SOCIAL MARKETING RESEARCH SERIES

Cambodia (2008): HIV TRaC Study Evaluating Condom Use with Sweethearts among High Risk Urban Men from four cities in Cambodia. First Round.

T h e   P S I   D a s h b o a r d

Cambodia
December 2008

**Cambodia (2008): HIV TRaC Study Evaluating Condom Use with
Sweethearts among High Risk Urban Men from Phnom Penh, Siem
Reap, Sihanoukville, and Battambang, Cambodia**

PSI Research Division
2008

Contact Information:

Mr, Chris Jones, Country Representative	Ms. Long Dianna, Director of Strategic Information
Population Services International/Cambodia	Population Services International/Cambodia
No. 29 Street 334	No. 29 Street 334
Boeung Keng Kang I, Chamcar Mon	Boeung Keng Kang I, Chamcar Mon
Phnom Penh, Kingdom of Cambodia	Phnom Penh, Kingdom of Cambodia
Phone. +855–23–210–814	Phone. +855–23–210–814
cjones@psi.org.kh	dianna@psi.org.kh

Summary

Background & Research Objectives This HIV TRaC survey was conducted among high risk urban men in four cities – Phnom Penh, Siem Reap, Battambang and Sihanoukville – in December 2008. The main objectives of this and future rounds of the study are threefold:

1. To identify determinants of condom use at last sex and consistent condom use with sweethearts among high risk urban men;
2. To monitor changes in donor and project indicators, behaviors, and behavioral determinants over time;
3. To evaluate the impact of PSI/C's communication campaign focusing on behaviors and behavioral determinants within this target group. Although this is a baseline study, the sample has overlap with an earlier study conducted in Cambodia, allowing for evaluation analysis to be conducted on a sub-set of the sample from this round of the survey.

The results are presented according to the PSI behavior change framework, focusing on opportunity, ability, and motivation (OAM) factors associated with condom use with sweethearts. The objective of adopting the OAM framework was to focus on a set of behavioral determinants that can be changed through social marketing strategies. Opportunity factors are those that influence an individual's chance to implement a promoted behavior, such as availability and social norms. Ability is an individual's skills or proficiencies needed to perform a promoted behavior, which comprises factors such as, knowledge, social support, and self-efficacy. Motivation refers to an individual's arousal or desire to perform a promoted behavior and examines constructs such as attitudes and beliefs.

Description of Intervention PSI/Cambodia identified a lack of HIV prevention interventions reaching clients of entertainment workers as a critical gap in Cambodia. The transition of sex work out of brothels into other settings (such as beer gardens, karaoke bars and evening restaurants, known as Entertainment Establishments – EE) requires more expansive HIV prevention interventions and creative, targeted messaging to increase consistent condom use and availability of condoms to clients of entertainment workers. International research also shows that multiple and concurrent sexual partners, as exhibited by this risk group, represent a significant threat to progress made in reducing HIV prevalence in Cambodia. A drop in condom use during transactional and semi-transactional sex has accompanied the transition of sex work out of brothels. Married men who engage in these behaviors also serve as a bridge to their wives, putting women at risk of contracting HIV, as condoms are rarely used within marriage.

Launched in June 2008, the iBCC campaign targeting high risk urban men promotes consistent condom use within sweetheart relationships – especially with high risk sweethearts who work in entertainment establishments. The iBCC campaign specifically aims to ensure that high risk urban men:

- will not rely on 'trust' or 'background' of a partner when making condom use decisions;
- will believe condoms are both appropriate and necessary to use in sweetheart relationships;
- will be encouraged to talk with their sweethearts and male friends about condom use; and
- will be less embarrassed to purchase and/or carry condoms during a night out.

The communication strategy employs targeted interpersonal communication (IPC) sessions with high risk urban men. These sessions are conducted during evening hours in entertainment venues where men in the target audience typically gather and socialize, including restaurants and beer gardens. Qualitative research found that these types of venues are frequented by men when they go out with a group of friends for an evening of entertainment and socializing that might culminate in sex with an entertainment worker (i.e. indirect sex worker), brothel-based sex worker or sweetheart.[1] The IPC program was implemented first in Phnom Penh and expanded to Siem Reap, Sihanoukeville and Battambang. IPC outreach workers use communication tools that are participatory and interactive, such as quick quiz games, to engage men in discussion and activities through which the key campaign messages are conveyed. Each IPC session typically lasts about 15 minutes. Print materials are distributed to the target audience following the IPC sessions.

