

# asian gay community periodic survey

SYDNEY 2002

Limin **MAO**  
Paul **VAN DE VEN**  
Garrett **PRESTAGE**  
John **WANG**  
Matthew **HUA**  
Priyadi **PRIHASWAN**  
Alexander **KU**



NATIONAL CENTRE IN HIV SOCIAL RESEARCH  
NATIONAL CENTRE IN HIV EPIDEMIOLOGY AND CLINICAL  
RESEARCH  
ACON ASIAN PROJECT  
MULTICULTURAL HIV/AIDS AND HEPATITIS C SERVICE

# asian gay community periodic survey

SYDNEY  
2002

Limin **MAO**<sup>1</sup>  
Paul **VAN DE VEN**<sup>1</sup>  
Garrett **PRESTAGE**<sup>2</sup>  
John **WANG**<sup>1</sup>  
Matthew **HUA**<sup>3</sup>  
Priyadi **PRIHASWAN**<sup>3</sup>  
Alexander **KU**<sup>4</sup>

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

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

<sup>3</sup> ACON ASIAN PROJECT

<sup>4</sup> MULTICULTURAL HIV/AIDS AND HEPATITIS C SERVICE (NSW HEALTH AND  
AUSPICES OF THE CENTRAL SYDNEY AREA HEALTH SERVICE)

Monograph 1/2003

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



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

**National Centre in HIV Social Research**

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

© National Centre in HIV Social Research 2003  
ISBN 1-875978-59-3

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

# CONTENTS

---

Acknowledgments	ii
List of Tables	iii
<b>DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>SAMPLE AND RECRUITMENT</b>	<b>3</b>
Ethnicity	4
Australian Residential Status	6
Geographic distribution	7
Age	7
Employment and occupation	8
Education	8
Religion	9
Sexual relationships with women	9
Sexual relationships with men	10
<b>CONTACT WITH COMMUNITIES</b>	<b>12</b>
Attachment to ethnic community	12
Ethnic community involvement	12
Sexual identity and disclosure of homosexuality	14
Attachment to gay community	15
Gay community involvement	16
Use of gay venues	17
Contact with HIV epidemic	18
<b>HIV AND STI TESTING</b>	<b>20</b>
Time since most recent HIV-antibody test	20
Regular partner's HIV-status	22
STI Testing	23
<b>SEXUAL PRACTICE AND 'SAFE SEX'</b>	<b>24</b>
Sexual behaviour between men	24
Sexual practices with regular and with casual partners	26
Other sex practices	27
Use of condoms in regular relationships	28
Sex with casual male partners	31
<b>DRUG USE</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>QUESTIONNAIRE</b>	<b>38</b>

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

---

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

### **FUNDING**

NSW Health Department

### **RECRUITMENT**

Mark Chisholm, Matthew Hua, Gerald Lee, Priyadi Prihaswan, Alfeo Salcedo, Julie Truong, John Wang

### **SURVEY PARTICIPANTS**

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

### **VENUES**

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

## LIST OF TABLES

---

Table 1 : Source of Recruitment .....	3
Table 2.1 : Ethnic or Cultural Background .....	4
Table 2.2 : Country of Birth .....	5
Table 2.3 : Length of Time in Australia .....	6
Table 2.4 : Australian Residency Status .....	6
Table 2.5 : Residential Location .....	7
Table 2.6 : Age .....	7
Table 2.7 : Employment Status .....	8
Table 2.8 : Occupation .....	8
Table 2.9 : Education .....	9
Table 2.10 : Religion .....	9
Table 2.11 : Sex with Women in Previous Six Months .....	9
Table 2.12 : 'Current' Sexual Relationships with Men .....	10
Table 2.13 : Types of Regular Relationships with Men .....	10
Table 2.14 : Length of Relationship with Men .....	11
Table 3.1 : Ethnic Community Attachment .....	12
Table 3.2 : Ethnic Community Involvement .....	13
Table 3.3 : Proportion of Free Time with Other Asians .....	13
Table 3.4 : Proportion of Free Time Spent with Gay Asian Men .....	13
Table 3.5 : Ethnic Press readership .....	13
Table 3.6 : Heard of Gay Asian Events .....	14
Table 3.7 : Homosexual Discrimination within Ethnic Community .....	14
Table 3.8 : Sexual Identity .....	14
Table 3.9 : Disclosure of sexual identification .....	15
Table 3.10 : Gay Community Attachment .....	15
Table 3.11 : Gay Community involvement .....	16
Table 3.12 : Proportion of Gay Friends .....	16
Table 3.13 : Proportion of Free Time Spent with Gay Men .....	16
Table 3.14 : Gay Press Readership .....	17
Table 3.15 : Racial Discrimination within Gay Community .....	17
Table 3.16 : Being Gay Asian Men .....	17
Table 3.17 : Ways of Meeting Sex Partners .....	18
Table 3.18 : Number of People Known with HIV .....	18
Table 3.19 : Number of People Known to Have Died from AIDS .....	19
Table 4.1 : HIV Test Results .....	20
Table 4.2 : Time Since Most Recent HIV Test .....	21
Table 4.3 : Location of Last HIV Testing .....	21
Table 4.4 : Reasons for Not Having an HIV Test .....	21
Table 4.5 : HIV Status of Regular Partners .....	22
Table 4.6 : Match of HIV Status in Regular Relationships .....	22
Table 4.7 : STI Testing .....	23
Table 5.1 : Reported Sex with Male Partners in the Previous Six Months .....	24
Table 5.2 : Reported Sex with Male Partners in The Previous Six Months by Recruitment sites .....	25
Table 5.3 : Number of Male Partners in the Previous Six Months .....	25
Table 5.4 : Asian Men as Proportion of Male Partners .....	25

Table 5.5 : Sexual Behaviour with Regular Male Partners .....	26
Table 5.6 : Sexual Behaviour with Casual Male Partners.....	27
Table 5.7 : Other Sexual Activities with Male Partners in the Previous Six Months .....	28
Table 5.8 : Condom Use with Regular Partners .....	28
Table 5.9 : Serostatus and Condom Use among Regular Partners .....	29
Table 5.10 : Condom Use and Match of HIV Status in Regular Relationships.....	29
Table 5.11 : Agreements with Regular Male Partners about Sex <i>within</i> Relationship.....	30
Table 5.12 : Agreements with Regular Male Partners about Sex <i>outside</i> Relationship .....	30
Table 5.13 : Condom Use with Casual Partners.....	31
Table 5.14 : Serostatus and Condom Use among Casual Partners .....	38
Table 5.15 : Participants' Disclosure of Serostatus to Casual Partners .....	32
Table 5.16 : Casual Partners' Disclosure of Serostatus to Participants .....	32
Table 6.1 : Drug use in the previous six months.....	33

# Description of the Study

The Sydney Asian Gay Community Periodic Survey (SAGCPS) is a cross-sectional survey of gay and homosexually active men of Asian background recruited through a range of gay community events and sites in Sydney. It provides a snapshot of sexual and HIV-related practices among gay and homosexually active men of Asian background.

The major aim of SAGCPS was to provide data on levels of safe and unsafe sex practice in a broad cross-sectional sample of gay and homosexually active men of Asian background. To this end, men of Asian background were recruited from a number of gay-community events and social and sex-on-premises venues frequented by such men.

This study repeats a previous survey of gay Asian men in Sydney at the end of 1999 (Prestage *et al.*, 2000) and was conducted during November and December 2002. Apart from four sites used for recruitment in 1999, one additional sex-on-premises venue and two additional gay Asian social events were chosen this round. The current seven sites were: one gay commercial social venue, three gay sex-on-premises venues and three gay Asian social events. Recruitment in these venues was conducted by trained recruiters over a two-month period.

The questionnaire (appended to this report) is a short, self-administered instrument that typically takes about 10 minutes to complete. The same questions were used as in the last round of the survey with the focus on anal intercourse and oral sex, the use of condoms, the nature of sexual relationships, HIV testing practice and serostatus, aspects of gay community involvement, recreational drug use, and a range of demographic items including sexual identity, age, education, occupation and ethnicity. Some additional questions were included this time: for example, disclosure of homosexuality, additional aspects of attachment and involvement in gay, ethnic and gay Asian communities, racial and sexual discrimination in gay and ethnic communities, and more detailed information regarding testing for HIV and Sexually Transmissible Infections (STIs). Questions were designed to maximise comparability with the Sydney Gay Community Periodic Survey (Hull *et al.*, 2003).



More detailed analysis of the data will continue and will be disseminated as it is completed. As with any data analysis, further examination may necessitate minor reinterpretation of the findings. Discrepancies in  $n$  throughout this report are due to the small amount of missing data.

# Sample and Recruitment

Participants in the current survey (2002) were recruited from seven sites in Sydney. The response rate was 73% (457/626) in 2002, consistent with 77% in 1999. Compared with 1999, the 2002 sample had a higher proportion drawn from sex-on-premises venues (as one additional site was used in 2002) and this should be taken into account in the interpretations of the results (Table 1).

**Table 1 : Source of Recruitment**

	1999	2002
Sex-on-premises venues	97 (30.4%)	211 (46.2%)
Commercial gay social venue	176 (55.2%)	193 (42.2%)
Gay Asian group event	46 (14.4%)	53 (11.6%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>319 (100%)</b>	<b>457 (100%)</b>

$p < .001$

As indicated in the Gay Community Periodic Surveys (Hull *et al.*, 2003; Prestage *et al.*, 1999), men recruited from community events and from gay venues are different in some respects from each other. Nonetheless, most of the data reported here are for the sample as a whole, giving an account of practices drawn from a heterogeneous cross-sectional sample of Asian gay men in Sydney. The present data from the SAGCPS are compared, in places, with those from the Sydney Gay Community Periodic Surveys (SGCPS). The different sampling methods and the differences in recruitment sites should be considered in the interpretation of such comparisons (Hull *et al.*, 2003; Prestage *et al.*, 1999).

