INCONSISTENT CONDOM USE AMONG YOUNG MEN WHO HAVE SEX WITH MEN, MALE SEX WORKERS, AND TRANSGENDERS IN THAILAND

Tareerat Chemnasiri, Taweesak Netwong, Surasing Visarutratana, Anchalee Varangrat, Andrea Li, Praphan Phanuphak, Rapeepun Jommaroeng, Pasakorn Akarasewi, and Frits van Griensven

Young men who have sex with men (MSM) are at risk for HIV infection. We investigated inconsistent condom use among 827 sexually active young MSM (15-24 years), enrolled using venue-day-time sampling in Bangkok, Chiang Mai and Phuket, Thailand. Data was collected using palmtop computer-assisted self-interviewing. Of participants, 33.1% were regular MSM, 37.7% were male sex workers (MSWs) and 29.1% were transgenders (TGs). Of MSM, 46.7%, of MSWs, 34.9% and of TGs, 52.3% reported recent inconsistent condom use. In multivariate analysis, receptive anal intercourse (MSM, MSWs), receptive and insertive anal intercourse, living alone and a history of sexual coercion (MSWs), not carrying a condom when interviewed (MSM, TGs), lower education, worrying about HIV infection and a history of sexually transmitted infections (TGs) were significantly and independently associated with inconsistent condom use. Interventions for young MSM are needed and must consider the distinct risk factors of MSM, MSWs, and TGs.

Tareerat Chemnasiri, Anchalee Varangrat, and Pasakorn Akarasewi are with the Thailand Ministry of Public Health-U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Collaboration. Taweesak Netwong is with Patong Hospital, Phuket, Thailand. Surasing Visarutratana is with the Chiang Mai Provincial Health Office, Chiang Mai, Thailand. Andrea Li is with Vanderbilt School of Medicine, Nashville, TN. Praphan Phanuphak is with the Thai Red Cross Society, Bangkok, Thailand. Rapeepun Jommaroeng is with the Thai Red Cross Society, Bangkok, Thailand. Rapeepun Jommaroeng is with the Thai Red Cross Society, Bangkok, Thailand, and the Rainbow Sky Association of Thailand, Bangkok, Thailand. Frits van Griensven (PhD, MPH) is with the Thailand MOPH – U.S. CDC Collaboration and the Division of HIV/AIDS Prevention, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA.

This work is supported by the Thailand Ministry of Public Health and the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

The authors thank the staff and volunteers of the Rainbow Sky Association of Thailand, AIDS Research Centre, Thai Red Cross Society, Chiang Mai Provincial Health Office, Phuket Patong Hospital and the Thailand MOPH – U.S. CDC Collaboration. They are greatly indebted to the owners and managers of the assessment venues and to the participants for their support. The findings and conclusions reported in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the U.S. CDC.

Address correspondence to Tareerat Chemnasiri, Thailand Ministry of Public Health – U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Collaboration, DDC 7 Bldg., 4th Floor, Ministry of Public Health, Tivanon Road, Nonthaburi 11000 Thailand; e-mail: tareeratc@th.cdc.gov

Soon after the first case of AIDS in Thailand was identified in a homosexual male in 1984 (Wangroongsarb et al., 1985), HIV spread rapidly among injection drug users, female sex workers, their clients, wives, and eventually to their newborn children (Weniger et al., 1991). The Thai government and its partners rapidly implemented pragmatic HIV prevention programs, including the campaign for 100% condom use in sex work (Hanenberg et al., 1994). Subsequently, from 1989 to 2006, the HIV prevalence fell from 33.2% to 4.6% in female sex workers, from 2.3% to 0.9% in pregnant women, and from 4.0% to 0.5% in young military recruits (Danyuttapolchai et al., 2007). Despite the success in reducing HIV infection, little information is available about men who have sex with men (MSM) in the Thai HIV epidemic (van Griensven, Thanprasertsuk et al., 2005).

Most MSM and their behaviors are hidden in Thai society because open expression of homosexuality is not considered acceptable and is socially prohibited (Jackson & Sullivan, 1999). As a result, MSM are hard to reach for HIV research and prevention. MSM, particularly young MSM, may engage in multiple high-risk behaviors such as unprotected sex, multiple sex partners, sex work, and drug use (Jenkins et al., 1999; Kitsiripornchai et al., 1998; Nelson et al., 2002).