Nearly 60,000 clients were reached through IPC in Phnom Penh from July through December 2008, before this survey was conducted.

Methodology The sample for this study represents the target population of "high risk urban men" defined by the following inclusion criteria:

- At least 18 years old
- Resident of Phnom Penh, Battambang, Siem Reap or Sihanoukville
- Currently has a sweetheart ("sangsar" or "srey sneih")
- Had sex with sweetheart in the last 3 months
- Had another sexual partner (spouse, sex worker, another sweetheart, etc) in the last 12 months

Time-location sampling was used to recruit a random sample of men in urban entertainment venues, including barbeque restaurants, evening restaurants, beer gardens, snooker halls, gambling houses and Vietnamese coffee shops, where men in the target group often gather and socialize during evening hours. A total of 1,021 men were interviewed: 600 in Phnom Penh (58.7%), 201 in Siem Reap (19.7%), 110 in Sihanoukville (10.8%), and 110 in Battambang (10.8%). The required sample size was calculated with the following assumptions: 48.2% of high risk urban men consistently use condoms with their sweethearts (TRaC SAMS 2006), and this would increase to 55% (donor target) at follow-up.

Main Findings The results of this study are presented according to the PSI dashboard, comprising monitoring and segmentation tables. A cross-sectional evaluation analysis was conducted using the subset of respondents interviewed in Phnom Penh, where PSI has implemented a communication campaign targeting high risk men since June 2008. The evaluation results are presented in Annex 1.

- The monitoring table presents prevalence of behaviors, levels of behavioral determinants and project and donor indicators, which will be monitored over time in subsequent rounds of the survey. The survey results indicate that:

---

[1] PSI/Cambodia (2007): "Let's Go for a Walk: Sexual decision-making among clients of female entertainment workers in Phnom Penh, Cambodia" (Working Paper #77).

(1) Just over half (54.1%) of respondents reported that they used condoms consistently and correctly with their sweethearts in the last three months (always used condoms from start to finish during sexual intercourse), and 81.6% reported using a condom at last sex with their sweetheart.

(2) While nearly all respondents (99.3%) reported using a condom at last sex with a commercial partner, only 81.6% reported consistent and correct condom use with commercial partners in the last 3 months, which represents a substantial drop in consistent condom use from 2006.[2]

(3) Although most respondents (93.3%) reported a positive attitude that "Condoms are appropriate and necessary to use with a sweetheart," subjective norms for proposing condom use with sweethearts are low (scale mean of 2.56). Beliefs about the need to use condoms with a sweetheart despite knowing she has a good background and trusting her, while present among high risk urban men, are not particularly strong (scale mean of 3.12).

- The segmentation table presents findings on determinants of correct and consistent condom use with sweethearts among high risk urban men. The results of segmentation analysis on *correct and consistent condom use with sweethearts in the last 3 months* indicate that:

(1) Positive attitudes about the need to continue using condoms with a sweetheart even after being together for a while and that "Condoms are appropriate and necessary to use with a sweetheart" are significantly higher among those who use condoms consistently and correctly with their sweethearts compared to inconsistent users.

(2) Subjective norms[3] for proposing condom use with sweethearts are significantly higher among correct and consistent condom users than inconsistent users.

(3) Beliefs about the need to use condoms with a sweetheart who has a good background and is trustworthy are associated with correct and consistent condom use.

Programmatic Recommendations

- Despite relatively high levels of condom use at last sex with a sweetheart, there is a substantial gap between use at last sex and consistent condom use with sweethearts. The survey results show that only 54.1% of respondents reported consistent and correct condom use with their sweethearts. Given that condom use at last sex with a sweetheart is high (81.6%), there is an opportunity to promote and improve consistency of condom use. The results of segmentation analyses suggest that programmatic activities should focus on attitudes, beliefs and subjective norms.

---

[2] PSI/Cambodia (2006): HIV/AIDS TRaC Study Evaluating Condom Use among Sexually Active Men with Sweethearts in Phnom Penh. Second Round.