# Demographic Profile

## ETHNICITY

In 2002, as in 1999, the participants were drawn from a range of Asian backgrounds (Table 2.1). The proportion of participants of Chinese 'mainland' origin dropped in 2002 compared with that in 1999. The proportion of participants of South-East Asian origin dropped slightly from 40% in 1999 to around 37% in 2002. However, participants from Japan and Taiwan increased in 2002.

**Table 2.1 : Ethnic or Cultural Background**

	1999	2002
Chinese	145 (47.7%)	159 (38.3%)
Filipino	26 (8.6%)	46 (11.1%)
Thai	26 (8.6%)	39 (9.4%)
Japanese	11 (3.6%)	30 (7.2%)
Vietnamese	34 (11.2%)	26 (6.3%)
Indonesian	19 (6.3%)	26 (6.3%)
Korean	15 (4.9%)	18 (4.3%)
Taiwanese Chinese	1 (0.3%)	17 (4.1%)
Malay	11 (3.6%)	9 (2.2%)
Indian	5 (1.6%)	8 (1.9%)
Cambodian/Lao	3 (1.0%)	4 (1.0%)
Singaporean	4 (1.3%)	1 (0.2%)
Other	4 (1.3%)	32 (7.7%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>304 (100%)</b>	<b>415 (100%)</b>

$p < .001$

By country of birth, the two samples did not differ significantly. Over half in each survey were born in South-East Asia, with a sizable proportion from Mainland China, Hong Kong or Taiwan (Table 2.2). From Tables 2.1 and 2.2, the three predominant groups among gay Asian men in Sydney are Chinese, Vietnamese and Filipinos. Australian/NZ/European-born Asians accounted for around 9% of the samples.

**Table 2.2 : Country of Birth**

	1999	2002
Vietnam	38 (12.7%)	32 (7.7%)
Malaysia	37 (12.3%)	50 (12.1%)
Indonesia	35 (11.7%)	33 (8.0%)
Philippines	30 (10.0%)	42 (10.2%)
Australia	26 (8.7%)	33 (8.0%)
Thailand	23 (7.7%)	39 (9.4%)
China Hong Kong	22 (7.3%)	24 (5.8%)
China mainland	19 (6.3%)	36 (8.7%)
Singapore	18 (6.0%)	34 (8.2%)
Korea	13 (4.3%)	17 (4.1%)
Japan	12 (4.0%)	31 (7.5%)
Taiwan	10 (3.3%)	17 (4.1%)
New Zealand/Europe	4 (1.4%)	4 (1.0%)
Cambodia	3 (1.0%)	2 (0.5%)
India	3 (1.0%)	4 (1.0%)
Laos	2 (0.7%)	2 (0.5%)
Brunei	1 (0.3%)	–
Burma	1 (0.3%)	–
Sri Lanka	1 (0.3%)	–
Other	2 (0.7%)	13 (3.1%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>300 (100%)</b>	<b>413 (100%)</b>

ns

It may be that cultural and ethnic differences in the sample are reflected in differences in behaviour and attitude. However, there were insufficient men in each group to enable detailed analysis with sub-groupings (Table 2.2). As is the case with any analysis based on cultural groupings, ethnic or cultural background does not represent an homogenous category. Men in each of these groups may or may not identify in the same way or in some other way and each group may be different from the others in various ways. In particular, the Chinese men in the study spanned a variety of groups: those from the Chinese mainland, Hong Kong Chinese, Malay Chinese, Singaporean Chinese, Indonesian Chinese, Taiwanese, Vietnamese Chinese, etc. Indeed, the very basis of the survey — Asian gay men — is a pragmatic one that necessarily involves choices that are subjective (geographical boundaries, appearance, personal identity). Given these limitations, the findings of this survey should be considered with due regard to the possible differences between and within the various ethnic or cultural groupings that were included in the sample. What may be true for the sample as a whole may not necessarily be an accurate description of what applies to men of different ethnic or cultural backgrounds. Detailed analysis of these differences was not possible, mainly due to insufficient numbers within the subgroups.

In the report on the first survey (Prestage *et al.*, 2000), we described some of the apparent differences between the broad cultural and ethnic groupings that were present in the sample, while indicating the limitations of such analyses, both analytically and statistically. To the extent that it was possible to determine, this subsequent survey has found similar trends between and within these groupings. An exploration of these ethnic

and cultural subtleties may be better achieved through a subsequent in-depth study consisting of both quantitative and qualitative methods. It is also possible that cultural differences between the men in both samples are relatively minor, at least with regard to the issues addressed in this study. This report should be primarily viewed as a general description of practices in the target population.

## AUSTRALIAN RESIDENTIAL STATUS

In both samples, half of the men had been living in Australia for at least five years (Table 2.3). Relatively few men had lived here for less than twelve months in both years.

**Table 2.3 : Length of Time in Australia**

	1999	2002
Born in Australia	25 (7.9%)	20 (4.8%)
More than five years	144 (45.6%)	194 (46.2%)
3-5 years	47 (14.9%)	85 (20.2%)
1-2 years	51 (16.1%)	49 (11.7%)
Less than a year	49 (15.5%)	72 (17.1%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>316 (100%)</b>	<b>420 (100%)</b>

ns

Compared with 1999, the proportion of Australian citizens dropped in 2002, while the proportion of permanent residents increased (Table 2.4). Together, Australian citizens and permanent residents accounted for two-thirds of the sample in both years. Few men were temporary visitors/tourists (including most of the students) in both samples.

**Table 2.4 : Australian Residency Status**

	1999	2002
Australian citizen	154 (48.7)	175 (40.7%)
Permanent resident	60 (19.0%)	120 (27.9%)
Tourist/Visitor	49 (15.5%)	64 (14.9%)
Applying for residency	25 (7.9%)	22 (5.1%)
Other	28 (8.9%)	49 (11.4%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>316 (100%)</b>	<b>430 (100%)</b>

$p < .05$

As with cultural and ethnic differences, differences in the length of time living in Australia or in residential status may influence behaviour and attitude. Whereas the relatively small numbers limit the capacity to explore these issues in detail, in our earlier survey we examined the differences to the extent possible. With regard to the issues primarily addressed in this study (i.e. risk behaviours and access to information about HIV), length of time in Australia appeared to make little difference. Nonetheless, it is

likely that length of time in Australia would affect other issues not addressed directly in this study, or might affect the issues dealt with in this study in subtle ways that cannot be measured easily using this methodology or with such relatively small numbers. As was the case with cultural and ethnic differences, it is likely that a subsequent in-depth study encompassing both quantitative and qualitative methods, could better explore these issues in detail.

## GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION

As with most surveys of gay men in Sydney, this was a predominantly inner-city sample (Table 2.5). However, the proportion of inner-city dwellers (Gay Sydney, Eastern Suburbs and Inner Sydney) dropped from 62% in 1999 to 51% in 2002, while the proportion of participants categorised as living 'elsewhere/unknown' almost doubled (some due to missing data). Vietnamese and Filipino respondents, however, were more likely to live in Western Sydney than were other respondents.

**Table 2.5 : Residential Location**

	1999	2002
Gay Sydney	58 (18.2%)	70 (15.3%)
Eastern Suburbs	31 (9.7%)	37 (8.1%)
Inner Sydney	110 (34.5%)	130 (28.4%)
Northern Suburbs	34 (10.7%)	35 (7.7%)
Southern Suburbs	17 (5.3%)	33 (7.2%)
Western Suburbs	32 (10.0%)	42 (9.2%)
Elsewhere/unknown	37 (11.6%)	110 (24.1%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>319 (100%)</b>	<b>457 (100%)</b>

$p < .01$

## AGE

In 1999, respondents ranged between 19 and 65 years of age, with a median of 29 years. In 2002, the age range was the same and the median was 30 years. On average, the men in these samples were younger than those in the SGCPs (Hull *et al.*, 2003).

**Table 2.6 : Age**

	1999	2002
Under 25	56 (17.9%)	64 (15.2%)
25–29	104 (33.1%)	164 (38.9%)
30–39	135 (43.0%)	168 (39.8%)
40–49	17 (5.4%)	24 (5.7%)
50 and over	2 (0.6%)	2 (0.5%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>314 (100%)</b>	<b>422 (100%)</b>

ns

## EMPLOYMENT AND OCCUPATION

In 2002, compared with 1999, the proportion in full-time employment increased while the proportion in part-time employment decreased correspondingly (Table 2.7). Approximately 20% were students in both samples.

**Table 2.7 : Employment Status**

	1999	2002
Full-time	171 (54.3%)	275 (64.1%)
Part-time	68 (21.6%)	50 (11.7%)
Student	53 (16.8%)	81 (18.9%)
Unemployed/Other	23 (7.3%)	23 (5.4%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>315 (100%)</b>	<b>429 (100%)</b>

$p < .01$

In 2002, there was a significant increase in professional/managerial participants and a decrease in clerical/sales participants (Table 2.8). Blue-collar workers were a minority, as in other surveys of gay men (Hull *et al.*, 2003).