Despite the early absence of MSM-specific studies, research on HIV risk behavior in young Thai men showed homosexual activity to be common among military conscripts, students, and factory workers. In these studies the prevalence of maleto-male sex ranged from 3.3% to 16.3% (London, VanLandingham, & Grandjean, 1997) and inconsistent condom use with men from 52.8% to 60.0% (Kaewmarin, Jitsabuy, Pimpa, & Plipat, 2007). In 2003, the Thailand Ministry of Public Health U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (MOPH – U.S. CDC) Collaboration conducted the first assessment of HIV infection and risk behavior among MSM in Bangkok and found an HIV prevalence of 17.3% (van Griensven, Thanprasertsuk et al., 2005). In 2005, in a similar assessment, the HIV prevalence among MSM in Bangkok had increased to 28.3% (CDC, 2006). Among MSM aged 15-22 years old, the HIV prevalence was 11.2% (CDC, 2006). Because these young men are likely to have been homosexually active for only a short period of time, this HIV prevalence suggests a high underlying HIV incidence. Against the background of this increased risk for HIV infection in young MSM, we investigated factors associated with inconsistent condom use in this population. Because of distinct a priori economic and sexual characteristics of young MSM (such as selling sex or transgenderism) analyses were conducted separately for general MSM, male sex workers (MSWs) and transgenders (TGs). This information may help in developing appropriate HIV prevention interventions for distinct populations of young MSM in Thailand and elsewhere.

METHODS

SAMPLING AND ASSESSMENT

The methods for the current assessment have been described previously (van Griensven, Thanprasertsuk et al., 2005; CDC, 2006; Mansergh et al., 2006). Venue-day-time sampling (VDTS) was used to recruit 2,049 Thai MSM (response rate 97.3%) in Bangkok, Chiang Mai, and Phuket between March and October 2005. There are four phases in VDTS: (a) venue identification and mapping, (b) counting of male

102 CHEMNASIRI ET AL.

venue attendees, (c) determining eligibility and willingness to participate, and (d) recruitment of participants. All identified venues were visited, verified for existence, and characterized by owner-gatekeeper support, safety, and opening times. Participant eligibility included male sex; aged at least 15 years old; Thai nationality; residency in Bangkok, Chiang Mai, or Phuket; and having engaged in oral or anal sex with a man in the past 6 months. Participation was voluntary and anonymous. Once eligibility and verbal informed consent were attained, palmtop computer-assisted self-interviews were used to collect demographic and behavioral data. An oral fluid specimen was self-collected using OraSure device (OraSure Salivary Collection Device, OraSure Technologies Inc., Beaverton, Oregon) for HIV testing. A local community-based organization, Rainbow Sky Association of Thailand, aided research staff in mapping and recruitment of men at venues. The assessment protocol was determined a surveillance activity by the CDC, which, consequently, did not require an institutional board review. It was reviewed and approved by the Ethical Review Committee of the Thailand Ministry of Public Health.

STUDY POPULATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Of a total of 2,049 participants, 1,162 (56.7%) were aged 15-24 years. Of the latter, 827 (71.2%) reported having had anal intercourse with a man in the past 3 months. These men were included in this analysis. Of these 827 men, 274 (33.1%) were general MSM, 312 (37.7%) were MSWs, and 241 (29.1%) were TGs. In this study, group membership (MSM, MSWs, or TGs) was defined by the type of enrollment venue. MSM were enrolled from locations where men congregate to socialize with other men and seek male sexual partners (e.g., bars, discos, saunas and parks, MSWs from sex-work venues (e.g., "go-go" bars [i.e., bars where sex workers can be solicited], including some frequented by foreign clients; massage parlors, and street locations.) (Note: Clients were not enrolled at these venues.) TGs were enrolled based on their outward characteristics from sex-work venues and cabaret show theaters. At sex-work venues, all personnel (e.g., hosts, dancers and waiters) were offered enrollment; clients were not enrolled. Overall, MSM were recruited from 10 bars/discos (n = 77, 28.1%), 12 saunas (n = 28, 10.2%), and 17 parks/ street/public toilets (n = 169, 61.7); MSWs were recruited from 19 "go-go" bars (n = 230, 73.7%), five massage parlors (n = 16, 5.1%), and 7 parks/streets (n = 66, 5.1%)21.2%); TGs were enrolled from 14 "go-go" bars (n = 125, 51.9%), 4 cabaret show theaters (n = 61, 25.3%), and eight other venues (coffee shop/public toilets) (n = 55, 22.8%).

The outcome variable in our analysis was inconsistent condom (not always) use during anal intercourse with a man in the past 3 months. Variables related to condom use in each group (MSM, MSWs and TGs) were evaluated using bivariate and multivariate logistic regression analyses. Independent variables with bivariate *p* values of .05 or less were further evaluated in multivariate regression models, using generalized estimating equations logistic regression to adjust for clusters by venues and calendar dates. Because no between-group comparisons were made in the multivariate analyses, no adjustment to offset the likelihood of chance findings was performed.