[3] Subjective norms are the respondent's perception about what his sweetheart would think or feel if he proposed using a condom with her. This concept was measured using a composite scale consisting of 4 items listed below the monitoring and segmentation tables.

- An alarming drop in consistent condom use with commercial partners (see Annex 2) indicates that interventions should continue to focus on condom use with commercial partners – whether those partners are met in a brothel, EE, or on the street.

- Continued emphasis should be placed on dispelling the beliefs that it's okay to forego condom use if a sweetheart has a good background or if a man and his sweetheart trust each other. Messages should discourage men from believing that they can distinguish between "safe" and risky partners.

- Communications should address subjective norms for proposing condom use with sweethearts and dispel the perception that sweethearts will react negatively if a man suggests condom use. Messages should promote alternative subjective norms, such as "If you suggest using a condom, your sweetheart will trust you more because she believes you care enough to protect her." Prior research among Karaoke Women with Sweethearts revealed that subjective norms are also a determinant of women's condom use with their sweethearts, indicating the potential of addressing this determinant from both the male and female perspectives.[4]

- The attitude that it is necessary to use condoms with a sweetheart even after being together for a while is a determinant of correct and consistent condom use, but it is weakly held within the target population. Emphasis should be placed on the importance of consistent and sustained condom use over the course of sweetheart relationships.

---

[4] PSI/Cambodia (2006): HIV/AIDS TRaC Study Evaluating Condom Use among Karaoke Women with Sweethearts in Phnom Penh and Siem Reap. Second Round.

Monitoring Table

Title: Condom Use, OAM Determinants of Behavior and Population Characteristics among High Risk Urban Men, Cambodia, 2008

Risk: High Risk Urban Men, aged 18 and older

Behavior: Condom use with sweethearts & commercial partners

INDICATORS	2008 (N= 1021)
BEHAVIOR/USE	%
[DI] Correct and consistent condom use with sweetheart [1]	54.1
Used a condom at last sex with sweetheart	81.6
[DI] Correct and consistent condom use with commercial partners [1,2]	81.6
Used a condom at last sex with commercial partner [2]	99.3
OPPORTUNITY	
Availability	Mean[3]
It is easy to find condoms nearby the places where I meet my sweetheart	3.30
ABILITY	
MOTIVATION	
Attitudes	%
[DI] Condoms are appropriate and necessary to use with a sweetheart [4]	93.3
	mean
There is a need to use condoms with a S/H even after being together for a while	2.96
Subjective Norms	mean
§ Subjective norms about proposing condom use to sweetheart (Scaled Construct)	2.56
Threat	mean
I may put my partner at risk for STI or HIV if I don't use condoms	3.18
Beliefs	mean
[DI] § Beliefs about background and trust in a partner (Scaled Construct) [4]	3.12
Even if I trust my S/H, I need to use condoms with her	2.98
A man needs to use condoms not only with a S/H who works in EE	1.49
POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS	
	mean
Age (continuous)	29.38
	%
Marital status (single)	58.2
Currently has more than one sweetheart	36.4

Super-scripts:

[DI] = Donor indicator

[1] Correct and consistent condom use is defined as those who reported that they always used condoms in the last three months, excluding respondents who reported any time in the last three months that they did not use a condom from start to finish during sexual intercourse.

[2] The denominator for this proportion is the number of men who had sex with commercial partners in the last 12 months, n=935.

[3] Means were calculated by averaging response values based on a 4-point Likert scale; response options for scaled items were: strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), agree (3) and strongly agree (4). Higher means are indicative of more positive OAM characteristics.

[4] This item was a determinant of consistent condom use with sweethearts in TRaC SAMS 2006.