**Table 2.8 : Occupation**

	1999	2002
Professional/Managerial		
Professional/Managerial	73 (32.9%)	151 (50.2%)
Paraprofessional	22 (9.9%)	28 (9.3%)
White collar		
Clerical/ Sales	119 (53.6%)	98 (32.6%)
Blue collar		
Trades	5 (2.3%)	13 (4.3%)
Plant operator/Labourer	3 (1.4%)	11 (3.7%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>222 (100%)</b>	<b>301 (100%)</b>

Note: Includes all men who specified their occupation, whether currently employed or not.

$p < .001$

## EDUCATION

As in previous gay-community-based studies, this sample was relatively well educated: most of the men had received some post-secondary education and nearly two thirds had some university education (Table 2.9).

**Table 2.9 : Education**

	1999	2002
Up to 4 years of high school	20 (6.3%)	22 (5.3%)
Higher School Certificate	31 (9.8%)	36 (8.7%)
Trade certificate or diploma	67 (21.3%)	87 (21.0%)
University	197 (62.5%)	270 (65.1%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>315 (100%)</b>	<b>415 (100%)</b>

ns

## RELIGION

One-third of participants in both the 1999 and 2002 samples did not have a religious belief (Table 2.10). In 2002, there was an increase in the proportion of people who selected 'other' religion and the proportion of Christians in the 2002 sample dropped, compared with 1999.

**Table 2.10 : Religion**

	1999	2002
None	104 (33.3%)	142 (33.3%)
Buddhist	88 (28.2%)	136 (31.8%)
Christian	99 (31.7%)	108 (25.2%)
Muslim	14 (4.5%)	14 (3.3%)
Hindu	4 (1.3%)	7 (1.6%)
Other	3 (1.0%)	21 (4.9%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>312 (100%)</b>	<b>428 (100%)</b>

 $p < .05$ 

## SEXUAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH WOMEN

As with other samples of gay and homosexually active men, few of these men had had sex with women in the previous six months (Table 2.11). There was a slight decrease in the 2002 sample in terms of the proportion of men who had two or more female partners in the previous six months (borderline significance).

**Table 2.11 : Sex with Women in Previous Six Months**

	1999	2002
No female partners	277 (87.1%)	402 (88.7%)
One female partner	19 (6.0%)	36 (7.9%)
More than one female partner	22 (6.9%)	15 (3.3%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>318 (100%)</b>	<b>453 (100%)</b>

 $p < .05$



## SEXUAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH MEN

In both the 1999 and 2002 samples, one-third 'currently' had casual partners only, nearly one-third 'currently' had both regular and casual partners, over a quarter 'currently' only had regular partners, and one in ten gave no indication that they were 'currently' having sex with men (Table 2.12). There were no significant changes over time.

**Table 2.12 : 'Current' Sexual Relationships with Men**

	1999	2002
No sex with men	29 (9.9%)	41 (10.5%)
Casual partners only	97 (33.0%)	129 (33.1%)
Regular partner only	83 (28.2%)	100 (25.6%)
Both casual and regular partners	85 (28.9%)	120 (30.8%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>294 (100%)</b>	<b>390 (100%)</b>

ns

As in 1999, length of residence in Australia had little impact on the nature of the respondents' sexual contacts, other than that, those who had recently arrived in Australia had, somewhat, less sex with men 'currently' (which may have had as much to do with lack of opportunity as anything else).

Those who had a regular partner or boyfriend were specifically asked to describe the type of relationship they had. In both samples, over a third said they were in a monogamous relationship, while another third reported being in an open relationship where both partners had casual sex outside. There were some changes in relationship patterns over time, as shown in Table 2.13. In particular, somewhat more men indicated that they had sex with other men outside their relationship, while their partner did not.

**Table 2.13 : Types of Regular Relationships with Men**

	1999	2002
Monogamous	57 (36.8%)	67 (34.4%)
My partner has casual sex but I do not	12 (7.7%)	6 (3.1%)
I have casual sex but my partner does not	21 (13.5%)	47 (24.1%)
Both of us have casual sex	52 (33.5%)	67 (34.4%)
I have several regular partners	13 (8.4%)	8 (4.1%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>155 (100%)</b>	<b>195 (100%)</b>

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

$p < .05$

Among those men who were in a regular relationship, over half of the relationships had lasted for more than a year in both the 1999 and 2002 samples (Table 2.14). Separate analyses showed that length of residence in Australia had little impact on how long the respondents had been in a relationship.

**Table 2.14 : Length of Relationship with Men**

	<b>1999</b>	<b>2002</b>
Less than one year	82 (42.5%)	69 (34.8%)
At least one year	111 (57.5%)	129 (65.2%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>193 (100%)</b>	<b>198 (100%)</b>

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

ns

# Contact with Communities

In several respects, this was a gay-identified and gay-community-attached sample.

## ATTACHMENT TO ETHNIC COMMUNITY

A third of the men in the sample felt very much part of their ethnic community in Australia and one in five felt not at all part of that community (Table 3.1). There was no significant change over time.

**Table 3.1 : Ethnic Community Attachment**

	1999	2002
Very much a part of ethnic community in Australia	97 (31.2%)	148 (34.7%)
Only feel slightly a part of ethnic community	147 (47.3%)	194 (45.4%)
Do not feel part of ethnic community at all	67 (21.5%)	85 (19.9%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>311 (100%)</b>	<b>427 (100%)</b>

ns

## ETHNIC COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Table 3.2 shows that nearly 60% of participants felt 'somewhat' or 'very much' involved in ethnic communities in Australia. The Vietnamese men tended to feel more involved with their ethnic community than did other men.

**Table 3.2 : Ethnic Community Involvement**

	<b>2002</b>
Very much involved in ethnic community in Australia	56 (13.2%)
Somewhat involved in ethnic community	191 (44.9%)
Not involved in ethnic community at all	178 (41.9%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>425 (100%)</b>

Table 3.3 shows that over 60% of the participants spent 'some' or 'a lot' of their spare time with other Asians (non-gay-identified).

**Table 3.3 : Proportion of Free Time with Other Asians**

	<b>2002</b>
None	31 (6.8%)
A little	140 (30.7%)
Some	161 (35.3%)
A lot	124 (27.2%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>456 (100%)</b>

Table 3.4 indicates that in both samples (1999 and 2002), nearly a quarter of the participants spent 'a lot' of their spare time with fellow gay Asian men. Separate analyses revealed that length of residence in Australia had little relationship with how much time the respondents spent with gay Asian men.

**Table 3.4 : Proportion of Free Time Spent with Gay Asian Men**

	<b>1999</b>	<b>2002</b>
None	23 (7.3%)	47 (10.3%)
A little	100 (31.5%)	131 (28.8%)
Some	120 (37.9%)	179 (39.3%)
A lot	74 (23.3%)	98 (21.5%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>317 (100%)</b>	<b>455 (100%)</b>

ns

As indicated in the 2002 data shown in Table 3.5, half of the participants did not read any ethnic press. The Vietnamese and Indonesian men were somewhat more likely to read the ethnic press.

**Table 3.5 : Ethnic Press readership**

	<b>2002</b>
Never	204 (53.5%)
Some issues	168 (44.1%)
Most or all issues	9 (2.4%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>381 (100%)</b>

As indicated in the 2002 data shown in Table 3.6, sizable proportions of the participants were aware of ACON Asian Project/Silk Road and Asian Marching Boys. The Vietnamese respondents tended to have less knowledge of such organisations than did other respondents.

**Table 3.6 : Heard of Gay Asian Events**

	<b>2002</b>
ACON Asian project	224 (49.0%)
ACON Silk Road	187 (40.9%)
Asian Marching Boys	230 (50.3%)
Pe De Nite	96 (21.0%)

Note: Percentages are based on the total sample, although not all men responded to these items. Items are not mutually exclusive.  
N = 457

As shown in Table 3.7, approximately 43% of the participants in 2002 experienced some discrimination based on their homosexuality, within local ethnic communities, in the past year.

**Table 3.7 : Homosexual Discrimination within Ethnic Community**

	<b>2002</b>
Never	240 (57.0%)
Occasionally	158 (37.5%)
Often	23 (5.5%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>421 (100%)</b>

## **SEXUAL IDENTITY AND DISCLOSURE OF HOMOSEXUALITY**

The men in both samples were mostly homosexually identified (Table 3.8). Homosexual identification included 'gay/homosexual'. Non-homosexual identification included 'bisexual' and 'heterosexual'. (Length of residence in Australia had little impact on sexual identity but Vietnamese, Indonesian and Filipino respondents were somewhat less likely to be homosexually identified.)

**Table 3.8 : Sexual Identity**

	<b>1999</b>	<b>2002</b>
Homosexually identified	257 (82.9%)	391 (86.1%)
Not homosexually identified	53 (17.1%)	63 (13.8%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>310 (100%)</b>	<b>454 (100%)</b>

ns

In 2002, participants were asked about the people to whom they had disclosed their homosexuality. Over three-quarters had told any gay friends; over half had told any straight friends; nearly a half had told any work colleagues; and less than 40% had told any family members or relatives. The percentage of people who had disclosed their homosexuality to any doctors was less than a half. Vietnamese and Indonesian respondents tended to be less likely to have disclosed their homosexuality to any family members.

**Table 3.9 : Disclosure of sexual identification**

	<b>2002</b>
Told any family member	181 (39.6%)
Told any relatives	137 (30.0%)
Told any straight friends	262 (57.3%)
Told any gay friends	360 (78.8%)
Told any workmates	227 (49.7%)
Told any doctors	182 (39.9%)
<b>Told any others</b>	<b>67 (14.6%)</b>

Note: Percentages are based on the total sample, although not all men responded to these items. Items are not mutually exclusive.