SPSS 11.0 (Version 11.0.1) and STATA 9.0 (Version 9.1) were used for statistical analysis.

RESULTS

DEMOGRAPHIC AND BEHAVIORAL CHARACTERISTICS

A plurality of the 827 men were enrolled from Bangkok (40.7%), and the remainder from Chiang Mai (33.1%) and Phuket (26.1%); 30.6% were between ages 15 and 19, and 69.4% were between ages 20 and 24. The mean age was 20.7 years (median 21 years). Most were single (96.0%) and employed (74.4%), and 36.5% had technical school education or higher. The overall HIV prevalence was 13.1%; it was 13.9% in MSM, 14.7% in MSWs and 10.0% in TGs. In this study, 40.1% of MSM, 52.6% of MSWs and 38.2% of TGs reported to have been tested for HIV previously.

Of participants, 95.8% reported having ever drunk alcohol, of which 65.1% said to have had five drinks or more in one sitting at least five times in the past 3 months. Having been drunk during most recent sex was reported by 3.5% of all participants. Drug use (ever) was reported by 63.4% and drug use in the past 3 months by 42.2%. Of the latter, 22.9% reported use of benzodiazepines, 16.3% methamphetamines, 10.9% marijuana, 10.4% ecstasy, 10.0% inhaled nitrates ("poppers"), 5.7% ketamine, and 4.0% inhaled solvents (thinner or glue).

MSWs were less educated, more often employed, more likely to have ever used drugs, and more likely to live away from the family than MSM and TGs. Also, MSWs more often identified as the insertive partner during anal intercourse and more often reported carrying a condom at the time of the interview. MSWs were less likely to report having been sexually coerced and were more likely to have used condoms consistently with a man in the past 3 months than were MSM and TGs (all p values < 0.001).

BIVARIATE AND MULTIVARIATE ANALYSES OF INCONSISTENT CONDOM USE

Of the total study population, 43.9% reported using condoms inconsistently during the past 3 months; among MSM this was 46.7%, among MSWs, 34.9% and among TGs, 52.3%. These percentages did not differ significantly by partner type (steady, casual, and commercial partners).

MSM. In bivariate analysis, usually being receptive during anal intercourse (vs. being insertive only), being concerned about getting a sexually transmitted infection (STI), and not carrying a condom at the time of the interview were significantly associated with inconsistent condom use (see Table 1).

In multivariate analysis, usually being receptive during anal intercourse and not carrying a condom at the time of the interview were significantly and independently associated with inconsistent condom use (see Table 1).

MSWs. In bivariate analysis, being recruited from Phuket (vs. being recruited from Chiang Mai), living away from the family, having a history of drug use (ever), usually being receptive or both receptive and insertive during anal intercourse (vs. being insertive only), having been sexually coerced (ever), having self-reported an STI (ever), being concerned about getting STI, and being HIV-positive in the current study were significantly associated with inconsistent condom use (see Table 1).

TABLE 1. Demographic, Behavioral Characteristics and Inconsistent Condom Use in Bivariate and Multivariate Analysis of Young Men Who Have Sex With Men, Male Sex Workers, and Transgenders, Thailand, 2005

