	34.3	349	31.7
Agreement: No sex at all	76	26.9	293	26.6
Agreement: No anal sex at all	22	7.8	267	6.1
Agreement: All anal with condom	85	30.0	315	28.6
Agreement: Anal without condom	3	1.1	77	7.0
TOTAL	292	100	1109	100
<i>ns</i>				

## CASUAL PARTNERS

In the overall sample, there was a significant change in sex with casual partners. Although there were fluctuations among the mutually exclusive categories shown in Table 38, a greater proportion of the 2000 sample reported any unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners in the six months prior to the survey. This significant change was even more pronounced in the reduced base of men with casual partners (see lower portion of Table 38). The clear trend was away from 'no anal intercourse' to 'any unprotected anal intercourse'.

**Table 38 : Anal intercourse with casual partners**

	1992		1996		2000	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Total sample<sup>1</sup></b>						
No casual partners	150	28.1	131	22.3	555	30.3
No anal intercourse	158	29.6	135	23.0	267	14.6
Always protected	160	30.0	227	38.6	542	29.6
Any unprotected	66	12.4	95	16.2	468	25.5
TOTAL	534	100	588	100	1832	100
<b>Men who had casual partners<sup>2</sup></b>						
No anal intercourse	158	41.1	135	29.5	267	20.9
Always protected	160	41.7	227	49.7	542	42.4
Any unprotected	66	17.2	95	20.8	468	36.6
TOTAL	384	100	457	100	1277	100

<sup>1,2</sup>  $p < .001$

The increase in the proportion of men who reported any unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners applied equally to gay community attached and non gay community attached men (see Table 39). These trends are a continuation of these first documented in Male Call 96 (Crawford et al., 1998).

**Table 39 : Anal intercourse with casual partners by gay community attachment**

	1992		1996		2000	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>GCA</b>						
<b>Total sample<sup>1</sup></b>						
No casual partners	77	26.7	62	20.3	334	28.3
No anal intercourse	79	27.4	62	20.3	168	14.2
Always protected	94	32.6	136	44.6	376	31.8
Any unprotected	38	13.2	45	14.8	303	25.7
TOTAL	288	100	305	100	1181	100
<b>Men who had casual partners<sup>2</sup></b>						
No anal intercourse	79	37.4	62	25.5	168	19.8
Always protected	94	44.5	136	56.0	376	44.4
Any unprotected	38	18.0	45	18.5	303	35.8
TOTAL	211	100	243	100	847	100
<b>NGCA</b>						
<b>Total sample<sup>3</sup></b>						
No casual partners	73	29.7	69	24.4	221	33.9
No anal intercourse	79	32.1	73	25.8	99	15.2
Always protected	66	26.8	91	32.2	166	25.5
Any unprotected	28	11.4	50	17.7	165	25.3
TOTAL	246	100	283	100	651	100
<b>Men who had casual partners<sup>4</sup></b>						
No anal intercourse	79	45.7	73	34.1	99	23.0
Always protected	66	38.2	91	42.5	166	38.6
Any unprotected	28	16.2	50	23.4	165	38.4
TOTAL	173	100	214	100	430	100

<sup>1, 2, 3, 4</sup>  $p < .001$

As shown in Table 40, the increase in reported instances of any unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners 'in the previous six months' was across both of the serostatus groups, HIV negative and Unknown Serostatus. Whereas HIV positive men reported the highest rates in 2000, this finding was based on relatively small numbers and should be treated cautiously. Moreover, previous evidence has shown that positive-positive sex may account for some of the practice (Prestage et al., 1995), although such data were not collected in the 2000 Male Out Survey.

**Table 40 : Anal intercourse with casual partners by HIV serostatus**

	1992		1996		2000	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>HIV negative<sup>1</sup></b>						
No anal	107	38.2	74	24.5	203	21.7
Always protected	125	44.6	164	54.3	412	44.0
Any unprotected	48	17.1	64	21.2	321	34.3
TOTAL	280	100	302	100	936	100
<b>HIV positive<sup>2</sup></b>						
No anal	–	–	–	–	4	5.8
Always protected	–	–	–	–	22	31.9
Any unprotected	–	–	–	–	43	62.3
TOTAL	9	–	15	–	69	100
<b>Unknown serostatus<sup>3</sup></b>						
No anal	49	51.6	54	38.6	60	22.1
Always protected	30	31.6	56	40.0	108	39.7
Any unprotected	16	16.8	30	21.4	104	38.2
TOTAL	95	100	140	100	272	100

<sup>1,3</sup>  $p < .001$ <sup>2</sup> Numbers for 1992/96 too small to determine trend.

## Regional differences

As mentioned above, there were sufficient participants in the 2000 Male Out Survey to examine variations among the States with larger populations. Table 41 presents data on sexual practices with casual partners in the overall sample and in the reduced base of men with casual partners. As shown, there were no significant differences among the States.