N = 457

## ATTACHMENT TO GAY COMMUNITY

Around 40% the men in both the 1999 and 2002 samples felt very much part of gay communities in Australia (Table 3.10). The participants in both years were more "gay" than ethnic community attached.

**Table 3.10 : Gay Community Attachment**

	<b>1999</b>	<b>2002</b>
Very much a part of gay community in Australia	136 (43.2%)	158 (37.4%)
Only feel slightly a part of gay community	126 (40.0%)	191 (45.3%)
Do not feel part of gay community at all	53 (16.8%)	73 (17.3%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>315 (100%)</b>	<b>422 (100%)</b>

ns

Not surprisingly, those who had recently arrived in Australia viewed themselves as being less part of gay communities in Australia. Also, ethnic background had little effect on whether the respondents felt part of gay community.

## GAY COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

In 2002, participants were asked about their involvement within gay communities in Australia. Nearly 70% of the participants were 'somewhat' or 'very much' involved in gay community.

**Table 3.11 : Gay Community involvement**

	<b>2002</b>
Very much involved in gay community in Australia	79 (18.6%)
Somewhat involved in gay community	213 (50.2%)
Not involved in gay community at all	132 (31.1%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>424 (100%)</b>

The men in both the 1999 and 2002 samples were quite socially involved with gay men and over a third of the men in both samples reported 'most' or 'all' of their friends as being gay.

**Table 3.12 : Proportion of Gay Friends**

	<b>1999</b>	<b>2002</b>
None	5 (1.6%)	10 (2.2%)
Few	100 (31.3%)	110 (24.1%)
Some	102 (32.0%)	172 (37.6%)
Most or all	112 (35.1%)	165 (36.2%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>319 (100%)</b>	<b>457 (100%)</b>

ns

Correspondingly, in both years, approximately a third of the men reported spending 'a lot' of free time with gay men. Quite understandably, separate analyses showed that those who had recently arrived in Australia spent a little less time with gay friends.

**Table 3.13 : Proportion of Free Time Spent with Gay Men**

	<b>1999</b>	<b>2002</b>
None	4 (1.3%)	7 (1.5%)
A little	81 (25.6%)	92 (20.1%)
Some	129 (40.7%)	191 (41.8%)
A lot	103 (32.5%)	167 (36.5%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>317 (100%)</b>	<b>457 (100%)</b>

ns

In the 2002 sample, nearly one in five read 'most' or 'all' issues of the gay press. A similar proportion never read any gay print media. Tables 3.5 and 3.14 indicate that readership of gay press is more popular than that of ethnic press.

**Table 3.14 : Gay Press Readership**

	<b>2002</b>
Never	79 (19.0%)
Some issues	257 (61.8%)
Most or all issues	80 (19.2%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>416 (100%)</b>

In 2002, over half of the men experienced some discrimination based on their minority ethnic background, in gay communities in Australia, in the past year.

**Table 3.15 : Racial Discrimination within Gay Community**

	<b>2002</b>
Never	186 (44.2%)
Occasionally	204 (48.5%)
Often	31 (7.4%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>421 (100%)</b>

Table 3.16 shows that an overwhelming majority of the men in the 2002 sample were happy to be gay and felt comfortable being Asian. Around 10% of the participants, however, reported difficulty in either their homosexual or ethnic identity.

**Table 3.16 : Being Gay Asian Men**

<b>2002</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>
I am happy to be gay! (n =427)	218 (51.1%)	166 (38.9%)	37 (8.7%)	6 (1.4%)
Being Asian is great! (n = 402)	184 (45.8%)	166 (41.3%)	46 (11.4%)	6 (1.5%)

## USE OF GAY VENUES

In both samples, the majority of the men went to gay saunas or gay bars to meet partners. There was a significant increase, over time, in the proportion of men who used the Internet to seek partners. There was also a significant increase in the use of gay Asian events. However, as two additional gay Asian events were used for recruitment in 2002, it may have contributed to this increase. Similarly, an additional sex-on-premises venue was used during the 2002 recruitment, which may have contributed to the slight increase in the proportion of men using saunas (and probably, beats), compared with 1999. Increases were also seen in the use of both gay dance parties and gay sex parties to seek partners in 2002. There was also a decrease in the proportion of men who used adult bookshops or video parlours to find partners, but this was probably due to changes in recruitment. In 2002, as shown in Table 3.17, over 40% of the participants also reported meeting sex partners through their friendship circles.



**Table 3.17 : Ways of Meeting Sex Partners**

	1999 (n = 319)	2002 (n = 457)	p
Saunas	206 (64.6%)	341 (76.6%)	< .01
Gay bars	189 (59.2%)	286 (62.6%)	ns
Internet	109 (34.2%)	254 (55.6%)	< .001
Via friends	–	204 (45.1%)	–
Gay dance parties	101 (31.7%)	190 (41.6%)	< .01
Sex clubs	98 (30.7%)	149 (32.6%)	ns
Beats	72 (22.6%)	140 (30.6%)	< .05
Personal advertisements	77 (24.1%)	120 (26.3%)	ns
Gay Asian events	40 (12.5%)	115 (25.2%)	< .001
Adult bookshops/Video shops	104 (32.6%)	101 (22.1%)	< .001
Shopping malls	52 (16.3%)	97 (21.2%)	ns
Sex parties	24 (7.6%)	68 (14.9%)	< .01
Phone sex lines	28 (8.7%)	44 (9.6%)	ns
Leather events	15 (4.7%)	37 (8.1%)	ns
Other	13 (4.1%)	–	–

Note: Percentages are based on the total sample, although not all men responded to these items. Items are not mutually exclusive.

It is worth noting that the majority of the men in this study who were recruited in gay bars also used gay sex-on-premises venues to meet partners. Similarly, the majority of the men recruited in sex venues also used gay bars. (Length of residence in Australia had little impact on where the respondents sought male sex partners.)

## CONTACT WITH HIV EPIDEMIC

Over half the men in both samples knew nobody with HIV and few knew more than five HIV-positive people (Table 3.18). Separate analyses indicated little difference across the various ethnic subgroups in this regard.

**Table 3.18 : Number of People Known with HIV**

	1999	2002
None	176 (56.4%)	229 (52.4%)
One	48 (15.4%)	87 (19.9%)
Two	43 (13.8%)	42 (9.6%)
3-5	29 (9.3%)	57 (13.0%)
More than five	16 (5.1%)	22 (5.1%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>312 (100%)</b>	<b>437 (100%)</b>

ns

As shown in Table 3.19, in the 2002 sample, the percentage of men who knew somebody who had died following AIDS, decreased significantly, compared with 1999. There were even fewer men who knew more than five people who had died following

AIDS. This may be due to changes in the nature of the epidemic rather than changes in the target population. Thai respondents tended to know more people that had died.

**Table 3.19 : Number of People Known to Have Died from AIDS**

	<b>1999</b>	<b>2002</b>
None	233 (74.2%)	361 (82.2%)
One	34 (10.8%)	32 (7.3%)
Two	31 (9.9%)	23 (5.2%)
3-5	6 (1.9%)	19 (4.3%)
More than five	10 (3.1%)	4 (0.9%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>314 (100%)</b>	<b>439 (100%)</b>

*p* < .01

# HIV and STI Testing

Although most of the men had already been tested for HIV, around one-quarter had not (or did not know their HIV status). Only a small number of men were HIV positive (Table 4.1). There was no change over time. The percentage of men who had not had an HIV test was much higher in the Sydney Asian Gay Community Periodic Survey (SAGCPS) samples than in the Sydney Gay Community Periodic Survey (SGCPS) samples (on average, around 10%, Hull *et al.*, 2003).

**Table 4.1 : HIV Test Results**

	<b>1999</b>	<b>2002</b>
HIV-negative	223 (71.0%)	330 (73.7%)
HIV-positive	10 (3.2%)	16 (3.6%)
Not tested/No results	81 (25.8%)	102 (22.8%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>314 (100%)</b>	<b>448 (100%)</b>

ns

## **TIME SINCE MOST RECENT HIV-ANTIBODY TEST**

In both samples, among those men who have had tests for HIV, over 60% had done so within the previous year (Table 4.2). Less than 20% of the men reported infrequent testing, i.e., over two years prior to the survey.

**Table 4.2 : Time Since Most Recent HIV Test**

	1999	2002
Less than 6 months ago	112 (45.7%)	149 (41.5%)
7–12 months ago	48 (19.6%)	75 (20.9%)
1–2 years ago	53 (21.6%)	66 (18.4%)
Over 2 years ago	32 (13.0%)	69 (19.2%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>245 (100%)</b>	<b>359 (100%)</b>

Note: Includes only those men who have been tested for HIV.

ns

In 2002, those who had an HIV test were asked to indicate where they had the last test. Over 40% went to doctors/GPs and approximately a third went to sexual health clinics (Table 4.3). Some participants had an HIV test as part of immigration requirements.

**Table 4.3 : Location of Last HIV Test**

	2002
Doctors/GPs	158 (43.2%)
Sexual health clinics	112 (30.6%)
Hospitals	56 (15.3%)
'Immigration'	34 (9.3%)
Other	6 (1.6%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>366 (100%)</b>

In 2002, those who had *never* had an HIV test or who did *not* know their HIV status were asked about the reasons. The two most cited reasons were: "Don't want to know the result" and "I am at low risk and don't need to test" (Table 4.4). Some participants did not know where to go for an HIV test and some feared stigma or discrimination. Cost was cited as an obstacle by very few men. (Neither length of residence in Australia nor ethnic background was related to unknown HIV serostatus.)

