

6-5-2017

Sexual Risk Behaviours Associated with Unlicensed Driving among Young Adults in Miami's Electronic Dance Music Nightclub Scene

Mance E. Buttram

Nova Southeastern University, mance.buttram@nova.edu

Steven P. Kurtz

Nova Southeastern University, steven.kurtz@nova.edu

Roddia J. Paul

Nova Southeastern University, rp1181@mynsu.nova.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://nsuworks.nova.edu/shss_facarticles



Part of the [Arts and Humanities Commons](#), and the [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

NSUWorks Citation

Buttram, M. E., Kurtz, S. P., & Paul, R. J. (2017). Sexual Risk Behaviours Associated with Unlicensed Driving among Young Adults in Miami's Electronic Dance Music Nightclub Scene. *Sexual Health*, 14 (6), 584-586. <https://doi.org/10.1071/SH17073>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Scholarship at NSUWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in CAHSS Faculty Articles by an authorized administrator of NSUWorks. For more information, please contact nsuworks@nova.edu.



Published in final edited form as:

Sex Health. 2017 November ; 14(6): 584–586. doi:10.1071/SH17073.

Sexual risk behaviours associated with unlicensed driving among young adults in Miami's electronic dance music nightclub scene

Mance E. Buttram, Steven P. Kurtz, and Roddia J. Paul

Center for Applied Research on Substance Use and Health Disparities, Nova Southeastern University, 7255 NE 4th Avenue, Suite 112, Miami, FL 33138, USA

Abstract

Literature indicates that unlicensed driving (UD) offenders report substance use risk behaviours, yet data related to sexual risk behaviours is unknown. This study examined sexual and other risk behaviours among young adults in Miami, Florida, comparing UD and non-UD offenders ($n = 498$). Compared with others, UD offenders were more likely to report group sex history, being high for sex half the time or more, purchasing sex and sexually transmissible infection history. Results suggest that locating sexual risk reduction interventions inside of the justice system would benefit UD offenders.

Research demonstrates that young adult participants in the electronic dance music (EDM) nightclub scene report alcohol and drug use (e.g. cocaine, ecstasy, prescription opioids and benzodiazepines) in addition to multiple sexual risk behaviours, including condomless vaginal and anal sex, and group sex.^{1–4} EDM nightclub scene participants also report risky driving behaviours.⁵ One such risky driving behaviour, unlicensed driving (UD), is relatively understudied. Although literature suggests a connection between UD and substance use,^{6,7} the connection between UD and sexual risk behaviours is not apparent. Given this, we examined sexual and other risk behaviours among young adult EDM nightclub scene participants in Miami, Florida, comparing UD and non-UD offenders.

Data are drawn from baseline assessments conducted between September 2011 and November 2014 as part of a substance use and sexual risk reduction intervention trial. Participants ($n = 498$) were aged 18–39 years and met the following past-90-day eligibility criteria: 1) heterosexual sex; 2) use of club drugs (i.e. cocaine, ecstasy, g-hydroxybutyric acid [GHB], methamphetamine, ketamine, lysergic acid diethylamide [LSD]) three or more times; 3) non-prescribed use of prescription medications one or more time; and 4) attendance at large EDM nightclubs once or more in a typical month.

The assessments were primarily comprised of the Global Appraisal of Individual Needs (version 5.4),⁸ which includes core sections on substance use, sexual risk behaviours, sexually transmissible infection (STI) history and arrest history. Participants reported the

Conflicts of interest

None declared.

offences for which they were ever arrested, including UD, which was dichotomised into UD arrest versus not. Measures of past-90-day substance use and sexual behaviours, and STI history were dichotomised into endorsement and not. Descriptive statistics were calculated for the variables of interest. Bivariate logistic regression models were constructed to examine differences in characteristics and behaviours between UD and non-UD offenders. All analyses were conducted using SPSS Statistics version 24 (IBM Corporation, Armonk, NY, USA).

As shown in Table 1, compared with others, UD offenders were more likely to be Black and to report group sex history, being high for sex, half the time or more, purchasing sex, and STI history. In multivariate models controlling for significant demographic variables, all significant bivariate relationships remained, with the exception of group sex history ($P < 0.031$; data not shown). No measure of past-90-day substance use was significant, likely because the sample comprised frequent and heavy substance users.