**Table 41 : Anal intercourse with casual partners by State—2000 data**

	NSW		VIC		QLD		Other states	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Total sample<sup>1</sup></b>								
No casual partners	152	28.9	158	32.0	111	30.9	130	29.1
No anal	74	14.1	69	14.0	60	16.7	64	14.3
Always protected	165	31.4	149	30.2	94	26.2	134	30.0
Any unprotected	135	25.7	117	23.7	94	26.2	118	26.5
TOTAL	526	100	493	100	359	100	446	100
<b>Men who had casual partners<sup>2</sup></b>								
No anal	74	19.8	69	20.6	60	24.2	64	20.3
Always protected	165	44.1	149	44.5	94	37.9	134	42.4
Any unprotected	135	36.1	117	34.9	94	37.9	118	37.3
TOTAL	374	100	335	100	248	100	316	100

<sup>1,2</sup> *ns*

Based on the categories of residence from Question 60 (see Appendix), Table 42 presents data on sexual practices with casual partners in the overall sample and in the subset of men with casual partners. As with the parallel data pertaining to regular partners, there was an overall trend: men living in a capital city were less likely to have engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with a casual partner than men living in a major regional centre who in turn were less likely to have engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with a casual partner than their counterparts living in smaller cities and towns or rural/remote areas.

**Table 42 : Anal intercourse with casual partners by area of residence—2000 data**

	Capital city		Major regional centre		Smaller city / town / rural / remote	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Total sample<sup>1</sup></b>						
No casual partners	329	28.8	106	32.3	115	32.8
No anal intercourse	183	16.0	47	14.3	37	10.5
Always protected	374	32.7	84	25.6	83	23.6
Any unprotected	258	22.6	91	27.7	116	33.0
TOTAL	1144	100	328	100	351	100
<b>Men who had casual partners<sup>2</sup></b>						
No anal intercourse	183	22.5	47	21.2	37	15.7
Always protected	374	45.9	84	37.8	83	35.2
Any unprotected	258	31.7	91	41.0	116	49.2
TOTAL	815	100	222	100	236	100

<sup>1,2</sup>  $p < .001$

### Beats, saunas, sex clubs

Table 43 shows, for those men who had sex at a Beat, Sauna or Sex club 'in the previous six months' (see Question 30, Appendix), the proportions who did and did not have any unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners during that time period, but not necessarily at these particular venues. In each case, about half the men who had sex at these venues reported no instances of unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners—at these places or anywhere else. Separate analyses showed that men who had sex at each of these types of venues were significantly more likely (than their counterparts who did not have sex there) to have reported any unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners ( $p < .001$  in each case).

**Table 43 : Unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners (UAIC) in the six months prior to the survey among men who reported having sex at a Beat, Sauna or Sex club**

	Beat		Sauna		Sex club	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
No UAIC	349	58.2	191	45.3	213	52.0
Some UAIC	251	41.8	231	54.7	197	48.0
TOTAL	600	100	422	100	410	100

Note: The venue categories are not mutually exclusive

## ATTITUDES TOWARD CONDOMS

Means and standard deviations for the Attitudes toward Condoms scale are presented in Table 44. As shown, attitudes became less positive over time and there were remarkable similarities between gay and non gay community attached men. Bonferroni post hoc comparisons revealed that attitudes towards condoms in 1992 were significantly more favourable than in 1996 and 2000.

**Table 44 : Attitudes toward Condoms scale, total sample and by gay community attachment**

	1992		1996		2000		F
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
Total sample	8.23	1.67	7.75	1.66	7.48	2.06	32.16*
GCA	8.43	1.67	7.76	1.67	7.44	2.07	30.63*
NGCA	8.00	1.64	7.76	1.66	7.56	2.06	5.00

\*  $p < 0.001$

## AVOIDANCE AND EXPECTATIONS

For the 2000 Male Out Survey, a question about avoiding having sex with people thought to be HIV positive was introduced (see Question 49, Appendix). Table 45 presents the men's responses to this question. Most men reported that they practised such avoidance 'always' or 'sometimes'. Avoidance was stronger among non gay community attached than among gay community attached men. And avoidance was only tempered for HIV positive participants themselves, one-fifth of whom prefer positive-positive sex; HIV negative and status unknown men reported high levels of avoidance.

