


STRIVE

Tackling the structural drivers of HIV

Understanding Risk for HIV/STI Transmission and Acquisition within Non-Paying Partnerships of Female Sex Workers in Southern India



**Understanding Risk for HIV/STI Transmission and
Acquisition within Non-Paying Partnerships of
Female Sex Workers in Southern India**



© KHPT, July 2012

Souradet Shaw

University of Manitoba, Canada

Priya Pillai

Consultant, Karnataka Health Promotion Trust, India

Author Contact: umshaw@cc.umanitoba.ca

Suggested citation: Shaw, S and Pillai, P. *Understanding risk for HIV/STI transmission and acquisition within non-paying partnerships of female sex workers in Southern India.*

Design and layout: M. B. Suresh Kumar (Artwist Design Lab)

No. of copies printed: 200

Publisher: Director, Communications,

Karnataka Health Promotion Trust,

IT/ BT Park, 5th Floor,

1-4, Rajajinagar Industrial Area

Behind KSSIDC Administrative Office

Rajajinagar, Bangalore- 560 044

Phone: 91-80-40400200

Fax: 91-80-40400300

www.khpt.org



Support

This study was conducted with funding support from Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and Centre for Global Public Health (CGPH), University of Manitoba. This report was commissioned by STRIVE - a research consortium based at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, with partners in India, Tanzania, South Africa, focusing on the structural forces - in particular stigma, gender-based violence, poverty and drinking norms - that combine in different ways to create vulnerability to HIV transmission and to undermine prevention. The views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, CGPH or the STRIVE project.




Ethical Approval

This study was approved by the Institutional Ethical Review Board of the St. John's Medical College and Hospital, Karnataka on 5th March 2011 and the Ethical Review Board of University of Manitoba (Reference #: H2011:069)

Research Team

Souradet Shaw: data analysis, and dissemination (University of Manitoba, Canada), Dr. Kathleen Deering: data analysis, protocol and instrument development (University of British Columbia, Canada), Satyanarayana Ramanaik: field team coordination, data collection supervision and dissemination Karnataka Health Promotion Trust, India), Raghavendra T: local supervision and technical assistance (Karnataka Health Promotion Trust India), Laura H. Thompson: protocol development and technical assistance (University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada), Dr. Shiva Halli: technical assistance (University of Manitoba, Canada), Parinita Bhattacharjee: study concept development, and general project coordination (Karnataka Health Promotion Trust), Dr. Robert Lorway: Principal Investigator (University of Manitoba, Canada)





CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	V
1. Background	1
1.1. Objectives	
1.2. Methodology	
1.2.1 Study Design and Implementation	
1.2.2 Measures	
1.2.3 Analyses	
2. The Findings - Sex Worker Survey	5
2.1 Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Female Sex Workers	
2.1.1 Age	
2.1.2 Literacy Level	
2.1.3 Marital Status	
2.1.4 Other Characteristics	
2.2 Characteristics of Main Non-Paying Partner (Npp) of Female Sex Workers	
2.2.1 Profile of The Main Non-Paying Partner	
2.2.2 Duration of Knowing The Main Non-Paying Partner	
2.2.3 Time of Last Sex With The Main Npp	
2.2.4 Condom Use With The Main Npp	
2.2.5 Other Characteristics	
2.3 Support Provided By Main Non-Paying Partner, and Physical and Sexual Violence	
2.3.1 Sex Work Management By Main Non-Paying Partner	
2.3.3 Support Provided By Main Non-Paying Partner Related to Sex Work	



2.3.4	Economic Support Provided By Main Non-Paying Partner	
2.3.5	Other Types of Support Provided By Main Non-Paying Partner	
2.3.6	Support Provided to Main Non-Paying Partner By FSWs	
2.3.7	Physical and Sexual Violence By Main Non-Paying Partner	
2.4	Correlates of Support Provided By Main Non-paying Partner	
2.4.1	Main Non-Paying Partner Helps Manage Sex Work	
2.4.2	Main Non-Paying Partner Provide Support For Sex Work	
2.4.3	Main Non-Paying Partner Provides Economic Support	
2.5	Correlates of Condom Use at Last Sex With The Main Non-Paying Partner	
2.6	Correlates of Physical and Sexual Violence	
3.	The Findings - Partners Survey.	12
3.1	Characteristics of Main Non-Paying Partners	
3.2	Characteristics of Main Female Sex Worker Partnerships of Male Non-Paying Partners	
3.2.1	Other Characteristics of Partnerships	
3.3	Correlates of Support and Condom Use, Partners Survey	
4.	Community Dissemination.	15
5.	Conclusion	17
References		44





LIST OF TABLES

- Table 1 : Characteristics of Female Sex Workers, Non-Paying Partners Study: Sex Worker Survey (Bagalkot)
- Table 2 : Characteristics of Main Non-Paying Partner (NPP) of Female Sex Workers (FSW), Non-Paying Partners Study: Sex Worker Survey (Bagalkot)
- Table 3 : Main Non-Paying Partner (NPP) helps Manage Sex Work
- Table 4: Main Non-Paying Partner (NPP) Provides Support for Sex Work
- Table 5 : Main Non-Paying Partner (NPP) Provides Economic Support
- Table 6 : Provides Economic Support to Main Non-Paying Partner (NPP)
- Table 7 : Correlates of Condom Use at Last Sex with Main Non-Paying Partner (NPP)
- Table 8 : Correlates of Physical Violence Perpetrated by Main Non-Paying Partner (NPP)
- Table 9 : Correlates of Sexual Violence Perpetrated by Main Non-Paying Partner (NPP)
- Table 10 : Characteristics of Main Non-Paying Partner, Non-Paying Partners Study: Partners Survey (Bagalkot)
- Table 11 : Characteristics of Main Female Sex Worker Partnerships of Male Non-Paying Partners: Partners Survey (Bagalkot)
- Table 12 : Correlates of Main Male Non-Paying Partner Reporting Sex-Work Management
- Table 13 : Correlates of Main Male Non-Paying Partner Reporting Sex-Work Related Support: Partners Survey (Bagalkot)
- Table 14 : Correlates of Main Male Non-Paying Partner Reporting Economic Support: Partners Survey (Bagalkot)
- Table 15 : Correlates of Condom Use at Last Sex with Main Female Sex Worker Partner: Partners Survey (Bagalkot)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS



We would like to thank Dr. James Blanchard and Dr. Stephen Moses from University of Manitoba for their consistent support during the study.

We would like to thank Dr. Lori Heise and Annie Holmes from the STRIVE project for their comments and inputs in writing this report.

We acknowledge the active participation and support of Chaitanya AIDS Tadegatwa Mahila Sangha in designing and conducting this study. We are very encouraged by the fact that the study findings have supported the CBO to design an intervention with non-paying partners in the region.

Thanks to Mahesh Doddamane for his leadership and support at the study site and to the programme team which has been implementing interventions in the region.

We would like to appreciate Nancy Daniel and HR Sharada's contributions in co-ordinating the production of this report.

BACKGROUND



HIV prevalence remains high among women engaged in sex work in Karnataka state, southern India. Approaches to HIV prevention for female sex workers (FSWs¹) in India and elsewhere have typically focussed on increasing condom use with clients [1-3] since the majority of FSWs' sexual interactions are within the context of sex work. In many settings, these prevention approaches have been shown to increase condom use within commercial sex partnerships [4-9].

Much less is known about the extent to which the non-paying or non-commercial sex partnerships (including spouses and other male partners) of FSWs represent risk for both acquisition and transmission of HIV. Understanding the risk of transmission of HIV and other sexually transmitted infections (STIs) within non-paying partnerships is complicated, and is influenced by individual, interpersonal, environmental and societal factors [10, 11].

In many cases, HIV prevention approaches have been shown to be less successful at increasing condom use within non-paying or non-commercial partnerships of FSWs than they have been within commercial partnerships [12-19]. Some reasons for lowered condom use may include greater longevity, trust and intimacy within the partnership [14, 20] and fertility desires of the couple. Moreover, condoms may also be perceived as a symbol of infidelity and foster mistrust [21]. Importantly, in societies where cultural norms reinforce the lowered social status of women and reduce economic opportunities [20, 22, 23] power disparities that favour the male partner may exist within intimate partnerships. This will impact on women's abilities to negotiate safer sex behaviour [20, 24, 25] or partner testing and treatment for HIV and STIs. Interpersonal factors such as partner violence [22, 26] and sexual coercion [22] have been found in other studies to inhibit women's ability to negotiate safer sex behaviour. Negotiation within partnerships can be especially challenging, where women are economically dependent on their long term partner [12, 27].

Although non-paying partnerships of FSWs constitute an important component of their lived experience, little is known regarding the non-paying partners (NPPs) of FSWs in southern India or in other settings. Moreover, almost all information on non-paying partners has been collected from FSWs rather than from the perspective of their male partners. Given that targeting of non-commercial partnerships has been indicated as a means to maximize HIV prevention efforts [28, 29], understanding and quantifying risks and protective factors within non-paying partnerships, pertinent to HIV serves as a research priority.

The Non-Paying Partners Pilot Study therefore sought to address the key research gap pertaining to the characteristics of non-paying partners and partnerships of FSWs in southern India. In partnership with the University of Manitoba, Karnataka Health Promotion Trust

¹ In this report, the term 'female sex workers' is used as an umbrella term to describe all women who engage in sex work, defined in Inclusion Criteria in the Methodology section.

(KHPT) commissioned this pilot study to characterize non-paying partnerships, and to develop understanding around how non-paying partnerships function to increase risk to FSWs from HIV and STIs. This knowledge is required to help develop effective, efficient and setting-specific HIV prevention programmes tailored for FSWs and their non-paying partners.

1.1 OBJECTIVES

The main objective of the Non-Paying Partners pilot study was to understand the risk for HIV/STI transmission and acquisition within non-paying partnerships of FSWs, from the perspective of FSWs and their non-paying partners.

The specific objectives of the study were as follows:

1. To characterize partnerships from the perspective of both FSWs and their main non-paying partners
2. To assess the risk for transmission of HIV/STIs within non-paying partnerships
3. To identify and contextualize the factors that shape and influence risk for HIV/STIs within non-paying partnerships

1.2 METHODOLOGY

Both qualitative and quantitative methods were used to investigate sex partnerships of female sex workers and their male partners.

1.2.1 Study Design and Implementation

The study was based in the Northern Karnataka District of Bagalkot, where an HIV prevention programme currently operates. Under the supervision of a research team from KHPT and the University of Manitoba, experienced local staff, recruited from existing intervention programmes served as field workers for the study. Field workers administering the surveys were fluent in both English and the local language, Kannada.