**Table 4.4 : Reasons for Not Having an HIV Test**

	2002
Don't want to know the result	40 (39.2%)
I am at low risk and don't need to test	38 (37.3%)
Don't know where to go for a test	14 (13.7%)
Don't want government to know	13 (12.7%)
Fear of stigma/discrimination	12 (11.8%)
Cost	3 (2.9%)
Other	5 (4.9%)

Note: Items are not mutually exclusive. Only those who have not had a test or who did not their HIV status are included (n = 102).

## REGULAR PARTNER'S HIV-STATUS

Participants were asked about the serostatus of their 'current' regular partners. As the question referred to their current partner, fewer men responded to this item than indicated sex with a regular partner during the previous six months.

As shown in Table 4.5, nearly two-thirds had an HIV-negative regular partner, few men had an HIV-positive regular partner, and one in three men had a 'current' regular partner whose serostatus they did not know. There was no change over time.

**Table 4.5 : HIV Status of Regular Partners**

	1999	2002
HIV-positive	9 (4.9%)	18 (7.7%)
HIV-negative	110 (60.4%)	142 (60.7%)
HIV status unknown	63 (34.6%)	74 (31.6%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>182 (100%)</b>	<b>234 (100%)</b>

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

ns

In both 1999 and 2002, most of the HIV negative participants had an HIV negative partner. Likewise, the participants who did not know their own HIV status largely had a regular partner whose serostatus was also unknown to the participant. Of the small number of HIV positive men in 2002, six out of nine had an HIV negative regular partner (Table 4.6).

**Table 4.6 : Match of HIV Status in Regular Relationships**

Serostatus of Regular Partner	Participant's HIV Status		
	HIV-Positive	HIV-Negative	Unknown
<b>1999</b>			
HIV-positive	5 (62.5%)	3 (2.3%)	1 (2.6%)
HIV-negative	1 (12.5%)	94 (70.7%)	12 (31.6%)
HIV status unknown	2 (25.0%)	36 (27.1%)	25 (65.8%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>8 (100%)</b>	<b>133 (100%)</b>	<b>38 (100%)</b>
<b>2002</b>			
HIV-positive	2 (22.2%)	12 (6.8%)	4 (9.1%)
HIV-negative	6 (66.7%)	122 (68.9%)	12 (27.3%)
HIV status unknown	1 (11.1%)	43 (24.3%)	28 (63.6%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>9 (100%)</b>	<b>177 (100%)</b>	<b>44 (100%)</b>

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

## STI TESTING

In 2002, questions about STI testing were added to the questionnaire. About 40% of the participants have never had an STI test. Nearly one third of the men had had an STI test 'in the past six month' (Table 4.7).

**Table 4.7 : STI Testing**

	<b>2002</b>
Never tested	173 (40.2%)
More than 2 years ago	43 (10.0%)
1-2 years ago	44 (10.2%)
7-12 months ago	44 (10.2%)
Less than 6 months ago	126 (29.3%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>430 (100%)</b>

# Sexual Practice and 'Safe Sex'

## SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR BETWEEN MEN

Participants were asked to report separately, for regular and casual partners, on a limited range of sexual practices: anal intercourse with ejaculation inside, anal intercourse withdrawal prior to ejaculation and oral intercourse (each in terms of the insertive or the receptive role). The anal intercourse practices were selected for their possible association with HIV transmission.

Based on the responses to these sexual behaviour items and the sort of sexual relationships with men indicated by the participants, three quarters of the men were classified as having had sex with a casual male partner 'in the previous six months', for both 1999 and 2002 (Table 5.1). In 2002, the proportion of men having any sexual contact with a regular partner 'in the previous six months' decreased significantly, compared with 1999, but still, over half did so. The additional sex-on-premises recruitment site in 2002 may have contributed to this change.

**Table 5.1 : Reported Sex with Male Partners in the Previous Six Months**

	1999	2002	p
Any sexual contact with <i>regular</i> partners	210 (65.8%)	258 (56.5%)	< .01
Any sexual contact with <i>casual</i> partners	240 (75.2%)	351 (76.8%)	ns
<b>Total</b>	<b>319</b>	<b>457</b>	

Note: These categories are not mutually exclusive.

As shown in Table 5.2, in 1999, men recruited at sex-on-premises venues had more sexual contact with casual partners than those recruited at social venues. In 2002, the difference was even more marked.

**Table 5.2 : Reported Sex with Male Partners in The Previous Six Months by Recruitment Sites**

	Sex-on-Premises Venues	Social Venues	p
<b>1999</b>			
Any sexual contact with <i>regular</i> partners	61 (62.9%)	149 (67.1%)	ns
Any sexual contact with <i>casual</i> partners	83 (85.6%)	157 (70.7%)	< .01
<b>Total</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>222</b>	
<b>2002</b>			
Any sexual contact with <i>regular</i> partners	119 (56.4%)	139 (56.5%)	ns
Any sexual contact with <i>casual</i> partners	183 (86.7%)	168 (68.3%)	< .001
<b>Total</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>246</b>	

Note: These categories are not mutually exclusive.

In both samples, over 70% of the men had engaged in sex with between 1 and 10 partners 'in the previous six months', although nearly a quarter of the men had more than 10 partners (Table 5.3). In 2002, the proportion of men who had only one partner (in the six months prior to the survey) decreased, while the proportions of men who had between 6 and 10 partners increased substantially. The additional sex-on-premises site used for recruitment in 2002 may have contributed to this change.

**Table 5.3 : Number of Male Partners in the Previous Six Months**

	1999	2002
None	12 (3.8%)	24 (5.3%)
One	63 (19.9%)	56 (12.3%)
2–5	125 (39.4%)	165 (36.2%)
6–10	45 (14.2%)	99 (21.7%)
11–50	58 (18.3%)	83 (18.2%)
More than 50	14 (4.4%)	29 (6.4%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>317 (100%)</b>	<b>456 (100%)</b>

$p < .01$

Around 60% of the men had some Asian male partners 'in the previous six months' and, in particular, one in five had 'most' or 'all' Asian male partners (Table 5.4). There was no change over time. (Length of residence in Australia had little impact on whether the respondents had sex with other Asian men.)

**Table 5.4 : Asian Men as Proportion of Male Partners**

	1999	2002
None	135 (42.6%)	181 (39.7%)
Some	119 (37.5%)	174 (38.2%)
Most	39 (12.3%)	71 (15.6%)
All	24 (7.6%)	30 (6.6%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>317 (100%)</b>	<b>456 (100%)</b>

ns



## SEXUAL PRACTICES WITH REGULAR AND WITH CASUAL PARTNERS

In both years, over half of the participants engaged in oral intercourse with their regular male partners in the six months prior to the survey, and those who did were equally likely to do so in the insertive as in the receptive role (Table 5.5). In 2002, however, based on the total sample, the proportion of men who engaged in oral sex with regular partners decreased. Nevertheless, based on the reduced sample (among those who *had* regular partners), such change was not significant — so, if they had a regular partner they were just as likely to engage in insertive as well as receptive oral intercourse.

In both years, around half of the participants engaged in anal intercourse with their regular male partners. In 2002, however, based on the total sample, there were decreases in the proportions of men who had anal intercourse overall and in the proportions of the men who had insertive anal intercourse in particular. Nevertheless, based on the reduced sample, these differences were no longer present but there was a significant *increase* among men who had receptive anal intercourse. For those who had a regular partner, they were just as likely to engage in insertive as well as receptive anal intercourse

**Table 5.5 : Sexual Behaviour with Regular Male Partners**

	1999	2002	
	Total Sample (n = 319)	Total Sample (n = 457)	
			p
Any oral intercourse	206 (64.6%)	252 (55.1%)	< .01
Insertive oral intercourse	192 (60.2%)	240 (52.5%)	< .05
Receptive oral intercourse	200 (62.7%)	243 (53.2%)	< .05
Any anal intercourse	179 (56.2%)	220 (48.1%)	< .05
Insertive anal intercourse	151 (47.4%)	181 (39.6%)	< .05
Receptive anal intercourse	130 (40.8%)	184 (40.3%)	ns
	Those with Regular Partners (n = 210)	Those with Regular Partners (n = 258)	
			p
Any oral intercourse	206 (98.1%)	252 (97.7%)	ns
Insertive oral intercourse	192 (91.4%)	240 (93.0%)	ns
Receptive oral intercourse	200 (95.2%)	243 (94.2%)	ns
Any anal intercourse	179 (85.2%)	220 (85.3%)	ns
Insertive anal intercourse	151 (71.9%)	181 (70.2%)	ns
Receptive anal intercourse	130 (61.9%)	184 (71.3%)	< .05

Note: Items are not mutually exclusive.

Although three new recruitment sites were added in 2002, the participants' sex practices with casual partners did not change substantially over the years (Table 5.6). In both years, over 60% of the men had oral sex with casual partners in the six months

prior to the survey. Based on the total sample, the proportion of men who engaged in insertive oral sex with casual partners increased slightly. However, based on the reduced sample, there was no significant change over time — so, if they had sex with casual partners they were just as likely to engage in insertive as well as receptive oral intercourse.

For anal sex with casual partners, in both years, over half of the men did so and there was no significant change over the years. In 1999, it seemed that more men who practised the insertive role than the receptive role for casual anal intercourse. However, in 2002, differentiations between insertive and receptive roles for casual anal intercourse narrowed both in the total and reduced samples.