This study shows associations between UD and multiple sexual risk behaviours, which are concerning given the association between substance use and HIV and STI transmission. Moreover, it is common for group sex events to include participants from multiple high-risk populations (e.g. men who have sex with men, injection drug users) and lower risk populations (e.g. heterosexual young adults). These events serve as potential bridge environments in which HIV and STI may be transmitted across group boundaries and expose participants to greater risk.⁹

Findings from this study suggest that upon entering the justice system, UD offenders would likely benefit from interventions focused on sexual risk behaviours, in addition to substance use and driving safety. Although sexual risk reduction interventions delivered inside of the justice system have been studied,¹⁰ no apparent interventions have targeted UD offenders, whose infractions are less severe than other risky driving offences (e.g. driving under the influence) and are unlikely to be sentenced to confinement. Thus, for UD offenders, brief sexual risk reduction interventions could be delivered alongside the existing non-correctional facility justice system infrastructure (e.g. mandated safe driving education or court appearances). In addition, referrals for HIV and STI testing in these settings would assist in diagnosing unknown infections and connecting individuals to treatment.

This study has some limitations. The ability to generalise the findings to other populations is limited by the eligibility requirements and the high frequencies of reported substance use and sexual risk behaviours. All data are based on self-report, potentially leading to underreporting of socially undesirable behaviours.

Miami reports the highest HIV and syphilis prevalence rates in the USA, including among heterosexual populations, notably heterosexual Black women,^{11,12} thus identifying opportunities to reach populations at risk is a high priority. Locating adjunct sexual risk reduction interventions inside of the justice system in non-jail settings could likely be done at low cost and require little additional commitment from participants, including UD offenders. Future research should focus on developing intervention approaches for young adult UD offenders.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by Department of Health and Human Services Grant Number 5 R01 DA019048 from the National Institute on Drug Abuse. The content is solely the responsibility of the author and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institute on Drug Abuse or the National Institutes of Health.

References

1. Kurtz SP, Surratt HL, Buttram ME, Levi-Minzi MA, Chen M. Interview as intervention: the case of young adult multidrug users in the club scene. *J Subst Abuse Treat.* 2013; 44:301–8. DOI: 10.1016/j.jsat.2012.08.004 [PubMed: 22971689]
2. Buttram ME, Kurtz SP. Characteristics associated with group sex participation among men and women in the club drug scene. *Sex Health.* 2015; 12:560–2. DOI: 10.1071/SH15071 [PubMed: 26342286]
3. Kurtz SP, Buttram ME, Surratt HL. Benzodiazepine dependence among young adult participants in the club scene who use drugs. *J Psychoactive Drugs.* 2017; 49:39–46. DOI: 10.1080/02791072.2016.1269978 [PubMed: 28001962]
4. Ibañez GE, Kurtz SP, Surratt HL, Inciardi JA. Correlates of heterosexual anal intercourse among substance-using club-goers. *Arch Sex Behav.* 2010; 39:959–67. DOI: 10.1007/s10508-010-9606-3 [PubMed: 20217224]
5. Voas RB, Johnson MB, Miller BA. Alcohol and drug use among young adults driving to a drinking location. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2013; 132:69–73. DOI: 10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2013.01.014 [PubMed: 23415848]
6. Hanna CL, Hasselberg M, Laflamme L. Young unlicensed drivers and fatal road traffic crashes in the USA in the past decade. A neglected public health issue. *Inj Prev.* 2014; 20:54–6. DOI: 10.1136/injuryprev-2013-040809 [PubMed: 23938355]
7. Elliott MR, Ginsburg KR, Winston FK. Unlicensed teenaged drivers: who are they, and how do they behave when they are behind the wheel? *Pediatrics.* 2008; 122:e994–1000. DOI: 10.1542/peds.2008-1257 [PubMed: 18977967]
8. Dennis, ML. Global appraisal of individual needs. Version 5.4. Bloomington, IL: Chestnut Health Systems; 2006.
9. Friedman SR, Mateu-Gelabert P, Sandoval M. Group sex events amongst non-gay drug users: an understudied risk environment. *Int J Drug Policy.* 2011; 22:1–8. DOI: 10.1016/j.drugpo.2010.06.004 [PubMed: 20800465]
10. Underhill K, Dumont D, Operario D. HIV prevention for adults with criminal justice involvement: a systematic review of HIV risk reduction intervention in incarceration and community settings. *Am J Public Health.* 2014; 104:e27–53. DOI: 10.2105/AJPH.2014.302152
11. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Diagnosed HIV infection among adults and adolescents in metropolitan statistical areas – United States and Puerto Rico, 2013. *HIV Surveill Suppl Rep.* 2015; 20:15–7.
12. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Table 25. All stages of syphilis – reported cases and rates of reported cases in selected metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs) in alphabetical order, United States 2011–2015. 2016. Available online at: <https://www.cdc.gov/std/stats15/tables/25.htm> [verified 3 April 2017]