**Table 45 : Extent to which men reported avoiding having sex with people they think have HIV, by gay community attachment and HIV serostatus**

Avoid having sex with people who you think have HIV?	Total sample (n=1744) <sup>a</sup>	Gay community attachment <sup>1</sup> (n=1744) <sup>a</sup>		HIV status <sup>2</sup> (n=1387) <sup>a</sup>		
		GCA	NGCA	HIV-neg	HIV-pos	HIV-unknown
		(n=1125) %	(n=619) %	(n=1287) %	(n=80) %	(n=20) %
Yes, always	61.7	53.2	77.2	61.7	7.5	70.0
Sometimes	19.2	23.0	12.3	21.6	5.0	15.0
No, I don't avoid having sex with HIV positive people	17.8	22.1	9.9	16.4	67.5	15.0
I prefer having sex with HIV positive people	1.3	1.7	0.6	0.3	20.0	–
TOTAL	100	100	100	100	100	100

<sup>a</sup> Fluctuations in N due to missing data

<sup>1</sup>  $p < .001$ , <sup>2</sup>  $p < .001$

Also for the 2000 Male Out Survey, a new question about expectations of HIV positive disclosure was included (see Question 50, Appendix). Table 46 shows the men's responses to this question. Most men expected that HIV positive men would disclose prior to sex, and this expectation was held particularly strongly by non gay community attached men. Expectations of HIV positive disclosure were equally strong among HIV negative and status unknown men. HIV positive men themselves were less adamant that such disclosure would be forthcoming.

**Table 46 : Expectations that an HIV positive man would disclose his status prior to sex, by gay community attachment and HIV serostatus**

	Total sample (n=1744) <sup>a</sup>	Gay community attachment <sup>1</sup>		HIV status <sup>2</sup>		
		GCA (n=1125)	NGCA (n=619)	HIV-neg (n=1287)	HIV-pos (n=80)	HIV-unknown (n=20)
Expect HIV-positive man to reveal his HIV status before having sex with you?	%	%	%	%	%	%
Strongly disagree	7.0	8.5	4.5	6.5	21.3	4.8
Disagree	14.0	18.0	6.9	14.2	38.8	9.5
Agree	28.2	29.1	26.5	28.3	22.5	33.3
Strongly agree	50.7	44.4	62.1	51.0	17.5	52.4
TOTAL	100	100	100	100	100	100

<sup>a</sup> Fluctuations in *N* due to missing data

<sup>1</sup>  $p < .001$ , <sup>2</sup>  $p < .001$

It is interesting to reflect on the countervailing patterns in Tables 45 and 46. On the one hand, most of the participants expected HIV positive men to disclose their status before sex. Yet, on the other hand, large numbers of the men stated unequivocally that they avoided having sex with HIV positive men. In such a climate there is little incentive for HIV positive men to disclose at all.

# Drug Use

Questions pertaining to drug use were introduced in Male Call 96 and a limited number of items were retained in the 2000 Male Out Survey. As shown in Table 47, drug use ‘in the previous six months’ was fairly stable or slightly more extensive in 2000 compared with the 1996 data. A greater proportion of the men reported use of ecstasy, speed, cocaine or ‘any other drug’ in 2000. This finding may be attributable to the greater representation of gay identified men in the 2000 sample rather than to more extensive drug use among homosexually active men *per se*.

The most widely used drugs remained marijuana, nitrite inhalants (‘amyl’), ecstasy and speed. Although their use increased in 2000, only a small proportion of the men reported use of steroids.

**Table 47 : Drug use in the six months prior to the survey**

	1996		2000	
	n (N)	%	n (N)	%
Viagra	–	–	187 (1518)	12.3
Amyl / Poppers	119 (547)	21.8	551 (1585)	34.8
Marijuana / Hash	181 (548)	33.0	630 (1642)	38.4
Ecstasy	34 (547)	6.2	342 (1547)	22.1
Speed	48 (547)	8.8	314 (1538)	20.4
Cocaine	23 (547)	4.2	142 (1485)	9.6
Heroin	7 (547)	1.3	57 (1464)	3.9
Steroids	13 (547)	2.4	60 (1461)	4.1
Any other drug	20 (397)	5.0	236 (1494)	15.8

Note: Fluctuations in N due to missing data. Drug categories are not mutually exclusive.

Drug use was highly dependent on gay community attachment (see Table 48). For most types of drugs, they were used more extensively by men attached to gay community than by men not so attached.

**Table 48 : Drug use in the six months prior to the survey by gay community attachment**

	1996				2000			
	GCA		NGCA		GCA		NGCA	
	n (N)	%	n (N)	%	n (N)	%	n (N)	%
Viagra	–	–	–	–	140 (981)	14.3	47 (537)	8.8
Amyl / Poppers	82 (286)	28.7	37 (261)	14.2	432 (1039)	41.6	119 (546)	21.8
Marijuana / Hash	98 (287)	34.1	83 (261)	31.8	437 (1054)	41.5	193 (588)	32.8
Ecstasy	26 (286)	9.1	8 (261)	3.1	278 (1012)	19.6	64 (535)	12.0
Speed	33 (286)	11.5	15 (261)	5.7	239 (997)	24.0	75 (541)	13.9
Cocaine	13 (286)	4.5	10 (261)	3.8	115 (962)	12.0	27 (523)	5.2
Heroin	3 (286)	1.0	4 (261)	1.5	44 (944)	4.7	13 (520)	2.5
Steroids	4 (286)	1.4	9 (261)	3.4	40 (940)	4.3	20 (521)	3.8
Any other drug	13 (209)	6.2	7 (188)	3.7	169 (956)	17.7	67 (538)	12.5

Note: Fluctuations in *N* due to missing data. Drug categories are not mutually exclusive.

