



Tri-County Report 2005_4

Population Profile:
Socioeconomic and
Health Characteristics of
Men who have Sex with
Men (MSM), Non-MSM
Men, and Women

DRAFT!!!!

David Abramson

Columbia University
Mailman School of Public Health
In collaboration with Medical and Health Research
Association of New York,
the NYC Department of Health and Mental
Hygiene, the Westchester Department of Health,
and the NY Health & Human Services
HIV Planning Council

Originally submitted July 12, 2005
HRSA Grant # H89 HA 0015-15
© 2005 Trustees of Columbia University

C.H.A.I.N. REPORT

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A Technical Review Team (TRT) provides oversight for the CHAIN Project in New York City and in the Tri-County area of Putnam, Rockland, and Westchester counties. In addition to Peter Messeri, PhD, Angela Aidala, PhD, and David Abramson, PhD, of Columbia University's Mailman School of Public Health, TRT members include Mary Ann Chiasson, DrPH, MHRA (chair); Grace Moon, NYCDOHMH Office of AIDS Policy; Susan Forlenza, MD MPH, NYCDOHMH; JoAnn Hilger, NYCDOHMH; Julie Lehane, PhD, Westchester County DOH; Jennifer Nelson, MHRA; and Ken Butler, PWA Advisory Group.

This research was made possible by grant number H89 HA 0015-15 from the US Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) HIV/AIDS Bureau. The CHAIN study is supported by the HIV Health and Human Services Planning Council of New York under a Title I grant of the Ryan White Comprehensive AIDS Resource Emergency Act of 1990 through the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene. It is conducted under the auspices of the Medical and Health Research Association of New York City, Inc, and in Tri-County under the Westchester Department of Health. Its contents are solely the responsibility of the researchers and do not necessarily represent the official views of the U.S. Health Resources and Services Administration; the City of New York; Putnam, Rockland, or Westchester counties; or the Medical and Health Research Association of New York.

Introduction

This Population Profile explores the socioeconomic and health characteristics of three groups of adults living with HIV in the Tri-County region of Westchester, Rockland, and Putnam counties: Men who have sex with men (MSM), non-MSM men, and women. We have chosen to define MSM by sexual behavior rather than sexual identification or orientation. In other words, if an individual reports that he is of heterosexual orientation but also reports having had sex with men, we will count him in the MSM category. As we have noted in earlier Tri-County CHAIN reports, the cohort of 398 HIV+ adults assembled in 2001-2002 is generally representative of the people engaged in the public realm of HIV medical care or social services in the Tri-County region, and is likely to underrepresent those individuals whose sole contact with the medical care system is through private physicians. Furthermore, we recruited clients in to the study based on where they received services in the Tri-County region, and so we also will underrepresent (or are missing entirely) those individuals who only receive care from providers outside of the Tri-County region. There are other groups who are, by definition, missing from the cohort. Those individuals who do not know their serostatus are not included, nor are those who know their HIV status but who have not yet engaged any medical care or HIV-related social services or who have dropped out of care.

Notwithstanding the caveat noted in the previous paragraph, the composition of the Tri-County CHAIN baseline cohort is strikingly similar in its proportion of MSM when compared with epidemiologic data. In the Tri-County CHAIN cohort, 81 respondents (20%) of the 398 reported having had sex with men. According to data from the NYS Department of Health, Bureau of HIV/AIDS Epidemiology, as of Dec. 31, 2003 there were 550 people living with an AIDS diagnosis and 193 people diagnosed with HIV (not AIDS) who were reported as either MSM or MSM and IDU. This combines to a total of 743 MSM living in the Tri-County region. Overall, according to New York State data, there are 4,342 individuals who had been diagnosed with an AIDS or HIV diagnosis in the Tri-County region, as of Dec. 31, 2003. As a proportion of the total, MSM represent 17% of the full population, a number quite similar to CHAIN's 20%.