§ *Beliefs about background and trust in a partner [Scaled Construct]*

- Even if I know a sweetheart's background, I need to use condoms

- Even if my sweetheart is a good girl, I need to use condoms
- Even if my sweetheart comes from a good family, I'm likely to use condoms
- Because I can "see people," I know that my sweetheart is safe and I don't need to use condoms (reverse coded to reflect positive belief about needing to use condoms)
- There is a need to use condoms with sweethearts

§ Subjective norms about proposing condom use to sweetheart [Scaled Construct]

- My sweetheart would not think I have HIV or an STI if I suggest using a condom
- Asking my sweetheart to use a condom does not imply that I think she is not safe
- My sweetheart would not think that I have other sexual partners if I suggest using a condom
- Asking my sweetheart to use a condom does not imply that I don't trust her

Segmentation Table

Title: Determinants of Correct and Consistent Condom Use with Sweethearts among High Risk Urban Men, Cambodia, 2008

Risk: High Risk Urban Men, aged 18 and older

Behavior: Correct and consistent condom use with sweethearts in the last 3 months

INDICATORS	Correct & consistent users[1] (N=552) 54.1%	Inconsistent users (N=469) 45.9%	Odds Ratio	Sig.
OPPORTUNITY				
Availability	mean[2]	mean		
It is easy to find condoms nearby the places where I meet my sweetheart	3.25	3.36	0.76	*
ABILITY				
MOTIVATION				
Attitudes	%	%		
Condoms are appropriate and necessary to use with a sweetheart [3]	95.1	91.3	2.31	*
	mean	mean		
There is a need to use condoms with a S/H even after being together for a while	3.04	2.88	1.59	***
Subjective Norms				
§ Subjective norms about proposing condom use to sweetheart (Scaled Construct)	2.68	2.42	1.93	***
Threat				
I may put my partner at risk for STI or HIV if I don't use condoms	3.24	3.10	2.34	**
Beliefs				
§ Beliefs about background and trust in a partner (Scaled Construct) [3]	3.16	3.08	1.55	**
Even if I trust my S/H, I need to use condoms with her	3.08	2.86	1.62	***
A man needs to use condoms not only with a S/H who works in EE	1.42	1.57	0.70	**
POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS				
Age (continuous)	28.96	29.88	0.97	*
	%	%		
Marital status	53.4	63.8	0.52	***
Currently has more than one sweetheart	41.8	30.1	1.83	***

Omnibus test chi-square =253.061, df =14, p <0.001; Hosmer & Lemeshow test chi-square =4.731; df =8; p =0.786; Nagelkerke R-squared =29.3%

Significance: *p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

Super-scripts:

[1] Correct and consistent users are defined as those who reported that they always used condoms in the last three months, excluding respondents who reported any time in the last three months that they did not use a condom from start to finish during sexual intercourse.

[2] Means were calculated by averaging response values based on a 4-point Likert scale; response options for scaled items were: strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), agree (3) and strongly agree (4). Higher means are indicative of more positive OAM characteristics.

[3] This item was a determinant of consistent condom use with sweethearts in TRaC SAMS 2006.

§ Beliefs about background and trust in a partner [Scaled Construct]

- Even if I know a sweetheart's background, I need to use condoms
- Even if my sweetheart is a good girl, I need to use condoms
- Even if my sweetheart comes from a good family, I'm likely to use condoms

- Because I can "see people," I know that my sweetheart is safe and I need to use condoms (reverse coded to reflect positive belief about needing to use condoms)
- There is a need to use condoms with sweethearts

§ Subjective norms about proposing condom use to sweetheart [Scaled Construct]

- My sweetheart would not think I have HIV or an STI if I suggest using a condom
- Asking my sweetheart to use a condom does not imply that you think she is not safe
- My sweetheart would not think that I have other sexual partners if I suggest using a condom
- Asking my sweetheart to use a condom does not imply that I don't trust her

Annex 1: Evaluation Analysis

Evaluation Table
Title: Effect of PSI's IPC Campaign on Condom Use and OAM Determinants of Behavior among High Risk Urban Men in Phnom Penh, Cambodia, 2008
Risk: High Risk Urban Men, aged 18 and older
Behavior: Condom use with sweethearts & commercial partners