Characteristics	Total		M	MSM			MS	MSWs			T	TGs	
			Inconsistent condom use	Bivariate	Multivariate		Inconsistent condom use	Bivariate	Multivariate		Inconsistent condom use	Bivariate	Multivariate
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	OR (95%CI)	OR (95 %CI)	(%) N	N (%)	OR (95 %CI)	OR (95%CI)	N (%)	N (%)	OR (95%CI)	OR (95%CI)
Overall	827 (100)	274 (33.1)	128 (46.7)			312 (37.7)	109 (34.9)			241 (29.1)	126 (52.3)		
Location													
Chiang Mai	274 (33.1)*	86 (31.4)4	45 (52.3) ^b	Reference		93 (29.8)	27 (29.0)	Reference		95 (39.4)	56 (58.9)	Reference	
Bangkok	337 (40.7)	114 (41.6)	47 (41.2)	0.64 (0.36-1.12)		129 (41.3)	41 (31.8)	1.14 (0.64-2.04)		94 (39.0)	43 (45.7)	0.59 (0.33-1.05)	
Phuket	216 (26.1)	74 (27.0)	36 (48.6)	0.86 (0.46-1.61)		90 (28.8)	41 (45.6)	2.05 (1.11-3.77)*		52 (21.6)	27 (51.9)	0.75 (0.38-1.49)	
Recruitment venue													
Sauna	44 (5.3)	28 (10.2)	11 (39.3)	Reference		16 (5.1)	4 (25.0)	Reference		,	,	,	
Park/street	351 (42.5)	169 (61.7)	76 (45.0)	1.25 (0.57-2.76)		66 (21.2)	19 (28.8)	1.21 (0.35-4.24)		61 (25.3)	34 (55.7)	Reference	
Entertainment	432 (52.2)	77 (28.1)	41 (53.2)	1.76 (0.73-4.25)		230 (73.7)	86 (37.4)	1.79 (0.56-5.73)		125 (51.9)	66 (52.8)	0.89 (0.48-1.64)	
Other		,				,				55 (22.8)	26 (47.3)	0.71 (0.34-1.48)	
Age group (years)													
15-19	253 (30.6)	89 (32.5)	41 (46.1)	0.96 (0.58-1.60)		90 (28.8)	34 (37.8)	1.19 (0.72-1.98)		74 (30.7)	42 (56.8)	1.30 (0.75-2.25)	
20-24	574 (69.4)	185 (67.5)	87 (47.0)	Reference		222 (71.2)	75 (33.8)	Reference		167 (69.3)	84 (50.3)	Reference	
Education													
High school or less	525 (63.5)	140 (51.1)	72 (51.4)	Reference		249 (79.8)	88 (35.3)	Reference		136 (56.4)	61 (44.9)	Reference	Reference
Technical school or higher	302 (36.5)	134 (48.9)	56 (41.8)	0.68 (0.42-1.09)		63 (20.2)	21 (33.3)	0.92 (0.51-1.64)		105 (43.6)	65 (61.9)	2.00 (1.19-3.36)* 1.82 (1.07-3.15)*	.82 (1.07-3.15)*
Living status													
With family	327 (39.5)	142 (51.8)	63 (44.4)	Reference		83 (26.6)	19 (22.9)	Reference	Reference	102 (42.3)	57 (55.9)	Reference	
Away from the family	500 (60.5)	132 (48.2)	65 (49.2)	1.22 (0.76-1.96)		229 (73.4)	90 (39.3)	$2.18\ (1.23\text{-}3.88)^*\ 1.85\ (1.02\text{-}3.36)^*$.85 (1.02-3.36)*	139 (57.7)	(49.6)	0.79 (0.47-1.32)	
Work/study status													
Work and study	158 (19.1)	63 (23.0)	25 (39.7)	Reference		54 (17.3)	23 (42.6)	Reference		41 (17.0)	23 (56.1)	Reference	
Work	457 (55.3)	94 (34.3)	43 (45.7)	1.28 (0.67-2.45)		231 (74.0)	79 (34.2)	0.70 (0.38-1.28)		132 (54.8)	66 (50.0)	0.78 (0.39-1.58)	
Study	168 (20.3)	99 (36.1)	49 (49.5)	1.49 (0.79-2.83)		7 (2.2)	1 (14.3)	0.23 (0.03-2.00)		62 (25.7)	34 (54.8)	0.95 (0.43-2.10)	
Unemployed	44 (5.3)	18 (6.6)	11 (61.1)	2.39 (0.82-6.99)		20 (6.4)	6 (30.0)	0.58 (0.19-1.73)		6 (2.5)	3 (50.0)	0.78 (0.14-4.35)	
Used alcohol (ever)													
Yes	792 (95.8)	260 (94.9)	122 (46.9)	1.18 (0.40-3.49)		304 (97.4)	108 (35.5)	3.85 (0.47-31.69)		228 (94.6)	119 (52.2)	0.94 (0.31-2.87)	
No	35 (4.2)	14 (5.1)	6 (42.9)	Reference		8 (2.6)	1 (12.5)	Reference		13 (5.4)	7 (53.8)	Reference	