This report describes a number of characteristics of the sub-populations of interest – MSM, non-MSM men, and women – at baseline; we have considered such characteristics as socio-demographics, economic resources, family & household characteristics, HIV diagnosis and early medical care, current health status, and risk behaviors, among others. The two to three hour survey includes over 850 items, and provides a comprehensive quantitative profile of the people who have participated. A word of caution is in order, though, regarding those tables and cells with “small numbers.” When the groups being compared have at least 50 individuals in each group, then the comparisons may be statistically valid. With smaller numbers, the percentages may be skewed and it is difficult to ascertain true group differences. Wherever possible, we have noted those small denominators.

Statistical tests of significance were conducted (generally chi-square analyses) to determine whether the differences between sub-groups were related to chance or were significantly associated with the sub-group characteristic. For example, if 45% of women in the cohort are on HIV medications, compared with 50% of men, the statistical test would determine whether that difference was “real” or merely a result of chance (these figures are for illustration only).

Part I. DEMOGRAPHICS AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS*Sociodemographics (Table 1-2)*

- C MSM are more likely than other groups to be white, non-Hispanic, and to live in Suburban Westchester, Putnam, and Rockland counties.
- C Non-MSM men are more likely to be 50 years of age or older.

Economic characteristics (Table 1-3)

- C MSM are more likely to have achieved higher levels of formal education, but in contrast to non-MSM men are more likely to report insufficient money in the household for utilities, food, clothing, and recreational activities.
- C In contrast to both MSM and non-MSM men, women are much more likely to report insufficient money in the household for utilities, food, clothing, and recreational activities.

Family & Household (Table 1-4)

- C MSM are less likely to be married than non-MSM men and women, although 9% were married at the baseline interview (compared to 26% of non-MSM men and 19% of women). Overall, 22% of MSM have ever been married, compared to 69% of non-MSM men and 60% of women who have ever been married. Similarly, MSM are less likely to have minor children in the household – 9% of MSM have children under 18 in the household, compared to 28% of non-MSM men and 51% of women.
- C There were no statistically significant differences in housing status by sub-population.

HIV Diagnosis and Early Medical Care (Table 1-5)

- C There were no statistically significant differences among the sub-populations regarding the time between diagnosis and initial medical care, nor were there major differences regarding their health status at the time of the initial diagnosis.
- C Women were more likely than both MSM and non-MSM men to be married at the time of their initial diagnosis, less likely to be drinking a lot or using drugs regularly, and more likely to have had adequate medical insurance at the time of their diagnosis.

Current Health Status (Table 1-6)

- C Among MSM, the proportion of people who don't know their T-cell counts is significantly lower (4%) than non-MSM men (15%) or women (13%).
- C MSM are more likely to report having ever had a clinical diagnosis of AIDS or an AIDS-defining opportunistic infection (69%) than are non-MSM men (59%) or women (60%). Fourteen percent of MSM report having a sibling with HIV, a similar rate to non-MSM men (15%) and women (21%).

Risk Characteristics (Table I-7)

- C MSM and women are far less likely to have ever used drugs (not including marijuana) than non-MSM men, are are similarly less likely to have ever injected drugs.

- C Approximately half the cohort (47%) have scored low on a standardized mental health score, tallying less than a 42.0 on the Medical Outcomes Study mental health component summary scale. MSM (51%) and women (51%) are significantly more likely than non-MSM men (39%) to have scored low on the mental health scale.

Table 1-2. Sociodemographic Characteristics

	MSM		Non-MSM Men		Women		TOTAL	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Sample	81	100	123	100	194	100	398	100%
Race/Ethnicity ***								
<i>White, non-Hispanic</i>	33	41%	22	18%	27	14%	82	21%
<i>Black, non-Hispanic</i>	23	28%	64	52%	110	57%	197	50%
<i>Hispanic/Latino</i>	23	28%	36	30%	51	26%	110	28%
<i>Other</i>	2	2%	1	1%	6	3%	9	2%
Age categories ***								
<i>20-34 years old</i>	10	12%	10	8%	28	14%	48	12%
<i>35-49 years old</i>	54	67%	63	51%	132	68%	249	63%
<i>50+ years old</i>	17	21%	50	41%	34	18%	101	25%
Geography *								
<i>Urban Westchester</i>	33	41%	61	50%	119	61%	213	54%
<i>Suburban West./Putnam</i>	29	36%	41	33%	42	22%	112	28%
<i>Rockland</i>	19	23%	21	17%	33	17%	73	18%
Ancestry								
<i>Foreign-Born</i>	9	12%	25	22%	44	23%	78	20%
<i>US-Born</i>	69	88%	90	78%	145	77%	304	80%