**Table 5.6 : Sexual Behaviour with Casual Male Partners**

	<b>1999</b>	<b>2002</b>	
	<b>Total Sample (n = 319)</b>	<b>Total Sample (n = 457)</b>	
			p
Any oral intercourse	202 (63.3%)	308 (67.4%)	ns
Insertive oral intercourse	181 (56.7%)	292 (63.9%)	< .05
Receptive oral intercourse	199 (62.4%)	297 (65.0%)	ns
Any anal intercourse	165 (51.7%)	250 (54.7%)	ns
Insertive anal intercourse	139 (43.6%)	208 (45.5%)	ns
Receptive anal intercourse	120 (37.6%)	195 (42.7%)	ns
	<b>Those with Casual Partners (n = 240)</b>	<b>Those with Casual Partners (n = 351)</b>	
			p
Any oral intercourse	202 (84.2%)	308 (87.7%)	ns
Insertive oral intercourse	181 (75.4%)	292 (83.2%)	ns
Receptive oral intercourse	199 (82.9%)	297 (84.6%)	ns
Any anal intercourse	165 (76.5%)	250 (71.2%)	ns
Insertive anal intercourse	139 (57.9%)	208 (59.3%)	ns
Receptive anal intercourse	120 (50.0%)	195 (55.6%)	ns

Note: Items are not mutually exclusive.

## OTHER SEX PRACTICES

Participants were asked to report on some other sex practices with male partners, either regular or casual, 'in the previous six months' (insertive and receptive roles were not specified for these questions). One in five had engaged in 'group sex' with male partners, a little less than half had engaged in 'rimming'. One in ten respondents had engaged in sadomasochistic (SM) practices and one in eight in 'fisting'. There were no significant changes over time.

**Table 5.7 : Other Sexual Activities with Male Partners in the Previous Six Months**

	1999 (n = 319)	2002 (n = 457)
Rimming	136 (42.6%)	216 (47.3%)
Group sex	65 (20.4%)	120 (26.3%)
Fisting	39 (12.3%)	54 (11.8%)
S/M	32 (10.1%)	53 (11.6%)

Note: Percentages are based on the total sample, although not all men responded to these items. Items are not mutually exclusive.

All differences across time are *ns*.

## USE OF CONDOMS IN REGULAR RELATIONSHIPS

### Condom Use

Based on the total sample, about a quarter of the men who participated in the survey engaged in any unprotected anal intercourse with regular male partners ‘in the previous six months’. There was no change over the years. Among those who had a regular partner in the six months prior to the survey, over 40% engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with regular partners (UAIR) — no change over time (Table 5.8).

**Table 5.8 : Condom Use with Regular Partners**

	1999	2002	
	Total Sample (n = 319)	Total Sample (n = 457)	
No regular partner	109 (34.2%)	199 (43.5%)	p
No anal intercourse	31 (9.7%)	38 (8.3%)	
Always uses condom	90 (28.2%)	109 (23.9%)	
Sometimes does not use condom	89 (27.9%)	111 (24.3%)	ns
	Those with Regular Partners (n = 210)	Those with Regular Partners (n = 258)	
No anal intercourse	31 (14.8%)	38 (14.7%)	p
Always uses condom	90 (42.9%)	109 (42.2%)	
Sometimes does not use condom	89 (42.4%)	111 (43.0%)	ns

For 1999, of the 89 men who engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with a regular partner ‘in the previous six months’, 41 (46.1%) practised both withdrawal prior to ejaculation and ejaculation inside UAIR, 19 (21.3%) practised only ejaculation inside UAIR, and 29 (32.6%) engaged in consistent withdrawal UAIR. For 2002, of the 111 men who engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with a regular partner ‘in the previous six months’, 47 (42.3%) practised both withdrawal prior to ejaculation and ejaculation inside UAIR, 32 (28.8%) practised only ejaculation inside UAIR, and 32 (28.8%) engaged in consistent withdrawal UAIR (*ns* over time).

Table 5.9 shows condom use based on participant's HIV serostatus. For HIV negative men, there was no change over time. For the other men, the numbers were too small to permit detailed analyses.

**Table 5.9 : Serostatus and Condom Use among Regular Partners**

	Participant's HIV Status		
	HIV-Positive	HIV-Negative	Unknown Serostatus
<b>1999</b>			
No Anal	–	20 (12.6%)	11 (26.2%)
Always uses condom	3 (42.9%)	68 (42.8%)	19 (45.2%)
Sometimes does not use condom	4 (57.1%)	71 (44.7%)	12 (28.6%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>7 (100%)</b>	<b>159 (100%)</b>	<b>42 (100%)</b>
<b>2002</b>			
No Anal	4 (40.0%)	28 (14.1%)	6 (14.0%)
Always uses condom	2 (20.0%)	85 (42.7%)	17 (39.5%)
Sometimes does not use condom	4 (40.0%)	86 (43.2%)	20 (46.5%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>10 (100%)</b>	<b>199 (100%)</b>	<b>43 (100%)</b>

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

In Table 5.10, the serostatus of each of the participants has been compared with that of his regular partner. For each of the nine serostatus combinations, sexual practice has been divided into 'no unprotected anal intercourse' versus 'some unprotected anal intercourse'. The numbers overall are too small for detailed analyses and comparisons.

In 1999, 11 (out of 151) men engaged in any UAIR with a sero-discordant or non-concordant regular partner, whereas in 2002, 25 (out of 180) did so.

**Table 5.10 : Condom Use and Match of HIV Status in Regular Relationships**

Regular Partner's Serostatus		Participant's Serostatus		
		Positive	Negative	Don't Know
<b>1999 (n = 151)</b>				
Positive	No UAI	1	2	–
	Some UAI	3	1	1
Negative	No UAI	–	41	7
	Some UAI	1	45	2
Don't Know	No UAI	1	16	13
	Some UAI	–	11	6
<b>Total</b>		<b>6</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>29</b>

.../ continued

Regular Partner's Serostatus	Participant's Serostatus			
		Positive	Negative	Don't Know
<b>2002 (n = 180)</b>				
Positive	No UAI	1	5	1
	Some UAI	–	5	2
Negative	No UAI	2	55	5
	Some UAI	3	46	6
Don't Know	No UAI	1	20	6
	Some UAI	–	13	9
<b>Total</b>		<b>7</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>29</b>

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

## Agreements

In both years, over 60% of the participants with regular male partners had agreements with their partners about sex *within* the relationship. In the SGCPs (Hull *et al.*, 2003), over 80% of the men in a regular relationship had an agreement about sex within the relationship and about a third had agreed to allow anal intercourse without a condom.

**Table 5.11 : Agreements with Regular Male Partners about Sex *within* Relationship**

	1999	2002
No spoken agreement about anal intercourse	58 (32.8%)	78 (33.9%)
No anal intercourse between regular partners is permitted	13 (7.3%)	18 (7.8%)
Anal intercourse permitted only with condom	80 (45.2%)	89 (38.7%)
Anal intercourse without condom is permitted	26 (14.7%)	45 (19.6%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>177 (100%)</b>	<b>230 (100%)</b>

ns

Table 5.12 shows that nearly 60% of the participants with a regular partner had made an agreement about sexual interactions *outside* the relationship. Where men did make such an agreement, very few permitted unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners. There was no change over the years. Men in the SGCPs (Hull *et al.*, 2003) were similar in the extent of their spoken agreements with their regular partner about sex outside the relationship.

**Table 5.12 : Agreements with Regular Male Partners about Sex *outside* Relationship**

	1999	2002
No spoken agreement about anal intercourse	59 (37.6%)	93 (43.9%)
No sexual contact with casual partners is permitted	22 (14.0%)	20 (9.4%)
No anal intercourse with casual partners is permitted	16 (10.2%)	15 (7.1%)
Anal intercourse permitted only with condom	55 (35.0%)	78 (36.8%)
Anal intercourse without condom is permitted	5 (3.2%)	6 (2.8%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>157 (100%)</b>	<b>212 (100%)</b>

ns

## SEX WITH CASUAL MALE PARTNERS

### Condom use

Based on the total sample, around 15% of the men who participated in the survey engaged in any unprotected anal intercourse with their casual male partners 'in the previous six months'. Among those who had casual partners (on the reduced base), around 20% had unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners (UAIC). There was no significant change over the years. Separate analyses showed that neither length of residence in Australia nor ethnic background had much impact on the use of condoms with casual partners among the respondents.

**Table 5.13 : Condom Use with Casual Partners**

	1999	2002	
	Total Sample (n = 319)	Total Sample (n = 457)	
No casual partner	79 (24.8%)	106 (23.2%)	p
No anal intercourse	75 (23.5%)	104 (22.8%)	
Always uses condom	113 (35.4%)	181 (39.6%)	
Sometimes does not use condom	52 (16.3%)	66 (14.4%)	ns
	<b>Those with Casual Partners (n = 240)</b>	<b>Those with Casual Partners (n = 351)</b>	
No anal intercourse	75 (31.3%)	104 (29.6%)	p
Always uses condom	113 (47.1%)	181 (51.6%)	
Sometimes does not use condom	52 (21.7%)	66 (18.8%)	ns

For 1999, of the 52 men who engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with a casual partner 'in the previous six months', 21 (40.4%) practised both withdrawal prior to ejaculation and ejaculation inside UAIC, 10 (19.2%) practised only ejaculation inside UAIC, and 21 (40.4%) engaged in consistent withdrawal UAIC. For 2002, of the 66 men who engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with a casual partner 'in the previous six months', 38 (57.6%) practised both withdrawal prior to ejaculation and ejaculation inside UAIC, 6 (9.1%) practised only ejaculation inside UAIC, and 22 (33.3%) engaged in consistent withdrawal UAIC (*ns* over time).

A comparison of the data in Tables 5.8 and 5.13 confirms that more men had UAIR than UAIC. Consistent withdrawal during unprotected anal intercourse was more commonly practised during casual encounters than in regular relationships.