Used drugs ^d (ever)										
Yes	524 (63.4)	142 (51.8)	73 (51.4)	1.48 (0.92-2.39)	227 (72.8)	89 (39.2)	2.10 (1.19-3.70)*	155 (64.3)	83 (53.5)	1.15 (0.68-1.95)
No	303 (36.6)	132 (48.2)	55 (41.7)	Reference	85 (27.2)	20 (23.5)	Reference	86 (35.7)	43 (50.0)	Reference
Usual anal sex role										
Insertive	271 (32.8)	102 (37.2)	39 (38.2)	Reference Reference	166 (53.2)	41 (24.7)	Reference Reference	3 (1.2)	2 (66.7)	Reference
Receptive	400 (48.4)	105 (38.3)	63 (60.0)	2.42 (1.39-4.24)* 2.68 (1.51-4.76)*	76 (24.4)	34 (44.7)	2.47 (1.39-4.38)* 2.23 (1.23-4.02)*	219 (90.9)	113 (51.6)	0.53 (0.05-5.97)
Insertive and receptive	156 (18.9)	67 (24.5)	26 (38.8)	1.02 (0.54-1.93) 1.10 (0.58-2.10)	70 (22.4)	34 (48.6)	2.88 (1.60-5.18)* 2.42 (1.32-4.44)*	19 (7.9)	11 (57.9)	0.69 (0.05-8.96)
Sexual coercion (ever)										
Yes	179 (21.6)	67 (24.5)	29 (43.3)	0.83 (0.48-1.45)	42 (13.5)	26 (61.9)	3.66 (1.87-7.19)* 2.96 (1.48-5.95)*	70 (29.0)	40 (57.1)	1.32 (0.75-2.31)
No	648 (78.4)	207 (75.5)	99 (47.8)	Reference	270 (86.5)	83 (30.7)	Reference Reference	171 (71.0)	86 (50.3)	Reference
History of STIs (ever)°										
Yes	561 (67.8)	181 (66.1)	92 (50.8)	1.64 (0.98-2.72)	210 (67.3)	87 (41.4)	2.57 (1.49-4.44)*	170 (70.5)	99 (58.2)	2.27 (1.29-4.01)* 2.31 (1.28-4.19)*
No	266 (32.2)	93 (33.9)	36 (38.7)	Reference	102 (32.7)	22 (21.6)	Reference	71 (29.5)	27 (38.0)	Reference Reference
Being concerned about STI										
Yes	556 (67.2)	185 (67.5)	95 (51.4)	1.79 (1.07-3.01)*	212 (67.9)	82 (38.7)	1.71 (1.02-2.87)*	159 (66.0)	89 (56.0)	1.55 (0.91-2.64)
No	271 (32.8)	89 (32.5)	33 (37.1)	Reference	100 (32.1)	27 (27.0)	Reference	82 (34.0)	37 (45.1)	Reference
Being concerned about HIV										
Yes	547 (66.1)	175 (63.9)	88 (50.3)	1.49 (0.91-2.46)	221 (70.8)	79 (35.7)	1.13 (0.68-1.90)	151 (62.7)	88 (58.3)	1.91 (1.13-3.24)* 1.79 (1.03-3.11)*
No	280 (33.9)	99 (36.1)	40 (40.4)	Reference	91 (29.2)	30 (33.0)	Reference	90 (37.3)	38 (42.2)	Reference Reference
Prior HIV testing										
Yes	366 (44.3)	110 (40.1)	53 (48.2)	Reference	164 (52.6)	53 (32.3)	Reference	92 (38.2)	45 (48.9)	Reference
No	461 (55.7)	164 (59.9)	75 (45.7)	0.91 (0.56-1.47)	148 (47.4)	56 (37.8)	1.28 (0.80-2.03)	149 (61.8)	81 (54.4)	1.24 (0.74-2.09)
HIV test result in the current study										
Positive	108 (13.1)	38 (13.9)	18 (47.4)	1.03 (0.52-2.05)	46 (14.7)	22 (47.8)	1.89 (1.00-3.55)*	24 (10.0)	16 (66.7)	1.95 (0.80-4.73)
Negative	719 (86.9)	236 (86.1)	110 (46.6)	Reference	266 (85.3)	87 (32.7)	Reference	217 (90.0)	110 (50.7)	Reference
Carry condom at time of interview										
Yes	424 (51.3)	116 (42.3)	46 (39.7)	Reference Reference	188 (60.3)	62 (33.0)	Reference	120 (49.8)	54 (45.0)	Reference Reference
No	403 (48.7)	158 (57.7)	82 (51.9)	7)* 1.8	124 (39.7)	47 (37.9)	1.24 (0.77-1.99)	121 (50.2)	72 (59.5)	9)* 1.9

Note: MSM - men who have sex with men; MSWs - male sex workers; TGs - transgenders; OR - odds ratio; CI - Confidence interval; STIs – sexually transmitted infections. "Column percentage."

BRow percentage. Fitness center, beauty salon, etc. "dMarijuana, methamphetamine, ecstasy, ketamine, cocaine, sleeping pills, poppers (inhaled nitrates) and glue inhalants. "Self-reported history of genital discharge, genital/anal ulcer, genital/anal warts. "p < 0.05.

106 CHEMNASIRI ET AL.

In multivariate analysis, living away from the family, usually being receptive or both receptive and insertive during anal intercourse (versus being insertive only), and having been sexually coerced (ever) were significantly and independently associated with inconsistent condom use (table).

TGs. In bivariate and multivariate analysis, having completed technical school or higher, having self-reported an STI (ever), being concerned about getting HIV infection, and not carrying a condom at the time of the interview were significantly associated with inconsistent condom use (see Table 1).