As in 1996, only a small proportion of the men had ever injected drugs (see Table 49).

**Table 49 : Injecting drug use, ever**

	1996		2000	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	42	7.8	194	10.9
No	496	92.2	1578	89.1
TOTAL	538	100	1772	100
<i>ns</i>				

# HIV Optimism

Table 50 sets out HIV Optimism scale means and standard deviations, based on data collected in 2000 alone. As shown, scale means were toward the sceptical rather than the optimistic end of the continuum. Nevertheless, (based on Bonferroni post hoc comparisons) HIV negative men on the whole had a significantly lower mean than men without HIV test results (including those who did not respond to the question about HIV status);  $F_{(2, 1762)} = 11.56, p < .001$ . Men who engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with *casual* partners (UAIC) in the six months prior to being surveyed were significantly more optimistic than men who reported no UAIC in that period;  $t_{(1238)} = -13.07, p < .001$ . Likewise, men who engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with *regular* partners (UAIR) in the six months prior to being surveyed were significantly more optimistic than men who reported no UAIR during the period;  $t_{(1265)} = -7.59, p < .001$ .

**Table 50 : HIV Optimism scale scores, by HIV serostatus and unprotected anal intercourse with casual (UAIC) and regular (UAIR) partners—2000 data**

	<b>M</b>	<b>SD</b>
HIV Optimism score (total sample)	4.90	1.96
<b>HIV Status (n=1765)</b>		
HIV negative (n=1304)	4.81	1.84
HIV positive (n=80)	5.28	2.35
HIV No test results / NR (n=381)	5.33	2.23
<b>UAIC (n=1240)</b>		
No UAIC (n=786)	4.52	1.60
Any UAIC (n=454)	5.96	2.25
<b>UAIR (n=1267)</b>		
No UAIR (n=451)	4.42	1.65
Any UAIR (n=816)	5.31	2.16

NR = no response

# Conclusions

In all, 1832 homosexually active men participated in the 2000 Male Out Survey based on questionnaires distributed through pornographic video catalogues. The men's responses were compared with those men recruited through a similar strategy for Project Male Call in 1992 ( $n=534$ ) and Male Call 96 ( $n=588$ ).

The key findings of the 2000 Male Out Survey are summarised as:

- A smaller proportion of the men in the 2000 sample identified as *heterosexual* or *bisexual*, and a correspondingly greater proportion identified as *gay*. This important variation must be taken into account in interpreting the findings. (Table 9)
- There was a relatively greater degree of gay identity disclosure in 2000 than in previous years. (Table 10)
- Both indicators of contact with the HIV epidemic—knowing people with HIV/AIDS *and* having personally known people who died following AIDS—showed a significant increase in 2000 over the previous surveys. (Table 11)
- Commensurate with the greater degree of gay identification in 2000 compared with previous years, there was an upturn in two indicators of social engagement in gay community. The 2000 participants were more likely spend free time with gay men and to have more gay friends. (Table 12)
- For the 2000 Male Out Survey there was a significant increase in the proportion of gay community attached men with almost two-thirds so classified. (Table 13)
- The men recruited in 2000 were significantly more likely to know their HIV status than those who participated in the previous years. Hence, a greater proportion reported being either HIV negative or HIV positive. In all, 86 men were HIV positive. (Table 14)
- The proportion of men *without* HIV test results (22%) is approximately double that for men who participate in Gay Community Periodic Surveys conducted in the major capital cities of Australia (Van de Ven et al., 2000c). (Table 14)
- Non gay community attached men were approximately twice as likely as their gay community attached counterparts to be without HIV test results. (Table 15)
- Having HIV test results is associated with age. In 2000, as in 1996, younger (<25 years) and older (50+ years) men were less likely to have HIV results than men aged between 25 and 49 years. Furthermore, younger (<25 years)

and older (50+ years) men were significantly less likely in 2000 to have HIV test results than in previous years. The reverse trend applied to men in the 30–39 and 40–49 age brackets, with these men significantly more likely to have HIV results at this time. (Table 16)