Table 1-3. Economic Resources

	MSM		Non-MSM Men		Women		TOTAL	
Total Sample	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	79	100	123	100	194	100	396	100%
Educational attainment ***								
<i>Less than high school</i>	9	12%	40	35%	84	44%	133	35%
<i>High school graduate</i>	44	56%	53	46%	82	43%	179	47%
<i>Some college</i>	5	6%	3	3%	3	2%	11	3%
<i>College graduate</i>	8	10%	12	10%	13	7%	33	9%
<i>Post-graduate</i>	12	15%	7	6%	7	4%	26	7%
Employment status								
<i>Employed full-time</i>	13	16%	13	11%	29	15%	55	14%
<i>Employed part-time</i>	12	15%	14	11%	24	12%	50	13%
<i>Not employed</i>	54	68%	95	77%	140	72%	289	73%
<i>Volunteer</i>	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%	2	1%
Annual household income								
<i><\$10,000</i>	32	40%	63	52%	108	56%	203	51%
<i>\$10,000 - \$14,999</i>	18	22%	19	16%	29	15%	66	17%
<i>\$15,000 - \$24,999</i>	15	19%	14	11%	26	13%	55	14%
<i>\$25,000 - \$44,999</i>	8	10%	19	16%	20	10%	47	12%
<i>\$45,000+</i>	6	7%	6	5%	9	5%	21	5%
<i>Refused/Don't Know</i>	2	2%	1	1%	1	1%	4	1%
Fairly often/ very often, respondent did not have enough money in the household for...								
<i>Rent</i>	7	9%	14	12%	35	19%	56	15%
<i>*Utilities</i>	12	15%	11	10%	42	22%	65	17%
<i>***Food</i>	10	13%	9	8%	48	25%	67	18%
<i>Medical care</i>	5	6%	9	8%	7	4%	21	6%
<i>***Clothing</i>	16	21%	20	17%	75	40%	111	29%
<i>***Recreational activities</i>	19	25%	33	29%	99	52%	151	40%

Table 1-4. Family & Household Characteristics

	MSM		Non-MSM Men		Women		TOTAL	
Total Sample	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	81	100	123	100	194	100	398	100%
Current marital status ***								
<i>Married</i>	7	9%	32	26%	37	19%	76	19%
<i>Separated</i>	2	2%	13	11%	18	9%	33	8%
<i>Divorced</i>	8	10%	36	29%	28	14%	72	18%
<i>Widowed</i>	1	1%	4	3%	34	18%	39	10%
<i>Never married</i>	63	78%	38	31%	77	40%	178	45%
Current partner relationship								
<i>Not in partner relationship</i>	47	58%	57	46%	89	46%	193	48%
<i>Living with spouse or partner</i>	17	21%	43	35%	59	30%	119	30%
<i>Non-coresident partner relationship</i>	17	21%	23	19%	46	24%	86	22%
Number of children under 18 in household***								
<i>None</i>	74	91%	89	72%	95	49%	258	65%
<i>1 - 3</i>	7	9%	33	27%	89	46%	129	32%
<i>4 or more</i>	0	0%	1	1%	10	5%	11	3%
Current living situation								
<i>Own or rent an apartment or house</i>	60	74%	92	75%	164	85%	316	79%
<i>"Doubled up" with friend or relative</i>	7	9%	9	7%	12	6%	28	7%
<i>Welfare hotel or motel</i>	2	2%	4	3%	3	2%	9	2%
<i>Specialized AIDS housing</i>	7	9%	7	6%	7	4%	21	5%
<i>Drug treatment program housing</i>	2	2%	2	2%	0	0%	4	1%
<i>Shelter, street, or other public place</i>	0	0%	5	4%	3	2%	8	2%
<i>Hospital, nursing home, hospice</i>	2	2%	3	2%	3	2%	8	2%
<i>Jail, prison, halfway house</i>	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%	2	1%
<i>Other</i>	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%	2	1%
Stability of housing in past 6 months								
<i>Stably housed</i>	68	84%	97	79%	163	84%	328	82%
<i>Unstably Housed or Doubled-Up</i>	12	15%	16	13%	20	10%	48	12%
<i>Homeless at least one night</i>	1	1%	10	8%	11	6%	22	6%