Based on extensive previous research conducted by members of the study team in this region, quantitative and qualitative data were collected in three steps:

1. First, a brief survey was administered to female sex workers ('Sex Worker Survey') recruited into the study, in order to characterize non-paying partnerships from the perspective of FSWs. Information was gathered on their main non-paying (male) sex partnership, on any additional non-paying partnerships they had, and on their more long-term commercial sexual partners.
2. Second, the results of the sex worker survey were reviewed, and some women were selected whose non-paying partnerships met specific criteria (determined after reviewing the surveys). These women were requested to discuss the proposed pilot study with their main non-paying partners and to invite their non-paying partners to participate in a follow-up survey. A short survey was then administered to the non-paying partners ('Non-paying partner survey') that consented to participate. The non-paying partner survey collected similar data to the sex worker survey, to allow for cross-comparisons with sex workers and a



detailed understanding of the ego-centric sexual networks of the male non-paying partners from the male perspective.

3. Third, a small sample was selected, after the administration of the sex worker survey, to participate in an in-depth one-on-one semi-structured qualitative interviews. This was to help gain a more nuanced understanding of how characteristics of non-paying partnerships influence risk for HIV/STIs.

All interviews were undertaken in spaces in which participants were comfortable. Spaces for the interviews included a project office consultation room, and the project's boardroom. For those participants requiring more discretion, small lodges were used. All surveys and interviews were conducted in Kannada, and signed, informed consent was obtained. For the qualitative components of the study, permission was sought to audio record the interview.

Inclusion Criteria

Women were screened for potential inclusion in the study using the following criteria:

- ◇ Being a practicing sex worker i.e., traded sex for money/gifts/shelter/food in the last month
- ◇ Self-identifying as female, including women who are biologically female as well as identify as transgendered
- ◇ Having at least one current non-paying male partner. This definition included traditional sex workers such as *Devadasi*, who represent an important population in Northern Karnataka.

Male participants were screened using the following criteria

- ◇ Having at least one female sex worker as a current non-paying sex partner. 'Intimate sex partner' or 'Non-paying partner' was self-defined by participants as a non-commercial sex partner (i.e., a partner who the participant would not define currently as a commercial client or sex worker, although s/he could have been in the past) and appropriate for the local context.

Within these inclusion criteria, a purposive sampling procedure, aimed at capturing various perspectives thought to be important in terms of non-paying partnerships and HIV/STI risk was applied. Participants represented a range of age categories, duration of sex work categories, and level of involvement with the prevention programme and sex work environments (e.g. soliciting clients in brothels, public places or homes).

For the purposes of this report, the term non-paying partner was used as an umbrella term to categorise those non-commercial/intimate partnerships reported by participating females. Informed by preliminary research, non-paying partner was thought to be a more inclusive term as it was broad enough to capture the complex relationships that exist between FSWs and their partners. For example, preliminary work had used the term 'Lover' (in place of non-paying partner) to describe non-commercial/intimate relationships. However, after consultation with community members and project staff, it was felt that the term Lover was uncommon among older female participants.

1.2.2 Measures

In addition to the main study inclusion/exclusion criteria as listed above (i.e., definitions of female sex workers and non-paying partners), several definitions are outlined below. As this was a pilot study, research team members felt it was important to more fully understand who might meet the definition of non-paying partner. Thus female participants were given the choice of categorising their male non-paying partners as Lovers, Husbands, *Hiriya*, *Malak*, or Other.

Categorisation of Non-Paying Partners

- ◇ Lovers, typically, is a term used by younger participants to refer to their intimate partners
- ◇ Husband is a term typically used by FSWs such as *Devadasi* to refer to an informal and long-standing relationship, since *Devadasi*, in accordance with tradition, cannot legally marry
- ◇ *Hiriya* and *Malak* are terms used by older sex workers to refer to a more permanent, or regular non-paying partner with whom an emotional bond is shared

Socio-demographic variables explored included age, literacy level, place of residence since birth, location of sex work, sources of income, marital status and profile of first sex partner. Marital status included sex workers who reported being a *Devadasi*². Female participants were also asked about duration of the relationship with their main non-paying partner, as well as questions regarding frequency of sexual contact and condom use with their partners. The prevalence of physical and sexual violence was also assessed. Finally, participants were asked about the types of support given to them by their main non-paying partner.

Broadly speaking, four types of support were investigated: management of sex work, support of sex work, economic, and other types of support. Participants were also asked about types of economic support given to their main non-paying partner, and these included gifts, money, food and shelter.

1.2.3 Analyses

Basic descriptive statistics were generated for socio-demographic, sex-work related and main non-paying partner relationship variables. Results are presented in Sections 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3. Bivariate analyses examining the association between types of support and socio-demographic, sex and main non-paying partner relationship variables are presented in Section 2.4. Statistical significance was assessed using chi-squared tests of association, with $p < .05$ considered statistically significant. Section 2.5 investigated the correlates of condom use at last sex with main non-paying partners. For these analyses bivariate comparisons were made, as well as a final multivariable logistic model, adjusted for socio-demographic factors. Finally, the correlates of physical and sexual violence were investigated in Section 2.6. Stata 11 (College Station, TX) was used for all analyses.

² 'The *Devadasi* tradition involves a religious rite in which adolescent girls are dedicated, through marriage, to different gods and goddesses, after which they become the wives or servants of the deities and perform various temple duties. Over time, these duties came to include provision of sexual services to patrons of the temples. The sex work associated with *Devadasi* has become increasingly commercialised in many contexts, and is socially and culturally embedded.' Macchiwalla T and Bhattacharjee P. Rural Sex Work Targeted Interventions; February 2012.



THE FINDINGS - SEX WORKER SURVEY



The following findings capture the socio-demographic characteristics of the female sex workers (FSWs) in Bagalkot district, and key characteristics of the main non-paying partners (NPP). The types of support provided by the main NPP, including, help in managing sex work, economic and non-economic types of support, economic support provided by FSW to the main NPP and experience of physical and sexual violence from the main NPP are described. The findings explore the influence of variables – source of income outside of sex work, plans to have children with the main NPP, physical and sexual violence by the main NPP among others – that may aid or deter support provided by the main NPP. Condom use and incidences of physical and sexual violence are also measured against these variables.

2.1 SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF FEMALE SEX WORKERS

The responses from a total of 257 female sex workers were analysed as part of the study. The socio-demographic characteristics describe age, literacy level, marital status, location of sex work, presence of an alternate source of income, and the profile of the first sex partner (Table 1).

2.1.1 Age

Overall, a majority of the FSWs (40%) covered in the survey were under the age of 25 years, with the average age of the sample being 27 years. More than a quarter of the participants (29%) were between the age of 25 and 29 years. A similar proportion (27%)

Age of Female Sex Workers	
Age	Percentage of FSWs
18-24	39.3
25-29	28.8
30-39	26.5
40+	5.5

of the sex workers was between the age of 30 and 39 years. Less than 6 percent of the survey participants were over 40 years of age.


2.1.2 Literacy Level

The literacy level of the participants was low. Only a small proportion, less than a third, of the participants (29%) could read or write.

2.1.3 Marital Status

More than half of the female sex workers (56%) were *Devadasis* and 4 percent were married. The remaining 40 percent were separated (8%), divorced (19%), widowed (8%) or never married (4%).





2.1.4 Other Characteristics

Close to three-fourths (74%) of FSWs had lived in the current location since birth. Over 80 percent of the FSWs did sex work outside their home town in the previous year. Sex work was the only source of income for about half of the participants. About 48 percent of participants reported their ‘First Night Ceremony Partner’ as their first sex partner.

2.2 CHARACTERISTICS OF MAIN NON-PAYING PARTNER (NPP) OF FEMALE SEX WORKERS

This section describes the nature and duration of FSW’s relationship with their main NPP, time of last sex with the main NPP, average number of sex acts in the last month and condom use at last sex with the main NPP (Table 2).

2.2.1 Profile of the Main Non-Paying Partner

Overall, half of FSWs classified their main NPP as their ‘lover’. The remaining 50 percent described them as ‘husband’ (21%), ‘*hiriya*’ (11%) or ‘*malak*’ (18%).


2.2.2 Duration of Knowing the Main Non-Paying Partner

Approximately 60 percent of FSWs reported knowing their main NPP for more than 5 years. A majority of FSWs (36%) were acquainted with their main NPP for a period between 1 to 4 years. Only a small proportion (4%) of FSWs reported knowing their main NPP for less than a year.

How long have you known your main NPP? (N=250)	
Time Period	Percentage of FSWs
< 1 year	3.9
1 – 4 years	36.1
5 – 9 years	34.5
10+ years	25.5

2.2.3 Time of Last Sex with the Main NPP

Reported sexual contact with main NPPs was high. About 50 percent of FSWs reported at least one sexual contact with their main NPP in the past one week. A significant proportion (32%) of FSWs had sexual contact with their main NPP in the past month.



An average number of 10 sexual encounters in the previous month were reported by those FSWs reporting sex in the last month with their main NPP.

2.2.4 Condom Use with the Main NPP

Reported condom use with main NPPs was low. Less than 40 percent of FSWs had used a condom at last sex with their main NPP.

2.2.5 Other Characteristics

A majority (over 80%) of FSWs had been paid for sex by their main NPP prior to becoming their main non-paying partner. About 22 percent of FSWs reported having other non-paying partners other than their main NPP.

2.3 SUPPORT PROVIDED BY MAIN NON-PAYING PARTNER, AND PHYSICAL AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE

This section explores the types of support provided by main non-paying partner (NPPs) to their FSWs partners, as described by FSWs. These included the role of the main NPP in managing sex work for FSWs, and economic and non-economic types of support. Further, this section explores FSWs’ experience of physical and sexual violence from their main NPP.

2.3.1 Sex Work Management by Main Non-Paying Partner

About 12 percent of FSWs reported that their main NPP played a role in managing sex work. Influencing condom use during sex work emerged as the most frequently cited (11% of FSWs) role of the main NPP. Other possible roles explored by the study, such as soliciting and choosing of clients and setting

The main NPP influenced condom use in 11% of FSWs

11% of FSWs received protection from the clients from their main NPP

of prices, had the main NPP play a negligible or limited role.

2.3.3 Support Provided by Main Non-Paying Partner Related to Sex Work

Approximately 11 percent of FSWs reported that their main NPP provided support related to sex work. Among the various kinds of support,

protection from clients was the most frequently cited (10.5%) followed by protection from goondas (7.4%) and police-related support (5%).

2.3.4 Economic Support Provided by Main Non-Paying Partner

An overwhelming majority (98%) of FSWs reported that they were provided economic-related support by their main NPP. Provision of money was the most frequently (93%) cited support, followed by food (65%) and gifts (60%).

93% of FSWs received money from their main NPP

The main NPP was a source of emotional support for 91% of FSWs

2.3.5 Other Types of Support Provided by Main Non-Paying Partner

Most FSWs (98%) reported receiving non-economic related support from their main NPP. For 91 percent of the FSWs, their main NPP was a source of emotional support, while 31 percent reported main NPPs providing social status, and 12 percent reported protection from other men.

2.3.6 Support Provided to Main Non-Paying Partner by FSWs

Relatively few participants (6%) reported supporting their main NPP with either money (5%), gifts or food.

2.3.7 Physical and Sexual Violence by Main Non-Paying Partner

Approximately 23 percent of FSWs reported physical violence (hurt, hit, slapped, pushed, kicked, punched, choked, burned but not used a weapon) from their main NPP.