- There was a marked downward trend in recency of HIV testing. The proportion of men who had had an HIV test in the last year declined from approximately 56% in 1992, to approximately 51% in 1996 to approximately 45% in 2000. (Table 17)
- Most commonly, the men had between two and 10 male sexual partners in the six months prior to the 2000 Male Out Survey. (Table 19)
- Reflective of the greater degree of gay identification and gay community attachment in 2000, a much larger proportion of the men recruited in 2000 had no female sexual partners (approximately 80%). (Table 19)
- A notable change was in the smaller proportion of men in the 2000 Male Out Survey having *casual* sex only at the time of the survey. The switch was towards a larger proportion of men who had a regular partner *plus* casual sex. (Table 22)
- With *regular* partners, oral-genital sex with ejaculation was more commonly practised, particularly among gay community attached men. Insertive and receptive anal intercourse, including the practice of withdrawal prior to ejaculation, also became more widely practised regardless of degree of gay community attachment. (Table 24)
- Similar trends in oral and anal sexual practices were documented for *casual* partners. Oral-genital sex with ejaculation was more commonly reported, particularly among gay community attached men. Insertive and receptive anal intercourse, including the practice of withdrawal prior to ejaculation, also became more prevalent among both gay and non gay community attached men. (Table 25)
- As in previous years, the men who had female partners were more likely to 'never' use condoms with regular than with casual female partners. However, over time there was a significant upward trend the men's reporting of 'sometimes'/'always' having used a condom with *regular* female partners. With *casual* female partners there was a significant trend in the opposite direction. (Table 28)
- There was a significant upward trend in the practice of anal intercourse with *women*, such that of the men who had female partners almost 58 per cent engaged in some anal intercourse with women. This finding cannot be attributed solely to the nature of the 2000 sample as the trend was an extension of a 'cultural' shift first documented in Male Call 96 (Crawford et al., 1998). (Table 29)
- Approximately 70 per cent of the men in the 2000 Male Out Survey reported sexual contact with *regular* male partners and approximately 70 per cent reported sexual contact with *casual* male partners, in the six months prior to the survey. There was a significant upward trend with respect to regular partners and a slight downward trend for casual partners. (Table 30)

- A smaller proportion of the 2000 participants had no regular partners and a larger proportion had any unprotected anal intercourse with regular partners in the six months prior to the survey. The proportionate increase in any unprotected anal intercourse with regular partners remains if the trends are examined only among the men who had regular partners. (Table 31)
- The increase in the proportion of men who reported any unprotected anal intercourse with *regular* partners applied to gay community attached and non gay community attached men alike. (Table 32)
- Among HIV negative men and those of unknown serostatus there was a significant upward trend in unprotected anal intercourse with *regular* partners in the six months prior to the survey. There were too few HIV positive men in 1992/96 to determine statistically significant change over time. (Table 33)
- Across the States, there were no significant differences in unprotected anal intercourse with *regular* partners. (Table 34)
- There were, however, significant differences based on area of residence: men living in a capital city were less likely to have engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with a *regular* partner than men living in a major regional centre who in turn were less likely to have engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with a *regular* partner than their counterparts living in smaller cities and towns or rural/remote areas. (Table 35)
- Over time, proportionately fewer regular couples had an agreement about sex *within* the relationship yet a greater proportion of couples had a spoken agreement that anal intercourse within the relationship could be without a condom. (Table 36)
- Consistent with data from Gay Community Periodic Surveys in Sydney (Van de Ven et al., 2000d), Melbourne (Aspin et al., 2000a) and Queensland (Aspin et al., 2000b), a greater proportion of the 2000 sample reported any unprotected anal intercourse with *casual* partners in the six months prior to the survey. (Table 38)
- The increase in the proportion of men who reported any unprotected anal intercourse with *casual* partners applied equally to gay community attached and non gay community attached men. (Table 39)
- The increase in reported instances of any protected anal intercourse with *casual* partners 'in the previous six months' was across both of these serostatus groups, HIV negative and Unknown Serostatus. (Table 40)
- Across the States, there were no significant differences in unprotected anal intercourse with *casual* partners. (Table 41)
- There were, however, significant differences based on area of residence: men living in a capital city were less likely to have engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with a *casual* partner than men living in a major regional centre who in turn were less likely to have engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with a *casual* partner than their counterparts living in smaller cities and towns or rural/remote areas. (Table 42)

- Attitudes toward Condoms have become significantly *less* favourable over time. (Table 44)
- Drug use 'in the previous six months' was fairly stable or slightly more extensive in 2000 compared with 1996. (Table 47)
- Drug use was related to extent of gay community attachment. For most types of drugs, they were used more extensively by men attached to gay community than by men not so attached. (Table 48)
- Men who engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with *regular* partners (UAIR) in the six months prior to being surveyed were significantly more optimistic about HIV treatments than men who reported no UAIR in that period. Likewise, men who engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with *casual* partners (UAIC) in the six months prior to being surveyed were significantly more optimistic about HIV treatments than men who reported no UAIC during the period. (Table 50)

Altogether, 135,000 questionnaires were distributed through the pornographic video catalogues. Most of the recipients were, without doubt, not eligible to participate in the survey. Three people—a very small number in the overall scheme of things—lodged complaints with the Ethics Secretariat of the University of New South Wales. A few also complained to the first author of this report who was listed as the contact person for inquiries (see Appendix). The latter's complaints were specifically homophobic rather than erotophobic, expressing disgust and disdain about the homosexual (as opposed to the sexual) content of some of the questions. When asked whether they would object to a parallel heterosexual version of the questionnaire, all these complainants answered in the negative.