Table 1-5. HIV Diagnosis & Early Medical Care

	MSM		Non-MSM Men		Women		TOTAL	
Total Sample	81	100%	123	100%	192	100%	396	100%
Year of HIV or AIDS diagnosis								
<i>1978-1989</i>								
<i>1990-1995</i>								
<i>1996-2000</i>								
<i>2001-2003</i>								
Time between diagnosis and HIV medical care								
<i>Less than 3 months</i>	64	79%	91	74%	147	77%	302	76%
<i>Greater than 3 months</i>	15	19%	27	22%	41	21%	83	21%
Health at time of initial HIV medical care								
<i>No medical problems</i>	34	43%	58	49%	105	56%	197	51%
<i>Minor medical problems</i>	18	23%	25	21%	33	18%	76	20%
<i>Major medical problems</i>	27	34%	35	30%	48	26%	110	29%
Life circumstances at time of initial HIV diagnosis **								
<i>Married or in a regular relationship</i>	47	60%	71	62%	146	77%	264	69%
<i>Drinking a lot</i>	30	38%	55	48%	50	26%	135	35%
<i>Using drugs regularly</i>	31	40%	65	57%	75	40%	171	45%
<i>Had adequate medical insurance</i>	47	60%	71	62%	146	77%	264	69%

Table 1-6. Current Health Status

	MSM		Non-MSM Men		Women		TOTAL	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Sample	81	100	123	100	194	100	398	100%
Most recent t-cell count								
<i>Greater than 500 copies per mm³</i>	27	33%	33	27%	72	37%	132	33%
<i>201-500 copies per mm³</i>	33	41%	44	36%	62	32%	139	35%
<i>Less than 200 copies per mm³</i>	18	22%	28	23%	35	18%	81	20%
<i>Missing/Don't know</i>	3	4%	18	15%	25	13%	46	12%
Stage of HIV infection*								
<i>Asymptomatic HIV</i>	7	9%	33	27%	45	23%	85	21%
<i>Symptomatic HIV</i>	18	22%	17	14%	32	16%	67	17%
<i>Clinically-diagnosed AIDS</i>	56	69%	73	59%	117	60%	246	62%
Current use of antiretroviral therapy								
<i>None</i>	17	21%	22	18%	60	31%	99	25%
<i>Non-HAART Combination therapy</i>	15	19%	24	20%	36	19%	75	19%
<i>HAART</i>	49	60%	77	63%	98	51%	224	56%
Family members with HIV								
<i>Sibling</i>	11	14%	19	15%	41	21%	71	18%
<i>Spouse/partner</i>								
<i>*Children under 18 years old</i>	0	0%	4	3%	13	7%	17	4%

Table 1-7. Risk Characteristics

	MSM		Non-MSM Men		Women		TOTAL	
Total Sample	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	81	100	123	100	194	100	398	100%
HIV risk***								
<i>MSM</i>	62	77%	0	0%	0	0%	62	16%
<i>Problem drug use</i>	0	0%	86	70%	85	44%	171	43%
<i>MSM + problem drug use</i>	19	23%	0	0%	0	0%	19	5%
<i>Heterosexual and other</i>	0	0%	37	30%	109	56%	146	37%
Drug use**								
<i>Never used drugs</i>	34	42%	23	19%	76	39%	133	33%
<i>Former drug use</i>	36	44%	74	60%	81	42%	191	48%
<i>Current drug use</i>	11	14%	26	21%	37	19%	398	19%
Injection drug use***								
<i>Never injected drugs</i>	69	85%	50	41%	135	70%	254	64%
<i>Ever injected drugs</i>	12	15%	73	59%	59	30%	144	36%
Mental health component summary score (MCS)*								
<i><37.0 (very low mental health score)</i>	25	31%	28	23%	78	40%	131	33%
<i>37.0 - 42.0 (low mental health score)</i>	16	20%	20	16%	21	11%	57	14%
<i>>42.0 (average mental health score)</i>	40	49%	75	61%	95	49%	210	53%
Dually-diagnosed individuals (Low mental health & drug use)								
<i><37.0 MCS + current drug use</i>	4	5%	7	6%	20	10%	31	8%