DISCUSSION

In this study, Thai MSMs, MSWs, and TGs aged 15-24 years old reported high levels of HIV risk behavior: 52.3% of TGs, 46.7% of MSM and 34.9% of MSWs used condoms inconsistently during anal intercourse with another man. Given the background HIV prevalence of 13.1% in this group, young MSM, MSWs and TGs are at high risk for the acquisition and transmission of HIV infection. Risk factors for inconsistent condom use included receptive anal intercourse, a self-reported history of STI, a history of sexual coercion and not carrying a condom at the time of the interview. Most risk factors varied between MSM, MSWs and TGs, highlighting the importance of analyzing these groups separately.

We found that young MSM and TGs who did not carry a condom at the time of the interview were more likely to report inconsistently using condoms. Studies have demonstrated that having a condom at disposal at all times increases the likelihood of its use when sexual intercourse occurs (Ichikawa et al., 1996). Alternatively, possession of a condom may be a marker of being better informed and motivated to use a condom when necessary. MSWs were more likely than MSM or TGs to carry a condom at the time of the survey, and the prevalence of condom use among those who carried a condom was highest in MSWs. As MSWs were recruited from venues where sex is available for purchase, these results suggest MSWs are prepared to use condoms with clients. Male sex work venues may also be more often targeted for outreach activities, which include the distribution of condoms. Other studies among MSWs confirm the higher levels of condom use than among other groups at risk (Hsieh, 2002).

MSWs who live away from the family were more likely to use condoms inconsistently when having anal intercourse. As has been previously suggested, it is possible that men living away from the family have lower social support levels and fewer financial means to negotiate condom use effectively with partners, particularly if there is an obligation to support the extended family at home (International Organization for Migration [IOM], 2007; McCamish, 2002; Morisky, Stein, & Chiao, 2006).

Being receptive during anal intercourse (or being receptive and insertive) was found associated with inconsistent condom use in MSM and MSWs. Because almost all TGs reported practicing receptive anal intercourse, the association with inconsistent condom use could not be evaluated in this group. However, the high prevalence of receptive anal intercourse illustrates their increased vulnerability in this respect. The decreased control the receptive partner has over condom use compared to the insertive partner may contribute to this risk. Programs aiming to increase consistent

condom use in MSM should therefore address the responsibilities of both partners in anal intercourse and include strategies for increased condom negotiation skills and abilities to carry out safer sexual scripts of partners to effectively negotiate condom use (Drezin, Torres, & Daly, 2007; Maticka-Tyndale, 1991). With an awareness of the group-specific risk factors highlighted in the analysis, this information can be used to design HIV prevention messages that are applicable to MSM in general and various subgroups.

In our analysis, TGs who self-reported a history of STI had two times the odds of using condoms inconsistently. STI history is likely a surrogate marker for unprotected intercourse (Lagarde et al., 2001) and young men with a history of STIs should therefore be specifically targeted for promotion of condom use (Beyrer et al., 1995; London, VanLandingham & Grandjean, 1997). Because STIs have been established as a risk factor for both the acquisition and transmission of HIV infection, routine screening for STIs, including asymptomatic STIs, is recommended (Fleming & Wasserheit, 1999; Tapsoba Ly, Moreau, Niang & Castle, 2004).

Low levels of consistent condom use among young MSM reflect recent trends of condom use among the broader population of young Thais. In the 2006 National Behavioral Surveillance Survey, 60.3% and 58.3% of Thai male military conscripts with a median age of 21 years reported inconsistent condom use with female and male casual partners, respectively (Kaewmarin et al., 2007). In another survey in 2006, 88.0% and 53.0% of Thai (predominantly heterosexual) 18-24 year-old men, reported inconsistent condom use with regular and casual partners (Chamratrithirong, Kittsuksathil, Podhisita, Isarabhakdi, & Sabuying, 2007). Our data and those of an earlier survey of MSM in Bangkok in 2003, (Mansergh et al, 2006) show similarly low levels of consistent condom use among this group. Thus, high percentages of inconsistent condom use in MSM, MSWs and TGs and the lack of increase among MSM since 2003, point at the larger problem of unaddressed sexual risk taking among Thai youths. However, background HIV prevalence among heterosexual Thais is low; 0.5% in male conscripts and 0.9% in young pregnant women in 2006 (Danyuttapolchai et al., 2007). Because MSM, MSWs and TGs have a higher background HIV prevalence of 19.2%, 15.6%, and 13.5% respectively (CDC, 2006), the epidemic has further potential to spread in this population. These epidemiologic factors combined with the difficulty of reaching this target population signify the need for HIV prevention initiatives specific to young MSM, MSWs and TGs.

Even though substance use was not significantly associated with unprotected sex in our study, its high level of use is reason for concern. Several studies have shown an association between drug use and sexual risk taking among MSM, particularly of the use of amphetamine type substances (Colfax et al., 2001; Garofalo, Mustanski, McKirnan, Herrick, & Donenberg, 2007). More detailed study and monitoring of the association of substance use, sexual risk taking and HIV infection in Thai MSM is therefore warranted.