All told, the 2000 Male Out Survey was conducted highly successfully. A large sample of homosexually active men was recruited through the mail-out, self complete questionnaire procedure. The participants represent a broad cross-section of the homosexually active population of Australia, both gay community attached and non gay community attached men. The resultant data based on this diverse sample of homosexually active men drawn from every corner of Australia complement those findings from periodic surveys conducted in principal gay communities. The overall method is both efficient and cost effective. Hence, serious consideration should be given to repeating the survey in 2004 as part of the four-year cycle and as a way of obtaining reliable data on homosexually active men, particularly non gay community attached men who are rarely recruited into other studies.

# References

- Aspin, C., Van de Ven, P., Prestage, G., Kippax, S., Horn, G. and Madeddu, D. (2000a). *Melbourne Gay Community Periodic Survey: February 2000*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research, The University of New South Wales.
- Aspin, C., Van de Ven, P., Prestage, G., Kippax, S., Mason, D., Lewis, C. and Gallagher, S. (2000b). *Queensland Gay Community Periodic Survey: June 2000*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research, The University of New South Wales.
- Aspin, C., Van de Ven, P., Prestage, G., Kippax, S., Schamburg, K. and Coase, D. (2001). *Canberra Gay Community Periodic Survey*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research, The University of New South Wales.
- Crawford, J., Rodden, P., Kippax, S., Donohoe, S. and Van de Ven, P. (1998). *Male Call 96: Telephone survey of men who have sex with men*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research, Macquarie University.
- Feachem, R.G.A. (1995). *Valuing the Past ... Investing in the Future: Evaluation of the National HIV/AIDS Strategy 1993–94 to 1995–96*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Grierson, J., Bartos, M., de Visser, R. and McDonald, K. (2000). *HIV Futures II: The health and welfare of people with HIV/AIDS in Australia*. Monograph Series No. 17. Melbourne: Australian Research Centre in Sex, Health and Society, LaTrobe University.
- Kippax, S., Crawford, J., Rodden, P. and Benton, K. (1994). *Report on Project Male-Call: national telephone survey of men who have sex with men*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- National Centre in HIV Epidemiology and Clinical Research. (2001). *Australian HIV Surveillance Report, Vol 17, No 1*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Epidemiology and Clinical Research.
- Prestage G, Kippax S, Noble J, et al. (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., Van de Ven, P., Knox, S., Grulich, A., Kippax, S. and Crawford, J. (1999). *The Sydney gay community periodic surveys 1996-1999: Changes over time*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research, The University of New South Wales.
- Prestage, G., Race, K., Grierson, J., Grulich, A. and Kippax, S. (2000). *Positive Health: Method and sampling 1998–1999*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research, The University of New South Wales.
- Van de Ven, P., Prestage, G., Kippax, S., French, J., Derrin, L. and Bebbington, M. (1999). *Perth Gay Community Periodic Survey: September/October 1998*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research, The University of New South Wales.

- Van de Ven, P., Crawford, J., Kippax, S., Knox, S. and Prestage, G. (2000a). A scale of optimism-scepticism in the context of HIV treatments. *AIDS Care*, 12, 171-176.
- Van de Ven, P., Prestage, G., Kippax, S., Knox, S., Nicholas, G., Horwood, B. and Petersen, K. (2000b). *Adelaide Gay Community Periodic Survey: November 1999*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research, The University of New South Wales.
- Van de Ven, P., Prestage, G., Knox, S. and Kippax, S. (2000c). Gay men in Australia who do not have HIV test results. *International Journal of STD & AIDS*, 11, 456-460.
- Van de Ven, P., Prestage, G., Crawford, J., Grulich, A. and Kippax, S. (2000d). Sexual risk behaviour increases and is associated with HIV optimism among HIV-negative and HIV-positive gay men in Sydney over the four-year period to February 2000. *AIDS*, 14, 2951-2953.



# Appendix

## Facts & Figures: 2000 Male Out Survey

---

Male Out is a short survey of the sexual practices of Australian men who have sex with men. The data will provide valuable information for sexual health programs.

**Only men who have had sex with another man in the past five years should complete this survey.**

This survey is completely voluntary and anonymous. Do not write your name or put any identifying marks on the questionnaire.

As this is an anonymous survey, feedback will be provided through the media, through public meetings and seminars (advertised in the gay and other press), and through reports.