23% of FSWs faced physical violence and 9% of FSWs experienced sexual violence from their main NPP

Participants (9%) also reported being subject to sexual violence (beaten or otherwise physically forced to have sexual intercourse with him) from their main NPP.

2.4 CORRELATES OF SUPPORT PROVIDED BY MAIN NON-PAYING PARTNER

The section describes the results from examination of correlates related to types of support given to FSW participants by their main NPP.

2.4.1 Main Non-Paying Partner Helps Manage Sex Work

Overall, 12 percent of FSWs reported involvement by their main NPP in managing sex work (Table 3). For those FSWs where the main NPP helped manage sex work, the correlates significant at $p < 0.5$ included: participants with sex work as the only source of income ($p=0.009$), a stated desire to have children with their main NPP in the following year ($p=0.016$) and physical ($p<0.0001$) and sexual violence ($p=0.001$) ever perpetrated by their main NPP.

Among those who reported their main NPP helped manage sex work, 72 percent stated they had no other source of income other than sex work, as against 47 percent among those who did not report involvement of their main NPP in sex work.

Among FSWs whose main NPP managed sex work, a significantly higher proportion reported a desire to have children with their main NPP, having sex work as their only source of income, and experiences of physical and sexual violence

Similarly, a higher proportion of FSWs (41%) with main NPPs managing sex work stated a desire to have children with their main NPP, as compared to FSWs (21%) with no involvement from main NPPs in sex work management.

The proportion of FSWs who faced physical and sexual violence was much higher among those whose main NPP helped managed sex work. As compared to 55 percent of FSWs whose main NPP was involved in sex work, only 20 percent of FSWs whose main NPP was not involved with sex work reported physical violence. Likewise, the proportion of FSWs who experienced sexual violence (where main NPP managed sex work) was three times higher (23% vs. 7%) as opposed to when there was no involvement in sex work from the main NPP.

2.4.2 Main Non-Paying Partner Provide Support for Sex Work

Overall, 15 percent of FSWs reported that their main NPP provided support for sex work (Table 4). For those FSWs where the main NPP provided support for sex work, the correlates significant at $p < 0.5$ included: participants with sex work as the only source of income ($p=0.037$), and physical

A higher proportion of FSWs - whose main NPP supported sex work - had sex work as the only source of income, and experienced physical and sexual violence, as compared to FSWs with no support from their main NPP

($p<0.0001$) and sexual violence ($p=0.005$) ever perpetrated by their main NPP.

A higher proportion of sex workers (66%), whose main NPP provided support, reported no other source of income as compared to FSWs who had no support from the main NPP (approximately 48%).

The proportion of FSWs (where the main NPP supported sex work) who faced physical violence was almost three times higher as compared to FSWs whose main NPP did not support sex work (54% vs. 19%). Similarly, a higher proportion of FSWs experienced sexual violence (21% vs. 7%) when their main NPP supported sex work.

2.4.3 Main Non-Paying Partner Provides Economic Support

Almost all FSWs stated their main NPPs provided some type of economic support (Table 5). The correlates related to having a main NPP who provided economic support included having a child with the main NPP ($p=0.022$), and length of time since first sex with main NPP ($p=0.029$).

A significant proportion of the FSWs - whose main NPP provided economic support - had a child and were sexually active for higher number of years with the main NPP, as compared to FSWs with no economic support from their main NPP

Over half of participants (52%) who stated that their main NPP provided economic support had a child with the main NPP.

FSWs whose main NPP provided economic support were sexually active with that partner for higher number of years as compared to FSWs who had no economic support from their main NPP.

About 37 percent of FSWs whose NPP provided economic had been sexually active for at least five to nine years and 35 percent for at least one to four years with the main NPP. In comparison, FSWs whose main NPP did not provide economic support were sexually active for a lesser time.

2.4.4 Female Sex Workers Provide Economic Support to Main Non-Paying Partner

Overall, very few FSWs (6%) reported providing economic support to their main non-paying partner (Table 6). No factor reached statistical significance (at the $p < 0.05$ level) with regard to correlates related to FSW participants providing economic support to their main NPP. However, marital status ($p = .06$) and having children with main NPP ($p = .06$) trended towards significance.

2.5 CORRELATES OF CONDOM USE AT LAST SEX WITH THE MAIN NON-PAYING PARTNER

Approximately 38 percent of FSWs reported using condoms at last sex with their main NPP (Table 7). Condom use was significantly associated with marital status ($p < 0.0001$), type of NPP ($p = 0.007$), whether they had any children of their own (i.e., not with the main NPP, $p = 0.017$), whether participants had a child with their main NPP ($p = 0.038$) and whether they planned on having children in the future with their main NPP ($p < 0.0001$).

Female Sex Workers who used a condom at last sex were either *separated, divorced or widowed, were less likely to have had a child, and did not plan on having a child in the near future* with their main NPP. Majority of the sex workers who used and did not use condoms described their main NPP as 'lovers'

Most of the FSWs who reported not using condoms were *Devadasis* (68%) as compared to majority of the FSWs who used condoms (48%) being separated, divorced or widowed. With respect to the presence of children and fertility desires, FSWs who reported not using condoms at last sex with their main NPP were more likely to state they had a child with their main NPP (55%), compared to those who reported using condoms (42%). Similarly, 32 percent of women who reported not using condoms also reported they planned on having children with their main NPP in the next year, compared to 10 percent of women who reported using condoms.

2.6 CORRELATES OF PHYSICAL AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE

Overall, 24 percent of FSWs reported physical violence by their main non-paying partner (NPP) (Table 8). The type of NPP ($p = .008$), having no other source of income ($p = .002$) and having a child whose father was not the main NPP ($p = .013$) were factors found to be significantly associated with physical violence.

FSWs reporting physical violence were more likely to classify their main NPPs as their husband (33% vs. 17%). In comparison, most FSWs who did not face physical violence described their main NPP as a lover (50%).



FSWs who had been subjected to physical violence from their main NPP were more likely to describe their *main NPP as their husband, report sex work as the only source of income and to have children from a non-NPP relationship.*

Further, FSWs who experienced physical violence from their main NPP were more likely to report no income other than sex work: sex work was the only reported source of income for 68 percent of FSWs who faced physical violence, as compared to 46 percent of the FSWs who did not face violence.

Finally, a larger proportion of FSWs who experienced physical violence from their main NPP were more likely to have children from a non-NPP relationship. About 48 percent of FSWs who had been subjected to physical violence had children from a non-NPP partner, as compared to 31 percent of FSWs who did not face violence.

A larger proportion of FSWs, who had been subject to sexual violence by their main NPP, had *sex work as the single source of income*, compared to FSWs with no experience of sexual violence from their main NPP

Overall 9 percent of FSWs reported sexual violence from their main non-paying partner (Table 9). With respect to sexual violence, only having sex work as the only source of income reached statistical significance at the $p < .05$ level. Here, 70 percent of FSWs who experienced sexual violence by their main NPP had only sex work as a source of income as compared to 48 percent of FSWs who did not face sexual violence.





THE FINDINGS - PARTNERS SURVEY

This section discusses the results from the Partners Survey (Table 10). In total, 76 men were recruited by their FSW partners to participate in the survey.

3.1 CHARACTERISTICS OF MAIN NON-PAYING PARTNERS

Chapter - 3

Most of the male NPPs (approximately 28%) were between 25 to 29 years of age. The average age of male NPPs was 31 years of age; NPPs were approximately four years older than their FSW partners.

In comparison to their FSW partners, the literacy level of NPPs was high. A majority of NPPs (62%) could read and write as compared to only 29 percent of FSWs.

The NPPs were either married or never married. It is of interest to note that more than three fourths of NPPs (76%) reported being married, while most (84%) had lived in their current location since birth. Approximately 16 percent of NPPs reported having paid for sex in their lifetime.

Characteristics of Main NPP	
Mean Age	30.8 years
Can read and write	61.8%
Lived current location since birth	84.2%
Paid for sex work outside residence	15.8%
Current marital Status	
♦ Married	76%
♦ Separated	1.3%
♦ Never Married	22.7%

3.2 CHARACTERISTICS OF MAIN FEMALE SEX WORKER PARTNERSHIPS OF MALE NON-PAYING PARTNERS

The section describes the characteristics of main FSW partners and partnerships, as reported by males who participated in the pilot study (Table 11).

Overall, the results were similar to those reported by FSWs. One third (33%) of the men reported knowing their main FSW partners for five to nine years (compared to 35% reported by FSWs) while 31 percent of men reported knowing their FSW partners for 10+ years (compared to 26% reported by FSWs).

Similarly, 63 percent of men reported having sex with their main FSW partner in the past 7 days (compared to 50%, as reported by FSWs), 23 percent within a month's time (compared to 32%, as reported by FSWs) and 16 percent more than a month ago (compared to 18%, as reported by FSWs).

Reported condom use at last sex by both NPPs and FSWs were consistent. About 40 percent of men stated using condoms at last sex with their main FSW partner, similar to the 38 percent reported by FSWs.



The responses varied substantially with regard to payment for sex. More than three-fourths (84%) of FSWs reported being paid for sex by their main NPP at some point, as compared to only 54 percent of NPPs saying they had previously paid their main FSW partner for sex.

Characteristics of Partnerships: Comparison of Reportage by NPPs and FSWs		
	As reported by male NPPs	As reported by FSWs
Duration of knowing their partner		
♦ 5-9 years	33.3%	34.5%
♦ 10+ years	30.7%	25.5%
Time since last sex	62.7%	50%
♦ Last 7 days	22.7%	31.9%
♦ 1 week ago, less than a month	16.0%	17.9%
♦ More than one month ago	39.5%	37.7%
Condom use at Last Sex	53.9%	83.9%
Paid for sex to FSW/ by NPP	55.3%	15%
Provides sex work related support to FSW partner	19.7%	~12%
Provides sex work management related support to FSW partner	96.1%	98%
Provides economic support to FSW partner		

With regard to types of support given to main FSW partners, providing economic support to their main FSW partners was reported by 96 percent of NPPs, similar to the 98 percent reported by FSWs. However, the responses differed substantially with regard to support for managing sex work and sex work related support. While more than half of NPPs (55.3%) reported providing sex work related support to their FSW partner, only 15 percent of FSWs stated the same. The difference was much lower for reported support to manage sex work. While approximately 20 percent of NPPs reported involvement in managing their FSW partner’s sex work, only 12 percent of FSWs reported the same.

3.2.1 Other Characteristics of Partnerships

About 11 percent of men reported having another FSW partner in the last six months, while 8 percent reported currently having another FSW partner. Fewer than half (40%) of men reported they had a child with their main FSW partner, while 45% stated it was okay to hit their main FSW in certain circumstances. Finally, 17 percent of men reported having paid for sex with another FSW in the last six months.

Partnership characteristic, as reported by NPPs & FSWs were similar on most features. However, FSWs were more likely to report that their main NPPs had paid for sex prior to their relationship becoming more permanent. Also, FSWs were less likely to report support by NPPs in managing sex work and other sex work related support.