Sample characteristics and bivariate logistic regression models of unlicensed driving (N=498)

Table 1

| | UD Offender | | Non-UD Offender | | P | OR | 95% CI |
|---|-------------|--------|-----------------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| | N=118 | 23.7% | N=380 | 76.3% | | | |
| Demographics | | | | | | | |
| Hispanic | 62 | 52.5% | 258 | 67.9% | 0.003 | 0.524 | 0.344, 0.797 |
| Black | 37 | 31.4% | 67 | 17.6% | 0.002 | 2.134 | 1.334, 3.414 |
| White | 17 | 14.4% | 43 | 11.3% | 0.369 | 1.319 | 0.721, 2.413 |
| Other | 2 | 1.7% | 12 | 3.2% | 0.167 | 0.34 | 0.073, 1.571 |
| Female | 32 | 27.1% | 190 | 50.0% | 0.000 | 0.372 | 0.237, 0.585 |
| Young age (18-24) | 36 | 30.5% | 224 | 58.9% | 0.000 | 0.306 | 0.197, 0.476 |
| Education | 95 | 80.5% | 327 | 86.1% | 0.145 | 0.669 | 0.390, 1.149 |
| Substance Use^a | | | | | | | |
| Alcohol | 118 | 100.0% | 379 | 99.7% | 0.999 | | |
| Marijuana | 115 | 97.5% | 360 | 94.7% | 0.229 | 2.130 | 0.622, 7.297 |
| Cocaine (powder) | 114 | 96.6% | 347 | 91.3% | 0.065 | 2.710 | 0.940, 7.816 |
| Crack cocaine | 31 | 26.3% | 103 | 27.1% | 0.858 | 0.958 | 0.600, 1.531 |
| Ecstasy | 118 | 100.0% | 364 | 95.8% | 0.998 | | |
| LSD | 50 | 42.4% | 187 | 49.2% | 0.195 | 0.759 | 0.500, 1.151 |
| Hallucinogens | 66 | 55.9% | 212 | 55.8% | 0.978 | 1.006 | 0.664, 1.525 |
| Methamphetamine | 34 | 28.8% | 84 | 22.1% | 0.136 | 1.426 | 0.895, 2.274 |
| GHB | 24 | 20.3% | 54 | 14.2% | 0.111 | 1.541 | 0.905, 2.626 |
| Heroin | 24 | 20.3% | 83 | 21.8% | 0.728 | 0.914 | 0.549, 1.521 |
| Rx benzodiazepines | 114 | 96.6% | 348 | 91.6% | 0.075 | 2.621 | 0.907, 7.570 |
| Rx opioids | 107 | 90.7% | 339 | 89.2% | 0.649 | 1.176 | 0.584, 2.369 |
| Sexual Behaviors | | | | | | | |
| Condomless vaginal sex ^a | 107 | 90.7% | 343 | 90.3% | 0.894 | 1.049 | 0.517, 2.128 |
| Condomless anal sex ^a | 49 | 41.5% | 150 | 39.5% | 0.691 | 1.089 | 0.715, 1.657 |
| Group sex history | 59 | 50.0% | 144 | 37.9% | 0.020 | 1.639 | 1.081, 2.485 |
| High for sex half the time ^a | 103 | 87.3% | 285 | 75.0% | 0.006 | 2.289 | 1.270, 4.126 |
| Traded / sold sex ^b | 20 | 16.9% | 47 | 12.4% | 0.205 | 1.446 | 0.818, 2.556 |

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

| | UD Offender N=118 | | Non-UD Offender N=380 | | P | OR | 95% CI |
|--|----------------------|-------|--------------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| Purchased sex ^a | 26 | 22.0% | 31 | 8.2% | 0.000 | 3.182 | 1.800, 5.624 |
| Sexually transmitted infection history | 27 | 22.9% | 56 | 14.7% | 0.040 | 1.717 | 1.026, 2.872 |

^a past 90 days;

^b past year