Table 5.14 shows condom use with casual partners based on participant's serostatus. For HIV negative men, there was little change over time. For the other men, the small numbers precluded detailed analyses.

**Table 5.14 : Serostatus and Condom Use among Casual Partners**

	Participant's HIV Status		
	HIV-Positive	HIV-Negative	Unknown Serostatus
<b>1999</b>			
No Anal	3 (42.9%)	51 (29.5%)	20 (36.4%)
Always uses condom	2 (28.6%)	88 (50.9%)	22 (40.0%)
Sometimes does not use condom	2 (28.6%)	34 (19.7%)	13 (23.6%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>7 (100%)</b>	<b>173 (100%)</b>	<b>55 (100%)</b>
<b>2002</b>			
No Anal	2 (12.5%)	75 (29.4%)	24 (32.0%)
Always uses condom	8 (50.0%)	140 (54.9%)	31 (41.3%)
Sometimes does not use condom	6 (37.5%)	40 (15.7%)	20 (26.7%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>16 (100%)</b>	<b>255 (100%)</b>	<b>75 (100%)</b>

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

## Serostatus

Two questions were included in the questionnaire to obtain a sense of disclosure of HIV status between casual partners. The inclusion of the two questions was *not* intended to endorse sexual negotiation between casual partners.

In both samples, around two thirds of the participants did not disclose their serostatus to any of their casual partners. Few men disclosed their HIV status to 'all' casual partners.

**Table 5.15 : Participants' Disclosure of Serostatus to Casual Partners**

	1999	2002
Told none	138 (70.1%)	204 (65.2%)
Told some	45 (22.8%)	76 (24.3%)
Told all	14 (7.1%)	33 (10.5%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>197 (100%)</b>	<b>313 (100%)</b>

ns

Likewise, over two thirds of the participants did *not* know any casual partner's HIV status. Very few men were routinely informed of their casual partner's HIV status. There was no change in these proportions over the years.

**Table 5.16 : Casual Partners' Disclosure of Serostatus to Participants**

	1999	2002
Told by none	142 (72.1%)	221 (69.9%)
Told by some	47 (23.9%)	82 (25.9%)
Told by all	8 (4.1%)	13 (4.1%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>197 (100%)</b>	<b>316 (100%)</b>

Ns

# Drug Use

Among the types of drugs listed, use of amyl and ecstasy were the most common. In 2002, the proportion of men who used amyl increased significantly. Two additional sex-on-premises sites used as recruitment in 2002 may have contributed to this increase. Use of marijuana also increased marginally.

**Table 6.1 : Drug use in the previous six months**

	1999 (n = 319)	2002 (n = 457)	p
Amyl	52 (16.3%)	126 (27.6%)	< .001
Ecstasy	51 (16.0%)	95 (20.8%)	ns
Marijuana	39 (12.2%)	80 (17.5%)	< .05
Speed	28 (8.8%)	51 (11.2%)	ns
Viagra	–	28 (6.1%)	–
Cocaine	12 (3.8%)	–	–
LSD	5 (1.6%)	–	–
Steroids	4 (1.3%)	–	–
Heroin	2 (0.6%)	–	–
Any other drug	4 (1.3%)	39 (8.5%)	< .001

Note: Percentages are based on the total sample, although not all men responded to these items. Items are not mutually exclusive.

In both years, very few men (two in 1999 and one in 2002) reported injecting any drugs in the previous six months. This rate is much lower than reported in the SGCPS (around 5%, Hull *et al.*, 2003).



# Discussion

The findings from the Sydney Asian Gay Community Periodic Survey provide a snapshot of the social and sexual lives of gay men of Asian background in Sydney. The survey provides important data, which can be used by policy makers and educators in program design.

Most of the men who participated lived in the inner-city areas of Sydney. They were predominantly in professional/managerial or white-collar occupations and most of them, well educated. Almost all of the men were born overseas yet a majority were now Australian citizens or permanent residents. Around 40% were of Chinese background and over a third were from South East Asia.

Over 85% of the participants in 2002 self-identified as gay/homosexual. Most of the men had disclosed their homosexual orientation to their gay friends and a fairly large proportion of the men had disclosed to straight friends, workmates, family members or relatives. On the other hand, nearly 60% did not tell their doctor/s about their homosexuality. Most of the men — regardless of ethnic background, felt attached, in some way, to gay communities in Australia. On the whole, the samples in both 1999 and 2002 were considerably involved in gay community socially, with high levels of gay friendships and substantial amount of free time spent with gay men. Most of the men in both samples also spent 'some' or 'a lot' of time with other gay Asian men. In terms of the HIV epidemic, a smaller proportion of men in 2002, compared with 1999, knew anyone who had died following AIDS.

Around 20% of the men in both surveys did not feel attached to their ethnic community in Australia, although more than half had some levels of involvement in local ethnic communities. Over half of the 2002 participants never read ethnic press.

The majority of the participants in 2002 felt comfortable being gay and Asian. Nonetheless, around half of the participants in 2002 experienced racial/homosexual discrimination in the past 12 months.

Nearly a quarter of the men did not have HIV test results, a significant higher proportion than is usually found among the broader population of Sydney gay men (Hull

*et al.*, 2003). Nonetheless, the majority of those who had been tested for HIV had done so 'within the past year'. Overall, about 4% of the men in 2002 were HIV-positive. The majority of the participants in 2002 indicated that they usually attended doctors/GPs or sexual health clinics for their HIV tests. Reasons for not having an HIV test varied, among them reluctance to know the result and perceptions of low-risk were most frequently cited. Around 40% of the 2002 participants reported never having a test for STIs.

Most of the men used a variety of methods and venues to meet their sex partners. A majority used gay social venues and gay sex-on-premises venues to meet partners (in particular, gay bars and saunas). The use of the Internet to find sex partners increased significantly over time.

'Current' sexual relationships with men were unchanged from 1999: about a quarter of the men only had regular partners; approximately a third had both regular and casual partners; and another third of the men only had casual partners. In both surveys, around 10% 'currently' had no sex with men.

In the six months prior to the 2002 survey, approximately half of the men had sex with regular partners and approximately three quarters of the men had sex with casual partners. Since 1999, the proportion of men who had sex with regular partners has decreased significantly. Around 60% of the men in both 1999 and 2002 samples had some sexual contact with other Asian men, and about 20% had Asian male partners in the main or exclusively.

Among those who had regular partners, nearly all engaged in oral sex and most in anal intercourse. Of note, the practice of receptive anal intercourse with regular partners increased from 1999 to 2002. Similarly, among those with casual partners, the majority engaged in oral sex and anal intercourse — albeit at a lower rate than with regular partners.

For condom use with regular partners, there was no change over time. Among those with regular partners, rates of unprotected anal intercourse remained steady at approximately 40%. In respect of casual partners, rates of unprotected anal intercourse also were unchanged over time — at around 20% among those with casual partners. (Note that over the same period, that is, 1999 to 2002, rates of unprotected anal intercourse with casual and regular partners increased in the Sydney Gay Community Periodic Survey data; Hull *et al.*, 2003.)

As in 1999, a majority of the 2002 participants had agreement with regular partners about sex within and outside of the relationship. Whereas nearly one in five of these agreements permitted unprotected anal intercourse within the relationship, unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners was rarely allowed.

Very few men injected drugs. Use of drugs was stable over time apart from significant increase in the use of amyl and marijuana.

In conclusion, the 2002 Sydney Asian Gay Community Periodic Survey was conducted very successfully. Recruitment strategies, consistent with those employed in 1999, attracted a large sample of gay Asian men from the Sydney metropolitan area. This corroborates the important lesson that direct recruitment strategies using short anonymous questionnaires are an effective way of recruiting from minority populations, particularly if due consideration is given to the specific concerns within those sub-groups. The results are robust and comparisons with previous findings are suggestive of sound reliability.

# References

Hull, P., Van de Ven, P., Prestage, G., Rawstorne, P., Grulich, A., Crawford, J., Kippax, S., Madeddu, D., McGuigan, D. and Nicholas, A. (2003). *Gay community periodic survey: Sydney 1996–2002*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research (monograph 2003 in press), The University of New South Wales.

Prestage, G., Van de Ven, P., Knox, S., Grulich, A., Kippax, S. and Crawford, J. (1999). *The Sydney gay community periodic surveys 1996–1999: Change over time*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research (monograph 11/1999), The University of New South Wales.

Prestage, G., Van de Ven, P., Wong, K., Mahat, M. and McMahon, T. (2000). *Asian gay men in Sydney: December 1999–January 2000*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research (monograph 2/2000), The University of New South Wales.

# Questionnaire

See next page.



13. How involved in the gay community are you here in Australia? Yes, very much   
Yes, a little   
No, not at all

14. How often in **the past 12 months** did you experience racial discrimination from *gay or bisexual men*? Never   
Occasionally   
Often

15. How often in **the past 12 months** did you experience anti-gay discrimination from *people of your ethnic/cultural background*? Never   
Occasionally   
Often

16. How many of the following have you told you are sexually attracted to men?

Immediate family	None <input type="checkbox"/>	Some <input type="checkbox"/>	Most or all <input type="checkbox"/>
Other relatives	None <input type="checkbox"/>	Some <input type="checkbox"/>	Most or all <input type="checkbox"/>
Straight friends	None <input type="checkbox"/>	Some <input type="checkbox"/>	Most or all <input type="checkbox"/>
Gay friends	None <input type="checkbox"/>	Some <input type="checkbox"/>	Most or all <input type="checkbox"/>
Workmates/colleagues	None <input type="checkbox"/>	Some <input type="checkbox"/>	Most or all <input type="checkbox"/>
My doctor/s	None <input type="checkbox"/>	Some <input type="checkbox"/>	Most or all <input type="checkbox"/>

*I have told nobody* True  False

17. How often do you read the following here in Australia?

Gay press	Never <input type="checkbox"/>	Some issues <input type="checkbox"/>	Most or all issues <input type="checkbox"/>
Ethnic press	Never <input type="checkbox"/>	Some issues <input type="checkbox"/>	Most or all issues <input type="checkbox"/>
Mainstream press	Never <input type="checkbox"/>	Some issues <input type="checkbox"/>	Most or all issues <input type="checkbox"/>

In this survey we use the terms **REGULAR** (boyfriend/lover) and **CASUAL** for your sexual partners.