Prior HIV testing and HIV test result in the current study were not associated with inconsistent condom use in this study. However, HIV voluntary counseling and testing should be promoted to increase protective behavior and reduce further HIV transmission (Mansergh et al., 2006).

Our study demonstrated low levels of consistent condom use among MSM, MSWs, and TGs; however, it had its limitations. Importantly, the risk behaviors of young MSM, MSWs and TGs may not be representative of the total population of men who engage in sex with other men since participants were recruited from venues where men socialize and find sex partners or clients. Levels of inconsistent condom

108 CHEMNASIRI ET AL.

use and risk behavior may be overestimated because young men who gather in these venues may have higher risk profiles. On the other hand, participants in our study may have overreported the use of condoms, because they may be aware that this is the normative response. However, we relied on palm-top computer-assisted selfinterviewing to assess behavioral data, which has shown to generate more candid and reliable information than other interview methods (van Griensven, Naorat, et al., 2005).

Despite Thailand's successes in controlling the HIV epidemic among heterosexual men and women, the epidemic has not been well controlled among populations of MSM. The inconsistent condom use among a large percentage of young MSM, MSWs, and TGs, demonstrated by our study suggests that the spread of HIV will not decrease until we observe wide-scale behavior change among these groups. To assist in designing condom promotion programs, we have identified several risk factors for unprotected anal intercourse. More information is needed about additional psychosocial factors not assessed here such as mental health, motivation, intention, self-efficacy, intimacy and other variables which may be important in increasing protective behavior. Finally, qualitative studies to increase and deepen our understanding of the reasons young MSM, MSWs, and TGs cite for not using condoms consistently are also urgently needed.

REFERENCES

- son, K. E., Ruckphaopunt, S., & Khamboonruang, C. (1995). Same-sex behavior, sexually-transmitted diseases and HIV risks among young northern Thai men. AIDS, 9(2), 171-176.
- (2006). HIV Prevalence among populations of men who have sex with men, Thailand, 2003 and 2005. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, 55(31), 844-848.
- Chamratrithirong, A., Kittisuksathit, S., Podhisita, C., Isarabhakdi, P., & Sabuying, M. (2007). National Sexual Behavior Survey of Thailand 2006. Bangkok, Thailand: Institute for Hanenberg, R. S., Rojanapithayakorn, W., Ku-Population and Social Research, Mahidol University.
- Colfax, G. N., Mansergh, G., Guzman, R., Vittinghoff, E., Marks, G., Rader, M., et al. (2001). Drug use and sexual risk behavior among gay and bisexual men who attend circuit parties: A venue-based comparison. Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes, 28(4), 373-379.
- Danyuttapolchai, J., Poolkaysorn, S., Tangrua, W., & Plipat, T. (2007). HIV sero-surveillance, Thailand 2006 (round 24) (in Thai). Thai AIDS Journal, 19(3), 125-140.
- Drezin, J., Torres, M., & Daly, K. (2007). Barriers to condom access: Setting an advocacy agenda. Canada: International Council of AIDS Service Organizations. Toronto, Ontario.

- Beyrer, C., Eiumtrakul, S., Celentano, D. D., Nel- Fleming, D. T., & Wasserheit, J. N. (1999). From epidemiologic synergy to public health policy and practice: The contribution of other sexually transmitted diseases to sexual transmission of HIV infection. Sexually Transmitted Infections, 75(1), 3-17.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Garofalo, R., Mustanski, B. S., McKirnan, D. J., Herrick, A. & Donenberg, G. R. (2007). Methamphetamine and young men who have sex with men: Understanding patterns and correlates of use and the association with HIV-related sexual risks. Archives of Pediatric Adolescent Medicine, 161, 591-596.
 - nasol, P., & Sokal, D.C. (1994). Impact of Thailand's HIV-control programme as indicated by the decline of sexually transmitted diseases. The Lancet, 344, 243-245.
 - Hsieh, Y. (2002). Changing faces of commercial sex in Thailand: Implications for the HIV/AIDS epidemic. Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes, 30(5), 537-539.
 - Ichikawa, S., Kihara, M., Ohyama, Y., Morio, T., Ohya, H., Kihara, M., et al. (1996, July). Condom use among men who have sex with men (MSM) in bath-houses of Tokyo metropolitan area [Abstract MoD1699]. Abstract presented at the 11th International Conference on AIDS, Vancouver, Canada.
 - International Organization for Migration. (2007). Assessment of mobility and HIV vulnerability among Myanmar migrant sex works and