Please direct any inquiries to Dr Paul Van de Ven, National Centre in HIV Social Research, The University of New South Wales (tel 02 9385-6445).

Complaints about this project (No. 00092) may be directed to the Ethics Secretariat, The University of New South Wales, Sydney 2052 AUSTRALIA (tel 02 9385-4234, fax 02 9385-6648, e-mail ethics.sec@unsw.edu.au).

---

**1** Are you a man who has had sex of any kind with another man in the past **five years**?

Yes → Please proceed.

No → Please do not complete this questionnaire.

In this survey we distinguish between **regular** (boyfriend/lover) and **casual** partners.

**2** Do you currently have sex with **casual** male partners?

Yes

No

**3** Do you currently have sex with a **regular** male partner?

Yes → How many? \_\_\_\_\_

No

**4** 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

I have no current regular male partner

I have no sex with men at present

**5** 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**

**6** Have you had sex with **regular** male partner/s in the last **six months**?

Yes → Continue

No → Go directly to Question 17

In the past **six months** which of the following have you done with your **regular** male partner/s?

- 7 I sucked his penis and he came in my mouth  
 Never  
 Occasionally  
 Often
- 8 He sucked my penis and I came in his mouth  
 Never  
 Occasionally  
 Often
- 9 I sucked his penis but he did NOT come in my mouth  
 Never  
 Occasionally  
 Often
- 10 He sucked my penis but I did NOT come in his mouth  
 Never  
 Occasionally  
 Often
- 11 Insertive anal intercourse (I fucked him) with a condom  
 Never  
 Occasionally  
 Often
- 12 Receptive anal intercourse (he fucked me) with a condom  
 Never  
 Occasionally  
 Often
- 13 Insertive anal intercourse (I fucked him) without a condom but I pulled out before I came  
 Never  
 Occasionally  
 Often
- 14 Receptive anal intercourse (he fucked me) without a condom but he pulled out before he came  
 Never  
 Occasionally  
 Often
- 15 Insertive anal intercourse (I fucked him) without a condom and I came inside  
 Never  
 Occasionally  
 Often
- 16 Receptive anal intercourse (he fucked me) without a condom and he came inside  
 Never  
 Occasionally  
 Often

**Casual male partners—last 6 months**

- 17 Have you had sex with **casual** male partner/s in the last **six months**?  
 Yes → How many? \_\_\_\_\_ Continue  
 No → Go directly to Question 28

In the past **six months** which of the following have you done with any of your **casual** male partners?

- 18 I sucked his penis and he came in my mouth  
 Never  
 Occasionally  
 Often

- 19 He sucked my penis and I came in his mouth  
 Never  
 Occasionally  
 Often
- 20 I sucked his penis but he did NOT come in my mouth  
 Never  
 Occasionally  
 Often
- 21 He sucked my penis but I did NOT come in his mouth  
 Never  
 Occasionally  
 Often
- 22 Insertive anal intercourse (I fucked him) with a condom  
 Never  
 Occasionally  
 Often
- 23 Receptive anal intercourse (he fucked me) with a condom  
 Never  
 Occasionally  
 Often
- 24 Insertive anal intercourse (I fucked him) without a condom but I pulled out before I came  
 Never  
 Occasionally  
 Often
- 25 Receptive anal intercourse (he fucked me) without a condom but he pulled out before he came  
 Never  
 Occasionally  
 Often
- 26 Insertive anal intercourse (I fucked him) without a condom and I came inside  
 Never  
 Occasionally  
 Often
- 27 Receptive anal intercourse (he fucked me) without a condom and he came inside  
 Never  
 Occasionally  
 Often
- 28 In the past **six months** have you done any of the following with either your **regular** or your **casual** male partner/s?
- |                             |                                |                                       |                                |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Fisting                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Never | <input type="checkbox"/> Occasionally | <input type="checkbox"/> Often |
| S/M or B&D                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Never | <input type="checkbox"/> Occasionally | <input type="checkbox"/> Often |
| Group sex with men only     | <input type="checkbox"/> Never | <input type="checkbox"/> Occasionally | <input type="checkbox"/> Often |
| Other group sex             | <input type="checkbox"/> Never | <input type="checkbox"/> Occasionally | <input type="checkbox"/> Often |
| Rimming (licking anus/arse) | <input type="checkbox"/> Never | <input type="checkbox"/> Occasionally | <input type="checkbox"/> Often |
- 29 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
- 30 In the past **six months**, have you had sex in these places?
- |             |                                |                                       |                                |
|-------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| beat        | <input type="checkbox"/> Never | <input type="checkbox"/> Occasionally | <input type="checkbox"/> Often |
| sauna (gay) | <input type="checkbox"/> Never | <input type="checkbox"/> Occasionally | <input type="checkbox"/> Often |
| sex club    | <input type="checkbox"/> Never | <input type="checkbox"/> Occasionally | <input type="checkbox"/> Often |