18. Do you currently have sex with men? No  Yes

19. Do you currently have sex with **casual** male partners? No  Yes

20. And do you currently have a **regular** male partner (boyfriend/lover)?  
Yes  No  Go directly to Question 22.

↓  
How would you describe your relationship with your **regular male partner/s** at present?

**we are monogamous – neither of us have 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**

21. 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 (BOYFRIEND/LOVER)—LAST 6 MONTHS

22. Have you had sex with regular male partner/s (boyfriend/lover) in the last six months?

Yes

No  Go directly to Question 31. →

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

### Oral sex (with or without ejaculation/cum)

23. **Oral sex:** I sucked his penis/cock Never  Occasionally  Often

24. **Oral sex:** He sucked my penis/cock Never  Occasionally  Often

### Anal sex

25. I fucked him **with a condom** Never  Occasionally  Often

26. He fucked me **with a condom** Never  Occasionally  Often

27. I fucked him **without a condom** but pulled out before I came (ejaculated)  
Never  Occasionally  Often

28. He fucked me **without a condom** but pulled out before he came (ejaculated)  
Never  Occasionally  Often

29. I fucked him **without a condom** and came (ejaculated) inside  
Never  Occasionally  Often

30. He fucked me **without a condom** and came(ejaculated) inside  
Never  Occasionally  Often

## CASUAL MALE PARTNERS—LAST 6 MONTHS

31. Have you had sex with casual male partner/s in the last six months?

Yes

No  Go directly to Question 42.

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

### Oral sex (with or without ejaculation/cum)

32. **Oral sex:** I sucked his penis/cock Never  Occasionally  Often

33. **Oral sex:** He sucked my penis/cock Never  Occasionally  Often

### Anal sex

34. I fucked him **with a condom** Never  Occasionally  Often

35. He fucked me **with a condom** Never  Occasionally  Often

36. I fucked him **without a condom** but pulled out before I came (ejaculated)  
Never  Occasionally  Often

37. He fucked me **without a condom** but pulled out before he came (ejaculated)  
Never  Occasionally  Often

38. I fucked him **without a condom** and came (ejaculated) inside  
Never  Occasionally  Often

39. He fucked me **without a condom** and came (ejaculated) inside  
Never  Occasionally  Often

40. How many of your *casual* partners in the last 6 months did you tell your HIV test result?  
None  Some  All

41. How many of your *casual* partners in the last 6 months told you their HIV test result?  
None  Some  All



**Other sexual activity**

In the past SIX MONTHS have you done any of the following with either your regular or your casual male partner/s?

42. Fisting Never  Occasionally  Often
43. S/M or B&D Never  Occasionally  Often
44. Group sex Never  Occasionally  Often
45. Rimming (licking anus/arsehole) Never  Occasionally  Often
46. Have you ever had an HIV test? No  Yes
47. When did you last have an HIV test?
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| Less than 6 months ago <input type="checkbox"/> | 2-4 years ago <input type="checkbox"/>         |
| 7-12 months ago <input type="checkbox"/>        | More than 4 years ago <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1-2 years ago <input type="checkbox"/>          | Never tested <input type="checkbox"/>          |



48. Which of the following concerns you about having an HIV test? (Tick as many as apply)

Don't want to know the result <input type="checkbox"/>	I am at low risk and don't need to test <input type="checkbox"/>
Fear of stigma or discrimination <input type="checkbox"/>	Cost <input type="checkbox"/>
Don't know where to go for a test <input type="checkbox"/>	Other (please specify) _____
Don't want government to know <input type="checkbox"/>	

49. Where did you have your last HIV test? (Tick ONE only)
- |                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | Your doctor <input type="checkbox"/>              |
|                              | Sexual health clinic <input type="checkbox"/>     |
|                              | Hospital <input type="checkbox"/>                 |
|                              | Immigration health check <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other (please specify) _____ | Never tested <input type="checkbox"/>             |

50. Based on the results of your HIV tests, what is your HIV status?
- |  |   |
|--|---|
|  | No test/Don't know <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | Negative <input type="checkbox"/>           |
|  | Positive <input type="checkbox"/>           |

51. When did you last have a test for any STI (sexually transmissible infection, e.g. gonorrhoea, NSU/chlamydia, syphilis)?
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| Less than 6 months ago <input type="checkbox"/> | 2-4 years ago <input type="checkbox"/>         |
| 7-12 months ago <input type="checkbox"/>        | More than 4 years ago <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1-2 years ago <input type="checkbox"/>          | Never tested <input type="checkbox"/>          |

52. How many people do you know who have HIV infection or the illness AIDS?
- |                               |                                       |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| None <input type="checkbox"/> | 3-5 <input type="checkbox"/>          |
| One <input type="checkbox"/>  | 6-10 <input type="checkbox"/>         |
| Two <input type="checkbox"/>  | More than 10 <input type="checkbox"/> |

53. In the past year, how many people do you know personally who have died from AIDS?
- |                               |                                       |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| None <input type="checkbox"/> | 3-5 <input type="checkbox"/>          |
| One <input type="checkbox"/>  | 6-10 <input type="checkbox"/>         |
| Two <input type="checkbox"/>  | More than 10 <input type="checkbox"/> |

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

54. Do you know the result of your regular partner's HIV test? Yes—He is Positive   
Yes—He is Negative   
No— I don't know/He hasn't had a test

55. Within your relationship do you have a **clear (spoken) agreement** with your regular partner about anal sex (fucking) with each other? (Tick ONE only)  
No agreement

Yes, we have an agreement {  
No anal sex at all   
All anal sex is with a condom   
Anal sex can be without a condom

56. Regarding casual partners, do you have a **clear (spoken) agreement** with your regular partner about sex with those partners? (Tick ONE only)  
No agreement

Yes, we have an agreement {  
No casual sex at all   
No anal sex at all   
All anal sex is with a condom   
Anal sex can be without a condom

57. How old are you?   years

58. What country were you born in? Australia   
Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

59. Are you? An Australian citizen   
A permanent resident   
A tourist/visitor   
Applying for Australian residency under the *interdependency* scheme   
Applying for Australian residency on other grounds   
Over-stayed visa   
Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

60. How long have you lived in Australia? I was born in Australia   
Less than a year  1–2 years   
3–5 years  More than 5 years

61. What is your ethnic or cultural background? (e.g. *Burmese, Cambodian, Chinese, Filipino, Indian, Indonesian, Malay, Thai, Vietnamese*)  
Please specify \_\_\_\_\_

62. What religion, if any, do you practise? None   
Buddhism   
Hinduism   
Islam   
Christianity   
Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

63. Are you **mainly**: (tick ONE only)  
Working full-time   
Working part-time   
Unemployed   
A student   
A pensioner or on social security benefits   
Other

64. What is your job? (e.g. *electrician, hairdresser, teacher*)  
(please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

65. Where do you live in Australia? Postcode

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

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

- Primary/elementary school only   
Up to 4 years high/secondary school   
Completed high/secondary school   
Tertiary diploma or trade certificate   
University or CAE

67. How much do you agree?

	Strongly		Strongly	
	Agree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree
<i>I am happy to be gay!</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Being Asian is great!</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

68. Have you heard of:

<i>ACON Asian project</i>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Silk Road</i>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Asian Marching Boys</i>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Pe De Nite</i>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>

69. If you are looking for **sex** with men, where do you go? (One tick for each item)

<i>gay bar</i>	Never <input type="checkbox"/>	Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/>	Often <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>gay dance parties</i>	Never <input type="checkbox"/>	Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/>	Often <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>beat/public toilet/park/beach</i>	Never <input type="checkbox"/>	Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/>	Often <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>shopping malls</i>	Never <input type="checkbox"/>	Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/>	Often <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>sex parties</i>	Never <input type="checkbox"/>	Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/>	Often <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>gay Asian events</i>	Never <input type="checkbox"/>	Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/>	Often <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>through friends</i>	Never <input type="checkbox"/>	Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/>	Often <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>leather scene</i>	Never <input type="checkbox"/>	Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/>	Often <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>phone sex lines</i>	Never <input type="checkbox"/>	Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/>	Often <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>internet</i>	Never <input type="checkbox"/>	Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/>	Often <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>personal ads</i>	Never <input type="checkbox"/>	Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/>	Often <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>sauna</i>	Never <input type="checkbox"/>	Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/>	Often <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>sex club</i>	Never <input type="checkbox"/>	Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/>	Often <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>bookshop/video shop</i>	Never <input type="checkbox"/>	Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/>	Often <input type="checkbox"/>

Anywhere else? (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

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

	<u>USED</u>		<u>Injected</u>	
<i>Amyl/Poppers</i>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>		
<i>Marijuana</i>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>		
<i>Viagra</i>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>		
<i>Ecstasy</i>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Speed</i>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Any other 'party' drug</i>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME

11/02