PART II. HEALTH STATUS and HEALTH SERVICE USE**Table 2-1. Self-reported Health Status and Service Utilization**

	MSM	Non MSM-Men	Women	TOTAL
(Total N=684)	81	123	194	398
In general, would you say your health is...				
<i>Excellent or very good</i>	43%	26%	33%	33%
<i>Good</i>	32%	35%	34%	34%
<i>Fair or poor</i>	25%	39%	34%	33%
Compared to six months ago, is your health generally...				
<i>Better</i>	46%	37%	38%	39%
<i>Same</i>	46%	41%	45%	44%
<i>Worse</i>	8%	23%	17%	17%
Opportunistic infections (OI)				
<i>OI in past 6 months</i>	36%	35%	36%	36%
Hospital & ER Use				
<i>Any in-patient use</i>	21%	20%	24%	22%
<i>Any ER Use</i>	33%	31%	38%	35%
Medical Care Characteristics*				
<i>Meets preferred practice guideline</i>	72%	67%	66%	68%
<i>Meets primary care characteristics of access and well-care</i>	65%	75%	73%	72%
Insurance				
<i>Private</i>	14%	7%	10%	10%
<i>Medicaid</i>	57%	69%	70%	67%
<i>Other public insurance</i>	30%	21%	20%	22%
<i>None</i>	0%	2%	1%	1%

* p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001

- C MSM are more likely than other population groups to report “excellent” or “very good” health status, and less likely to report that their health is poorer than it was six months earlier.
- C There are approximately equal rates of self-reported opportunistic infections, in-patient hospital use, and emergency use by all three population sub-groups.
- C MSM are slightly more likely than the other sub-groups to report having private insurance and ADAP as their health insurance.

PART III: NEED ASSESSMENT

Client Satisfaction

- C There were no significant differences among the population sub-groups related to having a medical provider, waiting times at their medical provider, overall satisfaction, and interest in changing their medical provider. MSM were slightly less likely to report having primary medical care that met criteria for “comprehensive medical care” (a measure of 24-hour access, preventive care such as well-visits and immunizations, and health education and promotion via health advice). (Table 3-1)

- C There are similar numbers of case managers across all sub-groups (on average, 1.6 to 1.7 case managers among those who report having a case manager). There are no differences among the sub-groups regarding waiting time to see a case manager, although MSM are slightly more likely to express satisfaction with their case managers (72%, compared to 59% among non-MSM men and 62% among women). (Table 3-2)

Service Gaps

- C Overall, the greatest needs are expressed by women, across all service categories. For all groups, well over half the problems that had been experienced in the prior six months are still considered problems or are getting worse. (Table 3-3)

Problems & Barriers

- C MSM are more likely than other sub-groups to report that they delayed or did not get medical services because it cost too much (perhaps related to issues of insurance coverage, given that MSM are more likely than other groups to have either private insurance or ADAP). MSM are also more likely to report various interpersonal barriers with staff at health and social service agencies, such as staff being disrespectful, not understanding their problems, not listening, or feeling discriminated because of their sexual orientation. (Table 3-4)

Table 3-1. Access, Waiting time, Satisfaction, and Comprehensiveness of Medical Care Services

Characteristics	MSM	Non-MSM Men	Women	TOTAL
Having a Medical Care Provider				
<i>Yes</i>	100%	99%	99%	99%
<i>No</i>	0%	1%	1%	1%
Waiting time to see Medical Care Provider				
<i>Less than 30 minutes</i>	74%	74%	70%	72%
<i>31-60 minutes</i>	17%	21%	19%	19%
<i>Over one hour</i>	9%	4%	11%	8%
Satisfaction with Medical Care Provider				
<i>Satisfied</i>	86%	90%	88%	88%
<i>Dissatisfied</i>	14%	10%	12%	12%
Comprehensive Medical Care ¹				
<i>Not comprehensive care</i>	34%	24%	27%	27%
<i>Comprehensive care</i>	66%	76%	73%	73%
Want to change Medical Care Provider				
<i>Yes</i>	14%	10%	14%	13%
<i>No</i>	86%	90%	86%	87%