INDICATORS	Not exposed (N=394) 65.7%	Exposed (N=206) 34.3%	Sig.
BEHAVIOR/USE	%	%	
[DI] Correct and consistent condom use with sweetheart [1]	51.9	54.1	
Used a condom at last sex with sweetheart	79.1	86.1	*
[DI] Correct and consistent condom use with commercial partners [1,2]	80.2	77.5	
Used a condom at last sex with commercial partner [2]	99.0	99.9	
OPPORTUNITY			
Availability	mean[3]	mean	
It is easy to find condoms nearby the places where I meet my sweetheart	3.28	3.30	
ABILITY			
MOTIVATION			
Attitudes	%	%	
[DI] Condoms are appropriate and necessary to use with a sweetheart [4]	92.9	97.0	*
	mean	mean	
There is a need to use condoms with a S/H even after being together for a while	2.80	3.02	***
Subjective Norms	mean	mean	
§ Subjective norms about proposing condom use to sweetheart (Scaled Construct)	2.60	2.66	
Threat	mean	mean	
I may put my partner at risk for STI or HIV if I don't use condoms	3.09	3.18	
Beliefs	mean	mean	
[DI] § Beliefs about background and trust in a partner (Scaled Construct) [4]	3.02	3.27	***
Even if I trust my S/H, I need to use condoms with her	2.85	3.02	***
A man needs to use condoms not only with a S/H who works in EE	1.57	1.56	

Socio-demographic control variables include: age and marital status.

Significance: *p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

Super-scripts:
[DI] = Donor indicator
[1] Correct and consistent condom use is defined as those who reported that they always used condoms in the last three months, excluding respondents who reported any time in the last three months that they did not use a condom from start to finish during sexual intercourse.
[2] The denominator for this proportion is the number of men who had sex with commercial partners in the last 12 months, n=935.
[3] Means were calculated by averaging response values based on a 4-point Likert scale; response options for scaled items were: strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), agree (3) and strongly agree (4). Higher means are indicative of more positive OAM characteristics.
[4] This item was a determinant of consistent condom use with sweethearts in TRaC SAMS 2006.

§ Beliefs about background and trust in a partner [Scaled Construct]

- Even if I know a sweetheart's background, I need to use condoms
- Even if my sweetheart is a good girl, I need to use condoms

- Even if my sweetheart comes from a good family, I'm likely to use condoms
- Because I can "see people," I know that my sweetheart is safe and I don't need to use condoms (reverse coded to reflect positive belief about needing to use condoms)
- There is a need to use condoms with sweethearts

§ Subjective norms about proposing condom use to sweetheart [Scaled Construct]

- My sweetheart would not think I have HIV or an STI if I suggest using a condom
- Asking my sweetheart to use a condom does not imply that I think she is not safe
- My sweetheart would not think that I have other sexual partners if I suggest using a condom
- Asking my sweetheart to use a condom does not imply that I don't trust her

Summary of Evaluation Results:

Evaluation analyses were conducted using the subset of respondents from Phnom Penh (N=600), where PSI's IPC program has been implemented since June 2008. The evaluation table shows that:

(1) Exposure to PSI's IPC program is associated with condom use at last sex with a sweetheart. 86.1% of those exposed to the program reported using a condom at last sex with a sweetheart, compared to 79.1% of those who were not exposed to IPC.

(2) Positive attitudes about the need to continue using condoms with a sweetheart even after being together for a while and that "Condoms are appropriate and necessary to use with a sweetheart" are associated with exposure to the IPC program.

(3) Beliefs in the need to use condoms with a sweetheart despite knowing she has a good background and trusting her are significantly higher among those exposed to the program, compared to those not exposed.

Annex 2: Reliability Analysis

Composite Variables	2008 (N=1,021) Cronbach's Alpha
MOTIVATION	
Subjective norms about proposing condom use to sweetheart • My sweetheart would not think I have HIV or an STI if I suggest using a condom • Asking my sweetheart to use a condom does not imply that I think she is not safe • My sweetheart would not think that I have other sexual partners if I suggest using a condom • Asking my sweetheart to use a condom does not imply that I don't trust her	.839
Beliefs about background and trust in a partner • Even if I know a sweetheart's background, I need to use condoms • Even if my sweetheart is a good girl, I need to use condoms • Even if my sweetheart comes from a good family, I'm likely to use condoms • Because I can "see people," I know that my sweetheart is safe and I need to use condoms (reverse coded to reflect positive belief about needing to use condoms) • There is a need to use condoms with sweethearts	.803

Response options were based on the 4-point Likert scale: strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), agree (3) and strongly agree (4).