3.3 CORRELATES OF SUPPORT AND CONDOM USE, PARTNERS SURVEY


Bivariate analyses examining the correlates of sex-work management, sex-work related and economic support given to main FSW partners (Tables 12-14) and the correlates of condom use at last sex with main FSW partners (Table 15) yielded no statistically significant relationships. The small sample size from the partners' survey may have led to a lack of power to detect significant differences in the correlates of support and condom use.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

- ◇ The main non-paying partner was most likely to be a 'lover' of the female sex worker
- ◇ Sexual contact with main non-paying partners is high
- ◇ Condom use with main non-paying partners is low
- ◇ Main non-paying partners are a source of economic and emotional support for the female sex worker
- ◇ Female Sex Workers experience physical and sexual violence from their main non-paying partners
- ◇ Female Sex Workers who experience physical and sexual violence are more likely to report sex work as their only source of income
- ◇ Female Sex Workers whose main non-paying partner helps manage and provide support for sex work, are more likely to report sex work as their only source of income, and to report physical and sexual violence from this partner



COMMUNITY DISSEMINATION



Results from the Non-Paying Partners pilot study were disseminated to community members, project staff and other stakeholders in Bagalkot, India in November 2011. An extensive discussion ensued after results were presented. Attendees at the dissemination felt results were both interesting and informative, and that results were relevant for programming. The feedback obtained from community members, especially surrounding the validity of the pilot study results served to validate the major findings of the study.

Two major themes emerged from the dissemination. First, although attendees felt results accurately reflected the lived experience of FSW/NPP partnerships, they felt there could have been an under and over-reporting of some of the questions, due to reasons such as social desirability bias. For example, they felt that the reporting of monetary support (under financial support) given by NPPs was likely an over-estimation by study participants. Community members stated that it was relatively rare that FSWs received money per se from their NPPs, and that financial support from NPPs were more likely to be in the form of gifts or food. Conversely, community members felt the extent to which FSWs reported financially supporting their NPPs was vastly underreported, with community members reporting that a large majority of FSWs supported their NPPs with money.

In these discussions, community members voiced that social desirability bias could have influenced the responses of both the NPPs and the FSWs. Community members felt that women were underreporting their financial contribution towards their NPPs in order to shed a more positive light on relationships with their NPPs. Similarly, FSWs could be over-reporting the extent to which they were being supported by their main NPPs, in order to justify the existence of the relationship.

In addition to this bias, it was suggested that the wording of questions pertaining to support could be refined. The survey did not delineate between 'ever' supported and 'present' support. This was felt to be an important distinction, as according to community members, any monetary support given to FSWs by NPPs was more likely to occur at the beginning of the partnership. It was suggested that frequency of type of support would more accurately capture the nature of support given to FSWs.

The second theme that emerged from the dissemination session was the importance of perceived emotional support given to FSWs by their NPPs. As reflected by the results of this study, 91 percent of FSWs reported they received emotional support from their NPPs. The emotional support offered by NPPs in the daily lives of FSWs was felt to be one of the most important reasons behind the existence of non-paying relationships. Being highly stigmatised (and thus less likely to have 'normal' committed relationships, according to community members), FSWs



felt NPPs fulfilled some of the important roles men might play in Indian society. These included listening, offering support through sickness or with domestic issues, and accompaniment to festivals and other outings.

However, community members suggested that for the same reasons discussed above, emotional support could be used by NPPs to emotionally blackmail the sex workers. Examples were given of instances where NPPs leveraged emotional support to both maintain relationships, and obtain money from FSWs. A more in-depth analysis of the role emotional blackmail plays in non-commercial partnerships was beyond the scope of this pilot study.

With respect to the results from the Partners' survey, attendees felt that there was underreporting by men of the presence of other non-commercial FSW partners and paying for sex from other FSWs. The attendees felt that almost all men were likely to have another FSW partner. Although several variables (such as duration of partnership, condom use and last sexual activity) matched those reported by FSWs, there are still some clear issues surrounding reporting biases on other variables. Further work in examining the extent of these biases, informed by further community consultation will help in the development of more reliable measures.



CONCLUSIONS



The results from analyses of the Non-Paying Partners pilot study affirm that relationships between FSWs and their main NPPs are extremely complex. Data suggest that FSW-NPP relationships endure, and evolve over time, with the majority of main NPPs starting off as sex work clients and over half of all partnerships existing for over five years. Relationships start off as commercial sex work partnerships and evolve to the point where physical, emotional and protective roles are played by main NPPs.

Analyses of support given by the main NPPs, as reported by FSW participants, demonstrate that the majority of FSWs are both financially and emotionally supported by their main NPPs. Moreover, condom use is lowest with main NPPs, and physical and sexual violence in these relationships is commonplace. However, further research is needed to determine whether rates of sexual and physical violence reported are lower or higher, when compared against rates in the general population. The main NPP sample was a sub-sample of the total potential sample of main NPPs and could help explain some of the discrepancy in the results between the main NPP and the FSW responses.

Questions such as duration of relationship, condom use and time since last sex were answered quite similarly by males and FSWs, suggesting that these questions evoked valid and reliable responses between both sides of the partnership. However, questions regarding the types of economic support provided by males (as reported by FSW), and whether males had other sex partners, seemed to suffer from self-reporting biases. It is imperative that future studies address self-report biases, and seek to either refine these questions further, or find means to triangulate different sources of data. Regardless, the community dissemination process was invaluable for the purposes of validating and explaining findings, as well as to ensure that findings reflect the reality of lived experiences.

Recent research has illustrated the importance of sustained, regular relationships between FSWs and their intimate partners (including non-commercial partnerships) in understanding the heterogeneity in HIV epidemics across India [29]. Our results highlight the risk for HIV acquisition and transmission to FSWs from their NPPs, and to NPPs' wives. While it has been fairly well established that risk behaviours are difficult to modify within the context of intimate and non-paying partnerships [12-19], the results of this pilot study serve to illustrate just how difficult the challenge may be. Challenges exist to addressing low condom use within non-commercial partnerships in the context of fertility desires. A reproductive health focus should be included in couples and male-oriented HIV prevention programs.

Although likely underreported, violence by NPPs remains high. Dependence on male partners for social acceptance and economic security continue to act as barriers to addressing violence and HIV prevention. De-stigmatizing structural and community-led responses that focus on increasing empowerment and education of FSWs and reducing economic and social vulnerability should be implemented, monitored and evaluated.





APPENDIXES - TABLES

Table 1: Characteristics of Female Sex Workers, Non-Paying Partners Study: Sex Worker Survey (Bagalkot)

	No.	%
Age (N=257)		
18-24	101	39.3%
25-29	74	28.8%
30-39	68	26.5%
40+	14	05.5%
Mean (SD)	27 .0 (6.3)	Range:18-50
Can read and write (N=257)	75	29.2
Lived current location since birth (N=257)	191	74.3%
Did sex work location outside residence (Last 1 yr, =253)	207	81.8%
No other income outside sex work	129	50.2%
Current marital status (N=256)		
Married	9	3.5%
Separated	19	7.4%
Divorced	48	18.8%
Widowed	19	7.4%
<i>Devadasi</i>	151	56.0%
Never Married	10	3.9%
First sex partner (N=256)		
Husband	80	31.3%
Lover/boyfriend	40	15.6%
First night ceremony partner	123	48.1%
Neighbour	9	3.5%
Client	4	1. 6%



Table 2: Characteristics of Main Non-Paying Partner (NPP) of Female Sex Workers (FSW), Non-Paying Partners Study: Sex Worker Survey (Bagalkot)

	No.	%
Main NPP would be interested in participating (N=256)		
Yes	128	50.0%
Describe your main NPP (N=250)		
Husband	52	21.0%
Lover	124	50.0%
<i>Hiriya</i>	27	10.8%
<i>Malak</i>	46	18.4%
How long have you known your main NPP?		
< 1 year	10	3.9%
1-4 years	92	36.1%
5-9 years	88	34.5%
10+ years	65	25.5%
Last time had sex with main NPP ? (N=250)		
Last 7 days	125	50.0%
1 week ago, less than a month	80	31.9%
More than 1 month, less than 1 year	45	17.9%
More than a year	1	0.4%
Average sex acts in last month with NPP*	9.6	
Condom used at last sex with main NPP (N=255)		
Yes	96	37.7%
Main NPP ever paid you for sex? (N=248)		
Yes	208	83.9%
Have another NPP? (N=254)		
Yes	56	22.1%



Table 3: Main Non-Paying Partner (NPP) helps Manage Sex Work*

	No		Yes		Total		p
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Age, categorical							0.623
18-24	87	38.7%	14	43.8%	101	39.3%	
25-29	63	28.0%	11	34.4%	74	28.8%	
30-39	62	27.6%	6	18.8%	68	26.5%	
40+	13	5.8%	1	3.1%	14	5.4%	
Total	225	100.0%	32	100.0%	257	100.0%	
Marital Status							0.365
<i>Devadasi</i>	128	57.1%	23	71.9%	151	59.0%	
Currently Married	9	4.0%	0	0.0%	9	3.5%	
Never Married	9	4.0%	1	3.1%	10	3.9%	
Separated Divorced/Widowed	78	34.8%	8	25.0%	86	33.6%	
Total	224	100.0%	32	100.0%	256	100.0%	
Describe main NPP							0.561
Husband	44	20.2%	8	25.8%	52	20.9%	
Lover	108	49.5%	16	51.6%	124	49.8%	
<i>Hiriya</i>	23	10.6%	4	12.9%	27	10.8%	
<i>Malak</i>	43	19.7%	3	9.7%	46	18.5%	
Total	218	100.0%	31	100.0%	249	100.0%	
No other income							0.009
No	119	52.9%	9	28.1%	128	49.8%	
Yes	106	47.1%	23	71.9%	129	50.2%	
Total	225	100.0%	32	100.0%	257	100.0%	
Has child with main NPP							0.944
No	111	49.3%	16	50.0%	127	49.4%	
Yes	114	50.7%	16	50.0%	130	50.6%	
Total	225	100.0%	32	100.0%	257	100.0%	
Do you plan to have children with your main NPP in the next year							0.016
No	177	78.7%	19	59.4%	196	76.3%	
Yes	48	21.3%	13	40.6%	61	23.7%	
Total	225	100.0%	32	100.0%	257	100.0%	