¹ Comprehensive medical care is based on the respondent reporting that his or her medical provider: (1) provides well-care visits, (2) is available to discuss health issues, (3) is available 24 hours a day, either directly or through a service or beeper

Table 3-2. Access, Waiting time, and Satisfaction of Case Manager Services

Characteristics	MSM	Non-MSM Men	Women	TOTAL
Number of Case Manager				
0	22%	33%	24%	26%
1	42%	41%	39%	40%
2	28%	18%	24%	23%
3+	7%	8%	13%	10%
Mean Number of Case Manager Among Who Has Case Manager				
<i>Mean Number</i>	1.6	1.6	1.7	
Waiting time to see Case Manager				
<i>Less than 30 minutes</i>	95%	93%	94%	94%
<i>31-60 minutes</i>	3%	5%	4%	4%
<i>Over one hour</i>	2%	2%	3%	2%
Satisfaction with Case Manager				
<i>Satisfied</i>	72%	59%	62%	63%
<i>Dissatisfied</i>	28%	41%	38%	37%
Want to change Case Manager				
<i>Yes</i>	14%	10%	14%	13%
<i>No</i>	86%	90%	86%	87%

Table 3-3. Reported Problems and Progress Towards Resolving Problems

<i>P roblem area</i>	MSM		Non-MSM Men		Women	
	having a problem	no progress/ problem has gotten worse*	having a problem	no progress/ problem has gotten worse*	having a problem	no progress/ problem has gotten worse*
<i>Housing</i>	*30%	83%	*36%	84%	*45%	77%
<i>Financial issues</i>	**28%	78%	**38%	91%	**49%	79%
<i>Legal issues</i>	15%	67%	8%	80%	15%	62%
<i>Job-related issues</i>	6%	60%	8%	90%	11%	73%
<i>Home care</i>	*2%	0%	*6%	43%	*12%	65%
<i>Household items</i>	***13%	50%	***11%	77%	***30%	75%
<i>Child care</i>	**1	100%	**0%	0%	**8%	88%
<i>Transportation</i>	*23%	58%	*14%	53%	*26%	68%
<i>Food</i>	***19%	43%	***16%	53%	***34%	52%

Note: Problems were identified by respondents in response to the question: Did you need help or assistance in this area in the last six months?"

* percentages among who have a problem

Table 3-4. Barriers to Medical Care and Social Service

	MSM		Non-MSM Men		Women	
	Medical Care	Social Service	Medical Care	Social Service	Medical Care	Social Service
LOGISTICAL BARRIERS						
<i>Reported at least one logistical barrier</i>	31%	26%	18%	25%	24%	30%
<i>Language barriers</i>	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%
<i>Cost too much</i>	14%	4%	7%	1%	6%	3%
<i>Unsure where to go for services</i>	5%	17%	2%	17%	6%	21%
<i>Transportation</i>	15%	14%	7%	10%	14%	18%
<i>Need for child care</i>	*1%	2%	*1%	2%	*6%	6%
PROVIDER / STAFF BARRIERS						
<i>Reported at lease one staff barrier</i>	28%	23%	16%	21%	21%	28%
<i>Didn't trust staff to safeguard privacy</i>	3%	1%	3%	2%	3%	3%
<i>Staff not competent</i>	8%	12%	8%	10%	7%	17%
<i>Staff disrespectful</i>	15%	*17%	6%	*6%	9%	*16%
<i>Staff didn't understand the problem</i>	12%	15%	7%	12%	10%	16%
<i>Staff didn't listen</i>	12%	17%	5%	12%	10%	18%
<i>Respondents nervous about what provider might say regarding condition</i>	8%	5%	8%	5%	11%	8%
<i>*Felt discriminated because of sexual orientation</i>	6%	6%	1%	1%	1%	-1%
<i>Felt discriminated because of drug use</i>	1%	1%	3%	4%	5%	5%