Annex 3: Population Characteristics

Table A. Population Characteristics of High Risk Urban Men by City, Cambodia, 2008

POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS	PP n=600 (%)	SR n=201 (%)	BB n=110 (%)	SV n=110 (%)	Total N=1,021 (%)
Gender					
Male	100	100	100	100	100
Marital status					
Single	60.0	51.2	53.6	50.0	56.5
Married / Cohabitating	37.3	48.3	46.4	50.0	41.8
Widowed / Divorced / Separated	2.7	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.7
Age					
Mean (in years)	28.8	29.6	29.8	32.0	29.4
Level of education					
No education	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.4
Primary school	2.8	8.0	0.9	3.6	3.7
Secondary school	12.5	19.9	3.6	15.5	13.3
High school	31.3	40.3	31.8	30.9	33.1
College / university	48.7	30.3	60.9	49.1	46.4
Vocational school / other	4.2	1.0	2.7	0.9	3.0
Occupation					
Unemployed	6.7	3.0	22.0	4.5	7.4
Government sector	17.7	20.4	27.5	32.7	20.9
Private sector	59.6	76.6	50.5	60.9	62.1
Student	16.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	9.6
Average monthly income					
< or = 50$	4.8	18.4	7.3	2.7	7.5
51 – 100$	28.0	34.3	24.5	15.5	27.5
101 – 250$	42.2	28.4	30.0	53.6	39.4
> 250$	21.0	18.4	24.5	20.9	20.9
No income / no answer	4.0	0.5	13.6	7.3	4.7
Mean (among those with income)	(n=573)	(n=200)	(n=95)	(n=102)	(n=973)
	214$	276$	257$	218$	232$
Number of sweethearts					
Currently have more than one sweetheart	27.7	55.2	63.6	22.7	36.4
Currently have more than one sweetheart with whom had sex	20.3	43.8	63.6	18.2	29.4
Mean (current sweethearts)	1.5	2.4	2.4	1.3	1.7

PP: Phnom Penh; SR: Siem Reap; BB:Battambang; SH: Sihanoukville

Annex 3 (cont.): Population Characteristics

Table B. Population Characteristics of High Risk Urban Men by Correct and Consistent vs. Inconsistent Condom Users, Cambodia, 2008

POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS	Correct & consistent users n=552 (%)	Inconsistent users n=469 (%)	Total N=1,021 (%)
Gender			
Male	100	100	100
Marital status			
Single	52.9	60.8	56.5
Married / Cohabitating	46.2	36.7	41.8
Widowed / Divorced / Separated	0.9	2.6	1.7
Age			
Mean (in years)	29.5	29.2	29.4
Level of education			
No education	0.5	0.2	0.4
Primary school	3.8	3.6	3.7
Secondary school	11.6	15.4	13.3
High school	32.2	34.1	33.1
College / university	49.3	43.1	46.4
Vocational school / other	2.5	3.6	3.0
Occupation			
Unemployed	5.3	9.8	7.4
Government sector	17.5	23.8	20.9
Private sector	63.0	61.3	62.1
Student	9.6	9.6	9.6
Average monthly income			
< or = 50$	8.2	6.8	7.5
51 – 100$	26.3	29.0	27.5
101 – 250$	35.5	43.9	39.4
> 251$	25.4	15.6	20.9
No income / no answer	4.7	4.7	4.7
Mean (among those with income)	(n=526)	(n=447)	(n=973)
	244$	217$	232$
Number of sweethearts			
Currently have more than one sweetheart	38.2	34.3	36.4
Currently have more than one sweetheart with whom had sex	29.5	29.2	29.4
Mean (current sweethearts)	1.8	1.6	1.7