	No		Yes		Total		p
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Do you have children, not with your main NPP?							0.678
No	149	66.2%	20	62.5%	169	65.8%	
Yes	76	33.8%	12	37.5%	88	34.2%	
Total	225	100.0%	32	100.0%	257	100.0%	
How long known NPP							0.994
<1 year	9	4.0%	1	3.1%	10	3.9%	
1-4 years	80	35.9%	12	37.5%	92	36.1%	
5-9 years	77	34.5%	11	34.4%	88	34.5%	
10+ years	57	25.6%	8	25.0%	65	25.5%	
Total	223	100.0%	32	100.0%	255	100.0%	
How long ago, first sex with NPP							0.940
<1 year	10	4.5%	1	3.1%	11	4.4%	
1-4 years	80	36.4%	11	34.4%	91	36.1%	
5-9 years	78	35.5%	13	40.6%	91	36.1%	
10+ years	52	23.6%	7	21.9%	59	23.4%	
Total	220	100.0%	32	100.0%	252	100.0%	
How long ago, last sex with NPP							0.952
Within last 7 days	108	49.3%	17	53.1%	125	49.8%	
1 week ago - less than a month	70	32.0%	10	31.3%	80	31.9%	
More than 1 month, less than a year	40	18.3%	5	15.6%	45	17.9%	
More than a year	1	0.5%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%	
Total	219	100.0%	32	100.0%	251	100.0%	
Physical violence by main NPP							<0.0001
No	175	80.3%	14	45.2%	189	75.9%	
Yes	43	19.7%	17	54.8%	60	24.1%	
Total	218	100.0%	31	100.0%	249	100.0%	
Sexual violence by main NPP							0.001
No	208	93.3%	24	75.0%	232	91.0%	
Yes	15	6.7%	8	25.0%	23	9.0%	
Total	223	100.0%	32	100.0%	255	100.0%	

* Bold indicates statistical significance at p<.05



Table 4: Main Non-Paying Partner (NPP) Provides Support for Sex Work*							
	No		Yes		Total		p
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Age, categorical							0.338
18-24	89	40.6%	12	31.6%	101	39.3%	
25-29	61	27.9%	13	34.2%	74	28.8%	
30-39	59	26.9%	9	23.7%	68	26.5%	
40+	10	4.6%	4	10.5%	14	5.4%	
Total	219	100.0%	38	100.0%	257	100.0%	
Marital Status							0.313
<i>Devadasi</i>	124	56.9%	27	71.1%	151	59.0%	
Currently Married	9	4.1%	0	0.0%	9	3.5%	
Never Married	9	4.1%	1	2.6%	10	3.9%	
Separated/Divorced/ Widowed	76	34.9%	10	26.3%	86	33.6%	
Total	218	100.0%	38	100.0%	256	100.0%	
Describe main NPP							0.361
Husband	41	19.4%	11	28.9%	52	20.9%	
Lover	106	50.2%	18	47.4%	124	49.8%	
<i>Hiriya</i>	22	10.4%	5	13.2%	27	10.8%	
<i>Malak</i>	42	19.9%	4	10.5%	46	18.5%	
Total	211	100.0%	38	100.0%	249	100.0%	
No other income							0.037
No	115	52.5%	13	34.2%	128	49.8%	
Yes	104	47.5%	25	65.8%	129	50.2%	
Total	219	100.0%	38	100.0%	257	100.0%	
Has child with main NPP							0.257
No	105	47.9%	22	57.9%	127	49.4%	
Yes	114	52.1%	16	42.1%	130	50.6%	
Total	219	100.0%	38	100.0%	257	100.0%	
Do you plan to have children with your main NPP in the next year							0.413
No	169	77.2%	27	71.1%	196	76.3%	
Yes	50	22.8%	11	28.9%	61	23.7%	
Total	219	100.0%	38	100.0%	257	100.0%	



	No		Yes		Total		p
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Do you have children, not with your main NPP?							0.065
No	149	68.0%	20	52.6%	169	65.8%	
Yes	70	32.0%	18	47.4%	88	34.2%	
Total	219	100.0%	38	100.0%	257	100.0%	
How long known NPP							0.435
<1 year	9	4.1%	1	2.7%	10	3.9%	
1-4 years	82	37.6%	10	27.0%	92	36.1%	
5-9 years	75	34.4%	13	35.1%	88	34.5%	
10+ years	52	23.9%	13	35.1%	65	25.5%	
Total	218	100.0%	37	100.0%	255	100.0%	
How long ago, first sex with NPP							0.673
<1 year	10	4.7%	1	2.7%	11	4.4%	
1-4 years	80	37.2%	11	29.7%	91	36.1%	
5-9 years	77	35.8%	14	37.8%	91	36.1%	
10+ years	48	22.3%	11	29.7%	59	23.4%	
Total	215	100.0%	37	100.0%	252	100.0%	
How long ago, last sex with NPP							0.778
Within last 7 days	106	49.8%	19	50.0%	125	49.8%	
1 week ago - less than a month	66	31.0%	14	36.8%	80	31.9%	
More than 1 month, less than a year	40	18.8%	5	13.2%	45	17.9%	
More than a year	1	0.5%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%	
Total	213	100.0%	38	100.0%	251	100.0%	
Physical violence by main NPP							<.0001
No	172	81.1%	17	45.9%	189	75.9%	
Yes	40	18.9%	20	54.1%	60	24.1%	
Total	212	100.0%	37	100.0%	249	100.0%	
Sexual violence by main NPP							0.005
No	202	93.1%	30	78.9%	232	91.0%	
Yes	15	6.9%	8	21.1%	23	9.0%	
Total	217	100.0%	38	100.0%	255	100.0%	

* Bold indicates statistical significance at p<.05



Table 5: Main Non-Paying Partner (NPP) Provides Economic Support*							
	No		Yes		Total		p
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Age, categorical							0.901
18-24	2	40.0%	99	39.3%	101	39.3%	
25-29	2	40.0%	72	28.6%	74	28.8%	
30-39	1	20.0%	67	26.6%	68	26.5%	
40+	0	0.0%	14	5.6%	14	5.4%	
Total	5	100.0%	252	100.0%	257	100.0%	
Marital Status							0.279
<i>Devadasi</i>	3	60.0%	148	59.0%	151	59.0%	
Currently Married	0	0.0%	9	3.6%	9	3.5%	
Never Married	1	20.0%	9	3.6%	10	3.9%	
Separated/Divorced/ Widowed	1	20.0%	85	33.9%	86	33.6%	
Total	5	100.0%	251	100.0%	256	100.0%	
Describe main NPP							0.476
Husband	2	40.0%	50	20.5%	52	20.9%	
Lover	3	60.0%	121	49.6%	124	49.8%	
<i>Hiriya</i>	0	0.0%	27	11.1%	27	10.8%	
<i>Malak</i>	0	0.0%	46	18.9%	46	18.5%	
Total	5	100.0%	244	100.0%	249	100.0%	
No other income							0.178
No	1	20.0%	127	50.4%	128	49.8%	
Yes	4	80.0%	125	49.6%	129	50.2%	
Total	5	100.0%	252	100.0%	257	100.0%	
Has child with main NPP							0.022
No	5	100.0%	122	48.4%	127	49.4%	
Yes	0	0.0%	130	51.6%	130	50.6%	
Total	5	100.0%	252	100.0%	257	100.0%	
Do you plan to have children with your main NPP in the next year							0.843
No	4	80.0%	192	76.2%	196	76.3%	
Yes	1	20.0%	60	23.8%	61	23.7%	
Total	5	100.0%	252	100.0%	257	100.0%	

	No		Yes		Total		p
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Do you have children, not with your main NPP?							0.220
No	2	40.0%	167	66.3%	169	65.8%	
Yes	3	60.0%	85	33.7%	88	34.2%	
Total	5	100.0%	252	100.0%	257	100.0%	
How long known NPP							0.029
<1 year	0	0.0%	10	4.0%	10	3.9%	
1-4 years	5	100.0%	87	34.8%	92	36.1%	
5-9 years	0	0.0%	88	35.2%	88	34.5%	
10+ years	0	0.0%	65	26.0%	65	25.5%	
Total	5	100.0%	250	100.0%	255	100.0%	
How long ago, first sex with NPP							0.029
<1 year	0	0.0%	11	4.5%	11	4.4%	
1-4 years	5	100.0%	86	34.8%	91	36.1%	
5-9 years	0	0.0%	91	36.8%	91	36.1%	
10+ years	0	0.0%	59	23.9%	59	23.4%	
Total	5	100.0%	247	100.0%	252	100.0%	
How long ago, last sex with NPP							0.947
Within last 7 days	3	60.0%	122	49.6%	125	49.8%	
1 week ago - less than a month	1	20.0%	79	32.1%	80	31.9%	
More than 1 month, less than a year	1	20.0%	44	17.9%	45	17.9%	
More than a year	0	0.0%	1	0.4%	1	0.4%	
Total	5	100.0%	246	100.0%	251	100.0%	
Physical violence by main NPP							0.203
No	5	100.0%	184	75.4%	189	75.9%	
Yes	0	0.0%	60	24.6%	60	24.1%	
Total	5	100.0%	244	100.0%	249	100.0%	
Sexual violence by main NPP							0.477
No	5	100.0%	227	90.8%	232	91.0%	
Yes	0	0.0%	23	9.2%	23	9.0%	
Total	5	100.0%	250	100.0%	255	100.0%	

* Bold indicates statistical significance at p<.05



Table 6: Provides Economic Support to Main Non-Paying Partner (NPP)*							
	No		Yes		Total		p
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Age, categorical							0.245
18-24	97	40.2%	4	25.0%	101	39.3%	
25-29	67	27.8%	7	43.8%	74	28.8%	
30-39	65	27.0%	3	18.8%	68	26.5%	
40+	12	5.0%	2	12.5%	14	5.4%	
Total	241	100.0%	16	100.0%	257	100.0%	
Marital Status							0.063
<i>Devadasi</i>	145	60.4%	6	37.5%	151	59.0%	
Currently Married	7	2.9%	2	12.5%	9	3.5%	
Never Married	10	4.2%	0	0.0%	10	3.9%	
Separated/Divorced/ Widowed	78	32.5%	8	50.0%	86	33.6%	
Total	240	100.0%	16	100.0%	256	100.0%	
Describe main NPP							0.244
Husband	46	19.7%	6	37.5%	52	20.9%	
Lover	119	51.1%	5	31.3%	124	49.8%	
<i>Hiriya</i>	26	11.2%	1	6.3%	27	10.8%	
<i>Malak</i>	42	18.0%	4	25.0%	46	18.5%	
Total	233	100.0%	16	100.0%	249	100.0%	
No other income							0.294
No	118	49.0%	10	62.5%	128	49.8%	
Yes	123	51.0%	6	37.5%	129	50.2%	
Total	241	100.0%	16	100.0%	257	100.0%	
Has child with main NPP							0.640
No	120	49.8%	7	43.8%	127	49.4%	
Yes	121	50.2%	9	56.3%	130	50.6%	
Total	241	100.0%	16	100.0%	257	100.0%	
Do you plan to have children with your main NPP in the next year							0.275
No	182	75.5%	14	87.5%	196	76.3%	
Yes	59	24.5%	2	12.5%	61	23.7%	
Total	241	100.0%	16	100.0%	257	100.0%	