- province, Thailand. Bangkok, Thailand: International Organization for Migration.
- Jackson, P. A., & Sullivan, G. (1999). Lady boys, mosexualities in contemporary Thailand. New York: the Haworth Press.
- Jenkins, R. A., Torugsa, K., Mason, C. J., Jamroenratana, V., Lalang, C., Nitayaphan, S., et al. (1999). HIV risk behavior patterns among young Thai men. AIDS and Behavior, 3(4), 335-346.
 - Kaewmarin, N., Jitsabuy, B., Pimpa, Y. & Plipat, T. (2007). Results of behavioral surveillance system among male conscripts, Thailand 1995-2004 [in Thai]. Thai AIDS Journal, 19(3), 155-164.
 - Kitsiripornchai, S., Markowitz, L. E., Ungchusak, K., Jenkins, R. A., Leucha, W., Limpitaks, T., et al. (1998). Sexual behavior of young men in Thailand: Regional differences and evidence of behavior change. Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes and Human Retrovirology, 18(3), 282-288.
- Lagarde, E., Auvert, B., Chege, J., Sukwa, T., Condom use and its association with HIV/ sexually transmitted diseases in four urban communities of sub-Saharan Africa. AIDS, 15(Suppl. 4), S71-S78.
 - London, A. S., VanLandingham, M. J., & Grandjean, N. (1997). Socio-demographic correlates, HIV/AIDS related cofactors, and >van measures of same-sex sexual behavior among Northern Thai male soldiers. Health Transition Review, 7(1), 33-60.
- Mansergh, G., Naorat, S., Jommaroeng, R., Jenkins, R. A., Jeeyapant, S., Kanggarnrua, K., et al. (2006). Adaptation of venue-day-time sampling in Southeast Asia to access men who have sex with men for HIV assessment in Bangkok. Field Methods, 18(2), 135-152.
- Mansergh, G., Naorat, S., Jommaroeng, R., Jenkins, R. A., Stall, R., Jeeyapant, S., et al. (2006). Inconsistent condom use with steady and casual partners and associated factors among sexually-active men who have sex with men in Bangkok, Thailand. AIDS and Behavior, 10(6), 743-751.
- Maticka-Tyndale, E. (1991). Sexual scripts and AIDS Prevention: variations in adherence to safer-sex guidelines by heterosexual adolescents. Journal of Sex Research, 28(1), 45-66.

- factory workers in Mae Sot district, Tak McCamish, M. (2002). The structural relationships of support from male sex workers in Pattava to rural parents in Thailand, Culture, Health and Sexuality 4(3), 297-315.
- tom boys, rent boys: Male and female ho- Morisky, D. E., Stein, J. A., & Chiao, C. (2006). Impact of a social influence intervention on condom use and sexually transmitted infections among establishment-based female sex workers in the Philippines: a multilevel analysis. Health Psychology, 25(5), 595-603.
 - Nelson, K. E., Eiumtrakul, S., Celentano, D. D., Beyrer, C., Galai, N., & Khamboonruang, C. (2002). HIV infection in young men in northern Thailand, 1991-98: Increasing role of injection drug use. Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes and Human Retrovirology, 29, 62-68.
 - Tapsoba, P., Ly, A., Moreau, A., Niang, C. I. & Castle, C. (2004, July). Building a broad coalition to support HIV/AIDS/STI responses for MSM in Senegal. [Abstract WePeC6150]. Paper presented at the XV International Conference on AIDS, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Glynn, J. R., Weiss, H. A., et al. (2001). Van Griensven, F., Naorat, S., Kilmarx, P. H., Jeeyapant, S., Manopaiboon, C., Chaikummao, S., et al. (2005). Palmtop-assisted selfinterviewing for the collection of sensitive behavioral data: randomized trial with drug use urine testing. American Journal of Epidemiology, 163(3), 271-278.
 - Griensven, F., Thanprasertsuk, S., Jommaroeng, R., Mansergh, G., Naorat, S., Jenkins, R.A., et al. (2005). Evidence of a previously undocumented epidemic of HIV infection among men who have sex with men in Bangkok, Thailand. AIDS, 19, 521-526.
 - Wangroongsarb, Y., Weniger, B. G., Wasi, C., Traisupa, A., Kunasol, P., Rojanapithayakorn, W., et al. (1985). Prevalence of HTLVIII/LAV antibody in selected populations in Thailand. Southeast Asian Journal of Tropical Medicine and Public Health, 16(4), 517-520.
 - Weniger, B., Limpakarnjanarat, K., Ungchusak, K., Thanprasertsuk, S., Choopanya, K., Vanichseni, S., et al. (1991). The epidemiology of HIV infection in Thailand. AIDS, 5(Suppl. 2), S71-S85.