Annex 4: Sweetheart Characteristics and Sexual Behavior with Sweetheart

Sweetheart Characteristics	PP n=600	SR n=201	BB n=110	SV n=110	Total N=1,021
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Duration of relationship with sweetheart (in months)	14.9	15.4	13.7	12.3	14.6
Way of describing sweetheart	%	%	%	%	%
• Srey/kou kamnann chet	63.8	76.6	64.5	53.6	65.3
• Satrey rok si phlouv phet	13.3	8.5	12.7	42.7	15.5
• Girl for fun	19.2	11.9	21.8	2.7	16.3
• Common women	3.7	3.0	0.9	0.9	2.9
At least one current sweetheart's main occupation is high risk [1]	36.3	67.2	57.3	58.2	47.0
Ever paid a current sweetheart money for sex	40.3	57.2	55.5	50.9	46.4
Sexual behavior with sweetheart					
Drank alcohol before last sex with sweetheart	47.5	58.7	54.5	55.5	51.3
Sex with sweetheart is typically...					
• Planned	66.7	61.2	30.0	61.8	61.1
• Unexpected / impulsive	33.3	38.8	70.0	38.2	38.9
Condom use with sweetheart					
Used condom at last sex with sweetheart	81.5	82.6	70.0	91.8	81.6
Frequency of condom use with sweetheart in last 3 months					
• Never	7.0	11.9	4.5	4.5	7.4
• Rarely	4.3	3.5	10.0	4.5	4.8
• Sometimes	8.5	3.5	20.0	2.7	8.1
• Often	23.3	14.4	32.7	10.0	21.2
• Always	56.8	66.7	32.7	78.2	58.5
Did not use condom from start to finish during sexual intercourse with sweetheart any time during the last 3 months (among those who reported always using condoms with sweetheart in the last 3 months)	7.3 (n=341)	3.0 (n=134)	13.9 (n=36)	12.8 (n=86)	7.5 (N=597)
Decision to use condoms with sweetheart is… (among those who used condoms with sweetheart in the last 3 months)	(n=558)	(n=176)	(n=105)	(n=104)	(N=943)
• Mostly your own decision	48.7	59.1	61.9	31.7	50.3
• Mostly your partner's decision	6.5	12.5	6.7	0.0	6.9
• Joint decision	44.8	28.4	31.4	68.3	42.8

PP: Phnom Penh; SR: Siem Reap; BB:Battambang; SH: Sihanoukville
[1] High risk occupations include: karaoke singer, beer promoter, waitress, hostess, masseuse and commercial sex worker

Annex 5: Sexual Behavior

Indicators	PP n=600	SR n=201	BB n=110	SV n=110	Total N=1,021
Types of sexual partners in the last 12 months	%	%	%	%	%
• Had sex with regular partner (spouse or cohabitating partner)	37.2	49.3	46.4	50.0	41.9
• Had sex with brothel-based sex worker	60.5	73.1	25.5	91.8	62.6
• Had sex with entertainment worker (paid)	69.3	64.2	71.8	85.5	70.3
• Had sex with street-based sex worker	24.5	32.8	23.6	55.5	29.4
• Had sex with any commercial partner (entertainment workers, brothel- and street-based sex workers)	94.7	85.1	78.2	100	91.6
• Had sex with casual partner (sweethearts and all other partners that are not a spouse, cohabitating partner or sex worker)	100	100	100	100	100
Number of sexual partners in the last 12 months [1]	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
• All partners	8.7	13.6	5.8	8.9	9.4
• Regular partners (spouse or cohabitating partner)	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.6	1.2
• Brothel-based sex workers	3.9	8.1	1.3	2.6	4.5
• Entertainment workers (paid)	4.2	5.1	2.0	2.3	3.9
• Street-based sex workers	2.6	2.3	1.5	1.6	2.2
• Total commercial partners (entertainment workers, brothel- and street-based sex workers)	6.2	11.7	2.7	5.2	6.8
• Casual partners (sweethearts and all other partners that are not a spouse, cohabitating partner or sex worker)	2.4	3.1	3.2	2.9	2.7
Sexual behavior with commercial partners	**n=568**	**n=171**	**n=86**	**n=110**	**N=935**
Sex with commercial partners is typically...	%	%	%	%	%
• Planned	40.5	62.6	10.6	59.1	43.7
• Unexpected / impulsive	59.5	37.4	89.4	40.9	56.3
Had sex with same commercial partner on more than one occasion in last 12 months	27.3	51.5	75.6	60.9	40.1
Frequency of sex with commercial partners	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Number of times visited same commercial partner (last 12 months) [2]	3.7	4.0	6.3	2.8	4.0
Number of times had sex with commercial partners in the past year	21.7	48.3	18.6	35.0	27.9
Condom use with commercial partners	%	%	%	%	%
Used condom at last sex with commercial partner	99.3	98.8	100	99.1	99.3
Frequency of condom use with commercial partners in last 3 months					
• Never	0.2	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.2
• Rarely	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
• Sometimes	1.2	1.2	1.2	0.0	1.1
• Often	15.7	6.4	25.6	8.2	14.0
• Always	82.9	91.8	73.3	91.8	84.7
Did not use condom from start to finish during sexual intercourse with commercial partner any time during the last 3 months (among those who reported always using condoms with commercial partners in the last 3 months)	4.5 (n=471)	1.9 (n=157)	1.6 (n=63)	4.0 (n=101)	3.7 (N=792)
Decision to use condoms with partners is… (among those who used condoms with commercial partners in the last 3 months)	(n=567)	(n=170)	(n=86)	(n=110)	(N=933)
• Mostly your own decision	77.4	78.2	87.2	40.0	74.1
• Mostly your partner's decision	5.6	5.3	1.2	0.0	4.5
• Joint decision	16.9	16.5	11.6	60.0	21.4
Condom breakage					
How many times did the condom you were wearing break or slip off while you were having sex (last 3 months)					
• Never	89.0	93.5	98.2	90.8	91.1

Indicators	PP n=600	SR n=201	BB n=110	SV n=110	Total N=1,021
• Only once	8.8	4.5	0.9	8.3	7.1
• A few times	2.2	2.0	0.9	0.9	1.9

PP: Phnom Penh; SR: Siem Reap; BB:Battambang; SH: Sihanoukville

[1] Among those who had sex with each type of partner in the past 12 months.

[2] Among those who had sex with the same commercial partner on more than one occasion in the past 12 months: PP n=155, SR n=88, BB n=65, SV n=67, total N=375.

Annex 6: Procurement of Commercial Sex and Condoms

INDICATORS	2008 (%)
Where do you usually go to find commercial sex partners (multiple response) [1]	(N=967)
• Brothel	46.4
• Karaoke	31.6
• Along the street	29.9
• Guesthouse / hotel	28.9
• Beer garden	21.1
• Night club	10.7
• Massage parlor	9.8
• Restaurant	6.4
• Entertainment place	5.7
• Telephone	3.2
• Other	2.5
Where do you get condoms most of the time (single response)	(N=1,021)
• Clinical pharmacy / pharmacy / drug store	48.5
• Guesthouse / hotel	18.0
• Street / mobile vendor	10.4
• Supermarket / mini-mart / grocery shop	10.1
• From sexual partner	4.8
• Brothel	3.8
• Karaoke	2.3
• Massage parlor	0.8
• Beer garden	0.3
• Other	1.1
Where would you most prefer to buy condoms (multiple response)	(N=1,021)
• Pharmacy	55.4
• Clinical pharmacy	46.2
• Guesthouse / hotel	36.9
• Street vendor	22.2
• Supermarket / mini-mart / grocery shop	13.6
• Brothel	10.5
• Karaoke	8.2
• Mobile vendor	6.9
• Drug store	3.2
• Massage parlor	2.1
• Beer garden	1.3
Once you plan to meet your sweetheart, when do you typically obtain a condom (single response)	(N=1,021)
• Already have condom before planning to meet sweetheart	38.7
• After meeting sweetheart	30.6
• On the way to meet sweetheart	23.2
• Sweetheart provides condom	6.6
• Don't obtain a condom	1.0

[1] Excludes 54 cases who reported never soliciting a commercial sex worker.

Annex 7: Exposure to IPC Intervention

INDICATORS	2008 Phnom Penh N=600 (%)
Have been approached by Inter-Personal Communication (IPC) teams from PSI in the last 6 months	34.3
Number of times met with IPCs from PSI in the last 6 months	(n=206)
• 1 time	50.0
• 2 times	32.5
• 3 or more times	17.5
Recall IPC messages (Spontaneous)	(n=206)
• It's not about trust, it's about being safe by always using condoms	58.7
• I cannot tell by looking if someone has HIV/AIDS	31.1
• Even if a girl looks pretty, I should still use condoms	38.3
• Using condoms correctly is the safest way to prevent from HIV infection	32.5
• Use condoms to protect against HIV/AIDS	54.4
• Recall at least one of any of the above messages	82.0