	No		Yes		Total		p
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Do you have children, not with your main NPP?							0.055
No	162	67.2%	7	43.8%	169	65.8%	
Yes	79	32.8%	9	56.3%	88	34.2%	
Total	241	100.0%	16	100.0%	257	100.0%	
How long known NPP							0.520
<1 year	10	4.2%	0	0.0%	10	3.9%	
1-4 years	88	36.8%	4	25.0%	92	36.1%	
5-9 years	82	34.3%	6	37.5%	88	34.5%	
10+ years	59	24.7%	6	37.5%	65	25.5%	
Total	239	100.0%	16	100.0%	255	100.0%	
How long ago, first sex with NPP							0.561
<1 year	11	4.7%	0	0.0%	11	4.4%	
1-4 years	87	36.9%	4	25.0%	91	36.1%	
5-9 years	84	35.6%	7	43.8%	91	36.1%	
10+ years	54	22.9%	5	31.3%	59	23.4%	
Total	236	100.0%	16	100.0%	252	100.0%	
How long ago, last sex with NPP							0.864
Within last 7 days	119	50.4%	6	40.0%	125	49.8%	
1 week ago - less than a month	74	31.4%	6	40.0%	80	31.9%	
More than 1 month, less than a year	42	17.8%	3	20.0%	45	17.9%	
More than a year	1	0.4%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%	
Total	236	100.0%	15	100.0%	251	100.0%	
Physical violence by main NPP							0.137
No	180	76.9%	9	60.0%	189	75.9%	
Yes	54	23.1%	6	40.0%	60	24.1%	
Total	234	100.0%	15	100.0%	249	100.0%	

* Bold indicates statistical significance at $p < .05$



Table 7: Correlates of Condom Use at Last Sex with Main Non-Paying Partner (NPP)*

	No		Yes		Total		p
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Age, categorical							0.164
18-24	70	44.3%	30	31.3%	100	39.4%	
25-29	44	27.8%	30	31.3%	74	29.1%	
30-39	38	24.1%	29	30.2%	67	26.4%	
40+	6	3.8%	7	7.3%	13	5.1%	
Total	158	100.0%	96	100.0%	254	100.0%	
Marital Status							<.0001
<i>Devadasi</i>	107	68.2%	42	43.8%	149	58.9%	
Currently Married	3	1.9%	6	6.3%	9	3.6%	
Never Married	8	5.1%	2	2.1%	10	4.0%	
Separated/Divorced/ Widowed	39	24.8%	46	47.9%	85	33.6%	
Total	157	100.0%	96	100.0%	253	100.0%	
Describe main NPP							0.007
Husband	35	22.7%	17	18.5%	52	21.1%	
Lover	65	42.2%	58	63.0%	123	50.0%	
<i>Hiriya</i>	22	14.3%	4	4.3%	26	10.6%	
<i>Malak</i>	32	20.8%	13	14.1%	45	18.3%	
Total	154	100.0%	92	100.0%	246	100.0%	
No other income							0.845
No	77	48.7%	48	50.0%	125	49.2%	
Yes	81	51.3%	48	50.0%	129	50.8%	
Total	158	100.0%	96	100.0%	254	100.0%	
Has child with main NPP							0.038
No	71	44.9%	56	58.3%	127	50.0%	
Yes	87	55.1%	40	41.7%	127	50.0%	
Total	158	100.0%	96	100.0%	254	100.0%	
Do you plan to have children with your main NPP in the next year?							<.0001
No	107	67.7%	86	89.6%	193	76.0%	
Yes	51	32.3%	10	10.4%	61	24.0%	
Total	158	100.0%	96	100.0%	254	100.0%	

	No		Yes		Total		p
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Do you have children, not with your main NPP?							0.017
No	112	70.9%	54	56.3%	166	65.4%	
Yes	46	29.1%	42	43.8%	88	34.6%	
Total	158	100.0%	96	100.0%	254	100.0%	
How long known NPP							0.698
<1 year	8	5.1%	2	2.1%	10	4.0%	
1-4 years	57	36.1%	34	36.2%	91	36.1%	
5-9 years	55	34.8%	33	35.1%	88	34.9%	
10+ years	38	24.1%	25	26.6%	63	25.0%	
Total	158	100.0%	94	100.0%	252	100.0%	
How long ago, first sex with NPP							0.678
<1 year	8	5.2%	3	3.2%	11	4.4%	
1-4 years	59	38.1%	31	33.0%	90	36.1%	
5-9 years	55	35.5%	36	38.3%	91	36.5%	
10+ years	33	21.3%	24	25.5%	57	22.9%	
Total	155	100.0%	94	100.0%	249	100.0%	
How long ago, last sex with NPP							0.051
Within last 7 days	87	56.5%	37	39.4%	124	50.0%	
1 week ago - less than a month	42	27.3%	36	38.3%	78	31.5%	
More than 1 month, less than a year	24	15.6%	21	22.3%	45	18.1%	
More than a year	1	0.6%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%	
Total	154	100.0%	94	100.0%	248	100.0%	
Physical violence by main NPP							0.382
No	115	74.2%	72	79.1%	187	76.0%	
Yes	40	25.8%	19	20.9%	59	24.0%	
Total	155	100.0%	91	100.0%	246	100.0%	
Sexual violence by main NPP							0.120
No	139	89.1%	91	94.8%	230	91.3%	
Yes	17	10.9%	5	5.2%	22	8.7%	
Total	156	100.0%	96	100.0%	252	100.0%	

* Bold indicates statistical significance at p<.05



Table 8: Correlates of Physical Violence Perpetrated by Main Non-Paying Partner (NPP)*

	No		Yes		Total		p
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Age, categorical							0.494
18-24	78	41.3%	19	31.7%	97	39.0%	
25-29	50	26.5%	21	35.0%	71	28.5%	
30-39	51	27.0%	16	26.7%	67	26.9%	
40+	10	5.3%	4	6.7%	14	5.6%	
Total	189	100.0%	60	100.0%	249	100.0%	
Marital Status							0.579
<i>Devadasi</i>	108	57.4%	38	63.3%	146	58.9%	
Currently Married	7	3.7%	1	1.7%	8	3.2%	
Never Married	9	4.8%	1	1.7%	10	4.0%	
Separated/Divorced/ Widowed	64	34.0%	20	33.3%	84	33.9%	
Total	188	100.0%	60	100.0%	248	100.0%	
Describe main NPP							0.008
Husband	31	17.1%	20	33.3%	51	21.2%	
Lover	91	50.3%	26	43.3%	117	48.5%	
Hiriya	18	9.9%	9	15.0%	27	11.2%	
Malak	41	22.7%	5	8.3%	46	19.1%	
Total	181	100.0%	60	100.0%	241	100.0%	
No other income							0.002
No	103	54.5%	19	31.7%	122	49.0%	
Yes	86	45.5%	41	68.3%	127	51.0%	
Total	189	100.0%	60	100.0%	249	100.0%	
Has child with main NPP							0.687
No	97	51.3%	29	48.3%	126	50.6%	
Yes	92	48.7%	31	51.7%	123	49.4%	
Total	189	100.0%	60	100.0%	249	100.0%	
Do you plan to have children with your main NPP in the next year							0.231
No	140	74.1%	49	81.7%	189	75.9%	
Yes	49	25.9%	11	18.3%	60	24.1%	
Total	189	100.0%	60	100.0%	249	100.0%	

	No		Yes		Total		p
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Do you have children, not with your main NPP?							0.013
No	131	69.3%	31	51.7%	162	65.1%	
Yes	58	30.7%	29	48.3%	87	34.9%	
Total	189	100.0%	60	100.0%	249	100.0%	
How long known NPP							0.299
<1 year	10	5.3%	0	0.0%	10	4.0%	
1-4 years	70	37.2%	22	37.3%	92	37.2%	
5-9 years	64	34.0%	20	33.9%	84	34.0%	
10+ years	44	23.4%	17	28.8%	61	24.7%	
Total	188	100.0%	59	100.0%	247	100.0%	
How long ago, first sex with NPP							0.219
<1 year	11	5.9%	0	0.0%	11	4.5%	
1-4 years	70	37.8%	21	35.0%	91	37.1%	
5-9 years	63	34.1%	25	41.7%	88	35.9%	
10+ years	41	22.2%	14	23.3%	55	22.4%	
Total	185	100.0%	60	100.0%	245	100.0%	
How long ago, last sex with NPP							0.379
Within last 7 days	91	49.5%	29	48.3%	120	49.2%	
1 week ago - less than a month	59	32.1%	19	31.7%	78	32.0%	
More than 1 month, less than a year	34	18.5%	11	18.3%	45	18.4%	
More than a year	0	0.0%	1	1.7%	1	0.4%	
Total	184	100.0%	60	100.0%	244	100.0%	

* Bold indicates statistical significance at p<.05



Table 9: Correlates of Sexual Violence Perpetrated by Main Non-Paying Partner (NPP)*

	No		Yes		Total		p
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Age, categorical							0.810
18-24	93	40.1%	8	34.8%	101	39.6%	
25-29	67	28.9%	6	26.1%	73	28.6%	
30-39	59	25.4%	8	34.8%	67	26.3%	
40+	13	5.6%	1	4.3%	14	5.5%	
Total	232	100.0%	23	100.0%	255	100.0%	
Marital Status							0.588
<i>Devadasi</i>	134	58.0%	16	69.6%	150	59.1%	
Currently Married	8	3.5%	1	4.3%	9	3.5%	
Never Married	10	4.3%	0	0.0%	10	3.9%	
Separated/Divorced/ Widowed	79	34.2%	6	26.1%	85	33.5%	
Total	231	100.0%	23	100.0%	254	100.0%	
Describe main NPP							0.281
Husband	43	19.2%	8	34.8%	51	20.6%	
Lover	116	51.8%	8	34.8%	124	50.2%	
<i>Hiriya</i>	23	10.3%	3	13.0%	26	10.5%	
<i>Malak</i>	42	18.8%	4	17.4%	46	18.6%	
Total	224	100.0%	23	100.0%	247	100.0%	
No other income							0.047
No	121	52.2%	7	30.4%	128	50.2%	
Yes	111	47.8%	16	69.6%	127	49.8%	
Total	232	100.0%	23	100.0%	255	100.0%	
Has child with main NPP							0.141
No	118	50.9%	8	34.8%	126	49.4%	
Yes	114	49.1%	15	65.2%	129	50.6%	
Total	232	100.0%	23	100.0%	255	100.0%	
Do you plan to have children with your main NPP in the next year							0.797
No	176	75.9%	18	78.3%	194	76.1%	
Yes	56	24.1%	5	21.7%	61	23.9%	
Total	232	100.0%	23	100.0%	255	100.0%	



	No		Yes		Total		p
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Do you have children, not with your main NPP?							0.321
No	155	66.8%	13	56.5%	168	65.9%	
Yes	77	33.2%	10	43.5%	87	34.1%	
Total	232	100.0%	23	100.0%	255	100.0%	
How long known NPP							0.549
<1 year	10	4.3%	0	0.0%	10	4.0%	
1-4 years	84	36.5%	7	30.4%	91	36.0%	
5-9 years	80	34.8%	8	34.8%	88	34.8%	
10+ years	56	24.3%	8	34.8%	64	25.3%	
Total	230	100.0%	23	100.0%	253	100.0%	
How long ago, first sex with NPP							0.686
<1 year	11	4.8%	0	0.0%	11	4.4%	
1-4 years	83	36.4%	7	31.8%	90	36.0%	
5-9 years	82	36.0%	9	40.9%	91	36.4%	
10+ years	52	22.8%	6	27.3%	58	23.2%	
Total	228	100.0%	22	100.0%	250	100.0%	
How long ago, last sex with NPP							0.625
Within last 7 days	115	50.9%	9	39.1%	124	49.8%	
1 week ago - less than a month	72	31.9%	8	34.8%	80	32.1%	
More than 1 month, less than a year	38	16.8%	6	26.1%	44	17.7%	
More than a year	1	0.4%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%	
Total	226	100.0%	23	100.0%	249	100.0%	

* Bold indicates statistical significance at p<.05



Table 10: Characteristics of Main Non-Paying Partner, Non-Paying Partners Study: Partners Survey (Bagalkot)

	N	%
Age (N=76)		
<25	17	22.4%
25-29	21	27.6%
30-34	15	19.7%
35-39	10	13.2%
40+	13	17.1%
Mean (SD)	30.8 (6.9)	Range:20-50
Can read and write (N=76)	47	61.8%
Lived current location since birth (N=76)	64	84.2%
Paid for sex work outside residence (Last 1 yr, =76)	12	15.8%
Current marital status (N=75)		
Married	57	76.0%
Separated	1	1.3%
Never married	17	22.7%



Table 11: Characteristics of Main Female Sex Worker Partnerships of Male Non-Paying Partners: Partners Survey (Bagalkot)

	N	%
How long have you known your main FSW partner? (N=75)		
< 5 years	27	36.0%
5-9 years	25	33.3%
10+ years	23	30.7%
Last time had sex with main FSW partner (N=76)		
Within the last 7 days	47	62.7%
1 week ago, less than a month	17	22.7%
More than 1 month ago	12	16.0%
Number of times had sex with main FSW partner, last month (N=76)	9.6	
< 10	39	52.0%
10-19	20	26.7%
20+	17	22.7%
Paid main FSW partner for sex (N=76)		
	41	53.9%
Condom used at last sex with main FSW partner (N=76)		
	30	39.5%
Never use condoms with main FSW partner (N=76)		
	43	56.6%
Have another FSW partner (ever)? (N=76)		
	18	23.7%
Have another FSW partner (last 6 months)? (N=76)		
	8	10.5%
Have another FSW partner (currently)? (N=76)		
	6	7.9%
Provides sex work-related support to FSW partner (N=76)		
	42	55.3%
Provides sex work management-related support to FSW partner (N=76)		
	15	19.7%
Provides economic support to FSW partner (N=76)		
	73	96.1%
Has child with main FSW partner (N=76)		
	30	39.5%
In certain circumstances, okay to hit main FSW partner (N=76)		
	34	44.7%
Paid for sex, last 6 months (N=76)		
	13	17.1%
Total number of different FSWs, last 6 months (mean)	3.5	
Number that were occasional (mean)	1.9	
Number that were regular (mean)	0.8	

Table 12: Correlates of Main Male Non-Paying Partner Reporting Sex-Work Management							
	No		Yes		Total		p
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Age							0.437
<25	12	19.7%	5	33.3%	17	22.4%	
25-34	29	47.5%	7	46.7%	36	47.4%	
35+	20	32.8%	3	20.0%	23	30.3%	
Total	61	100.0%	15	100.0%	76	100.0%	
Current marital status							0.819
Married	46	76.7%	11	73.3%	57	76.0%	
Separated	1	1.7%	0	0.0%	1	1.3%	
Never married	13	21.7%	4	26.7%	17	22.7%	
Total	60	100.0%	15	100.0%	75	100.0%	
Can read and write							0.870
No	23	37.7%	6	40.0%	29	38.2%	
Yes	38	62.3%	9	60.0%	47	61.8%	
Total	61	100.0%	15	100.0%	76	100.0%	
Paid main FSW partner for sex							0.114
No	25	41.0%	9	64.3%	34	45.3%	
Yes	36	59.0%	5	35.7%	41	54.7%	
Total	61	100.0%	14	100.0%	75	100.0%	
How long have you known your main FSW partner?							0.644
2 years or less	11	18.3%	2	13.3%	13	17.3%	
3-6 years	25	41.7%	5	33.3%	30	40.0%	
7+ years	24	40.0%	8	53.3%	32	42.7%	
Total	60	100.0%	15	100.0%	75	100.0%	
Last time had sex with main FSW partner							0.263
Within the last 7 days	36	59.0%	11	73.3%	47	61.8%	
1 week ago, less than a month	16	26.2%	1	6.7%	17	22.4%	
More than 1 month ago	9	14.8%	3	20.0%	12	15.8%	
Total	61	100.0%	15	100.0%	76	100.0%	
Provides sex work-related support to FSW partner							0.001
No	33	54.1%	1	6.7%	34	44.7%	
Yes	28	45.9%	14	93.3%	42	55.3%	
Total	61	100.0%	15	100.0%	76	100.0%	

	No		Yes		Total		p
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Provides economic support to FSW partner							0.546
No	2	3.3%	1	6.7%	3	3.9%	
Yes	59	96.7%	14	93.3%	73	96.1%	
Total	61	100.0%	15	100.0%	76	100.0%	
Provides sex work management-related support to FSW partner							<.0001
No	61	100.0%	0	0.0%	61	80.3%	
Yes	0	0.0%	15	100.0%	15	19.7%	
Total	61	100.0%	15	100.0%	76	100.0%	
Has child with FSW partner							0.525
No	38	62.3%	8	53.3%	46	60.5%	
Yes	23	37.7%	7	46.7%	30	39.5%	
Total	61	100.0%	15	100.0%	76	100.0%	
Have another FSW partner (last 6 months)?							0.693
No	55	90.2%	13	86.7%	68	89.5%	
Yes	6	9.8%	2	13.3%	8	10.5%	
Total	61	100.0%	15	100.0%	76	100.0%	
Condom used at last sex with main FSW partner							0.069
No	40	65.6%	6	40.0%	46	60.5%	
Yes	21	34.4%	9	60.0%	30	39.5%	
Total	61	100.0%	15	100.0%	76	100.0%	
In certain circumstances, okay to hit main FSW partner							0.775
No	32	54.2%	7	50.0%	39	53.4%	
Yes	27	45.8%	7	50.0%	34	46.6%	
Total	59	100.0%	14	100.0%	73	100.0%	



Table 13: Correlates of Main Male Non-Paying Partner Reporting Sex-Work Related Support: Partners Survey (Bagalkot)

	No		Yes		Total		p
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Age							0.391
<25	7	20.6%	10	23.8%	17	22.4%	
25-34	14	41.2%	22	52.4%	36	47.4%	
35+	13	38.2%	10	23.8%	23	30.3%	
Total	34	100.0%	42	100.0%	76	100.0%	
Current marital status							0.395
Married	26	78.8%	31	73.8%	57	76.0%	
Separated	1	3.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.3%	
Never married	6	18.2%	11	26.2%	17	22.7%	
Yes	0	0.0%	42	100.0%	42	55.3%	
Total	34	100.0%	42	100.0%	76	100.0%	
Provides economic support to FSW partner							0.050
No	3	8.8%	0	0.0%	3	3.9%	
Yes	31	91.2%	42	100.0%	73	96.1%	
Total	34	100.0%	42	100.0%	76	100.0%	
Provides sex work management- related support to FSW partner							0.001
No	33	97.1%	28	66.7%	61	80.3%	
Yes	1	2.9%	14	33.3%	15	19.7%	
Total	34	100.0%	42	100.0%	76	100.0%	
Has child with FSW partner							0.253
No	23	67.6%	23	54.8%	46	60.5%	
Yes	11	32.4%	19	45.2%	30	39.5%	
Total	34	100.0%	42	100.0%	76	100.0%	
Have another FSW partner (last 6 months)?							0.235
No	32	94.1%	36	85.7%	68	89.5%	
Yes	2	5.9%	6	14.3%	8	10.5%	
Total	34	100.0%	42	100.0%	76	100.0%	



	No		Yes		Total		p
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Condom used at last sex with main FSW partner							0.456
No	19	55.9%	27	64.3%	46	60.5%	
Yes	15	44.1%	15	35.7%	30	39.5%	
Total	34	100.0%	42	100.0%	76	100.0%	
In certain circumstances, okay to hit main FSW partner							0.938
No	18	52.9%	21	53.8%	39	53.4%	
Yes	16	47.1%	18	46.2%	34	46.6%	
Total	34	100.0%	39	100.0%	73	100.0%	

Table 14: Correlates of Main Male Non-Paying Partner Reporting Economic Support: Partners Survey (Bagalkot)							
	No		Yes		Total		p
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Age							0.507
<25	1	33.3%	16	21.9%	17	22.4%	
25-34	2	66.7%	34	46.6%	36	47.4%	
35+	0	0.0%	23	31.5%	23	30.3%	
Total	3	100.0%	73	100.0%	76	100.0%	
Current marital status							0.889
Married	2	66.7%	55	76.4%	57	76.0%	
Separated	0	0.0%	1	1.4%	1	1.3%	
Never married	1	33.3%	16	22.2%	17	22.7%	
Total	3	100.0%	72	100.0%	75	100.0%	
Can read and write							0.861
No	1	33.3%	28	38.4%	29	38.2%	
Yes	2	66.7%	45	61.6%	47	61.8%	
Total	3	100.0%	73	100.0%	76	100.0%	
Paid main FSW partner for sex							0.893
No	1	50.0%	33	45.2%	34	45.3%	
Yes	1	50.0%	40	54.8%	41	54.7%	
Total	2	100.0%	73	100.0%	75	100.0%	
How long have you known your main SW partner?							0.756
2 years or less	1	33.3%	12	16.7%	13	17.3%	
3-6 years	1	33.3%	29	40.3%	30	40.0%	
7+ years	1	33.3%	31	43.1%	32	42.7%	
Total	3	100.0%	72	100.0%	75	100.0%	
Last time had sex ith main FSW partner							0.517
Within the last 7 days	2	66.7%	45	61.6%	47	61.8%	
1 week ago, less than a month	0	0.0%	17	23.3%	17	22.4%	
More than 1 month ago	1	33.3%	11	15.1%	12	15.8%	
Total	3	100.0%	73	100.0%	76	100.0%	



	No		Yes		Total		p
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Provides sex work- related support to FSW partner							0.050
No	3	100.0%	31	42.5%	34	44.7%	
Yes	0	0.0%	42	57.5%	42	55.3%	
Total	3	100.0%	73	100.0%	76	100.0%	
Provides sex work management-related support to FSW partner							0.546
No	2	66.7%	59	80.8%	61	80.3%	
Yes	1	33.3%	14	19.2%	15	19.7%	
Total	3	100.0%	73	100.0%	76	100.0%	
Has child with FSW partner							0.154
No	3	100.0%	43	58.9%	46	60.5%	
Yes	0	0.0%	30	41.1%	30	39.5%	
Total	3	100.0%	73	100.0%	76	100.0%	
Have another FSW partner (last 6 months)?							0.544
No	3	100.0%	65	89.0%	68	89.5%	
Yes	0	0.0%	8	11.0%	8	10.5%	
Total	3	100.0%	73	100.0%	76	100.0%	
Condom used at last sex with main FSW partner							0.326
No	1	33.3%	45	61.6%	46	60.5%	
Yes	2	66.7%	28	38.4%	30	39.5%	
Total	3	100.0%	73	100.0%	76	100.0%	
In certain circumstances, okay to hit main FSW partner							0.639
No	2	66.7%	37	52.9%	39	53.4%	
Yes	1	33.3%	33	47.1%	34	46.6%	
Total	3	100.0%	70	100.0%	73	100.0%	



Table 15: Correlates of Condom Use at Last Sex with Main Female Sex Worker Partner: Partners Survey (Bagalkot)

	No		Yes		Total		p
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Age							0.748
<25	9	19.6%	8	26.7%	17	22.4%	
25-34	23	50.0%	13	43.3%	36	47.4%	
35+	14	30.4%	9	30.0%	23	30.3%	
Total	46	100.0%	30	100.0%	76	100.0%	
Current marital status							0.352
Married	36	80.0%	21	70.0%	57	76.0%	
Separated	1	2.2%	0	0.0%	1	1.3%	
Never married	8	17.8%	9	30.0%	17	22.7%	
Total	45	100.0%	30	100.0%	75	100.0%	
Can read and write							0.453
No	16	34.8%	13	43.3%	29	38.2%	
Yes	30	65.2%	17	56.7%	47	61.8%	
Total	46	100.0%	30	100.0%	76	100.0%	
Paid main FSW partner for sex							0.377
No	19	41.3%	15	51.7%	34	45.3%	
Yes	27	58.7%	14	48.3%	41	54.7%	
Total	46	100.0%	29	100.0%	75	100.0%	
How long have you known your main FSW partner?							0.622
2 years or less	7	15.6%	6	20.0%	13	17.3%	
3-6 years	20	44.4%	10	33.3%	30	40.0%	
7+ years	18	40.0%	14	46.7%	32	42.7%	
Total	45	100.0%	30	100.0%	75	100.0%	
Last time had sex with main FSW partner							0.965
Within the last 7 days	29	63.0%	18	60.0%	47	61.8%	
1 week ago, less than a month	10	21.7%	7	23.3%	17	22.4%	
More than 1 month ago	7	15.2%	5	16.7%	12	15.8%	
Total	46	100.0%	30	100.0%	76	100.0%	



	No		Yes		Total		p
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Provides sex work-related support to FSW partner							0.456
No	19	41.3%	15	50.0%	34	44.7%	
Yes	27	58.7%	15	50.0%	42	55.3%	
Total	46	100.0%	30	100.0%	76	100.0%	
Provides economic support to FSW partner							0.326
No	1	2.2%	2	6.7%	3	3.9%	
Yes	45	97.8%	28	93.3%	73	96.1%	
Total	46	100.0%	30	100.0%	76	100.0%	
Provides sex work management-related support to FSW partner							0.069
No	40	87.0%	21	70.0%	61	80.3%	
Yes	6	13.0%	9	30.0%	15	19.7%	
Total	46	100.0%	30	100.0%	76	100.0%	
Has child with FSW partner							0.940
No	28	60.9%	18	60.0%	46	60.5%	
Yes	18	39.1%	12	40.0%	30	39.5%	
Total	46	100.0%	30	100.0%	76	100.0%	
Have another FSW partner (last 6 months)?							0.904
No	41	89.1%	27	90.0%	68	89.5%	
Yes	5	10.9%	3	10.0%	8	10.5%	
Total	46	100.0%	30	100.0%	76	100.0%	
In certain circumstances, okay to hit main FFS FSW partner							0.474
No	25	56.8%	14	48.3%	39	53.4%	
Yes	19	43.2%	15	51.7%	34	46.6%	
Total	44	100.0%	29	100.0%	73	100.0%	



REFERENCES

1. Lowndes CM, Alary M, Meda H, Gnintoungbe CAB, Mukenge-Tshibaka L, Adjovi C, Buve A, Morison L, Laourou M, Kanhonou L, Anagonou S. Role of core and bridging groups in the transmission dynamics of HIV and STIs in Cotonou, Benin, West Africa. *Sexually Transmitted Infections* 2002;78:i69-i77.
2. Vickerman P, Foss AM, Pickles M, Deering K, Verma S, Eric Demerse, Lowndes CM, Moses S, Alary M, Boily M-C. To what extent is the HIV epidemic driven by commercial sex? A modelling analysis. *AIDS* 2010; 24:2563-2572.
3. Lowndes CM, Alary M, Belleau M, Bosu WK, Kintin DF, Nnorom JA, Seck K, Victor- Ahuchogu J, Wilson D. West Africa HIV/AIDS Epidemiology and Response Synthesis. Characterisation of the HIV epidemic and response in West Africa: Implications for prevention. Washington, USA: World Bank, 2008.
4. Reza-Paul S, Beattie T, Syed HUR, Venukumar KT, Venugopal MS, Fathima MP, Raghavendra H, Akram P, Manjula R, Lakshmi M, Isac S, Ramesh BM, Washington R, Mahagaonkar SB, Glynn JR, Blanchard JF, Moses S. Declines in risk behaviour and sexually transmitted infection prevalence following a community-led HIV preventive intervention among female sex workers in Mysore, India. *AIDS* 2008;22:S91-S100.
5. Ramesh BM, Beattie TSH, Shajy I, Washington R, Jagannathan L, Reza-Paul S, Blanchard JF, Moses S. Changes in risk behaviours and prevalence of sexually transmitted infections following HIV preventive interventions among female sex workers in five districts in Karnataka state, south India. *Sexually Transmitted Infections* 2010;86:i17-i24.
6. Jana S, Basu I, Rotheram-Borus MJ, Newman PA. The Sonagachi Project: a sustainable community intervention. *AIDS Education and Prevention* 2004;16:405-414.
7. Hanenberg R, Rojanapithayakorn W, Kunasol P, Sokal D. Impact of Thailand's HIV-control programme as indicated by the decline of sexually transmitted diseases. *Lancet* 1994;344:243 - 245.
8. Rojanapithayakorn W. The 100% Condom Use Programme in Asia. *Reproductive Health Matters* 2006;14:41-52.
9. Hogle J, Green EC, Nantulya V, Stoneburner R, Stover J. What happened in Uganda? Declining HIV prevalence, behavior change, and the national response. Washington, DC: USAID, 2002.
10. Blanchard JF, Aral SO. Emergent properties and structural patterns in sexually transmitted infection and HIV research. *Sex Transm Infect* 2010;86 Suppl 3:iii4-9.



11. Blanchard JF, Halli S, Ramesh BM, Bhattacharjee P, Washington RG, O'Neil J, Moses S. Variability in the sexual structure in a rural Indian setting: implications for HIV prevention strategies. *Sexually Transmitted Infections* 2007;83:30-36.
12. Luke N. Exchange and Condom Use in Informal Sexual Relationships in Urban Kenya. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 2006;54:319-348.
13. Gorbach PM, Sopheab H, Chhorvann C, Weiss RE, Vun MC. Changing Behaviors and Patterns Among Cambodian Sex Workers: 1997-2003. *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes* 2006;42: 242-247.
14. Murray L, Moreno L, Rosario S, Ellen J, Sweat M, Kerrigan D. The role of relationship intimacy in consistent condom use among female sex workers and their regular paying partners in the Dominican Republic. *AIDS and Behaviour* 2007;11:463-470.
15. Wang C, Hawes SE, Gaye A, Sow PS, Ndoye I, Manhart LE, Wald A, Critchlow CW, Kiviat NB. HIV prevalence, previous HIV testing and condom use with clients and regular partners among Senegalese commercial sex workers. *Sexually Transmitted Infections* 2007;83:534-540.
16. Chan MKT, Man K. A behavioural surveillance for female sex workers in the Social Hygiene Service in Hong Kong (1999+/-2000). *International Journal of STD & AIDS* 2002;13:815-820.
17. Voeten HACM, Egesah OB, Varkevisser CM, Habberma JDF. Female sex workers and unsafe sex in urban and rural Nyanza, Kenya: regular partners may contribute more to HIV transmission than clients. *Tropical Medicine and International Health* 2007;12:174-182.
18. Figueroa JP, Dolan CB, Dale D, Hileman SB, Weir S. An assessment of sites where person go to meet sexual partners in St. James, Jamaica, using the place method. *Sexually Transmitted Diseases* 2007;34:410-415.
19. Barrientos JE, Bozon M, Ortiz E, Arredondo A. HIV prevalence, AIDS knowledge, and condom use among female sex workers in Santiago, Chile. *Cadernos de Saúde Pública* 2007;23:1777-1784.
20. Wojcicki JM, Malala J. Condom use, power and HIV/AIDS risk: sex-workers bargain for survival in Hillbrow/Joubert Park/Berea, Johannesburg. *Social Science & Medicine* 2001;53:99-121.
21. Varga CA. The Condom Conundrum: Barriers to Condom Use among Commercial Sex Workers in Durban, South Africa. *The African Journal of Public Health* 1997;1:74-88.
22. Panchanadeswaran S, Johnson SC, Sivaram S, Srikrishnan AK, Latkin C, Bentley ME, Solomon S, Go VF, Celentano D. Intimate partner violence is as important as client violence in increasing street-based female sex workers' vulnerability to HIV in India. *Int J Drug Policy* 2008 19:106-112.
23. Blankenship KM, West BS, Kershaw TS, Biradavolu MR. Power, community mobilization, and condom use practices among female sex workers in Andhra Pradesh, India. *AIDS* 2008;22:S109-S116.
24. Shannon K, Kerr T, Allinott S, Chettiar J, Shoveller J, Tyndall MW. Social and structural violence and power relations in mitigating HIV risk of drug-using women in survival sex work. *Social Science and Medicine* 2008;66:911-921.



25. Wang Y, Li B, Song D-M, Ding G-Y, Cathy E. Power relation and condom use in commercial sex behaviour. *Biomedical and Environmental Sciences* 2007;20:302-306.
26. Shannon K, Kerr T, Strathdee SA, Shoveller J, M.W. T. Structural and environmental barriers to condom use negotiation with clients among female sex workers: Implications for HIV prevention strategies and policy. *AJPH* In Press.
27. Luke N. Confronting the 'Sugar Daddy' Stereotype: Age and Economic Asymmetries and Risky Sexual Behavior in Urban Kenya. *International Family Planning Perspectives* 2005;31:6-14.
28. Vickerman P, Foss AM, Pickles M, Deering K, Verma S, Eric D, Lowndes CM, Moses S, Alary M, Boily MC. To what extent is the HIV epidemic in southern India driven by commercial sex? A modelling analysis. *AIDS* 2010;24:2563-72.
29. Watts C, Zimmerman C, Foss AM, Hossain M, Cox A, Vickerman P. Remodelling core group theory: the role of sustaining populations in HIV transmission. *Sex Transm Infect* 2010;86 Suppl 3:iii85-92.



LONDON
SCHOOL of
HYGIENE
& TROPICAL
MEDICINE



Centre for
Global Public Health
University of Manitoba

 **KHPT**
Karnataka Health Promotion Trust