- 31 Do you think of yourself as:
- Straight/Heterosexual
  - Bisexual
  - Gay
  - Homosexual
  - Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- 32 Whom have you told that you are sexually attracted to men? (tick as many as applicable)
- I haven't told anyone
  - My mother
  - My father
  - My children (if any)
  - Other relatives
  - Female sex partners/ex-partners
  - Any gay friends
  - Any straight friends
  - Any workmates
  - Any neighbours
  - Anyone else
- 33 How many of your friends are gay or homosexual men?
- None
  - A few
  - Some
  - Most
  - All
- 34 How much of your free time is spent with gay or homosexual men?
- None
  - A little
  - Some
  - A lot
- 35 How many different **women** have you had sex with in the past **six months**?
- None → Go directly to Question 39
  - One
  - 2–5 women
  - 6–10 women
  - More than 10 women
- 36 Were the women you had sex with in the past **six months** . . .
- All regular female partners
  - All casual female partners
  - Some regular and some casual partners
- 37 Did you use condoms when having sex with women during the past **six months**?
- |                              | Never                    | Sometimes                | Always                   |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| With regular female partners | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| With casual female partners  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
- 38 Have you had **anal** intercourse with a woman in the past **six months**?
- Never
  - Occasionally
  - Often

39 The following statements are about condoms. For each one, please tick one box only.

- *I can't be bothered using condoms all the time because they are a nuisance.*

strongly disagree  disagree  agree  strongly agree

- *Condoms provide a sense of security.*

strongly disagree  disagree  agree  strongly agree

- *Condoms reduce sensitivity.*

strongly disagree  disagree  agree  strongly agree

- *Condoms can be fun and erotic.*

strongly disagree  disagree  agree  strongly agree

40 Have you ever had an HIV antibody test?

Yes → Continue

No → Go directly to Question 43

41 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

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

Negative

Positive

No test/Don't know

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

43 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

44 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

45 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

46 How many people do you know who have HIV infection or the illness AIDS?

None

One

Two

3–5

6–10

More than 10

- 47 How many people do you know **personally** who have died from AIDS?
- None
  - One
  - Two
  - 3–5
  - 6–10
  - More than 10
- 48 The following statements are about new treatments for HIV. For each statement, please tick one box only.. if you are unsure please give your best guess.
- *New HIV treatments take the worry out of sex.*
    - strongly disagree  disagree  agree  strongly agree
  - *HIV is less of a threat because the epidemic is on the decline.*
    - strongly disagree  disagree  agree  strongly agree
  - *HIV/AIDS is a less serious threat than it used to be because of new treatments.*
    - strongly disagree  disagree  agree  strongly agree
- 49 Do you avoid having sex with people you think have HIV? (tick one)
- Yes, always
  - Sometimes
  - No, I don't avoid having sex with HIV positive people
  - I prefer having sex with HIV positive people
- 50 I'd expect a man with HIV to tell me he was positive before we had sex.
- strongly disagree  disagree  agree  strongly agree
- 51 Which of these drugs have you used in the past **six months**?
- |                |                              |                             |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Viagra         | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Amyl/Poppers   | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Marijuana/Hash | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Ecstasy        | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Speed          | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Cocaine        | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Heroin         | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Steroids       | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Any other drug | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
- 52 Have you **ever** used a needle to inject drugs?
- Yes
  - No
- 53 How old are you? \_\_\_\_\_ years
- 54 What country were you born in?
- Australia
  - Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- 55 Are you of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander origin?
- Yes
  - No
- 56 What is your ethnic background? (eg Aboriginal, Dutch, Greek, Vietnamese, Lebanese, Chinese)
- Anglo-Australian only
  - Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- 57 Are you: (tick one only)
- Employed full-time
  - Employed part-time
  - Unemployed
  - A student
  - A pensioner or on social security benefits
  - Other

- 58 What is your occupation? (eg. bartender, teacher, welder)  
(please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- 59 In which State/Territory do you live?
- Australian Capital Territory
  - New South Wales
  - Northern Territory
  - Queensland
  - South Australia
  - Tasmania
  - Victoria
  - Western Australia
- 60 Where do you live?
- In the capital city of your State/Territory
  - In a major regional centre
  - In a smaller city/town
  - In a rural/remote area
- 61 What is the highest level of education you have had?
- Primary school only
  - Up to 3 years of high school
  - Year 10/School Certificate or equivalent
  - Year 12/HSC/VCE/SACE or equivalent
  - Tertiary diploma or trade certificate
  - University or CAE
- 62 With whom do you live/share accommodation?
- Alone
  - With a female sex partner (with or without children)
  - With a male sex partner (with or without children)
  - With parents/relatives
  - With friends (including one or more sex partners)
  - With friends (but no sex partners)
  - Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME