

**NATIONAL BASELINE HIGH RISK AND BRIDGE  
POPULATION BEHAVIOURAL SURVEILLANCE SURVEY  
(2001)**

**REPORT**

**PART 1  
(FEMALE SEX WORKERS AND THEIR CLIENTS)**

**NATIONAL AIDS CONTROL ORGANISATION  
Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, Government of India,  
Chandralok Building, 36 Janpath, New Delhi - 110001**

## PREFACE

The key objectives of the National AIDS Control Program are the reduction of the spread of HIV infection in the country and strengthening India's response to HIV/AIDS on a long-term basis. To meet these objectives, data on the current situation in the country needs to be collected. Such information provides a backdrop for evidence based planning of strategic interventions for the control of HIV/AIDS. The impact of the interventions also needs to be periodically monitored through continuous surveillance.

Till recently surveillance systems only concentrated on tracking of AIDS cases and the spread of HIV virus. But such surveillance only documents the damage that has already been wrought on the individuals, families, communities and the country. This does not help in identifying factors like current behavior, which fuels the HIV pandemic. Documenting such behavior and documenting behavioral change, which predisposes to the spread of HIV/AIDS is of crucial importance for prevention of HIV/AIDS. Therefore a new framework for HIV surveillance has been developed. The Behavioral Surveillance Surveys, aptly called the Second Generation Surveillance System are based on tracking behavioral changes in the country.

A general population BSS was undertaken earlier and this was followed by BSS among high-risk groups and bridge populations. The present report highlights findings from Female Sex Workers across the country and their clients. The surveys have been contracted to ORG-CSR, so as to facilitate an independent evaluation of the existing situation. I appreciate the efforts of the ORG-CSR team in ensuring a high quality and for completion of the work in time.

I hope NACO and State AIDS Control Societies and all other concerned agencies will use the findings to plan effective interventions and to identify critical 'gray' areas, which need urgent attention. This wave of BSS is intended to furnish base line information and future waves will be undertaken over the next five years to monitor changes in behavioral parameters.

I wish to complement UNAIDS for their signal contribution in terms of financial and technical support to setting up the Baseline Behavioural indicators.

I thank the World Bank, APAC, DFID and FHI for supporting this endeavor. I thank Dr. Laxmi Bai (APAC), Ms. Stella Manoharan (FHI) for coordinating the Training of Trainers Workshop and contributing to standardization of the survey instruments.

I congratulate Dr. P.Salil (Joint Director) and Dr. GVS Murthy (Consultant) for successfully coordinating the survey and for ensuring a speedy compilation of this crucial report.

A survey of this magnitude would not have been possible without the unstinted cooperation and patience of thousands of female sex workers and their clients.

(Mr. J V R Prasada Rao)  
Special Secretary (Health) &  
Project Director, NACO

## CONTENTS

Sl.No.	<i>Particulars</i>	Page No.
	<b>Executive Summary</b>	i-xi
	<b>CHAPTER 1.0 :INTRODUCTION</b>	
1.1	Background	1
1.2	India's Response to the AIDS Challenge	
1.2.1	National AIDS Control Project-I	
1.2.2	National AIDS Control Project-II	
1.3	Monitoring and Evaluation of the NACP-II	
1.4	Why BSS	
1.5	BSS: It's Objectives and Characteristics	
1.6	Objectives of the Present Study	
	<b>CHAPTER 2.0: METHODOLOGY AND SAMPLING DESIGN</b>	
2.1	Consultation Process in Planning the Survey	
2.2	Efforts in Reaching Consensus on the Survey Process	
2.3	Target Respondents	
2.4	Core Indicators	
2.5	Coverage of the Survey	
2.6	Development of Research Instrument	
2.7	Pretesting the Research Instrument	
2.8	Training of Field Team	
2.9	Sample Size Calculation	
2.10	Sampling Procedure	
2.10.1	Brothel Based Female Sex Workers (FSW-bb)	
2.10.2	Non-Brothel Based Female Sex Workers (FSW-nbb)	
2.10.3	Client of Female Sex Workers	
2.10.4	Control Group of Female Sex Workers	
2.10.5	Achieved Sample Size	
2.11	Field Work	
2.12	Data Management and Data Analysis	
2.13	Quality Assurance Mechanism	
	<b>CHAPTER 3.0: FEMALE SEX WORKERS</b>	
3.1	Background	
3.2	Profile of FSW	
3.2.1	Age Distribution	
3.2.2	Educational Profile	
3.2.3	Marital Status of the Respondents	
3.2.4	Residential Status of the Respondents	
3.2.5	Additional Source of Income	
3.2.6	Use of alcohol and drugs	
3.3	Awareness of HIV/AIDS	
3.3.1	Ever Heard of HIV/AIDS	
3.3.2	Awareness of prevention through consistent condom use	
3.3.3	Awareness of prevention through one faithful uninfected sex partner	
3.3.4	Knowing both the methods of prevention	
3.3.5	Correct belief about HIV/AIDS transmission	

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b><i>Particulars</i></b>	<b>Page No.</b>
3.4	Awareness of STD, STD Occurrence and Treatment Seeking Behavior	
3.4.1	Ever heard of STD	
3.4.2	Awareness of STD Symptoms	
3.4.3	STD Prevalence	
3.4.4	STD Treatment Seeking Behavior	
3.5	Sexual Behavior and Condom Usage	
3.5.1	Age at first sex	
3.5.2	Age when first started sex work	
3.5.3	Mean number of paying clients/ non-paying regular partners/ non-paying non-regular partners in past 7 days	
3.5.4	Mean number of paying clients on last working day	
3.5.5	Last time condom use with paying client and non-paying partner	
3.5.6	Consistent condom use with paying clients and non-paying partners	
3.5.7	Person suggested condom use at last sex with paying client and non-paying partner	
3.5.8	Type of condom brands used at last sex with paying client and non-paying partner	
3.5.9	Source of condom used at last sex with paying client and non-paying partner	
3.5.10	Reasons for not using condom at last sex with paying client and non-paying partner	
3.6	Other Salient Observations	
3.6.1	Condom negotiation with paying clients	
3.6.2	Risk perception of getting infected with HIV/AIDS	
3.6.3	Possibility of a confidential HIV testing in the area	
3.6.4	Occurrence of HIV test	
3.6.5	Interpersonal communication on STD/HIV/AIDS	
3.6.6	Attended/ participated in any campaign/ meeting on STD/ HIV/ AIDS	
	<b>CHAPTER 4.0: CLIENT OF FEMALE SEX WORKERS</b>	
4.1	Background	
4.2	Respondents' Profile	
4.2.1	Age of the Respondents	
4.2.2	Educational Level of the Respondents	
4.2.3	Marital Status of the Respondents	
4.2.4	Main Occupation of the Respondents	
4.2.5	Residential Status of the Respondents	
4.2.6	Substance Use (Alcohol/Drug Use/Injecting Drug Use)	
4.3	Awareness of HIV/AIDS	
4.3.1	<b>Ever Heard of HIV/AIDS</b>	
4.3.2	Awareness of Prevention through Consistent Condom Use	
4.3.3	Awareness of prevention through having one faithful uninfected sex partner	
4.3.4	Knowing both the methods of prevention	
4.3.5	Awareness of HIV transmission through needle sharing/ mother to child/ breast feeding	
4.3.6	Rejecting two common myths about HIV transmission and accepting that a healthy person may be suffering from HIV/AIDS	

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b><i>Particulars</i></b>	<b>Page No.</b>
4.4	Awareness of STD, STD Prevalence and Treatment Seeking Behavior	
4.4.1	Ever heard of STD	
4.4.2	Awareness of Other STD Symptoms	
4.4.3	STD Prevalence	
4.4.4	STD Treatment Seeking Behavior	
4.5	Sexual Behavior and Condom Usage	
4.5.1	Age at first sex with any partner	
4.5.2	Age and type of first sex partner	
4.5.3	Sex with any male partner and Condom Usage	
4.5.4	Sex with Commercial/Non-regular/Regular Female Partner	
4.5.5	Median Age at First Sex with any Commercial/Non-regular/Regular Female Partner	
4.5.6	Mean number of Commercial/Non-regular/Regular Female Partner in Last 3 months	
4.5.7	Last Time Condom Use with Commercial/Non-regular/Regular Female Partner	
4.5.8	Consistent Condom Use with All Commercial/Non-regular/Regular Female Partner in Last 3 Months	
4.5.9	Person Suggested Condom Use at Last Sex with Commercial/Non-regular/Regular Female Partner	
4.5.10	Type of Condom Brands Used at Last Sex with Commercial/Non-regular/Regular Female Partner	
4.5.11	Source of Condom Used at Last Sex with Commercial/Non-regular/Regular Female Partner	
4.5.12	Reasons for Not Using Condom at Last Sex with Commercial/Non-regular/Regular Female Partner	
4.6	Other Salient Observations	
4.6.1	Risk Perception of Getting Infected with HIV/AIDS	
4.6.2	Availability of Confidential HIV Testing in the Area	
4.6.3	Exposure to STI/ HIV/AIDS Program Interventions in the Past 1 Year	

**LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1.1	Global Summary of the HIV/AIDS Epidemic, December 2000
Table 2.1	Achieved Sample Sizes
Table 3.1	Age Distribution of the Respondents
Table 3.2	Education Level of the Respondents
Table 3.3	Marital Status and Age at Marriage
Table 3.4	Status of Sexual Partnership of the Respondents
Table 3.5	Main Occupation of the Respondents
Table 3.6	Residential Status of the Respondents
Table 3.7	Alcohol Intake by the Respondents in Past 4 Weeks
Table 3.8	Drug use by Respondents
Table 3.9	Awareness of Methods of Preventing HIV Infection
Table 3.10	Awareness of HIV transmission through needle sharing/ mother to child/ breast feeding
Table 3.11	Correct belief about HIV transmission
Table 3.12	Ever heard of STD and STD symptoms among Men/ Women
Table 3.13	STD Prevalence
Table 3.14	STD Treatment Seeking Behavior
Table 3.15	STD Treatment Seeing Behavior – Time Taken to Visit a Health Practitioner during the last Episode and Type of Taken Medicine at Last Episode
Table 3.16	STD Treatment Source Planned to be Utilized for Future Episodes
Table 3.17	Age at First Sex with any Partner
Table 3.18	Age and Type of First Sex Partner
Table 3.19	Sex with Any Male Partner and Condom Usage
Table 3.20	Sex with Non-regular /Regular Female Partner in Last 3 Months
Table 3.21	Median Age at First Sex with Commercial /Non-regular /Regular Female Partner
Table 3.22	Mean Number of Commercial /Non-regular /Regular Female Partner in the Last Three Months
Table 3.23	Last time Condom use with Commercial /Non-regular /Regular Female Partner
Table 3.24	Consistent Condom Use with All Commercial /Non-regular /Regular Female Partner In the Last 3 Months
Table 3.25	Person Suggested Condom Use at Last Sex with Commercial / Non-regular/ Regular Female Partner

Table 3.26	Type of Condom Brands Used at Last Sex with Commercial / Non-regular/ Regular Female Partner
Table 3.27	Source of Condom Used at Last Sex with Commercial / Non-regular/ Regular Female Partner
Table 3.28	Reasons of Not Using Condom at Last Sex with Commercial / Non-regular / Regular Female Partner
Table 3.29	Perception Regarding Risk of Contracting HIV/AIDS
Table 3.30	HIV Testing
Table 3.31	Exposure to STI/HIV/AIDS Programme Interventions in the Past 1 Year
Table 4.1	Age Distribution of the Respondents
Table 4.2	Education level of the Respondents
Table 4.3	Marital Status and Age at Marriage
Table 4.4	Status of Sexual Partnership of the Respondents
Table 4.5	Residential Status and Mobility Pattern of the Respondents
Table 4.6	Additional Sources of Income of Respondents (For Only Non Brothel Based Sex Workers)
Table 4.7	Alcohol Intake by the Respondents
Table 4.8	Drug Use by Respondents
Table 4.9	Awareness of HIV/AIDS and methods of preventing HIV Infection
Table 4.10	Correct Belief about HIV Transmission
Table 4.11	Awareness of STD and STD symptoms among Women and Men
Table 4.12	STD Prevalence
Table 4.13	STD Treatment Seeking Behavior - No Treatment or went to Informal Health Facility during the Last Episode
Table 4.14	STD Treatment Seeking Behavior - Went to Health Practitioner during the Last Episode
Table 4.15	STD Treatment Seeking Behavior - Time taken to visit a Health Practitioner during the Last Episode and Type of taken Medicine at Last Episode
Table 4.16	Preferred treatment Source for Future Episodes of STDs
Table 4.17	Age at First Sex
Table 4.18	Age when First started sex work
Table 4.19	Mean Number of Paying Clients and Non Paying Partners in the Last 7 days
Table 4.20	Number of Paying Clients on the Last Working day
Table 4.21	Condom Usage with Paying Client and Non Paying Partners

Table 4.22	Person who Suggested Condom Use at Last Sex with Paying Client/Non Paying Partner
Table 4.23	Type of Condom Brands Used at Last Sex with Paying Client/Non Paying Partners
Table 4.24	Source of Condom Used at Last Sex with Paying Client/Non Paying Partners
Table 4.25	Reasons for Not Using Condom at Last Sex with Paying Client/Non Paying Partner
Table 4.26	Condom Negotiation with Paying Clients
Table 4.27	Perception regarding Risk of Contracting HIV/AIDS
Table 4.28	HIV Testing
Table 4.29	Exposure to STI/HIV/AIDS Programme Interventions in the Past 1 year



**LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

AIDS:	Acquired Immuno Deficiency Syndromme
APAC:	AIDS Prevention And Control Project
BB/bb:	Brothel based
BSS:	Behavioural Surveillance Survey
DFID:	Department for International Development
FHI:	Family Health International
FSW:	Female Sex Workers
HIV:	Human Immuno Deficiency Virus
ISSA:	Integrated System for Statistical Analysis
M&E:	Monitoring & Evaluation
NACO:	National AIDS Control Organization
NACP:	National AIDS Control Program
NBB/nbb:	Non Brothel based
NE:	North Eastern
NGO:	Non Governmental Organizations
ORG-CSR:	Operations Research Group – Center for Social Research
SACS:	State AIDS Control Society
SD:	Standard Deviation
SI:	Sampling Interval
SPSS:	Statistical Package for Social Sciences
STD:	Sexually Transmitted Diseases
UNAIDS:	Joint United Nations Program on HIV/AIDS
USAID:	United States Agency for International Development
UT:	Union Territory
WHO:	World Health Organization

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

NACO and ORG-CSR sincerely thank the following NGOs who made it possible to complete this survey in time by extending support and cooperation in the field

<i>State</i>	<b>Name of NGO</b>
<i>Andhra Pradesh</i>	<b>Integrated Rural Development Services</b> Nallakunta, Hyderabad
	<b>Kothapeta Mahila Mandali (KMM)</b> Kotapeta, Guntur
	<b>Priya Darshani Service Organisation</b> Akkayapalem, Vishakapatnam
	<b>Parthasarathi Seva Samiti</b> Tirupati, Chittoor
	<b>ERISE,</b> Rajahmundry, East Godavari
	<b>CHANGES,</b> Kakinada, East Godavari
Assam	<b>AIDS Prevention Society</b> Zoo Narengi Road, Guwahati
	<b>Reiyukai</b> Bandardewa ,District – N. Lakhimpur
Bihar	<b>Helping Hand Foundation</b> Patna
	<b>Adithi</b> Patna
	<b>Janajagaran</b> Bihar Sharif, District Gaya
Delhi	<b>Sharan</b> Safdarjung Development Area, Delhi
	<b>Modi Foundation</b> Daryaganj, Delhi
	<b>Joint Women's Programme</b> Jangpura , Delhi
Goa	<b>Vasco Anti AIDS Association</b> South Goa
	<b>Desterro Eves Mahila Mandal</b> South Goa
	<b>Positive People</b> South Goa
Gujarat	<b>Jyoti Sangh</b> Ahmedabad
	<b>Vikas Jyot</b> Vadodara
	<b>YMCA</b> Gandhi Dham, District – Kutch
	<b>Vardan Trust</b> Govind Nagar, District – Dahod
	<b>Mahila Sangh</b> Vadva Washing Ghat, District - Bhavnagar
Haryana	Voice, Bahadurgarh

<i>State</i>	<b>Name of NGO</b>
Jammu & Kashmir	Society for Promotion of Youth and Masses (SPYM) Narwal, Jammu
Kerala	<b>Saranik</b> , Palarivaltam, Cochin
	<b>Soma</b> Thampanur, District Trivandrum
	Amakhara Vikasana Sangam (AVS) Kumali, District – Iuoukki
	<b>Association for Care and Support</b> Ayanthol, District – Thrissur
	<b>CSRD</b> Calicut
	<b>Jeevana Samskuti</b> Mancha Palam, Chalad, Kannur
	<b>Sarang</b> Cochin, District – Eruakulam
	Maharashtra
<b>Sathi Project of MSACS</b> Thane	
<b>Akhil Budhwar Peth Devdasi Sanstha</b> Pune	
<b>Manavya</b> Pune	
<b>Sangram</b> Sangli	
<b>Indian Red Cross Society</b> Nagpur	
<b>Amrapali Shakti Sangathan</b> Nagpur	
<b>Muslim Prabodhiniva Shikshan Sanstha</b> Kolahapur	
Manipur	The Meetel Leimerol Sinnai Sang (MLSS) Khoyathong, Imphal
	<b>MLSS (Women Health Clinic)</b> Khuyatharg Bazar, Imphal
Madhya Pradesh & Chhattisgarh	Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Social Welfare Education & Research Society MP Nagar Bhopal
	Centre for Labour Education and Social Research , Bilaspur, Chattisgarh
Orissa	<b>Jagrut Shramik Sangathan</b> Khariar, District – Nuapada
	<b>Universal Service Organisation</b> Amalabhata, P.O. – Penta, District – Rayagada
	Association of Rural Upliftment & National Allegiances, Nilachal Nagar, District – Ganjam
	Centre of Integrated Development & Research (CIDR), Sahadevkhunte, District – Balasore
	<b>Orissa Patita Udhar Samiti</b> Bhubaneswar
	<b>RUSH</b> Uppar Nua Sahi, District – Puri

<i>State</i>	<b>Name of NGO</b>
Nagaland	<b>Akimbo Society</b> Duncan Basti, Dimapur
Mizoram	Voluntary Community Mental Health (Volcomh), Sikiulpiwkan, Aizwal
	Community Health Action Network (CHAN), Aizwal
	<b>Shalom</b> Bongkawn, Aizwal
	<b>Grace Society</b> Salem, Lungei
Sikkim	<b>Voluntary Health Association in Sikkim</b> Kothi Area, East Sikkim
	<b>Arigaon Samaj Sudhar Mandali (Pelling)</b> Arigaon, Gayxing,
Tripura	<b>Udiyaman Sangha</b> Near Ramthakur Sangha, West Tripura, Agartala
Rajasthan	<b>Institute of Human Help</b> Bihari Ganj, Shiv Nagar, KK Villa, Ajmer
	<b>Pragati and Prerana Sanstha</b> Dholpur
Tamil Nadu	<b>DESH</b> Nandanam Ext., Chennai
	South India Aids Action Programme (SIAPP), Adayar , Chennai
	<b>Madras Christian Council Society (MCCS)</b> Perambur, Chennai
	Protection of Women & Aids Prevention Centre, West Baidaget, Chennai
Uttar Pradesh	<b>Sarvajan Kalyan Samiti</b> Katghar, Allahabad
	<b>Sukriti Sewa Sanstha</b> Brahmapuri, Meerut
	<b>Global Science Academy</b> Malviya Nagar, Basti
West Bengal	<b>Durbar Mahila Samanaya Committee</b> Kolkata

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **1.0 Introduction**

- The National AIDS Control Program was launched in 1992. The increasing prevalence of HIV/AIDS in the country necessitated the launch of a second phase of the National Program in 1999 (NACP-II). The major objectives of NACP-II are reduction in spread of HIV infection in the country and strengthening the country's response to HIV/AIDS on a long-term basis. Specific objectives include interventions to change behaviour, especially among high-risk groups, decentralization of service delivery, protection of human rights, operational research and management reform.
- Monitoring and Evaluation has been given key importance in NACP-II. This is to facilitate evidence based planning for NACP. This will be done through a regular Computerized Management Information System and through conduct of a series of Behavioural Surveillance Surveys (BSS) in the general population, bridge populations and the high-risk groups.
- BSS in the general population and high-risk groups is proposed to be undertaken thrice during the period 2001 – 2005. To provide an independent evaluation of NACP-II activities, an external agency was contracted for BSS. ORG-CSR was identified for this purpose and will be involved in conducting a baseline, mid-term and end evaluation by BSS in the general population and the high-risk groups.
- The present report details the observations of the national baseline BSS survey among high risk and bridge groups, female sex workers and clients of female sex workers, which was conducted in 32 States and Union Territories of the country. This baseline provides basic information needed to strategize and prioritise programs under NACP-II during its five years of implementation.

### **2.0 Methodology and Sampling Design**

- 32 States and Union Territories in the country were categorized into 21 sampling units for the purpose of the survey. The survey was not undertaken in Lakshadweep, Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu as the estimated number of FSW were insignificant. Bihar and Jharkhand was clubbed into one group, as were Madhya Pradesh and Chattisgarh, Tamil Nadu and Pondicherry, Uttar Pradesh and Uttaranchal, Punjab and Chandigarh and six North Eastern states of Meghalaya, Mizoram, Arunachal Pradesh, Nagaland, Tripura and Sikkim.
- A total of 5648 clients of sex workers and 5572 female sex workers were interviewed across all the sampling units. For each sampling unit, FSW were selected from the predominant type of sex work that was prevalent in that sampling unit. In addition, control groups of FSWs were surveyed in Delhi, Mumbai, Kolkata and Andhra Pradesh covering 1087 respondents. These control groups were included to assess if any significant differences existed between brothel and non-brothel based FSW in these geographic locations. Thus in the main round of BSS, brothel based FSW were covered in Delhi, Kolkata and Mumbai and non brothel based in Andhra Pradesh,

while for the control groups, non brothel based FSW were included in the three metros and brothel based in Andhra Pradesh.

- A four-stage cluster sampling design was adopted for selecting respondents among brothel based sex workers and a three-stage cluster sampling design was adopted for non-brothel based sex workers and clients of sex workers.
- The survey was conducted between October 2001 and March 2002. The fieldwork was carried out in five phases, each phase covering five to six states/state groups simultaneously.
- Standardisation and uniformity in data collection for the survey was ensured by conducting a training of key trainers in Delhi, organised by the technical group at NACO. Extensive six-day training for supervisors and investigators were organised in each state/state group. Teams were briefed every morning and debriefed every evening during data collection. Schedules were back translated and tight quality control was maintained during data collection.
- Data entry was done using ISSA package at four locations in the country while the final analysis was done using the SPSS (10.0) software in Delhi. Adequate checks were built in at data entry and data analysis stages to ensure data quality.

### **3.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

#### **3.1 Female Sex Workers**

##### **3.1.1 Profile of the FSWs**

- A total of 5572 FSWs were interviewed in the entire country. 82 per cent of the identified sample completed the questionnaire schedule.
- Nearly half the FSW (54%) were aged 20-29 years. 37% were above 30 years, while 8% were below 20 years. The median age of the FSWs was 27 years (Range: 11-49). In Tamil Nadu, Kerala, Uttar Pradesh, Haryana and Gujarat, a majority of the respondents were over 30 years.
- 61% FSWs were illiterate. Around a fifth had studied up to primary school (21%) and 17% had studied up to secondary school. Highest proportions of illiterates were observed in Uttar Pradesh (90%), Bihar (84%), Maharashtra (83%), Madhya Pradesh (81%), Assam (79%) and West Bengal (78%). Interestingly all these were brothel based FSW except in Assam.
- The proportions of brothel based FSWs and non-brothel based FSW who were illiterate was 77% and 51% respectively.
- A little over three-fifth of all respondents were ever married (62%). Nearly a third of these respondents were first married when they were below 15 years. For 65% the age at first marriage was between 15-21 years.
- Analysis of the marital status showed that 38% of the respondents were 'not currently married or living with a sexual partner' while 29% were 'currently married and living

with a spouse' while 16% were 'currently married but not living with spouse or other sexual partner'.

- The proportion of brothel based FSWs not currently married and not living with sexual partner was higher than non-brothel based FSWs (53% and 28% respectively) and the same was reflected among brothel based study groups in Delhi (69%) and Mumbai (83%) and the corresponding non-brothel based control groups of Delhi (15%) and Mumbai (45%).
- Most of the FSWs interviewed lived in the city/town where the interview was carried out (90%) except Kerala where about 46% of the respondents did not live in the city/town where they worked.
- Nearly 32% of the respondents lived in the city/town, where the interview was conducted, since birth. This proportion was the highest in Madhya Pradesh (80%) and below 3% in West Bengal (2%), Goa (2%), Maharashtra (2%) and Delhi (1%).
- Nearly 25% of the respondents were engaged in this profession before they came to the city/town where the interview was carried out. Also, a third of the respondents (33%) travel to other places for sex work.
- Nearly a third of non-brothel based FSWs had additional sources of income. Varied sources of income were reported of which the proportion who had a petty business (6.2%) or worked as maidservants were the highest (6%).
- Overall, 44% of the FSWs had ever consumed drinks containing alcohol. Of these 22% reported that they consumed alcohol everyday in the last 4 weeks while those drinking at least once a week was 38%. Overall, around 15% of FSWs reported that they drink regularly before sex
- Overall 6% of FSWs had ever tried any addictive drugs. Among them almost a third had injected drugs in the past 12 months. These proportions were significantly high in Manipur (64%), other North Eastern states (63%) and Karnataka (42%).

### 3.1.2 Awareness of HIV/AIDS

- Cumulative figures for the entire country show that 94% of FSW had heard of HIV/AIDS. The lowest rate was observed in Haryana (79 %) while highest levels of awareness were observed in West Bengal, Tamil Nadu, Maharashtra, Kerala and Delhi, where 99 % respondents had heard of HIV/AIDS.
- Overall, 83% of FSWs interviewed were aware that HIV could be prevented through consistent condom use. Lowest awareness rates were observed in Haryana (60%).
- Overall, around 76% of the respondents were aware that having one, uninfected and faithful partner could prevent HIV. Awareness was especially low in the states of Karnataka, Kerala, Delhi, Haryana, Rajasthan, Punjab and Uttar Pradesh.
- Among all respondents nearly 66% had correct knowledge of the two important prevention methods, i.e. consistent condom use and having one, uninfected and faithful partner. This proportion was low in Haryana (47%), Karnataka (47%), Rajasthan (52%) and Punjab (56%).

- Overall, around 63% of the FSWs were aware that a person could not get HIV by sharing a meal with an infected person, while 66% were aware that HIV could not be transmitted through a mosquito bite. The awareness that a healthy looking person could be infected with HIV was 58% for the entire country. These awareness levels were low in Himachal Pradesh (26%), Jammu and Kashmir (32%) and Rajasthan (37%). In the entire country, 29% of the respondents had correct awareness on these three aspects. The lowest proportions of respondents with correct awareness on these three aspects were in Himachal Pradesh (8%), Haryana (12%), Madhya Pradesh (12%), Punjab (18%) and Gujarat (19%).

### **3.1.3 Awareness of STD, STD prevalence, and treatment seeking behavior**

- About 83% of the respondents reported that they had heard of STD. The states with the lowest proportion of respondents who had ever heard of STD were Karnataka (48%), Jammu and Kashmir (58%) and other North Eastern states, Goa and Madhya Pradesh (64% each).
- In most states, a majority of the respondents (above 80%) could describe symptoms of STD among women and 76% among men.
- 46% of the respondents reported that they suffered from any one of the symptoms of STD in the last 12 months. The proportion suffering from more than one symptom was 31%. Overall, around 35% of the FSWs reported that they had genital discharge or genital ulcer or burning pain during urination.
- Overall, 14% of the FSWs did not undergo any treatment, while 14% took home-based remedies for their last episode of STD. About 5% borrowed prescriptions from friends or relatives, while another 5% took medicines already available at their homes and about 19% bought medicines, across the counter from a chemist shop. Overall, 35% of the respondents went to a private hospital/clinic for treatment while 28% visited a government hospital and 12% went to the clinic run by NGOs. 5% of the FSWs went to traditional healers / quacks.
- During their last episode of STD, 43% sought treatment from a health practitioner within a week of onset of symptoms, while an additional 36% sought attention within a month but beyond a week.
- Overall, the proportion of brothel based FSWs who visited health practitioner within one week or less was 65% as compared with 35% for non-brothel based FSWs
- Most FSWs (78.9%) across the states had taken allopathic medicine for their last episode.
- Overall, about 46% of the FSW would prefer a private hospital/clinic and about 37% would prefer a government hospital for the treatment of future episodes of STD.
- More non-brothel based FSWs preferred to visit a government hospital (43%) as compared to brothel based FSWs (28%).



### 3.1.4 Sexual behavior and condom usage

- The age at first sex was less than 15 years for 27% of the FSWs. The median age at first sex was about 17 years (Range: 7-31 years). The lowest median age at first sex was observed in West Bengal and Orissa.
- A higher proportion of brothel based FSWs (37%) experienced their first sex below the age of 16 years as compared with non-brothel based FSWs (21%).
- 65% respondents reported that they were between 16-21 years at the time they first sold sex. 10 % of the FSWs first sold sex below 15 years of age. Overall, the median age when sex was sold for the first time was 20 years (Range: 10-42 years).
- The proportion of brothel based FSWs (17%) who first started sex work below 16 was higher as compared with non-brothel based FSWs (5%)
- 39% of the respondents had less than 7 clients in last 7 days prior to survey while 35% had 8-14 clients and 17 % had 15-21 paying clients in last 7 days preceding the survey. Nearly 20% FSWs had over 22 clients in Delhi and Goa. The mean number of clients was 11 per week.
- Brothel based sex workers reported larger number of clients per week compared to non-brothel based sex workers.
- A higher proportion of non-brothel based FSWs (31%) had 1 paying client on the last working day as compared with brothel based FSWs (22%)
- More than half (54%) the FSWs had 2-3 clients on the last working day. The mean number of paying clients on the last working day was 2.6 clients.
- Three out of four respondents used a condom at last sex with paying clients.
- Overall, half of the respondents' consistently used condoms with all paying clients in the last 30 days. Low rates were observed in other NE States (24%).
- A higher proportion of brothel based FSWs reported consistent condom use (57%) as compared with non-brothel based FSWs (46%).
- Overall, 56% of respondents did not have non-paying regular partners in last 7 days. Nearly, 40 % of the respondents had 1 non-paying regular partner. Overall, mean number of non-paying regular partners was 1 per week.
- The mean number of non-paying regular partners was 2 partners in last 7 days.
- 39% FSWs used condoms the last time they had sex with non-paying partners.
- Consistent condom use with non-paying partners in the last 30 days was reported by one-fifth of the respondents.

- Over half the FSWs (62%), reported that they suggested use of a condom at last sex with client. About 27 % of the respondents, reported that client had suggested the use of condom.
- Among brothel based FSWs a higher proportion reported that the decision to use condoms at last sex was their own (79%) as compared with non-brothel based FSWs (51%).
- Two fifth of the respondents who used a condom at last sex used Nirodh brand both with the paying and non-paying partners. Deluxe Nirodh and Kamasutra were the other two commonly used brands.
- Nearly 43% non-brothel based FSWs obtained condoms from the person they had sex with and nearly 30% obtained it from a chemist shop/pharmacy, as compared with brothel based FSWs where the proportions obtaining condoms from these two sources was lower.
- 83% of respondents did not have non-paying non-regular partners in last 7 days prior to the survey
- Nearly 43 % of the respondents reported that the suggestion to use a condom with a non-paying client was her own. About a fourth of the FSWs, reported that the suggestion to use a condom last time had been their partner's (25%) and about 31 % of the respondents reported that it was a joint decision.
- A third of FSWs who used condom at last sex with paying and non-paying partners obtained the condom from the client/partner. The other main sources for obtaining condoms were NGOs/ peer educators (21% and 16% for last sex with client and non-paying partner respectively) and chemist shops (20% and 22% respectively).
- Overall, partner objection was the main reason for non-use of condoms with paying and non-paying partners (68% and 52% respectively). Non-availability (27%) and that they did not think that it was necessary (20%) were other important reasons for non-use with clients. Main reasons for non-use with non-paying partners was that they did not think it necessary (52%) and that it decreased pleasure (33%).
- Among non-brothel based FSWs 40% reported non-availability as a reason for not using condom as compared with just 9% brothel based FSWs and 28% non-brothel based FSWs reported didn't think necessary as a reason for not using condom as compared with 10% brothel based FSWs

### 3.1.5 Other salient observations

- Majority of the FSWs in all the states reported that they usually insist their clients to use a condom (81%). If client refused to use condom, about 38% of refused sex while 18% charged an extra amount.
- The proportion of brothel based FSWs insisting on the client using a condom was higher than non- brothel based FSWs. (92% and 73% respectively
- Regarding risk perception, only 17% of the FSWs perceived that they were at very high risk of contracting HIV/AIDS. Over half of FSWs reported that they were at

moderate/low risk of contracting HIV/AIDS (57%) while an additional 17% reported that they did not have any chance of contracting HIV/AIDS.

- A higher proportion of brothel based FSWs (21%) perceived that they were at a very high risk of contracting HIV as compared with non-brothel based FSWs (14%)
- Overall, nearly two-third of the respondents reported that it was possible to get a confidential HIV test (64%).
- Slightly over one-fourth of FSWs reported that they had an HIV test sometime in the past (28%). Of these, around three-fourth of the respondents got the test done voluntarily.
- Most of the respondents, who had an HIV test, also collected the result of the test (90%).
- Nearly 41% brothel based FSWs had ever had an HIV test as compared with 20% of non-brothel based FSWs.
- Nearly half the respondents reported that someone had approached them to educate them on the spread of STI/HIV/AIDS in the past one year (47%) and almost one-fourth of the respondents participated in some campaign or meeting on STI/HIV/AIDS.
- The proportion reporting that someone had approached them to educate them on the spread of STI/HIV/AIDS in the past one year was higher in case of brothel based FSWs (62%) as compared with non-brothel based FSWs (37%)

## **3.2 Clients of FSWs**

### **3.2.1 Profile of the Clients of FSWs**

- At the national level, a total of 5684 interviews were completed. An overall response rate of 81 percent was observed in the country.
- Nearly half, (46%) of the respondents were between 26-35 years. 34% of the respondents were aged 20-25 years. 5% respondents were aged less than 20 years. The mean and median age of respondents for the entire country were 28 years (SD +/- 6.6) and 27 years (Range: 15-49 years) respectively.
- Overall, nearly two-fifths of the respondents had studied up to Grade VI-X, about 18% respondents had studied up to primary school (Grade I-VI) and 21% respondents were illiterate. The proportion of illiterates was 43 % in Uttar Pradesh compared to only 7% in Kerala. Around 22% of them studied beyond secondary school.
- The proportion of ever-married respondents was around 54%. This proportion was highest in Punjab (71%) and lowest in Goa (26%). Among married respondents the highest proportion of respondents reported an age at marriage of 19-25 years (68%). 15% of ever-married respondents were married below 18 years.

- Nearly half the respondents were currently married (52%) and most of them were currently living with their spouses. The proportion of respondents who were not currently married and not living with any sexual partner was around 46%. The inter-state variation shows that the proportion of currently married varied from 71% in Punjab to 26% in Goa.
- Nearly a fifth of the respondents (21%) were local transport workers. Petty businessmen / small shop owners comprised 16% and non-agricultural / casual laborers 12% of respondents.
- Most respondents lived in the city/town where the survey was carried out (81%). Across the country, 38% of respondents had been living in the city / town since birth. The proportion of respondents staying alone was around 15%. The state with the highest proportion of respondents staying alone was Delhi (43%). For the entire country, the proportion of respondents staying away from their regular residence was around 13%. Around 10% of respondents were away from home, either weekly or fortnightly, in the past 12 months (10% and 8% respectively).
- Nearly three fourth of the respondents reported ever having alcohol (73%). The proportion of respondents drinking at least once a week was 45% and the proportion of respondents drinking daily was nearly 23%. Nearly 13% of the respondents regularly consumed drinks containing alcohol before having sex with their commercial partner.
- It was observed that 18% of clients from brothel area regularly consumed alcohol before sex compared to 11% of clients from non-brothel area
- Respondents who had ever tried any addictive drug were around 22%. The most commonly used drugs were Ganja (62%), Bhang (44%), Afim (13%) and Charas (12%). About one-tenth of these respondents reported that they injected drugs in the last 12 months. These proportions were significantly high in Other North Eastern States (33%), Madhya Pradesh (33%) and Manipur (30%).

### 3.2.2 Awareness of HIV/AIDS

- The proportion of respondents who had ever heard of HIV/AIDS was around 96%. Except in Other North Eastern States (89%), in all the other States, the proportion was over 90%.
- 85% of the respondents in the country reported that consistent condom use could prevent HIV. Awareness levels varied from a low of 75% in Rajasthan to a high of 96% in Tamil Nadu.
- Nearly three fourth of the respondents were aware that having one faithful and uninfected partner could prevent HIV (74%). Awareness levels were relatively lower in Karnataka (58%) and Madhya Pradesh (51%).
- Nearly 68% of the Clients of sex workers were aware of the two methods of prevention i.e. consistent condom use and faithful sex partnership. In Madhya Pradesh (48%), Karnataka (48%), Haryana (52%), and Rajasthan (53%) this proportion was lower.

- Comparable proportions of respondents were aware that HIV couldn't be transmitted through sharing a meal with an infected person (67%) or through mosquito bites (70%). Those aware that a healthy person could be infected with HIV were around 64%. The proportion of respondents, who were aware that HIV cannot be transmitted through sharing a meal or by mosquito bites and also knew that a healthy looking person could be infected with HIV, was 39%.

### 3.2.3 Awareness of STD, STD prevalence, and treatment seeking behavior

- In the country, 76% respondents had heard of STD. Most respondents in West Bengal, Orissa, Kerala, Tamil Nadu, Haryana and Himachal Pradesh had heard of STD (over 90%). States where the proportion was significantly lower were Karnataka (39%), Uttar Pradesh (47%) and Bihar (48%).
- Overall 9% respondents reported genital discharge during the past 12 months, 14% reported ulcer / sore and 24% of the respondents reported burning pain during urination. Nearly 30% respondents had at least one of the three symptoms in the past 12 months. 42.9% of them reported more than one symptom. 4.0% reported to have suffered either from genital ulcer/ sore or discharge during a 12- month recall period
- 18% of the respondents did not take any treatment during the last episode of STD. About 9% of the respondents took home-based remedy; another 20% purchased medicines, across the counter from chemist shops. The proportion of respondents who visited any private hospital/clinic and government hospital/clinic last time was 38% and 28% respectively.
- About 44% of the clients from brothel area went to private hospital compared to 36% clients from non-brothel areas
- Nearly 45% of those respondents visited a health practitioner within 1 week of onset of symptoms of STD and about 39% visited a health practitioner, beyond a week but within a month of onset of symptoms. Most respondents took allopathic treatment for the symptoms of STD (90%).
- Universally, respondents stated that they would prefer to seek treatment from a private or government hospital/clinic (91.2%). Respondents in most states preferred private hospital/clinic to a government hospital/clinic except in the 6 states of Assam, Jammu and Kashmir, Karnataka, Manipur, Orissa, the Other North Eastern States and Rajasthan.

### 3.2.4 Sexual behavior and condom usage

- A significant proportion of the respondents (68%) had their first sex at the age of 16-21 years. Nearly 18% of respondents were below 16 years at the time of first sex. The mean age at first sex was 20 years (SD: +/- 3.5), while the median age was 19 years (Range: 8-38 years).
- The mean age of first sexual partner was 19 years (SD: +/- 4.7). The age of first sexual partner had been reported as 16-18 years by 37% of the respondents. An

unpaid female partner was the first sexual partner for nearly two-thirds of the respondents (65%) while a paid female partner was reported by 35%. 2% respondents reported male partners as the first sexual partner.

- 11% of the respondents reported ever having sex with a male partner. Of these, less than a third had sex with a male partner in the last 12 months (29%). Nearly one fourth used condom at last sex (24%) and a lower proportion used condom consistently over the last 12 months (15%).
- Cumulative estimates for the country revealed that around 17% of the respondents reported sex with an unpaid non-regular partner and nearly half (48%) had sex with their regular partners in the last 3 months.
- Median age at first sex with any commercial or regular female partner was 22 years (Range: +/- 11-31 years), as against 20 years (Range: 12- 45 years) with unpaid non-regular partners.
- The mean numbers of commercial, non-regular and regular female partners during a three- month recall period was reported as 3.9, 1.1 and 1.5 respectively. The mean number of commercial female partners varied from a low of 1.6 in Manipur to a high of 6.2 in Gujarat.
- Three-fourth of the respondents used a condom at last sex with commercial partner. This varied from 67% in West Bengal to 87% in Jammu & Kashmir. A third used a condom at last sex with any non-regular female partner as against 18% with their regular partners.
- More than half (57%) the clients consistently used condoms with commercial partners (Range: 35% in Assam to 77% in Maharashtra). About a fifth (22%) consistently used condoms with their non-regular partners and 7% with their regular partners.
- Three out of five (66%) respondents reported that they themselves suggested use of condoms at last sex with commercial partner. A fourth (24%) reported that the suggestion came from the FSW. Over half the respondents (54%) themselves suggested condom use at last sex with other non regular partners and 52.2% with regular partners
- About 31% of clients from brothel areas reported that their partner had suggested use of condom last time with commercial partner as against 19% of the clients from non-brothel area
- Overall, Nirodh, Deluxe Nirodh and Kamasutra were three most commonly used brands. About one-third (32%) of the respondents used Nirodh and a fourth (25%) used Deluxe Nirodh with commercial partners. These three brands were also commonly used with other non-regular and regular partners.
- A significant proportion (43%) of the respondents cited chemist shop as source of condom used at last sex with commercial partner and a third (33%) obtained condom from the person they had sex with. Nearly three-fifths obtained condoms from a chemist shop at last sex with non-regular partner or regular partner.

- Whereas 27% of the clients from brothel area reported 'chemist shops' as source of condom used with commercial partner, 52% of the clients from non-brothel area reported the same source.
- The main reasons for not using condom with commercial partners were that it decreased pleasure (51%), they did not like condoms (38%), or that they did not think it was necessary (37%).
- The main reasons for not using condom with non-regular partners were the decrease of pleasure and that they didn't think it was necessary (48%) or that they did not like condoms (38%). Over half the respondents did not think it necessary to use condom with their regular partners (52%).

### 3.2.5 Other salient observations

- Around one-third (35%) of the respondents perceived that they had no chance of getting infected with HIV. Over half perceived a moderate/low proportion of risk (51%), while only 13% perceived themselves to be at a very high risk of getting infected.
- Around two-third (69%) felt it was possible to get a confidential test to find out if they were infected with HIV. Overall, 10.4% of the respondents had ever undergone an HIV test. Of these most got it done voluntarily (82%) and most received the result of the HIV test (95%).
- A fifth (22%) were approached by someone who wanted to educate them on the spread of STI/HIV/AIDS. This varied from a low 4.4% in Assam to a high of 42% in Delhi.

### 3.2.6 Conclusions

Almost all FSW had heard of HIV/AIDS but many did not have adequate information on prevention and risk of transmission. Overall, non- brothel based sex workers were more disadvantaged in terms of awareness, condom usage and access to NGOs. More brothel based FSW were able to negotiate better for condom usage compared to non brothel based FSW. Information available can be used for planning need based interventions for control of HIV/AIDS in the country.

## CHAPTER – I INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background

The human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), which causes Acquired Immuno Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS), has brought about a global epidemic far more extensive than what was predicted even a decade ago. UNAIDS and WHO estimates show that the number of people living with HIV or AIDS globally at the end of the year 2001 stood at **40 million**. This is more than one and half times higher than the estimate made by WHO's Global Program on AIDS in 1991 on the basis of the data then available (UNAIDS, 2001). The HIV/AIDS epidemic continues its expansion across the globe with approximately **5 million newly infected cases in the year 2001**.

It is estimated that nearly 7.1 million people are living with HIV/AIDS in Asia and the Pacific by 2001. The epidemic claimed the lives of 4,35,000 people in the region in 2001.

**Table 1.1: Global Summary of the HIV/AIDS Epidemic, December 2001**

<b>Number of people living with HIV/AIDS</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>40 million</b>
	Adults	37.2 million
	Women	17.6 million
	Children (<15 years)	2.7 million
<b>People newly infected with HIV in 2001</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>5 million</b>
	Adults	4.3million
	Women	1.8 million
	Children (<15 years)	800,000
<b>AIDS deaths in 2001</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>3 million</b>
	Adults	2.4 million
	Women	1.1 million
	Children (<15 years)	58,000

Source: UNAIDS, AIDS Epidemic Update: 2001

The Indian scenario is equally serious with nearly **3.97 million** HIV infected people at the end of 2001. HIV infections have been reported from almost all States and Union Territories. A shift in the epidemic has been marked from the high-risk group to bridge group and then to the general population. In the six States of Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Manipur and Nagaland, the HIV prevalence in the general population is more than one percent. Out of all the reported AIDS cases in 2001, it is estimated that 75% of the infections are in male population and 83% of the transmission is through sexual route. Significant variations among and within the States have also been observed. These estimates



are based on the annual sentinel surveillance data collected from selected sites all over the country (NACO, 2002).

## **1.2 India's Response to the AIDS Challenge**

In India the first few cases of HIV infection were reported in 1986. Government of India took serious note of the problem and initiated a series of important measures to tackle the epidemic without wasting any time. A high-powered National AIDS Committee was immediately constituted in 1986 and a National AIDS Control Program was launched in the year 1987. A medium term plan for control of HIV/AIDS, with the support of WHO, was developed in 1989. Project documents for the implementation of this plan were developed and implemented in 5 states and UTs that were most affected - Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, West Bengal, Manipur and Delhi.

In 1991 a "Strategic Plan for Prevention and Control of AIDS in India" was prepared for the five-year period 1992-1997. The Strategic Plan received support from the World Bank, WHO and other international donor agencies. The main aim of the plan was to establish a comprehensive, multi-sectoral program for prevention and control of HIV/AIDS. For combating the challenge of the HIV/AIDS epidemic effectively, the Government of India established National AIDS Control Organisation (NACO) in 1992. NACO functions as an executive body in the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare to execute the strategic plan for the prevention and control of AIDS in the country.

### **1.2.1 National AIDS Control Project-I**

The First National AIDS Control Project (NACP-I), funded by IDA credit from the World Bank, was launched in 1992 under the aegis of NACO. It was the first project in India to develop a national public health program in HIV/AIDS prevention and control, and was implemented between 1992 and 1999, with an extended period of 2 years. The ultimate objective of the project was to slow the spread of HIV to reduce future morbidity, mortality, and the impact of AIDS by initiating a major effort in the prevention of HIV transmission. The specific objectives were to:

- (i) Involve all States and UTs in developing HIV/AIDS preventive activities with a special focus on the major epicentres of the epidemic
- (ii) Attain a satisfactory level of public awareness on HIV transmission
- (iii) Develop health promotion interventions among high risk behaviour groups
- (iv) Screen all blood units collected for blood transfusions
- (v) Decrease the practice of professional blood donation

- (vi) Develop skills in clinical management, health education and counselling, and psycho-social support to HIV sero-positive persons, AIDS patients and their associates
- (vii) Strengthen the control of STD
- (viii) Monitor the development of HIV/AIDS epidemic in the country (NACO, 2001).

The NACP-I project substantially achieved its specific objectives and often exceeded the original targets. The nationwide capacity building in managerial and technical aspects of the program in all 32 States and UTs was a major focus during the implementation period. A multi-sectoral approach was adopted in planning, implementing and monitoring of all the key project activities. Maximum efforts were made for integrating relevant project activities with health care system. The vulnerable risk groups were targeted to some extent despite limited capacity of NGOs to deal with the HIV/AIDS in most of the target areas. A significant increase in the volume of condom distribution through social marketing (about 50% increase) was one of the significant achievements during the project period. Condom use in targeted risk groups increased from less than 10 percent to a range of 50-90 percent. The awareness about prevention of HIV infection improved significantly across all the States and UTs. Another significant achievement was almost universalisation of screening of donated blood. Beside these, the law banned professional blood donation. STD clinics were also strengthened with improved quality and effectiveness of STD management.

### **1.2.2 National AIDS Control Project - II**

The increasing incidence of HIV/AIDS epidemic necessitated the extension of NACP-I with larger objectives. As a result, the Phase II of the National AIDS Control Project (NACP-II) became effective from November 1999. The NACP-II project has two key objectives: to reduce the spread of HIV infection in India; and strengthen India's response to HIV/AIDS on a long-term basis (NACO, 2001). The specific objectives of the project are:

- (i) To shift focus from raising awareness to changing behaviour through interventions, particularly for groups at high risk of contracting and spreading HIV;
- (ii) To support decentralisation of service delivery to the States and Municipalities and a new facilitating role of NACO;
- (iii) To protect human rights by encouraging voluntary counselling and testing;
- (iv) To support structured and evidence based annual reviews and ongoing operational research; and
- (v) To encourage management reforms, such as better-managed State level AIDS Control Societies and improved drug and equipment procurement practices.

Building on the lessons learnt from the first National AIDS Control Project, five key components were highlighted in Phase II:

**Component 1:** Targeted interventions for communities at higher risk

**Component 2:** Prevention of HIV transmission among the general population

**Component 3:** Provision of low cost AIDS care

**Component 4:** Strengthening institutional capacities

**Component 5:** Inter-sectoral collaboration

The project is being implemented under the aegis of National AIDS Control Policy, which was formulated and approved by the National AIDS Committee. The policy aimed at establishing an enabling framework in order to mobilise the capacity of the private sector and civil society. It also emphasised the specific objective of ensuring the protection and promotion of human rights of people living with HIV/AIDS, including their rights to equal access to the health care system, education, employment, privacy and other fundamental rights.

### **1.3 Monitoring and Evaluation of the NACP-II**

Under the second phase of the National AIDS Control Project (NACP-II), an extremely important feature is concurrent monitoring and evaluation (M & E) of the program activities. Such a system will provide continuous critical information about the course of the AIDS epidemic in India and help guide National AIDS Control Organisation (NACO) and State AIDS Control Societies (SACS) in making decisions and taking corrective measures effectively, when needed. The information generated by the M& E system will indicate how well the program is being implemented and whether the progress made is satisfactory and in tune with the project objectives, as envisaged.

For the effective monitoring and evaluation to assess the implementation of the Phase-II of the National AIDS Control Project at National and State level, conducting baseline, midterm and final evaluation through Behavioural Surveillance Survey (BSS) has been given prime importance. The responsibility has been contracted to ORG Centre for Social Research (ORG CSR).

### **1.4 Why BSS?**

Until recently, the surveillance efforts of most countries have concentrated on infection alone mainly through tracking of AIDS cases and the spread of the HIV virus. But *concentrating on infection alone is like shutting the stable door after the horse has bolted*. Many experts have highlighted various limitations of present HIV surveillance system, which does not fulfill the required information need of HIV prevention program planners. For example, low prevalence in a sub-population group does not necessarily mean that the group is not involved in high-risk behavior. The

virus may not have reached a “critical mass” – the prevalence rate might shoot up suddenly once the critical mass is crossed. Therefore, risk behaviors, if any, need to be well documented through a scientific method for designing appropriate intervention programs, which will reduce the risk before the virus explodes through any specific sub-population. UNAIDS, WHO, FHI and others have developed a new framework for HIV surveillance, known as *Second Generation HIV Surveillance System* that is suitable to the epidemic state of a country. An extensive use of behavioral data in planning, management and evaluation of HIV/AIDS intervention programs has been emphasized by this new generation surveillance system. Behavioral Surveillance Survey provides repeated measures in behavioral indicators for observing trends in high-risk behavior among the specific sub-population groups based on cross-sectional surveys.

## 1.5 BSS: It’s Objectives and Characteristics

The basic objectives of BSS are as follows:

- Identify sub-populations with high risk behaviors
- Identifying specific behaviors in need of change
- Providing indicators to evaluate program success and identify persistent problem areas
- Serving as an advocacy and policy tool
- Supplying data to be used for cross country and cross regional comparisons of behavioral risks

The basic premises of BSS are that it is:

- (i) Conducted for fixed behavioral parameters for comparative analysis over time
- (ii) Carried out in the same sub-populations in the same areas over time and
- (iii) Carried out in waves (e.g. baseline or 1<sup>st</sup> wave, 2<sup>nd</sup> wave etc).

One of the most important characteristics of BSS is its consistency over time. It employs a consistent sampling methodology, and data collection methods for tracking a consistent set of behavioral indicators over time. The entire approach is designed to allow for reliable tracking of trends over time.

Another key characteristic of BSS is that it pays higher attention to behaviors in sub-populations that contribute most to the potential spread of HIV (as they contribute disproportionately to the spread of the virus).

## 1.6 Objectives of the Present Study

There is a need for a national survey to serve as baseline database, and thereafter, at a certain interval, undertaking mid-term and final evaluations to measure impact of the interventions under the program. The study requirement for undertaking the baseline survey is to cover three types of target population:

1. General Population Group
2. Bridge Group
3. High Risk Population Groups

The present report provides the detailed findings of the baseline survey conducted among the bridge group (Client of Female Sex Workers) and one high-risk population group (Female Sex Workers) seeking their present status on awareness, knowledge, attitude and behaviour with regards to STD/HIV/AIDS. The study has been conducted in 32 States and Union Territories of India. The detailed methodology/sampling design of this survey is discussed in Chapter II.

## CHAPTER - II

### METHODOLOGY AND SAMPLING DESIGN

This chapter presents an overview of the process of setting up and conducting the baseline HIV/AIDS risk behavioral surveillance survey (BSS) among the bridge group and a high- risk group.

#### 2.1 Consultation Process in Planning the Survey

While planning for BSS, it was felt to be very important that all the key groups and individuals agree on the goals of data collection as well as the practicalities. Keeping this basic premise in mind, NACO initiated a systematic consultation process among all the key partners right from the beginning. A technical working group (core group) was formed by NACO that included members from different key groups such as UNAIDS, FHI, DFID, World Bank, USAID, APAC, etc. The technical group members continued to contribute ideas and exchange experiences throughout the planning and implementation of the survey. The group met regularly during the preparatory phase of the survey to review progress and plan for the effective use of the emerging data.

#### 2.2 Efforts in Making Consensus on the Survey Process

NACO and ORG CSR organized a number of meetings and brainstorming sessions with all the stakeholders and members of the technical working group to build consensus on some basic issues of the survey process. Some of these key issues were:

- Which specific groups should be included in the survey?
- How will these groups be defined?
- What information needs to be collected from the selected respondent group?
- What will be the coverage of the study?
- How should the sample size be calculated? What sample design to be followed?
- What research techniques should be followed in collecting the information?
- What quality assurance mechanisms should be adopted?

There were focused deliberations on each of the above during the meetings of the technical group and efforts were made to come to agreement on these basic methodological issues. Encouragingly, technical group members provided valuable inputs in finalizing the plan of the proposed survey among the bridge group and high-risk groups.

The following sections of this chapter describe all the key components of the methodology and sampling procedure of the study.

#### 2.3 Target Respondents

NACO and ORG CSR carried out a number of consultations with members of the technical working group for choosing the specific target respondent groups for the survey. After considering all possible options, the following respondent target groups

were decided based on the prevention efforts that are either underway presently or planned for in the future:

- **Client of Female Sex Workers (Representative of bridge population)**
  - **Female Sex Workers**
  - **Men who have Sex with Men**
  - **Intravenous Drug Users**
- (Representing high risk groups)

In selecting the type of FSW to be covered in each State sampling unit, a rapid appraisal of the predominant group of FSW practising sex in each particular State, in terms of the population size was undertaken. If in a particular state, the population of brothel based FSW was more, then only brothel based FSW were covered in that State. The same logic was followed for identifying States where non-brothel based FSW were the predominant group and in these States only non-brothel based FSW were covered.

Among female sex workers, it was decided that the survey would also cover a control group of FSWs at four locations across the country. Based on this decision, non-brothel based FSWs were covered in Delhi, Mumbai and Kolkata and brothel based FSWs were covered in Andhra Pradesh.

## 2.4 Core Indicators

Once the decision on the target respondent groups was taken, ORG CSR research team finalised the list of core indicators in consultation with NACO, SACS and members of the technical working group. Nearly all the standard BSS core indicators, with their standardised definitions and time reference periods were selected for maintaining comparability of data across time and different populations. The following table presents the list of core indicators selected for FSW

CORE INDICATORS for FSW	
Indicator 1	Awareness of HIV/AIDS
Indicator 2	Knowledge of HIV prevention methods

Indicator 3	Correct Knowledge about HIV/AIDS transmission
Indicator 4	Awareness of STD
Indicator 5	Knowledge of STD Symptoms
Indicator 6	Condom use at last sex with client
Indicator 7	Consistent condom use with clients in the last month
Indicator 8	Condom use at last sex with non-regular partner
Indicator 9	Consistent condom use with non-regular partners in the last month
Indicator 10	Sex workers injecting drugs in the last twelve months
Indicator 11	Sex workers seeking voluntary HIV tests
Indicator 12	HIV- Risk perception
Indicator 13	Exposure to interventions

## 2.5 Coverage of the Survey

The survey among Female Sex Workers and Clients were carried out across the following 21 States/State Groups:

1. Andhra Pradesh – non-brothel based
2. Assam – Non-brothel based
3. Bihar (including Jharkhand) - Brothel based
4. Delhi - Brothel based
5. Goa - Brothel based
6. Gujarat- Non brothel based
7. Haryana - Non-brothel based
8. Himachal Pradesh - non-brothel based
9. Jammu & Kashmir (Jammu region) - Non-brothel based
10. Karnataka - Non-brothel based
11. Kerala - Non-brothel based
12. Madhya Pradesh (including Chattisgarh) - Brothel based
13. Maharashtra - Brothel based
14. Manipur - Non-brothel based
15. Orissa - Brothel based
16. Other NE States (Arunachal Pradesh+ Nagaland+Meghalaya+ Mizoram+Tripura+ Sikkim) - Non-brothel based
17. Punjab + Chandigarh - Non brothel based
18. Rajasthan - Non-brothel based
19. Tamil Nadu + Pondicherry - Non brothel based
20. Uttar Pradesh (including Uttaranchal) - Brothel based in Uttar Pradesh and Non-brothel in Uttaranchal
21. West Bengal - Non brothel based

The survey was not conducted in Daman & Diu, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Lakshadweep and Andaman & Nicobar Islands as the estimated numbers of high risk / bridge populations were negligible.

The Control group for the FSW category was covered in Delhi, Mumbai, Kolkata and East Godavari district (Andhra Pradesh). For control groups, non-brothel based



female sex workers were covered in Delhi, Mumbai and Kolkata whereas brothel based female sex workers were covered in Andhra Pradesh.

## **2.6 Development of Research Instrument**

ORGCSR research team developed separate semi-structured questionnaire schedules for the target groups to collect all the necessary information. The standard BSS research instruments were referred as the base document, which is the result of long experience and has been widely tested across the world. The draft questionnaire schedule for pre-testing in the field was finalised in consultation with NACO and members of the technical working group.

## **2.7 Pre-testing the Research Instrument**

The questionnaires were translated into vernacular for each State or State Group. Back translation of all vernacular editions was also undertaken to make sure that the questions were asked in a standardized manner, without any regional deviations. A small-scale rapid qualitative research was undertaken by ORG CSR core research team members, involving some target respondents, to develop a comprehensive understanding on the interpretation of the questions and correct terminologies for ensuring that the original meaning of the question was not lost. A project orientation workshop was organised in Delhi for all the core research team members of ORG CSR who were involved in this research project. The technical working group organized a training of trainers (TOT) workshop in Delhi for the core research team of ORG CSR and all research professionals as well as field executives who coordinated the project at the state level.

Pre-testing was undertaken in four States, Delhi, Maharashtra, West Bengal and Andhra Pradesh. A total of about 400 interviews were conducted across these four States. The questionnaire schedule was finalised in consultation with NACO and technical working group members based on the feedback of the pre-test.

## **2.8 Training of Field Teams**

State level training workshops for field investigators and supervisors were organised in each State or State Group. Around 9 investigators and 3 supervisors were recruited in each State or State Group for carrying out the survey. However, in the North Eastern States six teams, each consisting of two investigators and one supervisor carried out the fieldwork in six separate States. Most of investigators and supervisors, recruited across all the States, had prior experience of working on similar research projects with ORG CSR in the recent past. But an extensive training program for all the investigators and supervisors was thought to be very important as their attitude and aptitude could greatly influence the outcome of the survey, especially when they were working among very hard to reach target groups and enquiring about sensitive behavioural aspects. A six days intensive training workshop was organised in each State or State Group for training investigators and supervisors thoroughly on the final questionnaires, interview techniques and appropriate recording of responses. One day's field visit during the training workshop provided useful insights to each investigator and supervisor about the approach and field methodology to be adopted for successfully carrying out the survey. Mock calls were also undertaken during the training. An STD specialist was also invited as a resource person in each State or State Group to sensitise investigators and supervisors on STD. In most of the States/State Groups the NGO advisor of SACS outlined on-going prevention activities. Representatives also attended the state level training workshops from SACS and key NGOs.

## **2.9 Sample Size Calculation**

Before calculating the required sample sizes, the following points were considered:

The procedures presented are intended for surveys where the primary objective is to measure changes in selected behavioral indicators over time. The sample size required to measure changes in indicators over time are larger than those required to measure a variable or indicator at a single point in time.

The sample size required per survey round for the measurement of change on a given indicator is a function of five factors:

- i) The initial or starting level of the key variable
- ii) The magnitude of change that needs to be detected reliably
- iii) The level of significance
- iv) The power of estimation
- v) The proportion of the population of interest that is eligible to be considered for the key variable

An expression for the required sample size for a given sub-population for each survey round is calculated by:

$$n = D \frac{[Z_{1-\alpha}\sqrt{2 P (1 - P)} + Z_{1-\beta}\sqrt{P_1 (1 - P_1) + P_2 (1 - P_2)}]^2}{(P_2 - P_1)^2} \dots\dots\dots (S)$$

where

n = the required sample size

D = design effect

P<sub>1</sub> = the estimated proportion at the time of the first survey

P<sub>2</sub> = the target proportion at some future date, so that (P<sub>2</sub> – P<sub>1</sub>) is the magnitude of change to be detected

P = (P<sub>1</sub>+ P<sub>2</sub>) / 2

Z<sub>1-α</sub> = the Z – score corresponding to the desired level of significance

Z<sub>1-β</sub> = the Z – score corresponding to the desired level of power

The following table shows different target groups covered in the survey, key variables to be measured, estimated baseline value of the key variables and sample size.

Target Groups	Key Variable	Estimated baseline value of key indicator	Domains	Estimated midterm value	Sample Size
Client of Female Sex Workers	Consistent condom use with commercial partners in past 3 months	50%	Each State/ State group	65%	267
Female Sex Workers	Consistent condom use with Client in past one month	50%	Each State/ State group	65%	267
Control Group for Female Sex Worker*	Consistent condom use with Client in past one month	50%	Delhi Mumbai Kolkata Andhra Pradesh	65%	267

\*: Non-brothel based FSW in Delhi, Mumbai and Kolkata and brothel based in AP

Assumptions made in the formula (S)

D = 2

Z<sub>1-α</sub> = 1.645 (Corresponding to 95% confidence level)

Z<sub>1-β</sub> = 0.84 (Corresponding to 80% power of estimate)

Estimated proportion at the time of the baseline survey (P<sub>1</sub>) = 50%

Target proportion which NACO is aiming to achieve at mid-term (P<sub>2</sub>) = 65%

### 2.10 Sampling Procedure

The following sections detail out the specific sampling designs adopted for different target groups.

### 2.10.1 Brothel Based Female Sex Workers (FSW-bb)

The following Four-Stage Cluster Sampling Design was adopted for selecting target respondents in each State/State Group:

STAGE I	Selection of Cities/Towns/Rural Areas
STAGE II	Selection of Brothel Areas
STAGE III	Selection of Brothels (Clusters)
STAGE IV	Selection of Target Respondents

#### *STAGE I: Selection of Cities/Towns/Villages*

In each State/State Group a rapid situational analysis was undertaken by the core research team of ORG CSR (at state level) to identify cities/towns/rural areas with high concentration of brothel based sex workers. An in-depth secondary research was carried out based on information available from different sources e.g. States AIDS Control Society, key NGOs working among the target community, donor agencies, previous research studies etc. In some States detailed mapping information was already available (e.g. West Bengal, Maharashtra, Gujarat etc). Efforts were made to utilise existing information to select Cities/Towns/Rural Areas for carrying out the survey among brothel based female sex workers.

Once cities/towns/rural areas were selected, the core field team including the state field coordinator undertook a rapid mapping exercise to identify all the brothel areas in the selected cities/towns/rural areas. The number of brothels as well as female sex workers in each brothel area were estimated by the core field team with the help of key informants e.g. brothel owners, madams, pimps, local community leaders, NGO peer educators etc.

#### *STAGE II: Selection of Brothel Areas*

Most of the selected cities/towns/rural areas had one brothel area. However, a number of brothel areas were found in some big metropolitan cities e.g. Mumbai, Kolkata etc. At least three to four brothel areas were randomly selected from each of those big metropolitan cities. For example, four brothel areas were selected both in Mumbai as

well as Kolkata. The number of FSWs covered in each selected brothel area was proportional to the total numbers of FSWs estimated in the area.

*STAGE III: Selection of Brothels (Clusters)*

Each selected brothel area were segmented in to three to four equally sized parts. The required number of brothels to be selected in the entire brothel area was equally distributed across three/four segments.

All efforts were made to ensure a fair degree of randomness in selecting the required number of brothels in each segment. A starting point was chosen randomly at the center of the segment and then every  $i$ -th brothel was selected following the right hand rule. The value of  $i$  (sampling interval) was calculated dividing the total number of brothels in the segment ( $N$ ) by the number of brothels to be selected ( $n$ ) i.e.  $i = N/n$ .

*STAGE IV: Selection of Target Respondents*

In each selected brothel a quick listing exercise was carried out. Since names of the female sex workers could not be used for the listing exercise (to ensure confidentiality), the color or type of dress of the female sex workers were used to prepare the list. The serial numbers of the female sex workers were written on small paper pieces (folded) and the required number of respondents selected randomly from the list. An example of a quick listing exercise at a selected brothel...

1. Red sari and white blouse
2. Blue skirt
3. Red sari and yellow blouse
4. Green salwar and yellow kurta
5. Green salwar and blue kurta
6. Jeans and tee shirt
7. Black trouser and blue shirt
8. White skirt
9. White skirt and orange tee shirt

### **2.10.2 Non-Brothel Based Female Sex Workers (FSW-nbb)**

The following Three-Stage Cluster Sampling Design was adopted for selecting target respondents in each State/State Group:

STAGE I	Selection of Cities/Towns/Rural Areas
STAGE II	Selection of Non-Brothel Based Sites (Clusters)

## STAGE III

## Selection of Target Respondents

*STAGE I: Selection of Cities/Towns/Villages*

Like the brothel-based category, a rapid situational analysis was undertaken by the core research team of ORG CSR (at state level) to identify cities/towns/rural areas with high concentration of non-brothel based sex workers. An in-depth desk research was carried out based on information available from different secondary sources.

Once cities/towns/rural areas were identified, the core field team including the state field coordinator undertook a rapid mapping exercise to identify all the non-brothel sites in the selected cities/towns/rural areas. The number of non-brothel based female sex workers available at each non-brothel site across different points of time of a day were estimated by the core field team with the help of key informants e.g. local transport workers, shop keepers, pimps, local community leaders, NGO peer educators etc.

*STAGE II: Selection of Non-Brothel Sites (Clusters)*

The steps followed in the selection of non-brothel sites were as follows:

- |        |  |
|--------|--|
| Step 1 | The list of non-brothel sites, arranged geographically, was prepared.  |
| Step 2 | The sampling interval (SI) was calculated by dividing the total number of non-brothel sites (M) by the number of clusters to be selected (a) i.e. $SI = M/a$ . |
| Step 3 | A random number (RS) between 1 and SI was selected. The site on the numbered list corresponding to the number was the first sample cluster.                    |
| Step 4 | Subsequent units were chosen by adding the sampling interval (SI) to the number identified in step 3.  |
| Step 5 | This procedure was followed until the list was exhausted.  |

### *STAGE III: Selection of Target Respondents*

The field team reached the selected site at the beginning of the peak hour. If the number of female sex workers present at that point of time was more than the required number, a quick listing exercise was carried out using type/colour of clothes of the target respondents and the required number of respondents were randomly selected from the list. But, if the number of target respondents was less than or equal to the required sample size to be covered at the site, all of them were approached for the interview.

#### **2.10.3 Client of Female Sex Workers**

The following Three-Stage Cluster Sampling Design was adopted for selecting target respondents in each State/State Group:

STAGE I	Selection of Cities/Towns/Rural Areas
STAGE II	Selection of Brothel Areas/Non-Brothel Sites
STAGE III	Selection of Target Respondents

#### *STAGE I: Selection of Cities/Towns/Villages*

Cities selected for the FSW category were also selected for the Client category.

#### *STAGE II: Selection of Brothel Areas/Non-Brothel Sites*

All brothel areas or non-brothel sites selected in each selected city/town/rural area for the FSW category were selected for the client target group as well.

#### *STAGE I: Selection of Target Respondents*

Exit interviews were conducted with client of female sex workers at each selected brothel area or non-brothel based site. To ensure a fair degree of randomness, the required sample size of target respondents were equally distributed across four equal size segments.

#### **2.10.4 Control Group of Female Sex Workers**

As mentioned earlier, non-brothel based female sex workers were included as a control group in Delhi, Mumbai and Kolkata whereas brothel based female sex workers were included as a control group in Andhra Pradesh. This was based on the predominant type of FSW covered in each region.

The sampling design followed in Delhi, Mumbai and Kolkata was similar to the design discussed in section 2.10.2 and the sampling procedure followed in Andhra Pradesh is same as the design highlighted in section 2.10.1.

### **2.10.6 Achieved Sample Sizes**

The following table presents achieved sample sizes of the target respondents across different States/ State Groups:



**Table 2.1: Achieved Sample Sizes**

Sl. No	State/State Group	FSW	Type of FSW (BB- Brothel based, NBB- Non-brothel based)	Client	Control (FSW)
1.	Andhra Pradesh	279	NBB	277	
3.	Assam	270	NBB	271	
3.	Bihar+	288	BB	289	
4.	Delhi	269	BB	269	
5.	Goa	270	BB	270	
6.	Gujarat	288	NBB	297	
7.	Haryana	270	NBB	271	
8.	Himachal Pradesh	271	NBB	267	
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	114	NBB	215	
10.	Karnataka	267	NBB	269	
11.	Kerala	270	NBB	270	
12.	Madhya Pradesh+	276	NBB	280	
13.	Maharashtra	269	BB	270	
14.	Manipur	267	NBB	267	
15.	Orissa	272	BB	276	
16.	Other NE States	272	NBB	268	
17.	Punjab	267	NBB	273	
18.	Rajasthan	271	NBB	267	
19.	Tamil Nadu+	269	NBB	267	
20.	Uttar Pradesh+	273	BB	267	
21.	West Bengal	282	BB	284	
1	Delhi		NBB		274
2	Mumbai		NBB		269
3	Kolkata		NBB		274
4	Andhra Pradesh		BB		270
	All India	5574		5684	1087

**2.11 Fieldwork**

The fieldwork was initiated in early October 2001 and was completed by mid March 2002. The entire fieldwork was carried out in five phases. In each phase the survey was carried out in five to six States/ State Groups simultaneously. The fieldwork among Control Group was taken up in the last phase of survey, immediately after completing the fieldwork among FSWs and Clients. Each State/State Group had three teams (each consisting of three field investigators and one supervisor, excepting in Other North Eastern States where one supervisor and 2 investigators covered one State due to the small number of respondents to be covered in each State and because of the difference in languages).

The core research team members and senior field professionals of ORG CSR made a number of field visit across different States/State Groups for ensuring quality of data collection and recording. Field supervisors made at least 20% spot checks to ensure completeness and accuracy of the filled up questionnaires. Field supervisors initiated detailed manual scrutiny of the filled up questionnaires as well as the coding exercise during the fieldwork itself. NACO representatives and members of the technical working group also made several field visits across different parts of the country and provided their valuable inputs.

## **2.12 Data Management and Data Analysis**

Data were entered in the Integrated System for Survey Analysis (ISSA) package. This package was preferred due to its inbuilt capacity of making range and consistency checks. Data were analysed using SPSS (10.0) package. Estimates of all the key variables including the core indicators for different target groups have been calculated and presented in the following chapters.

## **2.13 Quality Assurance Mechanism**

The core research team of ORG CSR made all efforts for maintaining high quality of output at every stage of the project. During the fieldwork core team members and senior field professionals made regular field visits for quality control. Each field supervisor carried out a minimum of 20% spot checks for ensuring accuracy of the collected information. Moreover, members of the technical working group and NACO officials also visited the field and during training/data collection to provide their valuable inputs and feedback. All questionnaires were manually scrutinised and coded in the field itself for ensuring quality.

## **CHAPTER - 3**

### **FEMALE SEX WORKERS (FSWs)**

#### **3.1 Background**

Female Sex Workers (FSW) are one of the key target groups for any intervention project that aims at prevention and control of HIV infections. The national baseline BSS survey among high risk and bridge groups thus had undertaken a detailed study of this population, in terms of their demographic profile, their awareness of STD and HIV/AIDS, self reported prevalence of STD, their treatment seeking behavior, their sexual behavior and condom usage, beside other salient observations pertaining to their risk behavior and prevention of HIV/AIDS. Each of these issues is discussed in detail in the ensuing sections. The discussion will present the national scenario as well as inter-state variations.

#### **3.2 Profile of the FSWs**

This section presents the socio - demographic profile of the FSWs. The discussion will be centred on the age, educational level, marital status, residential status, the additional source of income and the use of substances like alcohol, drugs (taken intravenously and otherwise), the details of which are presented in individual sub-sections.

##### **3.2.1 Age distribution**

The age distribution of the respondents is presented in Table 3.1. Overall, about 54 % of the respondents were aged 20-29 years. About 8 % of FSWs were aged less than 20 years. The overall median age of respondents was 27 years.

21% of FSWs in Orissa were below 20 years of age as against 0.4% in Tamil Nadu, 1.1% in Himachal Pradesh, 2.2 % in Uttar Pradesh and 3% in Delhi. Overall, only around 6% were aged over 40 years. The proportion of respondents over 40 years was the highest in Kerala (23%).

The non-brothel based FSW were older compared to their counterparts practicing sex in brothels, as is evidenced by the differences in the median ages between the two groups.

##### **3.2.2 Educational Profile**

At the national level, illiteracy seems to be the characteristic of the FSWs. Slightly more than three-fifths of the respondents interviewed were found to be illiterate (61%). Around one-fifth of the respondents had studied up to 5<sup>th</sup> standard. Only about 17% of the FSWs reported to have studied up to the 10<sup>th</sup> standard.

**Table 3.1: Age Distribution of the Respondents**

(All figure are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/State Group	Age Group (in Years)					Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Range	
		<20	20-24	25-29	30-39	40-49				Min	Max
1.	Andhra Pradesh	14.0	28.7	32.3	23.7	1.4	25.7	6.0	25.0	11	45
2.	Assam	10.7	21.9	33.3	30.0	4.1	26.7	6.1	26.0	15	46
3.	Bihar+	14.2	26.7	27.1	27.1	4.9	26.2	6.5	25.0	14	46
4.	Delhi	3.0	23.8	43.5	24.9	4.8	27.2	5.0	26.0	17	42
5.	Goa	8.5	43.0	28.5	18.9	1.1	24.8	4.7	24.0	15	40
6.	Gujarat	5.2	18.8	26.4	41.0	8.7	29.2	6.8	29.0	16	48
7.	Haryana	7.4	17.4	26.7	44.1	4.4	28.7	6.2	29.0	15	45
8.	Himachal Pradesh	1.1	28.0	40.6	29.9	0.4	27.6	4.5	27.0	19	40
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	11.4	21.9	42.1	22.8	1.8	26.3	5.0	26.0	16	41
10.	Karnataka	7.1	19.5	37.8	32.6	3.0	27.6	5.3	28.0	18	49
11.	Kerala	1.1	10.0	19.6	46.3	23.0	33.9	7.1	34.0	18	49
12.	Madhya Pradesh +	14.1	27.9	28.3	25.0	4.7	25.8	6.2	25.0	15	48
13.	Maharashtra	4.8	26.4	39.8	24.5	4.5	26.5	5.4	25.0	18	42
14.	Manipur	10.9	20.2	30.0	32.6	6.4	27.8	6.5	27.0	15	45
15.	Orissa	21.3	25.4	23.5	24.6	5.1	25.7	7.2	25.0	13	45
16.	Other NE States+	11.8	30.9	31.6	24.6	1.1	26.0	5.5	25.0	16	42
17.	Punjab	6.4	21.0	36.0	28.8	7.9	28.6	6.5	28.0	15	47
18.	Rajasthan	12.2	41.3	29.2	16.6	0.7	24.7	4.9	24.0	15	45
19.	Tamil Nadu+	0.4	4.5	24.9	58.4	11.9	32.9	5.3	33.0	19	47
20.	Uttar Pradesh+	2.2	12.5	28.2	45.1	12.1	30.3	6.3	30.0	17	45
21.	West Bengal	7.8	19.1	31.9	31.2	9.9	28.4	7.2	27.0	16	48
	Brothel Based	9.5	25.6	31.3	27.7	5.9	26.9	6.3	26.0	13	48
	Non Brothel Based	7.5	21.9	31.1	33.7	5.9	28.2	6.4	28.0	11	49
	<b>All India</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>23.3</b>	<b>31.1</b>	<b>31.3</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>27.7</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>27.0</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>49</b>

Base: All Respondents

There was a considerable difference between the proportions of brothel based FSWs and non-brothel based FSW who were illiterate (77% and 51% respectively), those who had studied up to 5<sup>th</sup> standard (14% and 25%) and those who had studied up to 10<sup>th</sup> standard (9% and 22%). As a whole, education levels were lower among brothel based FSWs. (Table 3.2).

A wide variation in terms of educational level of respondents across the states could be noticed. The proportion of illiterate respondents was significantly higher in Uttar Pradesh (90%), Bihar (84%), Maharashtra (83%), Madhya Pradesh (81%), Assam (79%) and West Bengal (78%). The educational profile in states like Kerala, Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh is very different from those of other states, in that the target population has better literacy status with many FSW educated at least up to the primary level, with best literacy levels being reported from Kerala. Only 0.6% had studied beyond the senior secondary level (Class XII).

The proportion of illiterate respondents was higher among brothel based FSWs of Maharashtra (83%) as compared with the non-brothel based control group (36%) in Mumbai. Similarly, the proportion of illiterate respondents was higher among brothel based FSWs of West Bengal (78%) as compared with the non-brothel based control group (59%). Thus even in the control groups, brothel based FSW had poorer literacy.

### 3.2.3 Marital Status of the Respondents

#### Age at first marriage

Overall, more than three-fifth of the FSWs were reported to be ever married. Of all the states, the proportion of ever-married FSWs was highest in Jammu & Kashmir (92%) (Table 3.3). The proportion of non-brothel based sex workers who had ever been married was higher (71%) compared to brothel based sex workers (48%). (Table 3.3)

Among brothel based FSWs nearly 42% were married before the age of 15 as compared to non-brothel based FSWs where the proportion was 15%.

Overall, the mean age at first marriage was about 18 years. In the states of Assam, Bihar, Goa, Maharashtra, Orissa and West Bengal the reported age at first marriage was less than 15 years for a significant proportion of the FSWs. 74% of the respondents in West Bengal reported that they were first married below 15 years. The mean age at first marriage is higher for Kerala, Tamil Nadu and Manipur (20 years). The age of marriage appears to be higher where the literacy is higher. The lowest median age at first marriage was found to be 14 years in West Bengal followed by Maharashtra (16 years) (Table 3.3)

In the non-brothel based control groups of Delhi (81%), Mumbai (69%) and Kolkata (89%) the proportions of ever married were higher than in the corresponding brothel based groups, where the proportions of ever married were 47%, 39% and 69% respectively. However, the mean age at marriage was similar.

**Table 3.2: Education level of the Respondents**

(All figure are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/State Group	Education Level				
		Illiterate <sup>1</sup>	Grade I-V	Grade VI-X	Grade XI-XII	Grade XII+
1.	Andhra Pradesh	44.8	31.2	21.9	1.8	0.4
2.	Assam	78.9	16.3	4.4	0.4	0.0
3.	Bihar+	83.7	11.1	5.2	0.0	0.0
4.	Delhi	67.7	20.4	11.9	0.0	0.0
5.	Goa	63.3	17.0	18.5	0.4	0.7
6.	Gujarat	61.5	20.8	15.3	2.1	0.3
7.	Haryana	57.4	24.4	17.0	0.4	0.7
8.	Himachal Pradesh	43.2	20.3	28.4	6.6	1.5
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	59.6	20.2	20.2	0.0	0.0
10.	Karnataka	48.3	25.5	23.6	2.2	0.4
11.	Kerala	15.2	34.1	45.6	3.0	2.2
12.	Madhya Pradesh +	81.2	13.0	5.8	0.0	0.0
13.	Maharashtra	82.9	11.2	5.6	0.0	0.0
14.	Manipur	51.3	22.1	24.3	1.1	1.1
15.	Orissa	68.4	21.0	10.3	0.0	0.4
16.	Other NE States+	48.9	19.9	25.0	4.0	2.2
17.	Punjab	65.9	18.4	14.2	1.5	0.0
18.	Rajasthan	64.9	20.3	14.0	0.4	0.4
19.	Tamil Nadu+	21.9	45.0	30.9	1.5	0.7
20.	Uttar Pradesh+	89.7	7.7	2.6	0.0	0.0
21.	West Bengal	78.0	12.1	9.6	0.0	0.4
Brothel Based		76.9	14.1	8.6	0.0	0.2
Non Brothel Based		50.5	24.7	22.0	2.0	0.8
<b>All India</b>		<b>61.0</b>	<b>20.5</b>	<b>16.7</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.6</b>

Base: All Respondents

<sup>1</sup> Includes those Respondents who are Literate but no Formal Education

**Table 3.3: Marital Status and Age at Marriage**

(All figure are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/State Group	Ever married*		Age at marriage**					Mean age at marriage	Median age at marriage	Std Deviation
		%	N	Up to 15	15-18	19-21	22-25	25+			
1.	Andhra Pradesh	59.1	165	11.5	48.5	28.5	11.5	0.0	18.1	18.0	2.7
2.	Assam	83.7	226	41.2	35.4	16.8	6.2	0.4	16.8	16.0	2.7
3.	Bihar+	53.1	153	39.2	29.4	23.5	7.2	0.7	16.6	16.0	3.6
4.	Delhi	46.5	125	26.4	48.8	20.8	2.4	1.6	17.0	17.0	2.4
5.	Goa	56.7	153	45.1	32.0	17.0	5.9	0.0	16.6	16.0	2.9
6.	Gujarat	78.5	226	20.4	41.2	27.0	10.6	0.9	17.9	18.0	2.8
7.	Haryana	84.1	227	29.5	45.8	19.8	4.0	0.9	17.1	17.0	2.7
8.	Himachal Pradesh	77.9	211	0.9	36.0	53.1	10	0.0	19.3	19.0	1.8
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	92.1	105	13.3	23.8	45.7	17.1	0.0	18.9	19.0	2.5
10.	Karnataka	73.0	195	13.8	33.8	29.2	19.5	3.6	19.0	19.0	3.3
11.	Kerala	75.6	204	8.8	33.3	30.4	19.1	8.3	19.7	19.0	3.5
12.	Madhya Pradesh +	37.0	102	21.6	41.2	23.5	11.8	2.0	17.9	17.0	3.0
13.	Maharashtra	38.7	104	44.2	35.6	12.5	6.7	1.0	16.2	16.0	3.4
14.	Manipur	53.2	142	9.2	25.4	39.4	20.4	5.6	19.6	20.0	3.2
15.	Orissa	52.2	142	40.1	35.9	17.6	3.5	2.8	16.8	16.0	3.3
16.	Other NE States+	45.2	123	2.4	41.5	39.0	15.4	1.6	19.2	19.0	2.6
17.	Punjab	81.6	218	5.0	46.8	40.8	7.3	0.0	18.5	18.0	2.0
18.	Rajasthan	42.8	116	25.9	55.2	13.8	2.6	2.6	16.6	16.0	2.5
19.	Tamil Nadu+	84.4	227	2.2	27.8	43.6	25.6	0.9	20.1	20.0	2.7
20.	Uttar Pradesh+	30.8	84	13.1	35.7	35.7	14.3	1.2	18.8	19.0	2.9
21.	West Bengal	68.8	194	73.7	17.5	7.2	1	0.5	14.3	14.0	2.8
	Brothel Based	48.1	1057	41.7	33.0	18.4	5.8	1.1	16.5	16.0	3.3
	Non Brothel Based	70.7	2385	14.6	38.1	32.6	12.9	1.8	18.5	18.0	3.2
	<b>All India</b>	<b>61.8</b>	<b>3442</b>	<b>22.9</b>	<b>36.5</b>	<b>28.2</b>	<b>10.7</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>17.9</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>3.2</b>

Base: \*All Respondents for “Ever Married”;

\*\* Married Respondents for “Age at Marriage”

## Type of sexual partnership

Table 3.4 indicates that at the all India level, three type of sexual partnership among FSWs were most common. These were:

- 'Not currently married, not living with sexual partner' as reported by 38% of the respondents followed by
- 'Currently married and presently living with spouse' (29%) and
- 'Currently married, not living with spouse or other sexual partner' (16%).

However, about 8% of the FSWs were 'currently married, living with other sexual partner' and 9% of FSWs were 'not currently married, living with sexual partner'. A higher proportion of non-brothel based FSWs were currently married and living with spouse than brothel based FSWs (37% and 16% respectively). However, the proportion of brothel based FSWs not currently married and not living with sexual partner was higher than non-brothel based FSWs (53% and 28% respectively).

The states where a high proportion of FSWs are not currently married and not living with any sexual partner were Maharashtra (83%), Delhi (69%), Uttar Pradesh (63%), other NE states (62%) and Rajasthan (55%). In direct contrast were states where the FSWs were married and living with their spouses, while also practicing the profession. As high as 82% of the FSWs in Jammu & Kashmir were currently married and living with spouse. This figure is 63% in Punjab, 59% in Himachal Pradesh, 54% in Haryana, about 50% in Gujarat and Assam. In some of the states like Goa (46%), Tamil Nadu (32%), Kerala (27%) and Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Delhi, Haryana, (23%) a significant proportion of FSWs were married but not living with spouse or any other sexual partner.

The proportion of not currently married and not living with sexual partner among the non-brothel based control groups of Delhi (15%) and Mumbai (45%) was lower than the corresponding brothel based groups (69% and 83% respectively).



**Table 3.4: Status of Sexual Partnership of the Respondents**

(All figure are in percentage)

Sl.No	State/State Group	Sexual Partnership Status				
		Currently married, living with spouse	Currently married, living with other sexual partner	Married, not living with spouse or other sexual partner	Not currently married, living with/having sexual partner	Not currently married, not living with/having sexual partner
1.	Andhra Pradesh	13.3	12.9	22.9	21.1	29.7
2.	Assam	50.7	4.1	23.0	6.7	15.6
3.	Bihar+	33.3	1.4	10.1	3.1	52.1
4.	Delhi	3.3	2.2	23.4	2.2	68.8
5.	Goa	3.0	5.2	45.9	8.9	37.0
6.	Gujarat	50.0	3.1	11.8	6.3	28.8
7.	Haryana	54.1	3.3	23.0	0.7	18.9
8.	HP	59.4	4.4	14.4	3.7	18.1
9.	J & K	82.5	0.9	9.6	0.0	7.0
10.	Karnataka	31.1	16.1	18.4	8.6	25.8
11.	Kerala	15.9	20.7	27.0	13.0	23.3
12.	Madhya Pradesh +	28.3	0.7	2.2	19.2	49.6
13.	Maharashtra	5.9	3.0	3.7	4.5	82.9
14.	Manipur	15.4	16.9	8.6	18.0	41.2
15.	Orissa	28.7	16.9	10.3	13.2	30.9
16.	Other NE States+	14.0	5.5	13.6	5.1	61.8
17.	Punjab	62.9	3.0	16.1	2.2	15.7
18.	Rajasthan	28.0	4.4	4.8	7.7	55.0
19.	Tamil Nadu+	32.0	18.2	32.0	6.3	11.5
20.	Uttar Pradesh+	16.5	2.6	12.1	5.9	63.0
21.	West Bengal	6.7	17.0	9.9	25.2	41.1
Brothel Based		15.9	6.1	14.6	10.3	53.1
Non Brothel Based		37.2	9.1	17.7	8.0	28.1
<b>All India</b>		<b>28.8</b>	<b>7.9</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>8.9</b>	<b>37.9</b>

Base: All Respondents

### 3.2.4 Residential Status of the Respondents

Table 3.5 reveals that majority of the FSWs in all the states, except Kerala, were living in the same city/town where the interviews were conducted. In Kerala, about 46% of the respondents originated from outside the city.

Overall, about 32% of the respondents reported to be living in the city/ town, where the interview was conducted, since birth. The proportion of respondents living since birth in the city/ town, where the interview was conducted was highest in Madhya Pradesh (80%). The fact that less than 3% of the FSWs of West Bengal, Goa, Maharashtra and Delhi reportedly living in the city where they regularly practiced sex, from birth, reflects a high degree of mobility and non-indigenous population composition engaged in commercial sex work. A higher proportion of non-brothel based FSWs were living in the city/town since birth than brothel based FSWs (36% and 26% respectively).

Overall, one-fourth of the FSWs were engaged in this profession before migrating to the city/town where the interview was conducted. As high as about 55% of the respondents in Karnataka reportedly engaged in this profession before migrating, followed by Orissa (47%), Andhra Pradesh (45%) and Manipur (37%).

Overall, one- third of the respondents reported travelling to other places for sex work. Non-brothel based FSWs were more likely than brothel based FSWs to travel to other places for sex work (42% and 20% respectively). The mobility of FSWs was found to be especially high in Orissa (87%), Andhra Pradesh (73%) and Karnataka (63%). Of all the states, the lowest mobility was in Madhya Pradesh (less than 1 %), Uttar Pradesh (7%) and West Bengal (11%).

The proportion of non-brothel based FSWs in the Delhi control group that traveled to other places for sex work was 59% as compared with 21% in the brothel-based group. However, the proportion of brothel based FSWs in the Andhra Pradesh control group that traveled to other places for sex work was 52% compared to 73% among the non-brothel based group. Thus there were significant differences between control and other populations reflecting differences between brothel and non-brothel based FSW in this regard, which cannot just be attributed to the residential status, but may be more related to the type of FSW.

### 3.2.5 Additional Source of Income

Table 3.6 indicates that for the entire country 33% of non-brothel based sex workers had an additional source of income apart from sex work. However, the inter-state variations show that as high as 62% of the non-brothel based FSWs in Jammu and Kashmir had other sources of income. Other states where a significant proportion of respondents had additional sources of income were Assam (57%), Manipur (46%), Punjab (44%), Haryana and Karnataka (about 40%).

Other North Eastern States (19%) and Andhra Pradesh (17%) were the only two states where the proportion of non-brothel based sex workers who had an additional source of income was below 20%.

**Table 3.5: Residential Status and Mobility Pattern of the Respondents**  
(All figure are in percentage)

Sl.No	State/State Group	Live in the City/Town	Live in the City/Town since Birth	Engaged in this profession before coming here	Travel to other places for sex work
1.	Andhra Pradesh	94.6	41.2	45.2	73.1
2.	Assam	83.7	0.0	20.4	23.3
3.	Bihar+	96.9	42.4	16.0	12.8
4.	Delhi	98.9	0.7	18.6	21.2
5.	Goa	95.6	1.9	20.7	19.6
6.	Gujarat	86.8	34.4	18.1	31.3
7.	Haryana	91.1	35.9	16.3	16.3
8.	Himachal Pradesh	84.5	38.4	18.8	43.2
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	93.0	52.6	18.4	43.9
10.	Karnataka	80.5	33.0	55.1	63.3
11.	Kerala	54.4	25.2	30.4	42.6
12.	Madhya Pradesh +	96.0	80.4	4.3	0.4
13.	Maharashtra	98.9	1.5	22.7	4.5
14.	Manipur	85.0	39.7	37.1	47.2
15.	Orissa	98.9	22.4	46.7	86.8
16.	Other NE States+	84.2	42.3	19.9	27.2
17.	Punjab	88.4	30.3	21.3	52.1
18.	Rajasthan	91.5	56.8	21.0	41.7
19.	Tamil Nadu+	93.3	46.1	14.9	39.4
20.	Uttar Pradesh+	97.4	51.3	18.3	6.6
21.	West Bengal	100.0	2.1	25.5	10.6
Brothel Based		97.8	25.6	21.6	20.2
Non Brothel Based		85.2	35.9	26.2	41.8
<b>All India</b>		<b>90.2</b>	<b>31.8</b>	<b>24.4</b>	<b>33.3</b>

Base: All Respondents

**Table 3.6: Additional Sources of Income of Respondents (For Only Non Brothel Based Sex Workers)**

(All figure are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/State Group	Reported Additional Source of Income	Main Occupation **					
			Work as maid servant	Work as bar girl	Work in a beauty/massage parlor	Work in an office	Have a petty business	Work as a factory worker
1.	Andhra Pradesh	16.5	4.7	0.4	0.4	0.7	6.5	3.6
2.	Assam	56.7	23.7	1.1	0.7	1.5	27	13.3
3.	Bihar+	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
4.	Delhi	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
5.	Goa	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
6.	Gujarat	32.3	11.8	0.3	0.0	0.3	3.1	7.3
7.	Haryana	41.0	7.8	0.0	1.1	13	4.8	1.1
8.	Himachal Pradesh	28.4	7.7	0.0	3.7	11.4	4.1	0.0
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	62.3	14.9	0.0	2.6	8.8	14	21.9
10.	Karnataka	39.7	9.7	0.4	1.5	3.4	13.5	10.1
11.	Kerala	22.2	6.3	0.0	1.1	2.2	2.2	5.9
12.	Madhya Pradesh +	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
13.	Maharashtra	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
14.	Manipur	45.7	1.5	0.4	0.4	0.7	41.2	3
15.	Orissa	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
16.	Other NE States+	19.2	5.5	2.6	1.1	2.9	5.1	1.1
17.	Punjab	44.0	13.1	0.0	2.2	20.2	6.7	0.7
18.	Rajasthan	32.1	6.6	0.4	0.4	1.1	3	11.8
19.	Tamil Nadu+	37.2	20.1	1.5	0.4	1.9	4.1	5.2
20.	Uttar Pradesh+	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
21.	West Bengal	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
<b>All India</b>		<b>33.3</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>3.5</b>

Base: All Respondents

\* Note: States having only brothel based sex workers

\*\*Base: NBB Respondents who reported Additional Source of Income

Across the country among the respondents who reported additional sources of income, the proportion of those who had a petty business was the highest (6.2%) followed by those who reported working as maid servants (6.1%). Factory workers comprised

3.5%, those who worked in an office 3.0%, those who worked in a beauty/massage parlor were 0.7% and bar girls were 0.3%.

In each state, varied trends of alternative occupations of FSWs were observed. There was considerable heterogeneity in the type of remunerative occupation

### 3.2.6 Use of alcohol and drugs

All FSWs interviewed across the states covered under the study were asked whether they had ever consumed alcohol. The pattern of current alcohol consumption was also elicited (last 4 weeks). They were also asked whether they had ever taken any drug or injected any non-medical / illegal drug in last 12 months.

#### *Use of alcohol*

Table 3.7 indicates that overall, nearly 44% of the FSWs interviewed reported that they had at some point of time consumed alcohol. Ever consumption of alcohol was higher among non-brothel based FSWs than brothel based FSWs (48% and 39% respectively). This was low in the states of Jammu & Kashmir (6%), Uttar Pradesh (9%) and Bihar (15%). High consumption of alcohol was reported from West Bengal (76%), Manipur (74%), Andhra Pradesh (73%), Tamil Nadu (68%) and Goa (65%).

Overall, about 22% of FSWs reported consuming alcohol everyday during last 4 weeks. The proportion of respondents reporting intake of alcohol at least once a week during last 4 weeks of the survey was found to be significantly high (38%). The proportion of brothel based FSWs consuming alcohol daily was lower than non-brothel based FSW. Overall, about 14% of respondents reported that they did not drink in the last 4 weeks prior to the survey.

About 15% of FSWs who had reported ever consuming alcohol in any form, reported to be drinking it always before having sex and about 46% of the FSWs had reported that they consumed alcohol sometimes before having sex. Overall, one-tenth of the respondents reported that they had never taken alcohol before having sex (Table 3.7). Nearly double the proportion of non-brothel based FSWs always consumed alcohol before sex compared with brothel based FSWs (18% and 9%) and a higher proportion of brothel based FSWs had never taken alcohol before having sex than non-brothel based FSWs (20% and 5% respectively).

The proportion of non-brothel based FSW who ever consumed alcohol, in the Mumbai control group was 60% as compared with only 26% in the brothel based FSW group from Maharashtra. Similarly, the proportion of non-brothel based FSWs in the Delhi control group that always consumed alcohol before sex was 13% as compared with only 2% in the brothel based FSW group interviewed in Delhi.

**Table 3.7: Alcohol Intake by the FSW**

(All figure are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/State Group	% Reporting Ever Drinking	Of those reporting ever drinking				
			% Drinking Daily*	% Drinking at least Once Week*	% Drinking in frequently*	% Regularly Drinking before Sex*	% Occasionally Drinking before Sex*
1.	Andhra Pradesh	73.1	38.2	45.6	16.1	25.5	74.0
2.	Assam	29.3	31.6	49.4	19.0	24.1	73.4
3.	Bihar+	14.9	7.0	39.5	53.5	4.7	67.5
4.	Delhi	45.4	8.2	30.3	61.5	1.6	68.8
5.	Goa	65.2	16.5	47.2	36.4	4.0	69.9
6.	Gujarat	27.4	21.5	39.2	38.0	12.7	68.3
7.	Haryana	36.3	14.3	25.5	60.2	8.2	90.9
8.	Himachal Pradesh	36.9	2.0	12.0	86.0	1.0	87.0
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	6.1	0.0	42.9	57.2	0.0	100.0
10.	Karnataka	61.4	39.6	29.9	29.9	20.7	75.6
11.	Kerala	57.8	23.7	15.4	60.9	19.9	75.7
12.	Madhya Pradesh +	29.7	20.7	48.8	30.5	18.3	64.7
13.	Maharashtra	26.4	15.5	32.4	52.1	7.0	66.2
14.	Manipur	73.8	37.1	45.2	17.3	36.0	63.4
15.	Orissa	43.4	35.6	44.1	19.5	25.4	66.1
16.	Other NE States+	62.9	24.0	51.5	24.6	21.6	74.3
17.	Punjab	43.1	2.6	19.1	78.3	3.5	80.8
18.	Rajasthan	21.4	6.9	25.9	63.8	6.9	74.2
19.	Tamil Nadu+	67.7	26.4	35.2	38.4	11.5	84.6
20.	Uttar Pradesh+	8.8	25.0	16.7	58.4	12.5	54.2
21.	West Bengal	76.2	10.2	54.4	35.3	7.0	81.4
Brothel Based		38.7	16.5	43.8	39.6	9.3	70.7
Non Brothel Based		47.7	25.3	34.4	40.0	18.1	76.4
<b>All India</b>		<b>44.2</b>	<b>22.2</b>	<b>37.7</b>	<b>39.9</b>	<b>15.1</b>	<b>74.4</b>

Base: All Respondents; \* Base: Those respondents reporting ever drinking

### ***Use of Drug /Injecting Drugs***

At the national level, very few FSWs had ever tried any addictive drug (6%). This proportion was higher among non-brothel based FSWs compared to brothel based FSWs (8% and 3% respectively). In some of the states drug use was relatively high. These states are Manipur (30%), other NE states (14%) and Punjab (14%). About one-fifth of the respondents in Manipur had tried Heroin and 9 % of them had taken Ganja. (Table 3.8).

All those who ever tried any drug for "Type of Drugs Tried" and "Injected Drug in Past 12 months"

Information about injecting drugs was collected only from those respondents who had ever used any type of intoxicating drugs and is also presented in Table 3.8. The Table also indicates that almost a third of FSWs who had ever tried any drug had taken some injectable drug in the 12 months prior to the survey. The proportion of non-brothel based FSWs was 38% as compared with 6% brothel based FSWs who had injected drugs in the past 12 months. As high as 64% of FSWs who had ever used drugs in Manipur had injected drugs in past 12 months prior to the survey followed by 63% in Other NE states and 42% in Karnataka. These percentages should be interpreted with caution, as bases are small.

The proportion of non-brothel based FSWs in the Delhi control group that ever tried any addictive drugs was 23% as compared with only 3% in the Delhi brothel based FSW group.

### **3.3 Awareness of HIV/AIDS**

This section focuses on the respondent's awareness about the modes of transmission and prevention from HIV/AIDS. It also discusses the misconceptions that exist among FSWs.

#### **3.3.1 Ever Heard of HIV/AIDS**

Proportion of FSWs who had ever heard of HIV/AIDS was high (94 %)(Table 3.9).

*Other modes of transmission*

#### **3.3.2 Awareness of prevention through consistent condom use**

Overall, about 83 % of respondents were aware of consistent and correct use of condoms as a mode of prevention from HIV/AIDS. Nearly 90% brothel based FSWs were aware of this mode of prevention as compared with 78% non-brothel based FSWs. States in which awareness was reported to be relatively higher were Tamil Nadu (99%), Maharashtra (98%), Goa (95%) and Delhi (94 %). (Table 3.9)

**Table 3.8: Drug Use by FSW**

(All figure are in percentage)

Sl.No.	State/State Group	Ever Tried Any Drug	Type of Drugs tried				Injected Drugs in Past 12 months of those who tried any dug
			Ganja	Bhang	Afim	Charas	
1.	Andhra Pradesh	6.1	3.6	0.7	0.0	1.4	35.3
2.	Assam	3.0	1.9	1.9	0.7	0.0	0.0
3.	Bihar+	2.1	0.7	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
4.	Delhi	2.6	1.9	0.7	0.0	1.9	0.0
5.	Goa	1.5	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0
6.	Gujarat	1.4	0.7	0.3	0.0	1.0	0.0
7.	Haryana	7.4	3.0	3.3	0.4	1.5	15.0
8.	Himachal Pradesh	4.4	0.4	2.6	1.1	0.7	16.7
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10.	Karnataka	4.5	1.5	1.1	0.0	0.7	41.7
11.	Kerala	5.6	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	26.7
12.	Madhya Pradesh +	1.4	0.0	0.4	0.7	0.0	25
13.	Maharashtra	1.1	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
14.	Manipur	30.3	8.6	0.7	1.9	0.0	64.2
15.	Orissa	10.3	0.4	7.0	2.6	0.0	7.1
16.	Other NE States+	14.0	9.6	0.7	1.1	2.6	63.2
17.	Punjab	13.9	0.4	8.2	7.1	1.5	13.5
18.	Rajasthan	5.5	1.8	2.2	0.4	0.7	6.7
19.	Tamil Nadu+	5.6	4.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.3
20.	Uttar Pradesh+	2.9	0.7	2.2	0.0	0.0	12.5
21.	West Bengal	1.1	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Brothel Based		2.9	0.6	1.6	0.4	0.3	<b>6.3</b>
Non Brothel Based		8.1	3.2	1.7	1.0	0.8	<b>38.0</b>
<b>All India</b>		<b>6</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>32.0</b>

Base: All Respondents for "Ever Tried Any Drug"



**Table 3.9: Awareness of HIV/AIDS and methods of preventing HIV Infection**  
(All figure are in percentage)

Sl.No	State/State Group	Ever heard of HIV/AIDS	Awareness About Different Methods of Prevention		Knowing both the methods of prevention i.e. consistent condom use and having faithful uninfected partner
			Consistent and Correct condom use	Having one uninfected faithful sex partner	
1.	Andhra Pradesh	97.1	85.3	86.0	74.6
2.	Assam	96.7	74.8	75.5	68.9
3.	Bihar+	87.8	79.2	83.4	67.4
4.	Delhi	98.9	94.4	68.8	66.2
5.	Goa	97.4	95.2	79.8	77.0
6.	Gujarat	84.0	83.0	83.5	69.4
7.	Haryana	79.3	60.4	69.2	46.7
8.	Himachal Pradesh	97.0	70.1	75.3	65.7
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	89.5	70.2	75.5	63.2
10.	Karnataka	88.0	74.9	60.9	46.8
11.	Kerala	98.9	87.0	68.2	63.0
12.	Madhya Pradesh +	92.8	84.8	74.6	63.0
13.	Maharashtra	98.9	97.8	78.9	77.0
14.	Manipur	97.4	82.4	79.2	67.0
15.	Orissa	92.3	83.8	78.9	66.5
16.	Other NE States+	87.9	78.3	79.9	63.6
17.	Punjab	90.6	74.2	71.1	55.4
18.	Rajasthan	93.7	71.2	69.7	52.0
19.	Tamil Nadu+	99.3	98.9	79.4	77.7
20.	Uttar Pradesh+	95.6	92.3	72.8	66.3
21.	West Bengal	99.3	90.4	84.6	79.8
Brothel Based		95.3	89.6	77.8	70.4
Non Brothel Based		92.4	78.1	75.0	62.7
<b>All India</b>		<b>93.5</b>	<b>82.7</b>	<b>76.1</b>	<b>65.7</b>

Base: All Respondents

### 3.3.3 Awareness of prevention through one faithful uninfected sex partner

Table 3.9 indicates that overall, only about 76% of respondents were aware that a person could be protected from HIV/AIDS, if he/she had one faithful and uninfected sexual partner. Awareness was relatively lower in the states of Karnataka, Kerala, Delhi, Haryana, Rajasthan, Punjab and Uttar Pradesh.

The proportion of brothel based FSWs in the Andhra Pradesh control group that were aware that having a faithful and uninfected partner can protect from HIV was 86% as compared with 65% in the Andhra Pradesh non-brothel based FSW group. However, the proportion of non-brothel based FSWs in the Mumbai control group that were aware that having a faithful and uninfected partner can protect from HIV was 94% as compared with 79% in the Maharashtra brothel based group

### 3.3.4 Knowing both the method of prevention

Table 3.9 indicates that overall, about 66% of respondents knew both the methods of prevention i.e. consistent condom use and having faithful and uninfected sexual

partner. Nearly 70% brothel based FSWs were aware of both modes of prevention as compared with 63% non-brothel based FSWs. The awareness level of respondents about both methods of prevention was high in West Bengal (80%), Tamil Nadu, Maharashtra, Goa (77%) and Andhra Pradesh (75%). It was relatively lower in Haryana, Karnataka (47%), Rajasthan (52%) and Punjab (56%).

### 3.3.5 Correct Awareness on common misconceptions regarding HIV/AIDS transmission

Table 3.10 illustrates that overall, about 63 % of respondents were aware that a person could not get HIV by sharing a meal with an infected person. This awareness level was high in Manipur (88%), Goa (85%), Tamil Nadu (83%), Rajasthan (81%) and Maharashtra (79%). It was low in Madhya Pradesh (37%), Haryana (39%), Punjab (44%) and Himachal Pradesh (49%).

Overall, nearly two-thirds of the FSWs were aware that, mosquito bites do not transmit HIV. FSW in Tamil Nadu (93%) had the highest proportion of respondents who were aware of this aspect. The awareness level was relatively lower in Himachal Pradesh (40%), Punjab (43%), West Bengal (51%) and Madhya Pradesh (52%).

Among brothel based FSWs the awareness that a healthy looking person could be suffering from HIV was higher than among non-brothel based FSWs (63% and 55% respectively). The awareness that a healthy looking person could be suffering from HIV was high in Orissa (83%), other NE states (72%), Kerala, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal (71%). The awareness level was low in Himachal Pradesh (26%), Jammu and Kashmir (32%) and Rajasthan (37%).

Complete correct awareness about HIV transmission was defined as the proportion of total respondents who correctly identified the following

**Table 3.10: Correct Belief about HIV Transmission**

(All figure are in percentage)

Sl.No	State/State Group	Proportion Aware that HIV is not transmitted through		Proportion Aware that a healthy looking person could be infected with HIV	Proportion of Respondents correctly identifying all three issues
		Sharing a meal with infected person	From mosquito bites		
1.	Andhra Pradesh	69.4	64.2	64.2	31.2
2.	Assam	65.5	57.9	67.8	32.2
3.	Bihar+	53.4	71.9	63.2	25.7
4.	Delhi	73.3	72.6	55.6	33.1
5.	Goa	85.9	76.0	54.8	38.5
6.	Gujarat	57.9	69.0	51.7	19.4
7.	Haryana	39.3	50.9	31.8	12.2
8.	Himachal Pradesh	49.0	39.9	26.2	7.7
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	67.6	76.5	32.4	21.1
10.	Karnataka	54.5	77.0	50.6	21.7
11.	Kerala	60.7	70.4	71.2	41.5
12.	Madhya Pradesh +	37.1	52.3	51.2	12.0
13.	Maharashtra	78.9	68.0	64.3	37.2
14.	Manipur	87.7	71.9	67.7	47.6
15.	Orissa	54.2	61.8	83.3	32.0
16.	Other NE States+	54.8	70.3	72.4	31.6
17.	Punjab	43.8	43.4	46.3	18.0
18.	Rajasthan	80.7	73.2	36.6	22.5
19.	Tamil Nadu+	83.5	93.3	71.2	60.6
20.	Uttar Pradesh+	62.5	75.1	64.0	28.6
21.	West Bengal	64.3	51.1	71.1	32.3
Brothel Based		63.9	66.0	63.4	29.8
Non Brothel Based		63.0	65.7	54.5	28.5
<b>All India</b>		<b>63.4</b>	<b>65.8</b>	<b>58.1</b>	<b>29.0</b>

Base: All Respondents

1. HIV is not transmitted through mosquito bites
2. HIV is not transmitted through sharing meal with any infected person
3. Healthy looking person may already be suffering from HIV

Table 3.10 further shows that overall, 29 % of the respondents had complete correct awareness on these aspects and accepted that a healthy looking person could be infected with HIV. This proportion was relatively high in Tamil Nadu (61%), Manipur (48%), Kerala (41%) and Goa (38%). It was low in Himachal Pradesh (8%), Haryana, Madhya Pradesh (12%), Punjab (18%) and Gujarat (19%).

The proportion of non-brothel based FSWs in the West Bengal control group that were aware that mosquito bites do not transmit HIV was 28% as compared with 41% in the brothel based group. The proportion of non-brothel based FSWs in the Delhi control group that were aware that a healthy looking person may be suffering from HIV was 28% as compared with 56% in the brothel based group, and only 14% in the non brothel FSW group were aware of all three issues as compared with 33% among the brothel based FSW of Delhi. These findings reinforce the hypothesis that non brothel based FSW, irrespective of the geographic location were more disadvantaged in relation to awareness on many aspects of transmission and prevention of HIV compared to the brothel based FSW, who may have more exposure to NGO interventional projects and are a more 'captive' group.

### **3.4 Awareness of STD, STD occurrence and Treatment Seeking Behaviour**

This section gives information about the awareness level of respondents about STD, symptoms of STD in men and women and whether the respondent had suffered from any type of STD during the last 12 months preceding the survey and if yes, their treatment seeking behavior.

#### **3.4.1 Ever Heard of STD**

Overall, about 83 % of the respondents reported that they had ever heard of sexually transmitted diseases identified by awareness of symptoms like genital discharge, genital ulcer/sore, pain during intercourse, lower abdominal pain or burning pain during urination.

The proportion of respondents being aware of any STD was lowest in Karnataka (48%), followed by Jammu and Kashmir (58%) and other NE states. The awareness of STD was very high in West Bengal (100%), Tamil Nadu (99%), Himachal Pradesh (98%), Gujarat (96%), Kerala (95%) and Delhi (93%). (Table 3.11)

The proportion of brothel based FSWs in the Andhra Pradesh control group that were aware of STD was 72% as compared with 86% in the non-brothel based study group and the proportion of non-brothel based FSWs in the Mumbai control group that were aware of STD was 76% as compared with 93% in the brothel based study group.

#### **3.4.2 Awareness of STD symptoms**

The respondents who were aware of STDs were asked whether they were aware of any other important symptoms of STDs among women and men separately. Table 3.11 reveals that in most of the states, most respondents (above 70%) could describe

'swellings in groin area' or 'warts' as symptoms of STDs. However in states like other NE states, Karnataka, Goa, Jammu and Kashmir, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Manipur and Maharashtra, the awareness level of respondents about the other symptoms of STD among women was relatively lower.

The awareness about the male symptoms of STD was lower than the awareness of the female's STD symptoms. Overall, about 68 % of the respondents were aware of any one symptom of STD among men (Warts, genital swellings). The corresponding proportion was low in other NE states (32%), Karnataka (34%), Goa (46%), Madhya Pradesh (48%), Jammu and Kashmir (51%), Haryana (57%), Manipur (58%) and Maharashtra (59%). However, the awareness level of STD symptoms in men were relatively better in the remaining states as more than 60 % of the respondents reported the same. (Table 3.11)

The proportion of brothel based FSWs in the Andhra Pradesh control group that were aware of STD symptoms in women was 71% as compared with 86% in the non-brothel based study group and the corresponding proportions for awareness of symptoms among men was 60% and 78% respectively. The proportion of non-brothel based FSWs in the Mumbai control group that were aware of STD was 76% as compared with 89% in the brothel based study group and the corresponding proportions for awareness of symptoms among men was 70% and 81%. Thus the differences between the brothel and non-brothel based FSW varied across the country.

### 3.4.3 STD Prevalence

The survey also elicited information on self-reported prevalence of STDs among FSWs. All the respondents were asked whether they suffered from genital discharge, genital ulcer / sore, pain during intercourse, lower abdominal pain or burning pain during urination during the last 12 months preceding the survey.

Table 3.12 indicates that overall, 46 % of the respondents had suffered from any one symptom of STD during past 12 months prior to the survey. A higher proportion of non-brothel based FSWs (56%) were suffering from symptoms of STD as compared to brothel based FSWs (30%). Table 3.12 further shows that overall, the proportion of FSWs suffering from more than one symptom of STD was 31%. A higher proportion of non-brothel based FSWs (39%) were suffering from more than one symptom of STD as compared with brothel based FSWs (19%).

Overall, about 23% of the respondents had suffered from either genital discharge or genital ulcer during the last one year prior to the survey. A higher proportion of non-brothel based FSWs (28%) were suffering from genital discharge or genital ulcer/sore as compared with brothel based FSWs (14%). Relatively a small proportion of FSWs reported such problems in Uttar Pradesh (4%), Goa (5%), Maharashtra (7%), Bihar (8%), Madhya Pradesh (12%) and Other NE states (15%) as compared to remaining states where a comparatively high proportion of FSWs, ranging from 18% in Kerala to 40% in Haryana reported similar STD symptoms. (Table 3.12)

**Table 3.11: Awareness of STD and STD symptoms among WOMEN**

(All figure are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/State Group	Ever heard of STD	Aware of other symptoms in WOMEN like Swelling in Groin Area and Warts	Aware of other symptoms in MEN like Swelling in Groin Area, Warts, Can't Retract Foreskin
1.	Andhra Pradesh	86.0	86.0	75.6
2.	Assam	88.1	88.1	68.9
3.	Bihar+	81.6	81.6	69.4
4.	Delhi	93.3	93.3	81.8
5.	Goa	63.3	63.3	46.3
6.	Gujarat	96.2	96.2	80.6
7.	Haryana	90.7	90.7	57.0
8.	Himachal Pradesh	97.8	97.8	94.1
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	57.9	57.9	50.9
10.	Karnataka	48.3	48.3	34.1
11.	Kerala	94.8	94.8	86.3
12.	Madhya Pradesh +	63.4	63.4	48.2
13.	Maharashtra	93.3	93.3	59.9
14.	Manipur	73.0	73.0	58.4
15.	Orissa	86.8	86.8	65.4
16.	Other NE States+	64.3	64.3	32.4
17.	Punjab	85.4	85.4	71.5
18.	Rajasthan	87.5	87.5	75.6
19.	Tamil Nadu+	99.3	99.3	87.7
20.	Uttar Pradesh+	72.9	72.9	68.9
21.	West Bengal	100.0	100.0	95.4
Brothel Based		81.9	69.3	67.0
Non Brothel Based		83.5	71.5	68.0
<b>All India</b>		<b>82.8</b>	<b>82.8</b>	<b>67.6</b>

Base: All Respondents

The proportion of non-brothel based FSWs in the Delhi control group that suffered from any STD symptom was 69% as compared with 59% in the brothel based group and the proportion suffering from more than one symptom was 60% for the control group and 45% for the brothel based FSW. The proportion of non-brothel based FSWs in the Mumbai control group that suffered from any STD symptom was 37% as compared to 30% among the brothel based FSW in Maharashtra.

#### **3.4.4 STD Treatment Seeking Behaviour**

Table 3.13 provides information on those FSWs suffering from STDs who sought informal health treatment or did not take any prescribed treatment. Overall, 14% did not undergo any treatment, while another 14% took home-based remedies. A higher proportion of non-brothel based FSWs (16%) took home based remedies as compared with brothel based FSWs (9%). About 5% borrowed prescriptions from friends or relatives based on self-diagnosis of symptoms and medicated themselves accordingly. Another 5% took medicines already available with them. About 19% bought across the counter medicines from a chemist shop. A higher proportion of non-brothel based FSWs (23%) bought medicines from a chemist shop as compared with brothel based FSWs (8%).

Self-diagnosis based on symptoms and using borrowed prescriptions were mostly seen in Tamil Nadu (16%), Bihar (11%) and other North Eastern states (9%). Taking medicines available at home was found to be higher in Himachal Pradesh (13%), Punjab (11%) and Assam (9%). The proportion of FSWs purchasing medicines from a

Chemist shop was higher for Tamil Nadu (50%), Assam (36%), Kerala (32%) and Haryana (31%).

The proportion of non-brothel based FSWs in the Delhi and Mumbai control group that took home based remedy was 24% and 20% respectively as compared with 5% in the -brothel based FSW groups in Delhi and 4% in the brothel based FSW group in Maharashtra.

Table 3.12: STD Prevalence

(All figure are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/State Group	Suffering from Any one symptom	Suffering from more than one symptom	Suffering from Gen. discharge/ulcer	Suffering from all five symptoms
1.	Andhra Pradesh	63.1	45.5	28.7	1.1
2.	Assam	59.3	39.6	29.3	1.9
3.	Bihar+	15.3	9.7	7.6	1.1
4.	Delhi	58.7	44.6	18.6	0.0
5.	Goa	15.9	7.4	5.2	0.7
6.	Gujarat	59.7	46.5	34.0	1.0
7.	Haryana	68.5	41.5	40.4	1.1
8.	Himachal Pradesh	61.6	36.9	22.1	0.0
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	45.6	39.5	21.1	9.6
10.	Karnataka	60.7	46.8	38.2	0.0
11.	Kerala	44.4	34.4	18.1	2.6
12.	Madhya Pradesh +	22.1	13.8	11.6	0.4
13.	Maharashtra	30.1	17.1	7.1	0.4
14.	Manipur	59.2	49.8	39.0	0.7
15.	Orissa	57.0	40.4	34.9	6.3
16.	Other NE States+	26.1	17.3	15.4	3.3
17.	Punjab	63.7	41.6	27.7	0.0
18.	Rajasthan	59.8	38.4	19.9	1.1
19.	Tamil Nadu+	53.9	30.1	29.7	0.0
20.	Uttar Pradesh+	9.2	2.9	4.4	0.
21.	West Bengal	31.2	17.0	20.6	1.4
Brothel Based		29.8	19.0	13.7	1.3
Non Brothel Based		56.3	39.1	28.3	1.4
<b>All India</b>		<b>45.8</b>	<b>31.2</b>	<b>22.6</b>	<b>1.3</b>

Base: All Respondents



**Table 3.13 STD Treatment Seeking Behavior - No Treatment or went to Informal Health Facility during the Last Episode****(All figure are in percentage)**

Sl.No	State/State Group	No treatment	Took home based remedy	Borrowed prescription from friend/relative	Took medicine I had at home	Purchased medicine from a Chemist shop
1.	Andhra Pradesh	7.4	1.7	8	5.1	33.0
2.	Assam	28.8	23.8	3.1	9.4	35.6
3.	Bihar+	11.4	20.5	11.4	6.8	18.2
4.	Delhi	10.1	5.1	1.9	3.2	8.9
5.	Goa	9.3	20.9	4.7	0.0	2.3
6.	Gujarat	16.3	16.9	6.4	0.0	7.0
7.	Haryana	20.5	15.1	3.2	7.6	31.4
8.	Himachal Pradesh	15.0	25.1	3.0	13.2	22.8
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	9.6	25.0	3.8	1.9	15.4
10.	Karnataka	11.7	6.2	3.7	4.3	11.1
11.	Kerala	0.8	8.3	5.8	4.2	31.7
12.	Madhya Pradesh +	29.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6
13.	Maharashtra	2.5	3.7	0.0	1.2	2.5
14.	Manipur	19.0	12.7	5.7	5.1	19.0
15.	Orissa	15.5	10.3	1.9	2.6	14.8
16.	Other NE States+	15.5	11.3	8.5	2.8	11.3
17.	Punjab	7.1	30.6	2.4	10.6	17.6
18.	Rajasthan	23.5	8.0	1.2	1.9	1.2
19.	Tamil Nadu+	1.4	19.3	15.9	9.0	50.3
20.	Uttar Pradesh+	28.0	12	0.0	4.0	12.0
21.	West Bengal	1.1	11.4	1.1	1.1	1.1
Brothel Based		11.8	8.9	2.1	2.3	8.1
Non Brothel Based		14.1	15.5	5.3	6.2	22.6
<b>All India</b>		<b>13.5</b>	<b>13.8</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>18.9</b>

Base: Those who reported any symptoms of STD in last 12 months  
Multiple responses possible

Table 3.14 indicates that overall, 35 % of the respondents who suffered from any of the STD problems went to a private hospital/clinic for the treatment of the problem for the last episode. About 28 % of such FSWs visited a government hospital and 12 % went to the clinic run by NGOs. A higher proportion of non-brothel based FSWs (6%) went to a traditional healer/quack as compared with brothel based FSWs (2%). However higher proportions of brothel based FSWs went to NGO peer educator/clinic (18%) compared to non- brothel based FSWs (10%). Similar proportions were recorded in seeking treatment from private hospitals (46% and 32%). However more non-brothel based FSWs (30%) went to government hospitals than brothel based FSWs (21%).

State wise analysis shows that FSWs suffering from any STD problems visited private doctors more often during their last episode in Delhi (75%), Bihar (54%), Goa (51%), Himachal Pradesh, Haryana (47%), Maharashtra (68%) and Punjab (44%). However, a significant proportion of FSWs went to government hospital for the treatment of STD in Kerala (50%), Tamil Nadu (48%), Orissa (47%), other NE states (45%), Rajasthan (39%) and Karnataka (36%). About 86 % of the FSWs in West Bengal visited NGO clinic followed by Kerala (43%) and Manipur (25%). As high as about 49% of respondents in Tamil Nadu purchased medicine from a chemist shop when they last suffered from STD.

Table 3.15 shows that overall, about 43 % of the respondents visited a health practitioner within one week and 36 % of them visited the health practitioner in less than a month but more than a week after experiencing the problem on the last occasion.

Overall, the proportion of brothel based FSWs who visited health practitioners within one week was 65% as compared with 35% for non-brothel based FSWs. The corresponding proportions for those who visited the health practitioner in less than a month but more than a week was 21% and 42% respectively (Table 3.15).

The proportion of FSWs visiting a health practitioner within a week was high in Manipur (91%), Delhi, Madhya Pradesh (84%), Goa (82%) and West Bengal (72%). Table 3.15 further reveals that most of the FSWs across all the states had taken allopathic medicines when they last suffered from STD. Higher proportions of non-brothel based FSWs took ayurvedic / herbal medicines than brothel based FSWs (18% and 5% respectively).

The proportion of brothel based FSW who sought medical attention within a week during the last episode of STD was 85% in Delhi, 91% in Maharashtra and 72% in West Bengal compared to 52%, 54% and 46% respectively among non-brothel based FSW control groups in the same states. Similarly, the proportion that visited a practitioner within a week during last episode of STD in the non-brothel based FSW group in Andhra Pradesh was 46% compared to 64% among the brothel based control group. Therefore brothel based FSW seemed to seek attention for their STD related complaints earlier compared to the non-brothel based FSW

**Table 3.14: STD Treatment Seeking Behavior – Went to Health Practitioner during the Last Episode**

(All figure are in percentage)

Sl.No	State/State Group	Went to a traditional healer/quack	Went to NGO peer educator/NGO Clinic	Went to a private hospital/clinic	Went to a Govt.Hospital/ clinic
		%	%	%	%
1.	Andhra Pradesh	0.0	2.8	35.2	28.4
2.	Assam	15.0	7.5	20.6	20.0
3.	Bihar+	15.9	0.0	54.5	9.1
4.	Delhi	0.0	12.7	74.7	11.4
5.	Goa	0.0	4.7	51.2	18.6
6.	Gujarat	0.6	21.5	32.6	30.2
7.	Haryana	9.7	0.0	48.1	10.8
8.	Himachal Pradesh	1.2	0.0	35.3	28.1
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	0.0	1.9	26.9	21.2
10.	Karnataka	4.3	8.0	26.5	35.8
11.	Kerala	9.2	43.3	24.2	50.0
12.	Madhya Pradesh +	0.0	0.0	52.5	16.4
13.	Maharashtra	0.0	7.4	67.9	18.5
14.	Manipur	8.9	25.9	12.7	10.1
15.	Orissa	1.9	8.4	15.5	47.1
16.	Other NE States+	7.0	5.6	21.1	45.1
17.	Punjab	4.7	0.0	44.1	35.9
18.	Rajasthan	6.2	3.1	25.3	38.9
19.	Tamil Nadu+	12.4	9.0	44.1	48.3
20.	Uttar Pradesh+	0.0	0.0	36.0	24.0
21.	West Bengal	0.0	86.4	15.9	5.7
Brothel Based		1.5	17.9	45.5	21.2
Non Brothel Based		6.2	9.6	31.6	30.1
<b>All India</b>		<b>5.0</b>	<b>11.7</b>	<b>35.1</b>	<b>27.8</b>

Base: Those who reported any symptoms of STD in last 12 months

\* Multiple responses possible

**Table 3.15: STD Treatment Seeking Behavior - Time taken to visit a Health Practitioner during the Last Episode and Type of taken Medicine at Last Episode**  
(All figure are in percentage)

Sl.No	State/State Group	Time taken to visit health practitioner			Type of Medicine		
		<=1 week	> 1 Week but <1 month	>1 month	Allopathic	Homeopathic	Ayurvedic/ Herbal
1.	Andhra Pradesh	46.1	36.4	7.9	90.3	1.7	9.1
2.	Assam	26.3	36.8	25.4	60.0	2.5	26.9
3.	Bihar+	46.2	51.3	2.6	86.4	4.5	6.8
4.	Delhi	84.5	12.7	2.8	88.6	0.6	4.4
5.	Goa	82.1	5.1	2.6	65.1	9.3	11.6
6.	Gujarat	24.1	26.9	48.3	79.1	0.6	5.2
7.	Haryana	34.0	46.9	18.4	74.6	2.7	4.9
8.	Himachal Pradesh	34.5	50.7	7.0	77.2	0.0	30.5
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	17.0	36.2	36.2	59.6	7.7	25.0
10.	Karnataka	33.6	51.0	12.6	75.9	2.5	9.3
11.	Kerala	50.4	37.0	12.6	96.7	6.7	13.3
12.	Madhya Pradesh +	83.7	11.6	4.7	70.5	0.0	0.0
13.	Maharashtra	91.1	3.8	3.8	86.4	9.9	1.2
14.	Manipur	29.7	33.6	33.6	63.3	13.9	10.8
15.	Orissa	19.8	35.9	35.9	79.4	1.3	3.9
16.	Other NE States+	40.0	46.7	8.3	74.6	1.4	7.0
17.	Punjab	36.7	44.9	15.8	82.9	1.2	26.5
18.	Rajasthan	28.8	41.6	21.6	70.4	1.2	11.1
19.	Tamil Nadu+	38.5	53.8	7.0	93.1	7.6	22.1
20.	Uttar Pradesh+	44.4	38.9	5.6	68.0	0.0	8.0
21.	West Bengal	72.4	20.7	6.9	98.9	0.0	3.4
Brothel Based		64.9	20.8	11.2	94.5	2.9	4.7
Non Brothel Based		34.7	42.0	18.9	89.9	4.1	17.7
<b>All India</b>		<b>42.5</b>	<b>36.4</b>	<b>16.9</b>	<b>78.9</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>12.4</b>

Base: Those who reported any or all symptoms of STD in last 12 months

When respondents were asked to cite a source that they would prefer for STD treatment for any likely episodes in the future, 46 % of the FSW stated that they would prefer private hospital/clinic and about 37 % preferred government hospitals. More brothel based FSWs preferred NGO peer educators (12%) as compared with non-brothel based FSWs (6%)

A higher proportion of non-brothel based FSWs preferred to visit a government hospital (43%) as compared to brothel based FSWs (28%). A majority of FSW, (ranging from 66 % to 81 %), preferred private hospital/clinic in Uttar Pradesh, Goa, Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh, Bihar and Delhi whereas, about 45 % to 57 % of respondents preferred government hospital/clinic in Assam, Madhya Pradesh, Punjab, Karnataka, Kerala, Jammu and Kashmir and Rajasthan. Majority of the respondents in West Bengal preferred to be treated by NGO peers/clinic (80%) (Table 3.16)

### 3.4 Sexual Behaviour and Condom Usage

This section presents information about age at first sex and the age at which the FSW first started sex work. Also presented are the degree of high-risk behavior in terms of multiple partners (paying and non-paying) and the use of condoms as protective measures. To avoid the problem of a recall bias, data was only captured for a week's time frame, i.e. the week preceding the date of the survey. Thus data is presented on number of paying clients as well as non-paying partners in past 7 days, number of paying clients on last working day, condom use with paying client as well as non-paying partners, persons suggesting use of condom, type of condom brands used at last sex, source and reason of not using condom with paying client as well as non-paying partners.

#### 3.5.1 Age at First Sex

Table 3.17 indicates that the age at first sex was below 16 years for 27% of the FSWs. A higher proportion of brothel based FSWs (37%) had first sex below the age of 16 years as compared with non-brothel based FSWs. Nearly half (49%) of the non-brothel based FSWs were between 16-18 years at the time of first sex. In Maharashtra and Manipur, the minimum age at first sex was reported as 7 years. These individuals seemed to be exploited as young children. Only 0.6% reported that they had first sex beyond 25 years of age.

Overall, the median age at first sex was 17 years. The age at first sex appeared to be higher in those states with higher literacy. The lowest median age at first sex was found to be 15 years in West Bengal and Orissa.

As far as the mean age at first sex is concerned, there was no significant differences between the brothel based FSW and non-brothel based groups in Delhi, Maharashtra, West Bengal and Andhra Pradesh.

**Table 3.16: Preferred Treatment Source for Future Episodes of STD**  
(All figure are in percentage)

Sl.No	State/State Group	Would go to a private hospital/ clinic	Would go to a Govt.Hospital/clinic	Would go to a NGO peer educator/ NGO Clinic	Would purchase medicine from a Chemist shop	Take home based remedy
1.	Andhra Pradesh	68.8	23.3	1.8	1.8	0.0
2.	Assam	8.1	69.6	2.2	11.5	5.9
3.	Bihar+	78.8	14.9	0.0	2.8	0.3
4.	Delhi	80.7	15.6	2.2	0.4	0.0
5.	Goa	67.8	23.3	4.8	0.0	3.7
6.	Gujarat	48.6	31.6	16.0	0.7	1.7
7.	Haryana	56.3	31.5	0.0	3.3	2.6
8.	Himachal Pradesh	53.1	39.5	0.0	1.1	1.1
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	25.4	55.3	0.0	1.8	5.3
10.	Karnataka	33.0	48.7	3.0	3.4	1.5
11.	Kerala	24.4	49.6	22.2	0.7	0.7
12.	Madhya Pradesh +	52.9	45.3	0.0	0.4	1.4
13.	Maharashtra	68.0	23.8	7.4	0.0	0.4
14.	Manipur	15.7	28.8	24.3	9.7	6.7
15.	Orissa	17.6	68.8	2.9	4.4	3.3
16.	Other NE States+	32.7	54.0	5.1	2.6	1.8
17.	Punjab	50.6	45.3	0.0	0.7	0.7
18.	Rajasthan	29.2	57.2	2.6	0.7	3.7
19.	Tamil Nadu+	55.4	35.7	1.9	1.1	1.5
20.	Uttar Pradesh+	66.3	27.5	0.0	0.7	3.3
21.	West Bengal	13.1	7.1	79.8	0.0	0.0
Brothel Based		55.6	28.1	12.4	1.1	1.5
Non Brothel Based		39.3	43.2	6.4	3.1	2.4
<b>All India</b>		<b>45.7</b>	<b>37.3</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>2.1</b>

Base: All Respondents

**Table 3.17: Age at First Sex**

(All figure are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/State Group	Age at the time of first sex					Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Range	
		<15	16-18	19-21	22-25	25+				Minimum	Maximum
1.	Andhra Pradesh	23.3	63.4	10.8	2.5	0.0	16.8	2.1	17.0	11	24
2.	Assam	38.1	40.7	15.2	5.6	0.4	16.8	2.6	16.0	13	26
3.	Bihar+	43.1	36.1	15.6	4.9	0.3	16.6	2.6	16.0	12	26
4.	Delhi	21.6	48.3	26.4	3.3	0.4	17.4	2.4	18.0	12	25
5.	Goa	35.9	38.5	19.6	5.2	0.7	17.0	2.8	17.0	11	29
6.	Gujarat	21.9	43.1	28.8	6.3	0.0	17.6	2.5	18.0	12	25
7.	Haryana	40.4	47.8	10	1.9	0.0	16.1	2.0	16.0	12	22
8.	Himachal Pradesh	6.3	55.4	35.4	3.0	0.0	18.1	1.9	18.0	9	24
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	16.7	32.5	43.0	7.9	0.0	18.1	2.4	19.0	14	23
10.	Karnataka	21.0	59.9	16.5	2.6	0.0	17.0	2.0	17.0	12	24
11.	Kerala	20.0	38.1	27.4	10.7	3.7	18.2	3.4	18.0	10	31
12.	Madhya Pradesh +	39.1	40.2	15.9	4.3	0.4	16.6	2.5	16.0	10	25
13.	Maharashtra	30.9	39.4	19.0	10.4	0.4	17.4	3.2	17.0	7	30
14.	Manipur	18.0	31.8	36.7	11.6	1.9	18.5	3.1	19.0	7	27
15.	Orissa	50.7	34.9	11.4	1.1	1.8	16.0	2.6	15.0	10	29
16.	Other NE States+	11.0	50.7	30.5	7.0	0.7	18.1	2.3	18.0	13	26
17.	Punjab	13.5	56.6	25.1	4.9	0.0	17.6	2.1	17.0	13	25
18.	Rajasthan	34.3	58.3	6.6	0.4	0.4	16.2	1.7	16.0	12	22
19.	Tamil Nadu+	4.1	47.2	36.8	11.9	0.0	18.8	2.3	18.0	12	25
20.	Uttar Pradesh+	16.1	46.5	27.1	10.3	0.0	18.1	2.6	18.0	12	25
21.	West Bengal	59.9	23.4	11.3	3.5	1.8	15.9	3.0	15.0	11	30
	Brothel Based	37.3	38.3	18.2	5.4	0.7	16.9	2.8	16.0	7	30
	Non Brothel Based	20.9	48.9	24.0	5.7	0.6	17.5	2.5	17.0	7	31
	<b>All India</b>	<b>27.4</b>	<b>44.7</b>	<b>21.7</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>17.3</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>17.0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>31</b>

Base: All Respondents

**Table 3.18: Age when First Started Sex Work**

(All figure are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/State Group	Age at which First Started Sex Work					Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Range	
		< 15	16-18	19-21	22-25	25+				Minimum	Maximum
1.	Andhra Pradesh	10.8	27.6	24.7	27.6	9.3	20.3	4.0	20.0	11	31
2.	Assam	4.4	24.1	25.6	27.8	18.1	21.8	4.9	21.0	13	41
3.	Bihar+	29.5	36.8	17.4	11.8	4.5	18.0	3.7	17.0	10	31
4.	Delhi	4.8	28.6	44.2	18.6	3.7	19.7	2.9	20.0	12	30
5.	Goa	7.8	25.6	29.3	27.8	9.6	20.7	4.1	20.0	12	39
6.	Gujarat	4.9	11.1	18.8	36.8	28.5	23.4	4.8	23.5	12	40
7.	Haryana	7.0	14.1	25.2	27.0	26.7	22.2	4.3	22.0	13	34
8.	Himachal Pradesh	0.7	12.9	28.0	44.6	13.7	22.2	3.0	22.0	15	29
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	4.4	22.8	30.7	32.5	9.6	20.9	3.4	21.0	14	30
10.	Karnataka	3.4	21.0	33.7	28.8	13.1	21.3	3.6	21.0	10	31
11.	Kerala	1.9	7.8	20.4	24.8	45.2	25.1	5.6	25.0	10	42
12.	Madhya Pradesh +	28.3	38.4	23.6	8.0	1.8	17.8	5.2	17.0	13	30
13.	Maharashtra	10.0	30.5	34.6	20.8	4.1	19.7	3.6	20.0	12	35
14.	Manipur	4.9	16.5	30.3	21.3	27.0	22.6	5.1	21.0	14	39
15.	Orissa	27.9	34.6	22.4	7.4	7.7	18.1	4.2	17.0	12	33
16.	Other NE States+	1.8	20.2	32.7	31.6	13.6	21.6	3.7	21.0	13	34
17.	Punjab	3.7	21.3	28.8	30.0	16.1	21.4	3.9	21.0	14	35
18.	Rajasthan	18.5	42.8	21.8	14.4	2.6	18.1	3.1	18.0	13	28
19.	Tamil Nadu+	0.4	1.5	7.4	42	48.7	25.5	3.3	25.0	14	37
20.	Uttar Pradesh+	6.6	34.8	33	21.2	4.4	19.7	3.3	20.0	15	30
21.	West Bengal	18.4	25.9	25.2	19.5	11.0	19.8	4.3	20.0	11	35
Brothel Based		16.8	31.9	28.6	16.8	5.9	19.2	3.8	19.0	10	39
Non Brothel Based		5.2	18.5	24.9	29.9	21.5	22.1	4.6	22.0	10	42
<b>All India</b>		<b>9.8</b>	<b>23.8</b>	<b>26.4</b>	<b>24.7</b>	<b>15.3</b>	<b>20.9</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>42</b>

Base: All Respondents



### 3.5.2 Age at first initiation into sex work

Overall, half the respondents started sex work between 16 years and 21 years (65%). 10 % of the FSWs started sex work before 16 years or less. Overall, the median age when sex was first sold was 20 years. The proportion of brothel based FSWs (17%) who first started sex work below 16 was higher as compared with non-brothel based FSWs (5%) (Table 3.18)

The median age at first selling sex was as high as 25 years in Kerala and Tamil Nadu, while half the respondents in Bihar, Madhya Pradesh and Orissa had started sex work by 17 years. (Table 3.18.)

The proportion of brothel based FSW in West Bengal who initiated sex work before 16 years of age was 18% compared to 4% among the non-brothel based control group.

### 3.5.3 Number of Paying Clients/Non-Paying Regular Partners/Non-Paying Non-Regular Partners in last 7 days

Table 3.19 reveals that across the country, about 39% of the respondents had less than 7 paying clients in last 7 days prior to survey. A higher proportion of non-brothel based FSWs (47%) had less than 7 clients compared with brothel based FSWs (26%). Generally brothel based FSW reported more clients compared to non-brothel based FSW. About 1% of the respondents did not have any paying client during the reference period.

Overall, the mean number of paying client was 11 clients in last 7 days prior to the survey. State figures in Table 3.20 clearly indicates that the mean number of clients was as high as 18 clients in Manipur followed by 17 clients in Delhi, Goa and 15 clients in Gujarat and Uttar Pradesh. The lowest mean numbers of clients in the last 7 days prior to survey were in Jammu and Kashmir followed by Assam, Tamil Nadu, other NE states, Haryana and Himachal Pradesh.

Overall, 56% of respondents did not have sex with non-paying regular partners in last 7 days prior to the survey. A higher proportion of brothel based FSWs (70%) did not have sex with any non-paying partner in the last 7 days as compared with non-brothel based FSWs (48%) but a higher proportion of non-brothel based FSWs (49%) had sex with one partner in the last 7 days as compared with brothel based FSWs (28%) Nearly, 40 % of all respondents had sex with one non-paying regular partner in the same reference period.

Overall, mean number of non-paying regular partners was 1 partner in last 7 days prior to the survey. Mean number of non-paying regular partners with whom respondents had sex was 1 partner in last 7 days prior to survey. States like Jammu and Kashmir and Punjab, which reported high percentages of one non-paying regular partner, were also states, which reported a high percentage of FSWs living with married spouses. (Table 3.19)

Overall, 83% of respondents did not have sex with non-paying non-regulars partners in last 7 days prior to the survey. A higher proportion of brothel based FSWs (96%) did not have sex with any non-paying non-regular partner in the last 7 days as compared with non-brothel based FSWs (75%) but a higher proportion of non-brothel

based FSWs (15%) had sex with 1 non-paying non-regular partner in the last 7 days as compared with brothel based FSWs (3%).

**Table 3.19: Mean Number of Paying Clients and Non Paying Partners in the Last 7 days**  
(All figures are in percentage)

Sl.No	State/State Group	Number of Paying Clients					Number of Non-paying Regular Partner			Number of Non-paying Non-Regular Partner			
		< 7	8-14	15-21	22+	Mean	1	2+	Mean	1	2-4	5+	Mean
1.	Andhra Pradesh	20.8	39.4	26.9	12.9	13.2	29.7	16.5	1.6	24.4	14.7	4.7	2.2
2.	Assam	58.5	38.5	3.0	0.0	6.7	60.7	0.0	1.0	7.8	3.3	0.4	1.5
3.	Bihar+	25.0	37.5	24.7	12.8	13.4	31.6	3.5	1.1	3.8	3.8	0.3	1.8
4.	Delhi	1.5	34.9	41.6	21.9	17.2	5.9	0.0	1.0	3.3	0.7	0.0	1.2
5.	Goa	3.7	38.5	38.5	19.3	17.0	15.2	0.0	1.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	1.0
6.	Gujarat	27.4	26.7	28.1	17.4	15.4	55.2	3.5	1.6	4.5	2.4	0.7	2.0
7.	Haryana	58.5	26.3	4.4	1.9	7.5	56.7	0.7	1.1	5.6	11.9	0.7	2.0
8.	Himachal Pradesh	60.1	36.2	3.7	0.0	7.1	67.2	0.0	1.0	23.6	6.6	0.0	1.3
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	77.2	22.8	0.0	0.0	5.5	80.7	0.0	1.0	7.0	0.9	0.0	1.1
10.	Karnataka	13.9	53.9	25.5	6.7	12.8	43.1	15.7	1.3	23.6	18.7	0.0	1.5
11.	Kerala	53.0	33.3	11.5	1.9	8.5	42.6	3.7	1.1	18.1	11.1	0.4	1.5
12.	Madhya Pradesh +	55.4	27.5	6.9	1.8	7.4	48.6	0.0	1.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	1.0
13.	Maharashtra	8.9	30.5	36.8	23.0	17.6	9.7	0.0	1.0	1.9	0.4	0.0	1.2
14.	Manipur	50.9	39.7	8.2	0.4	8.0	33.7	2.6	1.1	9.7	9.7	0.4	2.0
15.	Orissa	44.1	23.2	14.3	16.2	13.8	40.4	8.1	1.3	9.6	4.8	1.1	1.9
16.	Other NE States+	58.8	27.9	11.0	1.5	7.6	21.3	0.4	1.0	8.8	4.0	0.0	1.4
17.	Punjab	41.2	42.3	14.2	2.2	9.4	66.7	1.5	1.0	15.4	16.5	0.4	1.9
18.	Rajasthan	53.1	36.5	8.5	0.0	8.0	35.8	1.1	1.1	11.4	3.0	0.4	1.3
19.	Tamil Nadu+	60.2	37.2	2.2	0.4	6.8	55.8	3.0	1.1	33.5	8.6	0.0	1.2
20.	Uttar Pradesh+	20.5	35.9	26.0	17.2	14.6	23.4	0.0	1.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	1.0
21.	West Bengal	46.8	32.3	13.8	7.1	10.1	48.6	0.0	1.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	1.0
Brothel Based		26.0	32.6	25.2	14.8	14.8	28.1	1.5	1.1	2.6	1.2	0.2	1.6
Non Brothel Based		47.3	36.0	12.0	12.0	3.7	48.5	3.9	1.2	15.2	8.9	0.7	1.7
<b>All India</b>		<b>38.9</b>	<b>34.6</b>	<b>17.2</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>40.5</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>10.2</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1.7</b>

Base: All Respondents

Nearly, 10 % of the respondents had sex with one non-paying non-regular partner and about 6 % had 2-4 non-regular non-paying partners in the same reference period. Overall, mean number of non-paying non-regular partners was about 2 partners in last 7 days prior to the survey. State wise analysis in Table 3.19 reveals that more than 80% of the respondents in all the states, except Andhra Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala, Punjab and Tamil Nadu, did not have non-paying non-regular partners. A significant proportion of respondents in Tamil Nadu (33%), Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Andhra Pradesh (24%), Karnataka (18%) and Punjab (15%) had sex with one non-paying non-regular partner. About 5% of the FSWs in Andhra Pradesh reportedly had more than 5 non-paying non-regular partners. Of all the states, mean number of non-paying non-regular partner was highest in Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Haryana and Manipur in last 7 days prior to survey. (Table 3.19)

The mean number of paying clients in the last 7 days among brothel based FSW group in Delhi was 17 compared with 6 in the non-brothel based control group. Similarly, the mean number of paying clients in the last 7 days among brothel based study group in Andhra Pradesh was 23 compared with just 13 in the non-brothel based control group

#### **3.5.4 Number of Paying Clients on last working day**

Table 3.20 reveals that overall, about 54% of the respondents had 2-3 clients on the last working day. The proportion of FSWs having 1 paying client was 27% during the same reference period. Nearly 14 % of FSWs had 4-5 clients on last working day while 3% had 6-7 clients. A higher proportion of non-brothel based FSWs (31%) had 1 paying client on the last working day as compared with brothel based FSWs (22%) and a higher proportion of brothel based FSWs (18%) had 4-5 paying clients on the last working day as compared with non-brothel based FSWs (11%) Overall, mean number of paying clients was 2.6 clients on last working day prior to the survey. Generally brothel based FSW had larger number of clients.

Mean number of paying clients on last working day was as high as 4.3 clients in Delhi followed by 3.3 clients in Goa, 3.1 clients in Gujarat, Maharashtra, 2.8 clients in Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and Orissa. The lowest mean number of clients on last working day was reported from Jammu and Kashmir (1.7 clients) followed by other NE states and Himachal Pradesh (1.9 clients).

The mean number of paying clients on the last working day among brothel-based group in Delhi was 4.3 compared with 1.7 in the non-brothel based control group. Similarly, the mean number of paying clients on the last working day among brothel-based group in Andhra Pradesh was 4.5 compared with just 2.8 in the non-brothel based group. Thus, irrespective of location, brothel based FSW had more clients compared to non-brothel based workers.

**Table 3.20: Number of Paying Clients on the Last Working day**

(All figure are in percentage)

Sl.No	State/State Group	Number of Paying Partners on the Last Working Day						
		0	1	2-3	4-5	6-7	8+	Mean
1.	Andhra Pradesh	0.0	19.0	58.8	16.8	3.6	1.8	2.8
2.	Assam	0.0	34.8	57.0	7.4	0.7	0.0	2.0
3.	Bihar+	3.1	21.9	53.1	16.7	3.8	1.4	2.7
4.	Delhi	0.0	2.2	39.0	36.8	16.4	5.6	4.3
5.	Goa	0.0	12.6	58.1	24.8	4.1	0.4	3.0
6.	Gujarat	4.2	18.8	49.3	19.4	3.1	5.2	3.1
7.	Haryana	0.0	43.3	48.9	5.9	0.4	1.5	2.2
8.	Himachal Pradesh	0.0	34.7	58.3	7.0	0.0	0.0	1.9
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	0.0	43.0	55.3	1.8	0.0	0.0	1.7
10.	Karnataka	0.7	24.7	54.3	16.9	1.5	1.9	2.8
11.	Kerala	0.0	39.6	50.7	8.1	0.4	1.1	2.4
12.	Madhya Pradesh +	0.0	33.5	57.1	7.5	1.2	0.8	2.1
13.	Maharashtra	7.1	13.8	54.6	17.8	3.3	3.3	3.1
14.	Manipur	0.0	22.2	56.4	18.4	3.0	0.0	2.6
15.	Orissa	0.0	25.1	51.3	15.4	5.6	2.6	2.8
16.	Other NE States+	0.0	48.9	40.7	9.6	0.7	0.0	1.9
17.	Punjab	0.0	21.3	61.0	13.9	1.9	1.9	2.6
18.	Rajasthan	0.4	30.7	62.6	4.4	0.4	1.5	2.1
19.	Tamil Nadu+	0.0	26.4	63.9	8.2	0.7	0.7	2.5
20.	Uttar Pradesh+	0.0	27.1	57.5	11.0	1.8	2.6	2.6
21.	West Bengal	0.0	40.1	44.0	12.4	1.1	2.5	2.3
Brothel Based		1.3	22.1	51.8	17.8	4.7	2.4	2.8
Non Brothel Based		0.4	30.7	55.1	11.1	1.3	1.3	2.4
<b>All India</b>		<b>0.8</b>	<b>27.3</b>	<b>53.8</b>	<b>13.7</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>2.6</b>

Base: All Respondents

### 3.5.5 Condom Use in last sex with Paying Clients and Non-Paying Partner

Overall, about 76% of the respondents used condom last time they had sex with the paying clients. This was consistently high among FSW across all the states. (Table 3.21)

Table 3.21 further indicates that overall, about 39% of the respondents used condom last time when they had sex with non-paying partners. Last time condom use with non-paying partner is low in most of the states. But, a significant proportion of respondents in Manipur (68%), Delhi (67%), Karnataka (59%), Andhra Pradesh (58%), Orissa (54%), Madhya Pradesh (49%), Kerala and Assam (48%) reported high rate of condom use with non-paying partners on the last occasion.

Analysis shows that though FSWs take adequate prevention with the paying client (usually an unknown person), the same is not true with the non-paying partners, who are generally not regarded, by the FSW, as a source of infection. Thus, use of condom is much lower with the later group.

The proportion of respondents reporting last time condom use with paying client in the brothel based FSW group was higher than in the non-brothel based groups in Delhi, Maharashtra, West Bengal and Andhra Pradesh. This proportion was particularly high in the brothel based FSW group in Maharashtra (88%) and West Bengal (87%) compared with 74% in the non brothel -based control group in Mumbai and 69% in the non-brothel based West Bengal control group. The proportion of condom usage with non-paying partners was 56% in the non-brothel based Mumbai control group compared with 39% in the brothel based Maharashtra FSW group, while it was 69% in the non-brothel based control group in West Bengal compared with 23% in the brothel based study group.

### 3.5.6 Consistent Condom Use with Paying Clients and Non-Paying Partner

Overall, half of the respondents had used condom every time with all the paying clients during the last 30 days preceding the survey. A higher proportion of brothel based FSWs reported consistent condom use (57%) as compared with non-brothel based FSWs (46%) (Table 3.21).

Only one fifth of the respondents reported consistent use of condom with non-paying partners during the last 30 days. A small but significant proportion of respondents in Delhi (46%), Manipur (45%), Kerala, Orissa (38%), Karnataka (34%) and Goa (33%) had used condoms every time with all the non-paying partners during the last 30 days preceding the survey. Otherwise, in the remaining states the consistent condom use is quite low. (Table 3.21)

The proportion of respondents reporting consistent condom use with paying clients in last one month was higher than in the brothel based study group in Delhi (64%) compared to the non brothel -based control group (39%) while it was 73% in the Maharashtra brothel based study group compared to 55% in the non-brothel based control group. The proportion of condom usage with non-paying partners was 46% in the brothel-based Delhi study group compared with 19% in the non-brothel based control group.

**Table 3.21: Condom Usage with Paying Client and Non Paying Partners**

(All figure are in percentage)

Sl.No.	State/State Group	Last Time Condom Usage		Consistent Condom Usage in Last 30 days	
		With Paying Client	With Non Paying Partners *	With Paying Client	With Non Paying Partners in last 3 months *
1.	Andhra Pradesh	78.9	58.2	53.1	29.1
2.	Assam	75.2	48.5	26.9	12.6
3.	Bihar+	65.3	20.0	23.9	5.3
4.	Delhi	72.5	66.7	63.6	45.8
5.	Goa	77.0	44.2	69.3	32.6
6.	Gujarat	77.1	34.5	58.1	26.8
7.	Haryana	69.6	16.6	27.6	7.3
8.	Himachal Pradesh	87.8	35.7	41.0	16.3
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	80.7	26.3	50.9	6.3
10.	Karnataka	73.4	58.6	55.7	33.7
11.	Kerala	87.8	48.0	73.7	38.2
12.	Madhya Pradesh +	70.9	49.2	65.0	28.5
13.	Maharashtra	87.7	39.3	72.5	7.1
14.	Manipur	71.8	67.9	53.3	44.9
15.	Orissa	73.0	53.6	65.2	38.5
16.	Other NE States+	64.1	40.2	23.7	20.5
17.	Punjab	79.0	25.4	45.8	9.7
18.	Rajasthan	67.8	25.6	33.8	13.3
19.	Tamil Nadu+	83.3	25.0	54.1	9.2
20.	Uttar Pradesh+	68.9	41.5	61.9	13.8
21.	West Bengal	86.5	22.6	39.0	9.5
Brothel Based		75.2	39.0	57.2	21.3
Non Brothel Based		76.5	38.7	45.8	20.2
<b>All India</b>		<b>76.0</b>	<b>38.8</b>	<b>50.3</b>	<b>20.5</b>

Base: All Respondents

\* Base: Those Respondents who reported any Non Paying Partner in the last 7 days

### 3.5.7 Person suggesting Condom use at last sex with Paying Client/Non-Paying Partner

Overall, nearly 62 % of the respondents, who had used condom at last sexual intercourse with a paying client, reported that she herself suggested the use of condom. About 27 % of the respondents, reported that client had suggested use of condom and about 11 % of the respondents reported that it was a joint decision. Among brothel based FSWs a higher proportion reported that the decision was her own (79%) as compared with non-brothel based FSWs (51%). Relatively high proportion of FSWs, who had used condom last time, in Jammu and Kashmir (76%), Himachal Pradesh (65%), Punjab (54%), other NE (51%) and Haryana (48%) reported that the suggestion to use a condom last time had been the client's. (Table 3.22)

Table 3.22 further indicates that overall, nearly 43 % of the respondents, who had used condom at last sexual intercourse with a non-paying client, reported that she herself suggested use of condom last time. About 25 % of the respondents, who had used condom at last sex with non-paying partner, reported that the suggestion to use a condom last time had been their partner's. As with paying clients, among brothel based FSWs a higher proportion reported that the decision to use condom with her non-paying partner was her own (52%) as compared with non-brothel based FSWs (41%). However, a higher proportion of non-brothel based FSWs (30%) reported that the decision to use a condom was the client's than brothel based FSWs (11%).

The proportion of respondents who reported that the suggestion for using condom with paying client last time was their own was 74% in the brothel based control group compared with 51% in the non-brothel based study group in Andhra Pradesh. The proportion of respondents who reported that the suggestion for using condom with paying client last time was their own was 82% in the brothel based study group compared with 50% in the non-brothel based control group in Delhi.

### 3.5.8 Type of Condom Brands used at Last Sex with Paying Client/Non-Paying Partner

Overall, about two-fifth of the respondents, who had used condom at last sexual intercourse with paying client, reported using Nirodh brand. Deluxe Nirodh was another common brand, which was reported by 27 %, followed by Kamasutra (11 %), Masti (7 %) and Kohinoor (7 %). Majority of the respondents, who had used condom last time, in Madhya Pradesh (86%), Gujarat (84%), Maharashtra (83%), Assam (56%), Andhra Pradesh, Rajasthan (44%) reported use of Nirodh with paying client at last sexual intercourse, while 23% to 32% in Manipur, other NE states, Andhra Pradesh, Goa and Karnataka reported using Kamsutra last time. with a paying client.

**Table 3.22: Person who Suggested Condom Use at Last Sex with Paying Client/Non Paying Partner**

(All figure are in percentage)

Sl.No	State/State Group	Paying Client			Non Paying Partners		
		Self	Client	Joint decision	Self	Partner	Joint decision
1.	Andhra Pradesh	50.9	35.0	13.6	33.6	39.1	27.3
2.	Assam	52.2	35.5	12.3	31.7	39.0	29.3
3.	Bihar+	55.3	20.7	23.9	39.1	26.1	34.8
4.	Delhi	82.1	7.2	9.7	37.5	0.0	62.5
5.	Goa	82.7	8.2	9.1	47.4	15.8	36.8
6.	Gujarat	83.8	13.5	2.7	57.6	16.9	25.4
7.	Haryana	46.8	48.4	4.8	16.7	43.3	40.0
8.	Himachal Pradesh	16.8	65.5	17.6	14.8	48.1	34.6
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	19.6	76.1	4.3	20.0	36.0	44.0
10.	Karnataka	52.6	35.2	12.2	55.6	11.1	33.3
11.	Kerala	73.4	22.8	3.8	47.7	20.9	31.4
12.	Madhya Pradesh +	84.4	8.3	7.2	37.5	0.0	62.5
13.	Maharashtra	80.9	5.1	14.0	63.6	18.2	18.2
14.	Manipur	56.0	27.2	16.8	52.7	18.9	28.4
15.	Orissa	73.8	17.9	8.2	67.6	20.3	12.2
16.	Other NE States+	35.3	50.9	13.9	27.3	39.4	30.3
17.	Punjab	26.5	53.6	19.9	33.3	33.3	33.3
18.	Rajasthan	67.2	28.4	4.4	48.4	22.6	29.0
19.	Tamil Nadu+	66.5	25.9	7.6	67.3	26.5	6.1
20.	Uttar Pradesh+	84.6	7.4	8.0	70.4	11.1	18.5
21.	West Bengal	85.2	4.5	10.2	45.2	0.0	54.8
Brothel Based		78.9	9.6	11.3	52.1	10.9	37.0
Non Brothel Based		51.3	38.1	10.6	40.5	29.5	29.6
<b>All India</b>		<b>62.0</b>	<b>27.0</b>	<b>10.8</b>	<b>43.3</b>	<b>25.0</b>	<b>31.4</b>

Base: Respondents who used Condom at Last Sex



A large proportion of respondents, who had use condom last time, in Uttar Pradesh (80%), West Bengal (64%), Bihar (61%), Orissa (59%) and Delhi (55%) had used Deluxe Nirodh. A significant proportion in Manipur, Uttar Pradesh, Haryana, Orissa,

**Table 3.23: Type of Condom Brands Used at Last Sex with Paying Client/Non Paying Partners**

(All figure are in percentage)

Sl.No.	State /State Group	Paying Client			Non Paying Partners		
		Nirodh	Deluxe Nirodh	Kamasutra	Nirodh	Deluxe Nirodh	Kamasutra
1.	Andhra Pradesh	43.6	15.5	27.3	40.0	18.2	23.6
2.	Assam	55.7	7.9	14.8	47.6	8.5	14.6
3.	Bihar+	11.7	61.2	3.7	17.4	52.2	13.0
4.	Delhi	31.3	54.9	5.1	25.0	43.8	12.5
5.	Goa	43.3	1.9	28.4	31.6	5.3	36.8
6.	Gujarat	84.2	2.3	2.3	72.9	0.0	5.1
7.	Haryana	33.5	19.1	6.9	36.7	6.7	10.0
8.	Himachal Pradesh	18.9	22.7	12.2	17.3	24.7	11.1
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	23.9	23.9	12.0	24.0	32.0	8.0
10.	Karnataka	31.1	16.3	32.1	51.5	17.2	21.2
11.	Kerala	30.0	15.6	15.2	37.2	14.0	14.0
12.	Madhya Pradesh +	85.6	5.0	1.1	79.7	3.1	4.7
13.	Maharashtra	83.5	9.3	3.8	72.7	18.2	0.0
14.	Manipur	29.8	22.5	23.0	33.8	18.9	18.9
15.	Orissa	22.6	59.5	1.5	36.5	44.6	1.4
16.	Other NE States+	30.6	23.1	23.1	33.3	15.2	27.3
17.	Punjab	24.6	19.9	10.9	11.1	18.5	13.0
18.	Rajasthan	44.3	14.2	1.6	25.8	29.0	6.5
19.	Tamil Nadu+	40.2	26.8	17.0	40.8	30.6	6.1
20.	Uttar Pradesh+	6.9	79.8	0.5	11.1	63.0	0.0
21.	West Bengal	31.6	63.9	0.0	22.6	74.2	0.0
Brothel Based		40.3	41.6	5.6	41.5	36.6	6.0
Non Brothel Based		38.4	17.3	15.3	38.1	17.1	15.1
<b>All India</b>		<b>39.2</b>	<b>26.7</b>	<b>11.5</b>	<b>39.0</b>	<b>21.9</b>	<b>12.9</b>

Base: Respondents who used Condom at Last Sex

Rajasthan, Punjab, Himachal Pradesh and Jammu and Kashmir reported using Masti during last encounter with paying client while a significant proportion reported using Kohinoor condoms on the last occasion in Assam, Tamil Nadu, other NE states, Himachal Pradesh and Kerala (Table 3.23)

Overall, about two-fifth of the respondents, who had used condom at last sexual intercourse with non-paying partners, reported use of Nirodh condoms. Deluxe Nirodh was another common brand (22%), followed by Kamasutra (12%), Masti (9%) and Kohinoor (10%). A large proportion of respondents, in West Bengal (74%), Uttar Pradesh (63%), Bihar (52%), Orissa (45%) and Delhi (44%) used Deluxe Nirodh with non-paying partners. (Table 3.23).

### 3.5.9 Source of Condom Used at Last Sex with Paying Client/Non-Paying Partner

Overall, about 32% of the respondents who had used condom last time with paying clients reportedly obtained condom from their client itself. Slightly more than one-fifth had obtained the condom from NGOs or their peer educators. The other sources for obtaining condom were chemist shop/pharmacy (19%), government health worker/clinic (11%), pan shop (7%) and friend (2%). Nearly 43% non-brothel based FSWs obtained condoms from the person they had sex with and nearly 30% obtained it from a chemist shop/pharmacy, as compared with brothel based FSWs where the proportions obtaining condoms from these two sources was lower at 14% each. A considerably higher proportion of brothel based FSWs (35%) obtained condom from NGO clinic/peer educator as compared with non-brothel based FSWs (13%). A large proportion of FSWs, who had used condom last time with paying client, reportedly obtained the condom from the client in Himachal Pradesh (83%), Jammu and Kashmir (77%), Punjab (71%), Haryana (52%), Andhra Pradesh (51%) and Rajasthan (50%). As high as 62% of FSWs who had used condom last time with paying clients had obtained it from government hospital/clinic in Madhya Pradesh. The proportion of FSWs who had obtained it from NGOs/peer educator was as high as 79% in West Bengal followed by Delhi (52%), Maharashtra (47%) and Gujarat (45%). (Table 3.24)

Overall, about 33% of the respondents who had used condom last time with non-paying partners reportedly obtained condoms from their partners. Slightly more than one-fifth had purchased it from chemist shop/pharmacy. A considerably higher proportion of non-brothel based FSWs (39%) obtained condom from the person they had sex with as compared to non-brothel based FSWs (17%) and a nearly a fourth of the non-brothel based FSWs (25%) bought condom from chemist shop/pharmacy as compared to 14% brothel based FSWs. A higher proportion of brothel based FSWs (23%) obtained condoms from NGO clinic/peer

**Table 3.24: Source of Condom Used at Last Sex with Paying Client/Non Paying Partners**

(All figure are in percentage)

S.No.	State/ State Group	Paying Client			Non Paying Partners		
		Person had sex with	NGOs/ Peer educator	Purchased at chemist shop/ pharmacy	Person had sex with	Purchased at chemist shop/ pharmacy	NGOs/Peer educator
1.	Andhra Pradesh	51.4	11.4	28.2	50.0	24.5	13.6
2.	Assam	34.5	7.9	36.0	31.7	26.8	2.4
3.	Bihar+	31.9	1.1	14.4	21.7	8.7	0.0
4.	Delhi	14.4	52.3	4.1	18.8	18.8	25.0
5.	Goa	13.9	38.9	17.3	21.1	10.5	36.8
6.	Gujarat	16.7	450.0	9.0	27.1	10.2	35.6
7.	Haryana	52.1	2.7	26.6	30.0	46.7	0.0
8.	Himachal Pradesh	82.8	0.0	9.7	77.8	6.2	0.0
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	77.2	1.1	8.7	32.0	32.0	12.0
10.	Karnataka	20.4	3.1	36.7	16.2	44.4	6.1
11.	Kerala	29.1	28.7	15.2	37.2	12.8	30.2
12.	Madhya Pradesh +	6.7	3.9	14.4	0.0	18.8	3.1
13.	Maharashtra	5.9	47.5	5.9	9.1	9.1	27.3
14.	Manipur	23.6	23.6	35.1	17.6	31.1	31.1
15.	Orissa	34.4	32.8	5.6	36.5	4.1	23
16.	Other NE States+	40.5	14.5	30.6	45.5	27.3	21.2
17.	Punjab	71.1	0.5	18.0	55.6	24.1	0.0
18.	Rajasthan	49.7	4.9	12.6	64.5	9.7	6.5
19.	Tamil Nadu+	24.6	11.2	29.0	26.5	32.7	18.4
20.	Uttar Pradesh+	7.4	6.4	55.9	11.1	44.4	11.1
21.	West Bengal	4.1	78.7	2.0	3.2	6.5	77.4
Brothel Based		14.3	35.0	14.2	16.6	14.0	22.6
Non Brothel Based		42.9	12.6	22.9	38.9	24.7	14.0
<b>All India</b>		<b>31.8</b>	<b>21.3</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>33.4</b>	<b>22.1</b>	<b>16.1</b>

Base: Respondents who used Condom at Last Sex

educator as compared to non-brothel based FSWs (14%). The other sources for obtaining condom were NGOs/Peer educator (16%), government health worker/clinic (9%), pan shop (8%), friend (3%) and other outlets (2%). The NGOs/peer educators were instrumental in providing and promoting condom use in West Bengal (77%) followed by Goa (37%), Gujarat (36%), Manipur (31%) and Kerala (30%). (Table 3.24)

### 3.5.10 Reasons for Not Using Condom at Last Sex with paying client/Non-Paying Partner

The main reason (68%) for not using condoms was 'partner objection' at last sex with paying client. The other important reasons were 'not available (27%)' and 'did not think it was necessary' (20%). A very low proportion of non-users of condom reported other reasons such as 'did not think of it' (16%), 'do not like them' (14%), 'decreases pleasure' (14%), 'place inappropriate' (13%), 'used other contraceptives' (10%) and 'too expensive' (8%).

Among non-brothel based FSWs 40% reported non-availability as a reason for not using condom as compared with just 9% among brothel based FSWs and 28% non-brothel based FSWs reported didn't think it to be necessary as a reason for not using condoms as compared to 10% brothel based FSWs. Among brothel based FSWs, 87% reported partner objection as a reason for not using condom as compared to 54% non-brothel based FSWs. (Table 3.25)

'Not available' was the commonest reason cited in Jammu and Kashmir.

Table 3.25 shows that 'partner objected' and 'did not think it was necessary' were the main reasons for not using condom at last sex with non-paying partners also. The other commonly cited reasons were 'decreases pleasure (33%)', 'do not like them' (29%) and 'did not think of it' (27%). A low proportion of non-users of condom reported other reasons such as 'not available (22%)', 'used other contraceptives' (18%), 'place inappropriate' (6%), and 'too expensive' (4%). A higher proportion of non-brothel based FSWs (36%) reported 'decreases pleasure' as a reason for not using condom with non-paying partner as compared with nearly a fourth (25%) of brothel based FSWs. (Table 3.25)

In Haryana, about 85 % of non-users of condom reported that the reason for non-use was that condoms were 'not available'. Significant proportion also reported the same reason in Himachal Pradesh (50%), and Rajasthan (39%). A significant proportion of non-users in Other NE states, Himachal Pradesh, Orissa, Kerala and Rajasthan reported 'used other contraceptives' as a reason of not using condom. 'Do not think it was necessary' was also a major reason for not using condom last time with non-paying partner in most of the states. A significant proportion of non-users of condom in Kerala (50%), Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu (48 %), Punjab (47%), Other NE states (44%), Haryana (39%) and Gujarat (37%) reported 'decreases pleasure' as one of the reasons of not using condoms with non-paying partners. 'Did not think it was necessary' was an important reason in Tamil Nadu (53%), Haryana (52%), West Bengal (41%), Manipur (39%), other NE states (38%), Punjab (33%), Uttar Pradesh (32%) and Goa (29%). 57% of non-users in Rajasthan reported 'place was inappropriate' as a major reason with non-paying partners. (Table 3.25)

### 3.6 Other Salient Observations

Data pertaining to condom negotiation with paying clients, risk perception of FSWs, HIV testing and exposure to interventions is analyzed and presented in this section.

**Table 3.25: Reasons for Not Using Condom at Last Sex with Paying Client/Non Paying Partner**  
(All figure are in percentage)

S.N o.	State/ State Group	Paying Client			Non Paying Partners		
		Partner Objected	Not Available	Didn't think it was necessary	Partner Objected	Didn't think it was necessary	Decreases pleasure
1.	Andhra Pradesh	70.9	38.2	36.4	65.8	46.8	7.6
2.	Assam	52.3	29.2	23.1	55.3	40.0	28.2
3.	Bihar+	88.0	25.0	15.2	60.4	58.2	27.5
4.	Delhi	100.0	0.0	0.0	62.5	12.5	25.0
5.	Goa	98.4	0.0	1.6	25.0	87.5	29.2
6.	Gujarat	50.9	21.1	14.0	47.6	39.0	37.1
7.	Haryana	30.0	78.8	52.5	27.2	75.5	38.8
8.	Himachal Pradesh	36.4	63.6	9.1	33.6	36.3	16.4
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	18.2	100.0	18.2	42.9	44.3	7.1
10.	Karnataka	75.0	13.2	100.0	91.4	100.0	100.0
11.	Kerala	87.9	21.2	39.4	79.3	54.3	50.0
12.	Madhya Pradesh +	73.0	21.6	24.3	30.3	56.1	16.7
13.	Maharashtra	100.0	0.0	0.0	37.7	47.1	17.6
14.	Manipur	25.8	21.2	25.8	70.6	48.5	18.2
15.	Orissa	56.9	3.4	29.3	56.2	31.1	29.5
16.	Other NE States+	66.3	38.2	16.9	66.7	64.4	44.4
17.	Punjab	33.3	31.4	41.2	56.2	43.1	47.1
18.	Rajasthan	69.8	68.6	30.2	51.7	59.6	48.3
19.	Tamil Nadu+	88.6	11.4	9.1	54.1	58.2	48.6
20.	Uttar Pradesh+	92.9	4.7	2.4	21.1	60.5	5.3
21.	West Bengal	94.7	2.6	0.0	92.5	54.7	32.1
Brothel Based		87.4	8.9	10.1	55.2	53.5	24.8
Non Brothel Based		54.2	40.3	28.0	51.2	51.0	35.5
<b>All India</b>		<b>68.2</b>	<b>27.5</b>	<b>20.3</b>	<b>52.2</b>	<b>51.7</b>	<b>32.8</b>

Base: Respondents who had not used condom

### 3.6.1. Condom negotiation with paying clients

Table 3.26 indicates that majority of the FSWs in all the states reported that they usually insist on their clients to use condoms. If client refused to use condom, about 38% reported that they refused to have sex with him. Another 18% reported that they charged extra amount. About 15% of the respondents tried to persuade the client to use the condom and about 12% of FSWs did not do any thing. The proportion of brothel based FSWs insisting on the client using a condom was higher than non-brothel based FSWs. (92% and 73% respectively). On client refusal to use a condom, a higher proportion of brothel based FSWs (49%) refused to have sex and tried to persuade the client (22%) as compared with non-brothel based FSWs where the corresponding proportions were 30% and 11%. Respectively. A higher proportion of non-brothel based FSW (25%) charged extra as compared with brothel based FSW (8%) Table 3.26 clearly shows that majority of the FSW in all the states, except Maharashtra, Goa, Orissa, Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh, did not refuse sex if a client did not use condom. A significant proportion of FSWs in Karnataka, Punjab, Andhra Pradesh, Manipur, Gujarat, Rajasthan and Assam reported that they charged extra amount.

The proportion of respondents reporting that they insist that their clients use condom was 92% in the brothel based control group in Andhra Pradesh compared to 71% in the non-brothel based study group. The proportion of respondents reporting that they insist that their clients use condom was 97% in the brothel based study group in Delhi compared to 75% in the non-brothel based control group. The proportion of respondents reporting that they refused to have sex with the client if he refused condom use was 66% in the brothel based control group in Andhra Pradesh compared to 39% in the non-brothel based study group. The proportion of respondents reporting that they refused to have sex with the client if he refused condom use was 78% in the brothel based study group in Mumbai compared to 58% in the non-brothel based control group.

### 3.6.2 Perception of Risk of getting infected with HIV/AIDS

Overall, only 17% of the respondents reported that they perceived themselves to be at a very high risk of contracting HIV/AIDS. About 26% of FSWs reported that they were at moderate risk and 30% of respondents reported that they had a low risk of contracting HIV/AIDS. Nearly 17% of the respondents reported that they did not think that they had any chance of contracting HIV/AIDS. A higher proportion of brothel based FSWs (21%) perceived that they were at a very high risk of contracting HIV as compared with non-brothel based FSWs (14%). A significant proportion of FSWs in Madhya Pradesh (42%), Assam (34%), Uttar Pradesh, Karnataka (28%), Maharashtra, Orissa (26%) and Manipur (23%) reported that they perceived themselves to be at a very high risk of contracting HIV/AIDS. (Table 3.27).

**Table 3.26: Condom Negotiation with Paying Clients**

(All figure are in percentage)

Sl.No	State/State Group	Usually Insist on Client Using Condom	Reporting client refusal in past 3 months	Action taken on client refusal *				
				Refused sex	Charge d extra	Persuaded Successfully	Failed to persuade	Sold Sex
1.	Andhra Pradesh	71.1	65.2	39.3	32.0	5.6	12.4	10.7
2.	Assam	75.4	79.1	18.4	25.5	10.4	28.8	17.0
3.	Bihar+	87.5	90.0	14.2	8.3	15.8	26.9	34.8
4.	Delhi	97.0	71.0	45.0	11.5	33.0	7.3	3.1
5.	Goa	99.3	66.2	73.6	3.9	19.1	2.2	1.1
6.	Gujarat	89.5	69.1	43.7	27.9	7.4	5.3	15.3
7.	Haryana	66.3	52.5	35.8	11.7	3.6	2.9	44.5
8.	Himachal Pradesh	67.2	48.7	18.9	40.9	5.3	1.5	31.8
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	51.3	24.8	42.9	7.1	3.6	3.6	39.3
10.	Karnataka	69.2	56.3	20.3	33.1	12.2	11.5	22.3
11.	Kerala	87.0	70.3	23.3	18	45.5	6.3	6.9
12.	Madhya Pradesh +	78.3	67.4	60.8	7.0	16.1	3.2	12.9
13.	Maharashtra	98.9	58.7	77.8	3.2	19.0	0.0	0.0
14.	Manipur	77.7	66.1	31.9	29.5	9.6	6.6	22.3
15.	Orissa	81.4	64.0	67.3	14.5	4.8	4.2	7.9
16.	Other NE States+	61.3	65.8	12.6	14.3	9.7	17.7	45.7
17.	Punjab	62.2	65.3	23.1	33.1	3.6	5.3	34.9
18.	Rajasthan	68.0	80.8	37.7	27.9	1.4	5.1	27.4
19.	Tamil Nadu+	89.6	91.1	40.4	18.8	13.5	24.9	2.4
20.	Uttar Pradesh+	92.7	68.5	63.1	9.1	19.8	2.7	5.3
21.	West Bengal	99.6	88.7	18.0	3.6	38.8	36.0	3.6
Brothel Based		91.9	72.0	48.7	7.5	21.6	12.4	9.7
Non Brothel Based		73.0	66.1	29.6	25.4	10.9	11.5	22.2
<b>All India</b>		<b>80.5</b>	<b>68.5</b>	<b>37.6</b>	<b>17.9</b>	<b>15.4</b>	<b>11.9</b>	<b>17.0</b>

Base: All Respondents

\* Base: Respondents where client refused condom usage in past 3 months

**Table 3.27: Perception regarding Risk of Contracting HIV/AIDS**  
(All figure are in percentage)

Sl.No	State/State Group	Very high	Moderate	Low	No chance
1.	Andhra Pradesh	10.0	29.4	45.5	14.7
2.	Assam	33.7	21.5	34.4	5.2
3.	Bihar+	16.7	20.5	31.6	19.4
4.	Delhi	10.4	32.7	33.1	14.1
5.	Goa	8.1	23.3	38.1	28.1
6.	Gujarat	9.4	20.1	38.5	18.1
7.	Haryana	5.9	28.5	29.6	10.0
8.	Himachal Pradesh	0.4	6.6	36.2	41.3
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	10.5	8.8	28.9	29.8
10.	Karnataka	28.1	24.7	29.2	12.4
11.	Kerala	13.0	33.7	39.3	12.2
12.	Madhya Pradesh +	42.4	13.0	21.0	13.0
13.	Maharashtra	26.0	25.7	26.8	19.0
14.	Manipur	23.2	39.7	32.2	4.1
15.	Orissa	26.5	15.4	23.9	21.3
16.	Other NE States+	16.9	36.0	22.1	13.6
17.	Punjab	4.9	25.1	33.7	19.9
18.	Rajasthan	4.4	34.7	21.8	18.5
19.	Tamil Nadu+	19.7	49.4	23.8	7.1
20.	Uttar Pradesh+	28.2	11.4	25.6	30.4
21.	West Bengal	11.7	42.2	27.0	18.4
Brothel Based		21.2	23.1	28.4	20.5
Non Brothel Based		14.0	28.4	32.1	15.3
<b>All India</b>		<b>16.8</b>	<b>26.3</b>	<b>30.7</b>	<b>17.3</b>

Base: All Respondents

### 3.6.3 Possibility of a Confidential HIV Testing in the area

Overall, nearly two-third of the respondents reported that it was possible in their community for anyone to get a confidential test to find out if they were infected with



HIV (64%). The proportion of respondents reporting the possibility of confidential HIV test in their communities was more than 60% across all the states except Bihar (51%), Haryana (49%), Other NE states (41%) and Uttar Pradesh (23%). (Table 3.28)

### **3.6.4 HIV Testing**

Overall, 28 per cent FSWs reported that they ever had an HIV test. Nearly 41% brothel based FSWs compared with 20% non-brothel based FSWs had ever been tested. A large proportion of FSWs in Goa (83%), Maharashtra (58%) and Tamil Nadu (56%) had undergone an HIV test. Only 0.7% in West Bengal had ever been tested. Proportions getting tested were also low in Punjab, Haryana and Jammu & Kashmir. Three out of four respondents who had ever been tested had done so voluntarily. Table 3.28 also shows that most of the respondents, who had been tested, collected the result of the test.

### **3.6.5 Interpersonal Communication on STI/HIV/AIDS**

Table 3.29 indicates that in the country, about 47% of respondents reported that someone had approached them to educate them on the spread of STI/HIV/AIDS in the past one year preceding the survey. This proportion was higher in case of brothel based FSWs (62%) as compared to non-brothel based FSWs (37%). The proportion was relatively high in West Bengal (93%), Delhi (82%) and Goa (80%).

The proportion of respondents who reported that somebody approached them for education on STD/HIV/AIDS in the last 12 months was higher among the brothel based FSW groups compared to the non-brothel based groups in Andhra Pradesh, Delhi, Maharashtra and West Bengal.

### **3.6.6 Attended/Participated in any Campaign/Meeting on STI/HIV/AIDS**

Table 3.29 indicates that overall, nearly one-fourth of the respondents reportedly attended/participated in any campaign/meeting on STI/HIV/AIDS in the past one year prior to the survey. This proportion was higher in case of brothel based FSWs (30%) as compared with non-brothel based FSWs (21%). As high as 60% of FSWs in Kerala reported the same followed by Tamil Nadu (52%), West Bengal (51%), Goa (45%), Manipur (42%) and Maharashtra (36%).

The proportion of respondents who reported that they participated in campaign/meeting on STD/HIV/AIDS in the last 12 months was higher among the brothel-based groups compared to the non-brothel based groups in Andhra Pradesh, Delhi, Maharashtra and West Bengal.

**Table 3.28: HIV Testing Status of Respondents**

(All figure are in percentage)

Sl.No.	State/State Group	Possibility of confidential HIV testing	Ever had HIV test	HIV test undertaken		Ever found out result of test *
				Voluntarily	Required	
1.	Andhra Pradesh	64.5	23.3	61.5	38.5	100.0
2.	Assam	70.7	7.4	65.0	35.0	60.0
3.	Bihar+	50.7	8.3	75.0	25.0	58.3
4.	Delhi	83.3	37.2	63.0	37.0	96.0
5.	Goa	86.3	82.6	85.2	14.8	90.1
6.	Gujarat	70.1	26.7	68.8	31.2	81.8
7.	Haryana	48.9	1.9	40.0	40.0	60.0
8.	Himachal Pradesh	63.8	3.3	77.8	22.2	77.8
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	57.9	1.8	100.0	0.0	100.0
10.	Karnataka	69.3	24.0	62.5	37.5	93.8
11.	Kerala	59.6	34.8	59.6	40.4	94.7
12.	Madhya Pradesh +	64.5	43.8	81.8	17.4	96.7
13.	Maharashtra	78.8	58.4	92.4	7.6	97.5
14.	Manipur	64.8	36.0	87.5	12.5	86.5
15.	Orissa	89.3	47.8	62.3	37.7	73.1
16.	Other NE States+	41.5	13.6	89.2	8.1	91.9
17.	Punjab	63.7	4.9	92.3	7.7	92.3
18.	Rajasthan	59.8	15.1	56.1	39.0	87.8
19.	Tamil Nadu+	82.9	55.8	79.3	20.7	98.0
20.	Uttar Pradesh+	60.1	48.7	85.7	14.3	91.7
21.	West Bengal	23.0	0.7	100.0	0.0	100.0
Brothel Based		66.6	40.5	80.0	19.9	89.9
Non Brothel Based		63.1	19.9	71.9	27.5	91.1
<b>All India</b>		<b>64.5</b>	<b>28.0</b>	<b>76.5</b>	<b>23.2</b>	<b>90.4</b>

Base: All Respondents

\* Base: Those Respondents who have had a HIV test

**Table 3.29: Exposure to STI/HIV/AIDS Programme Interventions in the Past 1 year**  
(All figure are in percentage)

S.No.	State/State Group	Approaching for education on STI/HIV/AIDS	Attend/participate in campaign/meeting on STI/HIV/AIDS
1.	Andhra Pradesh	44.1	8.2
2.	Assam	52.2	12.6
3.	Bihar+	11.5	4.2
4.	Delhi	82.5	29.7
5.	Goa	80.4	45.6
6.	Gujarat	60.4	28.8
7.	Haryana	8.1	2.6
8.	Himachal Pradesh	14.8	8.1
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	9.6	2.6
10.	Karnataka	27.0	11.2
11.	Kerala	63.3	60.0
12.	Madhya Pradesh +	60.9	26.8
13.	Maharashtra	70.3	36.1
14.	Manipur	64.0	41.6
15.	Orissa	55.5	33.1
16.	Other NE States	20.2	9.6
17.	Punjab	10.9	4.5
18.	Rajasthan	33.6	18.1
19.	Tamil Nadu+	57.6	52.4
20.	Uttar Pradesh+	43.2	15.8
21.	West Bengal	92.9	50.7
Brothel Based		61.8	30.1
Non Brothel Based		37.2	20.8
<b>All India</b>		<b>46.9</b>	<b>24.5</b>

Base: All Respondent

## CHAPTER - 4

### CLIENT OF FEMALE SEX WORKERS

#### 4.1 Background

Acknowledged as the critical bridge group in the HIV/AIDS transmission route, Clients of Female Sex Workers are one of the key target groups for any intervention project. The national baseline BSS survey among high risk and bridge groups thus had undertaken a detailed study of this population, their awareness of STD and HIV/AIDS, prevalence of STD among the clients, their treatment seeking behavior, sexual behavior and condom usage, beside other salient observations pertaining to their risk behavior, HIV/AIDS testing and exposure to interventions. Each of the above issues would be discussed in detail in the ensuing sections. The discussion will present the national scenario and the state-wise trends. In addition trends will also look at any difference between clients of brothel based and non-brothel based sex workers.

#### 4.2 Respondents' Profile

The following sub-sections provide background information pertaining to the age, education levels, marital status, occupation, residential status and substance abuse among the target respondent group by each individual State/State Group.

##### 4.2.1 Age of the Respondents

The survey was conducted among **Men who had bought sex for money in the past one month irrespective of their age**. Age was recorded in completed years at the time of the survey.

Table 4.1 presents the age distribution of the respondents across states. Overall, half (46%) the respondents were aged 26-35 years. Those aged 20-25 years comprised about a third (34%) while those below 20 years were around 5%. The mean and median age of respondents across the country was 28 years (SD +/- 6.6) and 27 years (Range 15 - 49) respectively.

Clients visiting brothel based sex workers were younger compared to those visiting non-brothel based FSW.

There were considerable variations in age distribution of respondents across all the states/state groups (Table 3.1). Proportion of clients below 25 years was significantly higher in Goa (70%), Delhi (58%), Madhya Pradesh (52%) and Uttar Pradesh (51%), while the proportion of clients above 35 years was significantly high in Kerala (32%), West Bengal (27%), Tamil Nadu (23%) and Assam (23 %). The mean age of the clients was lowest in Goa (25.4) and highest in Kerala (31.9).

**Table 4.1: Age Distribution of the Respondents**

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/State Group	Age Groups (in Years)					Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Range	
		< 20	20-25	26-35	36-45	45+				Min	Max
1	Andhra Pradesh	3.6	38.6	48.4	9.4	0.0	27.6	5.6	27	18	45
2	Assam	2.2	25.5	49.4	22.5	0.4	30.3	6.6	30	16	46
3	Bihar+	9.7	32.5	42.9	13.1	1.7	28.2	7.2	28	16	49
4	Delhi	11.9	46.5	34.2	7.1	0.4	25.7	5.9	25	18	48
5	Goa	10.7	59.6	26.3	3.3	0.0	24.5	5.1	24	18	45
6	Gujarat	5.1	31.6	51.2	11.1	1.0	28.4	6.3	28	18	49
7	Haryana	8.1	39.5	44.6	7.7	0.0	26.6	5.7	26	18	45
8	Himachal Pradesh	1.9	39.0	53.6	5.6	0.0	26.8	4.7	26	18	41
9	Jammu & Kashmir	2.3	35.3	53.5	8.8	0.0	27.8	5.5	27	18	45
10	Karnataka	2.2	20.1	63.6	13.4	0.7	29.7	5.5	29	19	47
11	Kerala	1.5	23.7	43.0	25.6	6.3	31.9	8.2	29	18	49
12	Madhya Pradesh +	6.5	49.5	39.0	4.7	0.4	25.6	5.2	25	18	47
13	Maharashtra	8.1	44.4	36.7	10.4	0.4	26.7	6.2	25	18	47
14	Manipur	10.3	21.7	45.6	19.8	2.7	29.5	8.0	28	15	49
15	Orissa	2.9	32.6	39.9	23.6	1.1	30.0	7.2	30	17	48
16	Other NE States+	1.9	29.1	58.6	10.1	0.4	28.6	5.7	28	18	48
17	Punjab	5.9	30.0	46.9	16.1	1.1	28.5	6.6	28	18	49
18	Rajasthan	2.2	43.8	51.3	2.6	0.0	26.4	4.4	26	18	40
19	Tamil Nadu+	0.7	16.1	60.3	21.0	1.9	31.2	6.2	30	19	49
20	Uttar Pradesh+	10.9	40.4	38.6	9.7	0.4	26.9	6.7	25	18	48
21	West Bengal	3.5	21.8	46.8	22.9	4.9	31.5	7.8	30	15	49
	<b>Client-Brothel Based</b>	8.0	40.7	38.1	11.9	1.3	27.4	6.9	26.0	15	49
	<b>Client-Non Brothel Based</b>	3.7	30.3	51.5	13.4	1.1	28.7	6.4	28.0	15	49
	<b>All India</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>34.3</b>	<b>46.3</b>	<b>12.8</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>28.2</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>49</b>

Base: All respondents

## 4.2.2 Educational level of the Respondents

**Table 4.2: Education Level of the Respondents**

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl.No.	State/ State Group	Education Level				
		Illiterate*	Grade I-V	Grade VI-X	Grade XI-XII	Grade XII+
1	Andhra Pradesh	18.1	16.6	38.6	13.0	13.7
2	Assam	22.5	18.1	39.9	9.2	10.3
3	Bihar+	26.0	15.6	35.6	12.5	10.4
4	Delhi	21.9	15.2	36.8	10.0	16.0
5	Goa	8.1	11.9	44.8	14.1	21.1
6	Gujarat	18.9	27.9	35.7	12.1	5.4
7	Haryana	19.2	17.3	45.4	8.9	9.2
8	Himachal Pradesh	14.6	13.1	50.9	10.9	10.5
9	Jammu & Kashmir	17.2	25.1	46.0	9.8	1.9
10	Karnataka	27.1	17.1	35.3	14.5	5.9
11	Kerala	6.7	12.2	50.0	15.6	15.6
12	Madhya Pradesh +	14.6	22.5	41.4	10.4	11.1
13	Maharashtra	14.8	13.3	42.2	15.9	13.7
14	Manipur	21.3	7.5	31.8	18.4	21.0
15	Orissa	27.2	23.6	34.4	8.7	6.2
16	Other NE States+	29.9	14.9	40.7	7.1	7.5
17	Punjab	37.0	24.2	28.9	5.9	4.0
18	Rajasthan	11.6	14.6	43.8	6.4	23.6
19	Tamil Nadu+	15.7	16.5	50.2	7.9	9.7
20	Uttar Pradesh+	42.7	14.2	23.6	9.0	10.5
21	West Bengal	28.9	28.5	32.0	5.6	4.9
	<b>Client-Brothel Based</b>	23.0	18.2	36.4	10.7	11.7
	<b>Client-Non Brothel Based</b>	20.0	17.3	41.2	10.8	10.7
	<b>All India</b>	<b>21.2</b>	<b>17.6</b>	<b>39.3</b>	<b>10.7</b>	<b>11.1</b>

Base: All respondents

\* Includes those respondents who are literate but no formal education

Table 4.2 presents the current educational status of the respondents. Overall, nearly two-fifths of the respondents completed middle or secondary education i.e. Grade VI-

X, while 18% respondents attended up to primary school (Grade I-VI), 21% respondents were illiterate while 22% had studied to beyond secondary school.

No substantial difference was observed in the educational level of clients visiting FSW in brothel areas compared to the non-brothel FSW.

The proportion of illiterates was 43 % in Uttar Pradesh as compared to only 7% in Kerala. Nearly a third in Goa and Kerala studied beyond secondary level. In Gujarat (5.4 %), Jammu & Kashmir (1.9%), Karnataka (5.9%), Orissa (6.2%), Punjab (4.0%) and West Bengal (4.9%) only a very small proportion were educated to beyond secondary school.

### 4.2.3 Marital Status of the Respondents

For the country as a whole, the proportion of ever-married respondents was around 54% (Table 4.3). The proportion of ever-married respondents was highest in Punjab (71%) and lowest in Goa (26%). The proportion of ever-married respondents in most of the States was in the range of 50% to 60%.

The proportion of ever-married clients (48%) of brothel based FSW was lower compared to clients of non-brothel based FSW (58%).

For the country as a whole, 68% among married respondents were married between 19 – 25 years. About 15% were married below 18 years.

The proportion of respondents married below 19 years was higher in Madhya Pradesh (39%), Uttar Pradesh (37%) and Haryana (31%) and low in Kerala (0.7%), Tamil Nadu (1%), Himachal Pradesh (1%), Jammu & Kashmir (3%) and other North East States (4%).

Table 4.4 reveals that nearly half of the respondents were currently married (52%) and most of them were living with their spouse at the time of survey. The proportion of respondents who were not currently married and not living with any sexual partner was around 46%.

The inter-state variation in specific marital status of the respondents indicates that the proportion of “currently married” respondents was significantly high in Punjab (71%), Jammu & Kashmir (69%), Karnataka (62%) and Himachal Pradesh (61%) whereas comparatively a lower proportion of clients were currently married in Goa (26%), Maharashtra (31%), Other North-East States (40%) and Delhi (46%). The proportion of “not currently married and not living with any sexual partner” was as high as 71% in Goa and as low as 29% in Punjab.

**Table – 4.3: Marital Status and Age at Marriage**

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/State Group	Ever Married		Age at Marriage					Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Range	
		N	%	< 18 yrs.	19-21 yrs.	22-25 yrs.	26-30 yrs.	30+ yrs.				Min	Max
1	Andhra Pradesh	147	53.1	7.5	40.1	49.7	2.7	0.0	21.6	2.4	22.0	9	27
2	Assam	160	59.0	15.6	20.0	41.3	21.9	1.3	22.8	3.5	23.0	16	33
3	Bihar+	154	53.3	27.3	33.1	26.0	11.0	2.6	21.2	4.1	20.0	12	33
4	Delhi	128	47.6	24.2	38.3	28.9	6.3	2.3	20.9	3.6	20.0	12	33
5	Goa	70	25.9	11.6	23.2	46.4	18.8	0.0	22.9	3.4	23.0	17	30
6	Gujarat	183	61.6	19.8	24.2	52.7	3.3	0.0	21.4	3.0	22.0	10	28
7	Haryana	153	56.5	31.4	39.2	27.5	2.0	0.0	20.0	2.9	20.0	8	29
8	Himachal Pradesh	163	61.0	1.2	39.3	55.2	4.3	0.0	22.1	1.8	22.0	17	27
9	Jammu & Kashmir	150	69.8	2.7	32.0	52.0	12.7	0.7	22.7	2.8	22.0	10	32
10	Karnataka	175	65.1	5.7	22.9	45.7	25.1	0.6	23.4	3.1	24.0	14	36
11	Kerala	138	51.1	0.7	4.3	25.4	61.6	8.0	26.7	3.6	26.0	15	38
12	Madhya Pradesh +	145	51.8	38.6	29.7	27.6	3.4	0.7	20.0	3.2	20.0	12	32
13	Maharashtra	99	36.7	9.1	34.3	43.4	12.1	1.0	22.3	3.0	22.0	15	33
14	Manipur	147	55.1	6.8	19.7	38.1	29.9	5.4	24.2	4.6	24.0	11	45
15	Orissa	155	56.2	3.9	14.8	49.7	31.0	0.6	24.1	3.3	25.0	9	31
16	Other NE States+	123	45.9	4.1	23.8	54.1	17.2	0.8	23.2	2.9	23.0	16	31
17	Punjab	195	71.4	16.4	39.5	40.0	4.1	0.0	21.1	2.8	21.0	12	30
18	Rajasthan	148	55.4	32.0	51.7	15.0	1.4	0.0	19.2	3.2	20.0	11	26
19	Tamil Nadu+	149	55.8	0.7	4.7	61.7	30.9	2.0	24.9	2.3	25.0	18	32
20	Uttar Pradesh+	127	47.6	37.0	31.5	25.2	6.3	0.0	20.0	3.3	20.0	8	28
21	<b>West Bengal</b>	176	62.0	10.2	25.0	38.1	25	1.7	23.1	4.0	22.0	9	32
	<b>Client-Brothel Based</b>	1054	47.8	20.6	28.5	34.9	14.7	1.2	21.8	3.8	22.0	8	33
	<b>Client-Non Brothel Based</b>	2031	58.4	11.4	28.2	43.1	16.0	1.3	22.5	3.6	22.0	11	45
	<b>All India</b>	<b>3085</b>	<b>54.3</b>	<b>14.6</b>	<b>28.3</b>	<b>40.3</b>	<b>15.5</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>22.2</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>22.0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>45</b>

Base: All respondents for “Ever married”  
Married respondent for “Age at marriage”

It was observed that a higher proportion of Clients of non-brothel based FSW were currently married (57%) compared to clients of brothel based FSW (46.3%).



**Table 4.4: Status of Sexual Partnership of the Respondents**

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/ State Group	Currently Married and Living with spouse	Currently Married and living with other Sexual Partner	Currently married and not living with spouse or other Sexual Partner	Currently married	Not currently married and living with Sexual Partner	Not currently married and not living with Sexual Partner
1	Andhra Pradesh	37.5	10.5	4.0	52	10.5	37.5
2	Assam	29.5	0.4	28.4	58.3	1.5	40.2
3	Bihar+	40.8	0.7	7.3	48.8	0.3	50.9
4	Delhi	18.2	4.1	23.4	45.7	0.7	53.5
5	Goa	22.2	0.0	3.7	25.9	3.3	70.7
6	Gujarat	52.2	0.3	5.1	57.6	3.4	39.1
7	Haryana	33.9	1.5	19.9	55.4	1.1	43.5
8	Himachal Pradesh	54.3	0.0	6.4	60.7	0.4	39
9	Jammu & Kashmir	60.5	0.0	8.4	68.8	0.5	30.7
10	Karnataka	54.6	5.6	2.2	62.5	2.2	35.3
11	Kerala	44.4	1.5	4.1	50	1.5	48.5
12	Madhya Pradesh +	47.1	0.4	1.4	48.9	1.8	49.3
13	Maharashtra	28.5	0.4	2.2	30.7	0.7	68.5
14	Manipur	44.2	2.6	0.4	47.2	4.9	47.9
15	Orissa	36.2	9.1	10.9	56.2	4.0	39.9
16	Other NE States+	33.2	3	4.1	40.3	1.9	57.8
17	Punjab	47.3	0.4	23.8	71.4	0.0	28.6
18	Rajasthan	41.6	0.7	10.1	52.4	1.1	46.4
19	Tamil Nadu+	47.9	1.9	5.2	55.1	3.7	41.2
20	Uttar Pradesh+	39.7	1.5	6.7	46.8	1.1	52.1
21	West Bengal	53.9	0.7	5.3	59.9	0.4	39.8
	<b>Client-Brothel Based</b>	36	2	7.6	45.5	1.5	52.9
	<b>Client-Non Brothel Based</b>	44.5	2.2	9.4	56.1	2.6	41.3
	<b>All India</b>	<b>41.2</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>8.7</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>45.8</b>

Base: All respondents

**4.2.4 Main Occupation of the Respondents**

Table 4.5 presents the five main occupational categories of the clients of sex workers across the country.

The highest proportion of respondents (21%) were local transport workers including auto / taxi drivers, handcart pullers and rickshaw pullers. Petty businessmen / small shop owners comprised 16% of the target respondents and non-agricultural / casual laborers comprised 12%. Respondents in service (both private and government) comprised 12% and truck drivers / cleaners were the fifth largest occupational group (10%).

No substantial difference was observed with regard to the main occupational categories between the clients of brothel and non-brothel based FSW. However, difference between the proportions of clients belonging to “local transport worker” category visiting FSW was noticeable.

Across States, over 30% of the respondents in Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Punjab and Rajasthan were local transport workers. However the proportion of this occupational category among the respondents was low in West Bengal (9%), Goa (8%), Manipur (9%) and Madhya Pradesh (3%). Petty businessmen / small shop owners were more than 20% in Himachal Pradesh (29%) and Bihar (20%).

The proportion of non-agricultural labor was the highest in Other North Eastern States (26.7%). Other states with a high proportion (between 16%-18%) were Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Orissa, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal. Service, (both private and government) was the main occupation for over 20% of the respondents in Delhi, Goa and Maharashtra.

The proportion of respondents who reported to be truck drivers / cleaners was significantly high in Jammu and Kashmir (26%), Assam (19%) and Haryana (17%).

#### **4.2.5 Residential Status of the Respondents**

About 81% of respondents reported that they lived in the particular city / town where the survey was carried out (Table 4.6).

Across the country, 38% of respondents reported they had been living in the city / town since birth. In most of states the proportion of respondents who had lived in the city since birth was in the range of 40% to 60%.

**Table - 4.5: Main Occupation of the Respondents**

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/State Group	Main Occupation (Top Five)				
		Local transport worker	Petty business	Non-agricultural Labor	Service	Truck driver
1	Andhra Pradesh	18.8	11.9	15.2	12.6	7.9
2	Assam	14.8	14.4	14.0	15.9	19.2
3	Bihar+	16.6	20.1	18.3	7.3	6.9
4	Delhi	20.8	14.1	6.7	21.6	4.1
5	Goa	8.5	11.1	8.9	27.4	4.8
6	Gujarat	23.9	10.4	17.8	10.1	10.8
7	Haryana	35.1	10.7	6.6	4.4	17.3
8	Himachal Pradesh	33.7	29.2	9.7	9.0	3.7
9	Jammu & Kashmir	30.7	11.2	7.4	10.7	26.5
10	Karnataka	26.0	17.8	9.7	3.7	8.6
11	Kerala	16.7	19.6	14.1	14.1	6.3
12	Madhya Pradesh +	3.6	15.7	11.8	8.6	14.3
13	Maharashtra	15.2	9.6	7.4	20.7	4.8
14	Manipur	8.6	18.7	4.9	14.2	9.4
15	Orissa	23.9	15.2	17.4	8.3	13.8
16	Other NE States+	23.5	11.6	26.5	13.4	9.0
17	Punjab	42.5	19.8	8.4	9.2	7.3
18	Rajasthan	35.6	10.1	4.5	5.6	12.7
19	Tamil Nadu+	22.8	16.5	16.1	6.4	12.0
20	Uttar Pradesh+	21.3	17.6	12.4	8.2	1.9
21	West Bengal	9.5	25	17.6	12.7	5.6
	<b>Client-Brothel Based</b>	14.9	16.1	12.7	14.2	7.1
	<b>Client-Non Brothel Based</b>	25.5	15.6	12.0	9.9	11.4
	<b>All India</b>	<b>21.4</b>	<b>15.8</b>	<b>12.3</b>	<b>11.6</b>	<b>9.7</b>

Base: All respondents

**Table - 4.6: Residential Status of the Respondents**

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/ State Group	Live in this city/ town	Live in the city since birth	Staying alone	Not Staying at regular residence	Away from home in last 12 months*	
						Weekly	Fortnightly
1	Andhra Pradesh	89.5	48.0	10.5	7.2	4.3	7.2
2	Assam	87.8	22.1	19.9	36.9	5.2	4.4
3	Bihar+	63.3	6.9	17.6	17.0	9.7	6.6
4	Delhi	87.7	11.9	42.8	17.1	9.3	6.3
5	Goa	53.7	24.1	10.7	7.8	15.9	9.3
6	Gujarat	83.8	59.9	10.8	11.1	6.4	8.1
7	Haryana	90.4	26.6	23.6	9.2	10.0	3.3
8	Himachal Pradesh	92.5	52.8	10.1	4.9	10.5	11.2
9	Jammu & Kashmir	79.5	41.4	10.2	8.4	17.7	7.4
10	Karnataka	81.4	32.3	10.8	11.2	12.3	17.0
11	Kerala	59.3	38.1	8.5	20.4	5.2	8.5
12	Madhya Pradesh +	57.9	41.8	5.0	3.9	6.4	8.6
13	Maharashtra	85.9	47.8	9.6	4.1	3.3	3.3
14	Manipur	71.5	72.3	6.4	9.0	3.7	2.6
15	Orissa	86.6	29.3	12.7	35.9	9.4	5.4
16	Other NE States+	85.1	52.6	25.4	14.2	7.8	5.2
17	Punjab	89.0	45.1	15.8	12.5	5.5	1.5
18	Rajasthan	85.0	55.1	25.8	7.9	14.6	3.4
19	Tamil Nadu+	94.0	47.6	17.6	13.1	2.6	4.1
20	Uttar Pradesh+	90.6	52.4	17.6	11.6	2.2	0.4
21	<b>West Bengal</b>	80.3	0.0	8.1	7.4	8.1	7.7
	<b>Client-Brothel Based</b>	75.6	26.5	15.4	13.1	8.1	6.0
	<b>Client-Non Brothel Based</b>	83.8	45.8	15.1	12.8	8.0	6.5
	<b>All India</b>	<b>80.6</b>	<b>38.3</b>	<b>15.2</b>	<b>12.9</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>6.3</b>

Base: All Respondents

\* Base: All those who stay at residence

For the entire country the proportion of respondents staying alone was around 15 percent. The state with the highest proportion of respondents staying alone was Delhi (43%). Nearly half the States had a proportion ranging from 10% to 20% respondents who reported that they stayed alone. The states with the lowest proportions of respondents staying alone were Manipur (6%) and Madhya Pradesh (5%). The figures in Table 4.6 represent the responses of all respondents who were not staying at a

regular residence. These responses include those staying in a hostel / mess, labor camp, on a footpath / railway station / bus terminus / other public place or in any other place. For the entire country, the proportion of respondents not staying at their regular residence was around 13%. The states with the highest proportion of such respondents were Assam (37%) and Orissa (36%).

For the entire country the proportion of respondents who had been away from home at least once a week in the past 12 months was about 8% and the proportion of respondents who had been away from home fortnightly in the past 12 months was around 6%. This does not include those who work away from home but return home every evening.

A larger proportion of clients of brothel based FSW belonged to the city/ town where the brothels were located and where the respondents were interviewed compared to clients of non brothel based sex workers. In terms of risk factors, which could predispose to sex with FSW (staying alone, being away from regular residence etc.), the risk seemed to be similar to both groups of Clients.

#### **4.2.6 Substance Use (Alcohol/Drug use/Injecting Drug Use)**

At the national level 73% of the respondents reported ever-drinking alcohol (Table 4.7).

The proportion of respondents reporting drinking alcohol at any point of their life was particularly high in Himachal Pradesh (90%), Tamil Nadu (87%), Kerala (86%), Orissa (85%) and Punjab (85%).

The proportion of respondents drinking at least once a week was 45% and the proportion of respondents drinking daily was nearly about 23%. Respondents who had alcoholic drinks infrequently were 32% of all respondents – these included those who had drinks containing alcohol less than once a week or did not drink during the last 4 weeks from the date of the survey.

Nearly 13% of the respondents reported that they regularly consumed drinks containing alcohol before having sex with a commercial partner.

It was observed that a higher proportion of clients of brothel based FSW (18%) regularly consumed alcohol before sex when compared to clients of non-brothel FSW (11%).

The highest proportions of such respondents were in Orissa (31%) and in Other North Eastern States (25%). It is interesting to note that in both these states, the proportion of respondents who had drinks containing alcohol daily was also the highest (43%) in the country. Similarly, the State with the lowest proportion of respondents who regularly consumed drinks containing alcohol before having sex with their commercial partner was Himachal Pradesh (2%) and it also had the lowest proportion of respondents who had drinks containing alcohol daily (7%).

**Table -4.7: Alcohol Intake by the Respondents in Past 4 Weeks**

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl.No.	State/State Group	Ever had any alcoholic drinks	Drinking every day*	Drinking at least once in a week*	Drinking Infrequently*	Regularly drinking before sex *
1	Andhra Pradesh	79.1	20.5	53.4	26.0	9.6
2	Assam	80.1	35.9	49.8	14.3	8.3
3	Bihar+	60.9	22.7	42.0	35.2	17.6
4	Delhi	65.1	13.7	34.3	52.0	12.0
5	Goa	77.8	19.0	54.8	26.2	13.8
6	Gujarat	58.6	17.2	46.0	36.8	9.8
7	Haryana	77.5	25.2	43.3	31.4	4.3
8	Himachal Pradesh	89.9	7.1	45.0	47.9	1.7
9	Jammu & Kashmir	51.6	19.8	47.7	32.4	5.4
10	Karnataka	74.7	31.3	45.8	22.9	17.4
11	Kerala	85.9	17.7	54.7	27.6	16.4
12	Madhya Pradesh +	59.3	23.5	46.4	30.1	10.2
13	Maharashtra	67.0	13.8	37.0	49.2	18.8
14	Manipur	76.0	16.3	60.6	23.2	8.9
15	Orissa	84.8	42.7	37.6	19.7	30.8
16	Other NE States+	81.3	42.7	36.2	21.1	25.2
17	Punjab	85.0	14.2	32.8	53.0	7.3
18	Rajasthan	65.5	21.1	39.4	39.4	14.9
19	Tamil Nadu+	87.3	18.5	45.5	36.1	8.2
20	Uttar Pradesh+	45.3	16.5	41.3	42.1	11.6
21	West Bengal	81.0	31.7	44.3	23.9	21.7
	<b>Client-Brothel Based</b>	67.7	24.2	42.4	33.4	18.0
	<b>Client-Non Brothel Based</b>	76.6	22.1	46.1	31.8	10.6
	<b>All India</b>	<b>73.2</b>	<b>22.8</b>	<b>44.8</b>	<b>32.4</b>	<b>13.3</b>

Base: All respondents

\* All those who ever had alcoholic drinks.

The findings on substance use pertaining to drug use and injecting drug use are presented in Table 4.8.

**Table 4.8: Drug use by Respondents**

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl.No.	State/State Group	Ever Tried any drug	Types of Drugs				Inject drug in past 12 months
			Ganja	Bhang	Afim	Charas	
1	Andhra Pradesh	5.8	93.8	18.8	6.3	6.3	6.3
2	Assam	17.0	84.8	28.3	4.3	4.3	2.2
3	Bihar+	29.1	78.6	60.7	0.0	1.2	2.4
4	Delhi	13.4	61.1	50.0	11.1	33.3	0.0
5	Goa	4.8	76.9	23.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
6	Gujarat	7.7	34.8	17.4	39.1	17.4	13
7	Haryana	28.8	71.8	48.7	2.6	17.9	1.3
8	Himachal Pradesh	46.8	5.6	72.8	36.8	36.0	2.4
9	Jammu & Kashmir	8.8	26.3	84.2	26.3	0.0	5.3
10	Karnataka	8.6	65.2	30.4	0.0	4.3	0.0
11	Kerala	14.4	87.2	0.0	15.4	0.0	17.9
12	Madhya Pradesh +	11.8	63.6	21.2	24.2	3.0	33.3
13	Maharashtra	11.1	53.3	56.7	0.0	6.7	3.3
14	Manipur	37.5	82.0	2.0	8.0	2.0	30.0
15	Orissa	52.5	79.3	54.5	3.4	5.5	4.8
16	Other NE States+	25.0	73.1	14.9	0.0	10.4	32.8
17	Punjab	40.3	21.8	74.5	43.6	22.7	6.4
18	Rajasthan	28.1	52.0	69.3	21.3	24.0	9.3
19	Tamil Nadu+	19.9	98.1	5.7	1.9	0.0	15.1
20	Uttar Pradesh+	14.2	57.9	71.1	2.6	7.9	2.6
21	West Bengal	28.2	91.3	27.5	3.8	3.8	0.0
	<b>Client-Brothel Based</b>	20.8	75.2	48.8	4.6	6.5	4.8
	<b>Client-Non Brothel Based</b>	22.2	54.9	41.5	18.6	15.4	11.8
	All India	<b>21.7</b>	<b>62.4</b>	<b>44.2</b>	<b>13.4</b>	<b>12.1</b>	<b>9.2</b>

Base: All respondents for “Ever tried any drug”

All those who ever tried any drug for “Type of drugs tried” and “injected drug in past 12 months”

At the national level, around 22%, reported that they ever tried any drug. This proportion was particularly high in Orissa where over half the respondents reported this practice. Other states with high proportions were Himachal Pradesh (47%) and Punjab (40%). Among those respondents who had ever tried any drug, the most commonly used drugs were Ganja (62%), Bhang (44%), Afim (13%) and Charas (12%).

Those respondents who ever tried any drug were also asked if they had ever injected any drug without a doctor's prescription in the last 12 months. Drugs injected for medical purposes or for treatment of an illness were not included. About one-tenth of the respondents reported that they injected some drug without a doctor's prescription in the last 12 months. The proportions were significantly high in Madhya Pradesh (33%), the Other North Eastern States (33%) and Manipur (30%).

### **4.3 Awareness of HIV/AIDS**

The following sections highlight the awareness level among the respondents regarding different issues pertaining to the prevention of HIV/AIDS and common misconceptions pertaining to transmission of HIV/AIDS.

#### **4.3.1 Ever Heard of HIV/AIDS**

The respondents were asked whether they had ever heard of HIV/AIDS. While asking this question, owing to the prevalent nomenclature popular among the masses, no distinction was made between 'HIV' and 'AIDS'. The interviewers provided no description about HIV/AIDS.

The proportion of respondents who had ever heard of HIV/AIDS was significantly high across the country (96%). Over 99 % of respondents in Tamil Nadu, Goa, Himachal Pradesh, Kerala and Maharashtra reported having ever heard of HIV/AIDS (Table 4.9).

#### **4.3.2 Awareness of Prevention through Consistent Condom Use**

For the entire country 85% of the respondents reported that consistent condom use could prevent HIV. Awareness levels were over 90% in Tamil Nadu (96%), Goa (94%) and Maharashtra (91%). (Table 4.9).

#### **4.3.3 Awareness of Prevention by having one faithful uninfected sex partner**

Table 4.9 reveals that nearly three-fourths (74%) of all respondents reported that transmission can be prevented by having one faithful and uninfected sex partner. This proportion was over 80% in the 6 states of Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Himachal Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa, the Other North Eastern States and Tamil Nadu.



**Table- 4.9: Awareness of Methods of Preventing HIV Infection**

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/State Group	Ever Heard of HIV/AIDS	Awareness about different methods of prevention		Knowing two methods of prevention i.e. consistent condom use and faithful sex partner
			Consistent use	Having one uninfected faithful partner	
1	Andhra Pradesh	96.0	88.8	84.8	78.7
2	Assam	93.0	89.7	76.4	73.4
3	Bihar+	93.4	84.1	85.8	78.5
4	Delhi	97.8	90.0	68.8	64.3
5	Goa	99.3	93.7	79.6	75.6
6	Gujarat	93.6	83.8	68.0	62.3
7	Haryana	94.1	79.0	62.0	52.4
8	Himachal Pradesh	99.6	85.0	89.1	84.6
9	Jammu & Kashmir	97.2	80.9	77.2	74.9
10	Karnataka	91.4	78.8	57.6	48.3
11	Kerala	99.3	79.3	71.5	61.1
12	Madhya Pradesh +	95.7	86.8	50.7	47.9
13	Maharashtra	99.6	91.1	83.3	78.5
14	Manipur	97.8	77.9	73.4	65.5
15	Orissa	94.2	89.5	86.6	83.7
16	Other NE States+	88.8	82.1	84.3	78.0
17	Punjab	96.3	81.0	70.0	62.3
18	Rajasthan	98.9	74.9	67.0	52.8
19	Tamil Nadu+	100	95.9	83.1	79.4
20	Uttar Pradesh+	92.9	88.0	65.2	62.2
21	West Bengal	95.8	86.6	73.6	69.4
	<b>Client-Brothel Based</b>	96.1	88.7	74.2	70.0
	<b>Client-Non Brothel Based</b>	95.8	82.9	74.1	67.1
	<b>All India</b>	<b>95.9</b>	<b>85.1</b>	<b>74.2</b>	<b>68.2</b>

Base: All respondents

#### 4.3.4 Knowing both the Methods of Prevention

This section pertains to the knowledge of the two methods of prevention i.e. consistent condom use and faithful sex partnership. The levels of knowledge regarding the two methods of prevention have already been discussed earlier. (Section 4.2.2 and Section 4.2.3). In order to determine the proportion of respondents, who have a correct knowledge on methods of preventing HIV/AIDS, Table 4.9 provides the proportion of respondents correctly aware of both methods of prevention.

70% - 80% of respondents in 8 states (Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Goa, Jammu & Kashmir, Maharashtra, Other North East States and Tamil Nadu) were correctly aware of both methods of prevention. In Madhya Pradesh (48%), Karnataka (48%), Haryana (52%), and Rajasthan (53%) the proportion of respondents who were correctly aware of both methods of prevention was significantly lower than the other States. In Himachal Pradesh and Orissa the proportion of respondents correctly aware of both methods of prevention was over 80%.

#### **4.3.5 Awareness of HIV Transmission Through Needle Sharing / Mother to Child/ Breast Feeding**

Table 4.10 presents data on awareness of HIV transmission through needle sharing / mother to child/ breast-feeding.

Overall, 94% of the respondents reported that a person could get HIV/AIDS by getting injections with a needle that was already used by someone else who was infected

Nearly 86% of the respondents all over India were found to be aware of transmission of HIV from a pregnant woman to unborn child.

Nearly 71% of the respondents were aware of transmission of HIV from an infected woman to her newborn child. Better awareness levels were recorded in West Bengal (90%), Goa (88%), Andhra Pradesh (86%) and Other North East States (84%).

#### **4.3.6 Respondents aware that HIV is not transmitted through sharing meals with an infected person or through mosquito bites and that a healthy looking person may be suffering from HIV**

Table 4.11 presents the proportion of respondents who correctly identified the two most common misconceptions associated with the transmission of HIV and were aware that a healthy looking person may be suffering from HIV.

The two most common misconceptions are:

1. HIV can be transmitted through sharing a meal with an infected person
2. HIV can be transmitted through mosquito bites

**Table 4.10: Awareness of HIV Transmission Through Needle Sharing / Mother to Child/ Breast Feeding**

Sl.No.	State/State Group	Awareness of HIV Transmission Through		
		Needle Sharing	Mother to Child	Breast Feeding
1	Andhra Pradesh	98.1	91.4	86.1
2	Assam	98.8	89.7	62.3
3	Bihar+	97.4	87.4	76.7
4	Delhi	95.1	87.5	81.4
5	Goa	97.8	93.7	88.4
6	Gujarat	91.7	84.5	61.2
7	Haryana	87.5	63.9	52.2
8	Himachal Pradesh	86.5	69.9	54.1
9	Jammu & Kashmir	88.0	85.2	65.6
10	Karnataka	94.3	89.4	78.0
11	Kerala	92.5	90.3	79.1
12	Madhya Pradesh +	92.5	71.6	58.6
13	Maharashtra	95.5	90.7	72.9
14	Manipur	98.5	94.6	76.6
15	Orissa	97.3	80.4	50.8
16	Other NE States+	98.3	94.1	83.6
17	Punjab	90.9	85.2	57.0
18	Rajasthan	96.2	87.9	51.1
19	Tamil Nadu+	92.1	89.5	80.9
20	Uttar Pradesh+	92.7	86.7	72.2
21	West Bengal	96.3	98.5	90.1
	<b>Client-Brothel Based</b>	95.6	87.1	74.0
	<b>Client-Non Brothel Based</b>	93.4	85.8	68.2
	All India	94.2	86.3	70.5

For the entire country, the proportion of respondents who were aware that HIV couldn't be transmitted through sharing a meal with an infected person was 67%. Proportion harboring misconceptions was significantly high (over 80%) in Jammu and Kashmir, Maharashtra, and Rajasthan while the highest proportion of respondents who had correct awareness were in Manipur (92%). Relatively lower proportions

were recorded in the three states of Madhya Pradesh (50%), Bihar (50%) and Punjab (55%).

For the entire country, the proportion of respondents who were aware that HIV couldn't be transmitted through mosquito bites (70%) was comparable to the proportion of those who were aware that HIV couldn't be transmitted through sharing a meal with an infected person (67%). Over 80% in Jammu and Kashmir, Maharashtra and Manipur were aware of this issue and the highest proportion of respondents with correct awareness were in Tamil Nadu (91%).

The proportion of respondents aware that a healthy person could be suffering from HIV was around 64% at the national level. This proportion was the highest in West Bengal where 92% of the respondents were aware that a healthy person could be suffering from HIV. The proportion was also fairly high in Manipur (77%), Tamil Nadu (76%), other North East States (74%), Kerala (72%) and Orissa (71%). However, it was significantly lower in Goa (49%), Himachal Pradesh (37%) and Madhya Pradesh (39%).

The proportion of respondents who had correct awareness on the two misconceptions associated with the transmission of HIV and were aware that a healthy looking person could be infected with HIV was 39%. The lowest proportion was in Himachal Pradesh (15%) and Madhya Pradesh (18%). The proportion of respondents in Assam, Goa and Uttar Pradesh who had no incorrect beliefs about HIV transmission was in the range of 20% - 30%. The proportion was significantly high in the three states of Maharashtra, Manipur and Tamil Nadu.

**Table 4.11: Correct belief about HIV transmission**

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/State Group	Aware that HIV is not transmitted through		Aware that a healthy person could be infected with HIV	Respondents correctly identifying all three issues
		Sharing a Meal	Mosquito Bites		
1	Andhra Pradesh	79.4	76.2	65.0	41.2
2	Assam	57.2	63.8	67.1	29.9
3	Bihar+	49.8	58.1	56.7	31.5
4	Delhi	66.2	64.3	76.0	43.5
5	Goa	76.7	73.3	49.3	28.9
6	Gujarat	62.6	70.4	55.8	30.3
7	Haryana	64.6	61.6	50.6	32.5
8	Himachal Pradesh	69.3	54.7	37.2	15.4
9	Jammu & Kashmir	80.9	81.9	62.2	44.7
10	Karnataka	58.0	78.8	64.6	37.5
11	Kerala	67.4	70.0	72.4	45.9
12	Madhya Pradesh +	50.0	58.2	39.2	17.9
13	Maharashtra	86.3	85.9	65.4	54.8
14	Manipur	92.1	82.4	77.4	65.2
15	Orissa	58.0	68.8	70.8	44.9
16	Other NE States+	63.8	65.3	73.9	41.8
17	Punjab	54.9	57.5	57.8	33.0
18	Rajasthan	87.6	79.4	56.8	43.8
19	Tamil Nadu +	78.3	91.0	76.0	55.8
20	Uttar Pradesh +	55.4	59.6	68.1	27.3
21	West Bengal	60.2	65.1	91.5	46.1
	<b>Client-Brothel Based</b>	62.6	66.6	64.6	36.8
	<b>Client-Non Brothel Based</b>	70.2	71.6	62.7	39.6
	<b>All India</b>	<b>67.3</b>	<b>69.6</b>	<b>63.5</b>	<b>38.5</b>

Base: All respondents

#### **4.4 Awareness of STD, STD Prevalence and Treatment Seeking Behavior**

The section related to STD awareness, STD prevalence and treatment seeking behavior comprise an important part of the survey. The following sections provide an insight into the above-mentioned issues for all the State/State Groups where the survey was carried out.

##### **4.4.1 Ever heard of STD**

A prompted question on whether the respondent had “heard of problems like genital discharge or genital ulcer/sore or burning while passing urine which people get through sexual intercourse” was asked to all the respondents. Interviewers had to make sure that the respondents understood the symptoms and they also used local or popular terminologies to clarify the question.

About 76 % of Indian respondents had ever heard of STD. This proportion was significantly high in West Bengal (98%), Orissa (97%), Kerala (95%), Tamil Nadu (94%), Haryana (94%) and Himachal Pradesh (93%). States where the proportion was significantly lower were Karnataka (39%), Uttar Pradesh (47%) and Bihar (48%).

##### **4.4.2 Awareness of Other Common STD symptoms**

Respondents were asked two prompted questions on awareness of other STD symptoms (apart from the three mentioned earlier) for both men and women.

For awareness of other common STD symptoms among men, the symptoms included Swellings in the groin area, Warts, and inability to retract foreskin.

Overall, two-third of the respondents (68%) were able to correctly identify at least one of the other STD symptoms among men. States where the proportion was significantly lower were Assam (48%), Uttar Pradesh (46%), Bihar (45%), Madhya Pradesh (44%), Other North East States (40%), and Karnataka (35%).

For awareness of other common STD symptoms among women, the symptoms included Lower Abdominal Pain, Swellings in the groin area, and Pain during sexual intercourse, and Warts.

For the entire country, awareness of at least one of the other STD symptoms among women was 66%. The proportion was significantly high in Himachal Pradesh (93%), Jammu & Kashmir (81%), Kerala (91%), Maharashtra (80%), Rajasthan (81%), Tamil Nadu (84%) and West Bengal (87%).

**Table 4.12: Ever heard of STD and STD symptoms among Men/ Women**

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl.No.	State/State Group	Ever heard of STD	Aware of at least one of other STD symptoms in	
			Men	Women
1	Andhra Pradesh	79.1	77.6	62.8
2	Assam	68.3	48.3	57.6
3	Bihar+	47.8	44.6	43.3
4	Delhi	79.2	74.7	72.9
5	Goa	58.9	50.7	51.5
6	Gujarat	89.2	74.7	76.1
7	Haryana	93.7	87.8	78.6
8	Himachal Pradesh	93.3	86.9	92.9
9	Jammu & Kashmir	82.3	80.5	81.4
10	Karnataka	39.0	34.6	19.3
11	Kerala	95.2	90.0	90.7
12	Madhya Pradesh +	52.1	43.6	40.0
13	Maharashtra	87.0	84.1	80.4
14	Manipur	64.8	61.8	50.9
15	Orissa	97.1	75.4	62.0
16	Other NE States+	59.3	39.9	43.3
17	Punjab	81.0	74.0	78.4
18	Rajasthan	83.5	81.3	80.5
19	Tamil Nadu+	93.6	86.9	84.3
20	Uttar Pradesh+	46.8	45.7	45.7
21	<b>West Bengal</b>	97.5	92.3	87.3
	<b>Client-Brothel Based</b>	70.8	63.9	60.3
	<b>Client-Non Brothel Based</b>	78.7	71.0	68.8
	All India	<b>75.6</b>	<b>68.2</b>	<b>65.5</b>

Base: All respondents

### 4.4.3 STD Prevalence

Table 4.13 presents the findings on STD prevalence (self reported) among the respondents. During the survey the respondents were asked if they ever suffered the following symptoms in the past 12 months:

1. Genital discharge
2. Ulcer / Sore in the Genital area
3. Burning Pain during Urination

Table 4.13 presents the proportion of respondents who suffered from any of these symptoms or more than one symptom.

Overall 9% respondents reported genital discharge during the past 12 months. Over 20% respondents in Delhi, Haryana, Jammu and Kashmir and Karnataka had genital discharge during this recall period. Bihar (2%) and Maharashtra (2%) were the States with the lowest proportion of respondents reporting genital discharge. The proportion in most of the remaining states was in the range of 4% to 8%.

For the entire country, 14% reported ulcer / sore during the past 12 months. Delhi (23%), Haryana (22.9%) and Jammu and Kashmir (23%) had a high proportion of respondents reporting Ulcer / Sore but the highest proportion was reported in Tamil Nadu (26%). Uttar Pradesh (5%) and Kerala (4%) were the states with the lowest proportion of respondents who reported Ulcer / Sore in the Genital area in the past 12 months. The proportion reporting Ulcer / Sore was in the range of 10%-20% in the remaining states.

Nearly 24% of the respondents reported burning pain during urination during the past 12 months across the country. The proportion of respondents who reported burning pain during urination was the highest in Rajasthan (45%) and Tamil Nadu (44%).

Nearly 30% respondents at the all India level reported at least one of the three symptoms in the past 12 months. The proportion of respondents reporting at least one symptom was particularly high in Haryana (50%), Himachal Pradesh (49%), Rajasthan (49%) and Tamil Nadu (48%), whereas, the proportion was considerably low in Uttar Pradesh (11%), Other North East States (12%), Goa (13%), Kerala (13%) and Bihar (15%).

Nearly 43% respondents at the all India level reported more than one of the three symptoms in the past 12 months. The proportion of respondents reporting more than one symptom was high in Assam (74%), Haryana (54%), Jammu and Kashmir (75%), Karnataka (58%) and Orissa (51%), while it was low in Bihar (25%), Himachal Pradesh (25%), Goa (18%) and Maharashtra (16%).

Overall, only 4% of the respondents at the all India level who reported either genital discharge/ genital ulcer/sore or both in the last 12 months. Inter-state variation indicates that the proportion of respondents reporting both the symptoms was as low as 0.4% in Maharashtra and as high as 19 % in Jammu & Kashmir. Except, in Delhi (11%), Haryana (11%), Jammu & Kashmir (19%), Karnataka (7%), and Manipur (5%), the proportion of respondents reporting both the symptoms was even less than 5% in all the other states covered under study. Nearly 3% respondents at the all India level reported all the three symptoms (genital discharge, genital ulcer/sore and burning pain during urination) in the past 12 months.



**Table 4.13: STD Prevalence**

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/State Group	Reporting symptoms in last 12 months			Reporting at least one of three symptoms in last 12 month	Reporting more than one symptoms in last 12 months	Reporting Genital discharge / ulcer/sore	Reporting all three symptoms in last 12 months
		Genital Discharge	Genital ulcer/ Sore	Burning pain during urination				
1	Andhra Pradesh	7.9	16.2	19.5	28.2	46.2	4.7	2.5
2	Assam	4.4	19.2	21.4	24.4	74.2	2.6	2.6
3	Bihar+	1.7	6.9	11.1	15.2	25.0	0.7	0.7
4	Delhi	20.1	23.4	36.4	43.5	58.1	11.2	11.2
5	Goa	3.0	4.8	7.8	12.6	17.6	1.1	0.7
6	Gujarat	3.4	16.2	29.0	35.4	34.3	1.0	1.0
7	Haryana	28.0	22.9	34.7	50.2	54.4	11.1	8.1
8	Himachal Pradesh	8.6	10.5	42.3	49.1	25.2	1.1	0.0
9	Jammu & Kashmir	20.9	22.8	20.9	26.5	75.4	19.1	18.1
10	Karnataka	20.4	18.2	39.4	45.0	57.9	7.4	7.1
11	Kerala	4.1	3.7	10.0	13.0	31.4	1.5	0.7
12	Madhya Pradesh +	9.3	13.2	22.9	31.8	36.0	3.6	2.1
13	Maharashtra	1.5	7.4	13.3	18.9	15.7	0.4	0.4
14	Manipur	12.0	9.0	16.1	22.1	47.5	5.2	4.5
15	Orissa	5.8	12.0	24.6	26.8	51.4	2.2	1.8
16	Other NE States+	6.3	5.2	8.2	11.6	45.2	3.0	3.0
17	Punjab	8.1	16.1	30.0	41.0	28.6	2.2	1.5
18	Rajasthan	12.0	10.1	44.6	49.4	31.8	2.6	1.5
19	Tamil Nadu+	7.9	26.2	43.8	47.9	53.1	4.9	4.5
20	Uttar Pradesh+	4.1	4.5	6.0	10.9	27.6	1.1	0.7
21	<b>West Bengal</b>	6.0	16.9	12.3	25.4	30.6	2.1	2.1
	<b>Client-Brothel Based</b>	6.4	11.2	16.8	23.1	37.8	2.8	2.4
	<b>Client-Non Brothel Based</b>	10.9	15.0	27.8	34.2	45.0	4.9	4.0
	<b>All India</b>	<b>9.1</b>	<b>13.5</b>	<b>23.5</b>	<b>29.9</b>	<b>42.9</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.4</b>

Base: All respondents

**4.4.4 STD Treatment Seeking Behavior**

Those respondents who reported any symptom of STD in the last 12 months were asked where they had gone for treatment of their last STD episode. Table 4.14 presents the 5 commonest treatment choices reported.

**Table 4.14: STD Treatment Seeking Behavior**

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl.No.	State/State Group	Treatment Sought				
		Went to Pvt Hospital/ clinic	Went to Govt. hospital/ clinic	Purchased medicine from Chemist shop	No Treatment	Took Home based Remedy
1	Andhra Pradesh	48.7	29.5	28.2	6.4	1.3
2	Assam	27.3	19.7	60.6	12.1	9.1
3	Bihar+	47.7	25.0	34.1	11.4	15.9
4	Delhi	54.7	17.1	6.8	21.4	4.3
5	Goa	41.2	14.7	2.9	11.8	20.6
6	Gujarat	33.3	20.0	14.3	28.6	14.3
7	Haryana	42.6	11.0	25.7	25.0	8.8
8	Himachal Pradesh	32.8	23.7	16.0	30.5	9.9
9	Jammu & Kashmir	26.3	29.8	29.8	7.0	5.3
10	Karnataka	27.3	41.3	11.6	9.9	7.4
11	Kerala	51.4	20.0	20.0	5.7	8.6
12	Madhya Pradesh +	29.2	23.6	4.5	38.2	2.2
13	Maharashtra	49.0	21.6	9.8	21.6	2.0
14	Manipur	37.3	10.2	28.8	22.0	18.6
15	Orissa	32.4	67.6	9.5	6.8	18.9
16	Other NE States+	25.8	32.3	29.0	9.7	6.5
17	Punjab	34.8	30.4	25.9	19.6	8.9
18	Rajasthan	29.5	32.6	2.3	28.0	2.3
19	Tamil Nadu+	47.7	43.8	41.4	8.6	10.2
20	Uttar Pradesh+	58.6	27.6	10.3	3.4	17.2
21	West Bengal	34.0	18.0	10.0	0.0	8.0
	<b>Client-Brothel Based</b>	44.1	28.2	10.4	16.7	9.6
	<b>Client-Non Brothel Based</b>	35.9	27.4	23.7	18.6	8.5
	<b>All India</b>	<b>38.3</b>	<b>27.6</b>	<b>19.7</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>8.8</b>

Base: Those who reported any or all symptoms of STD in last 12 months

About 18% of the respondents, who reported any symptoms of STD, did not take any treatment during the last episode. 9% reported taking some home based remedy, while 20% reported that they purchased some medicines from chemist shop across the counter. The proportion of respondents who visited any private hospital / clinic and government hospital / clinic last time were 38% and 28% respectively.

There were considerable inter-state variations in STD treatment seeking behavior. The proportion of respondents who did not take any treatment last time was significantly high in Madhya Pradesh (38%), Himachal Pradesh (31%) and Gujarat (29%) and low (3% to 7%) in West Bengal, Uttar Pradesh, Kerala, Andhra Pradesh and Jammu & Kashmir. Nearly one-fifth of the respondents in Goa, Manipur, Orissa and Uttar Pradesh took home-based remedy compared to only 1% to 3% in Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Maharashtra. Similarly, the proportion of respondents who reported purchasing across the counter medicines from a chemist shop varied from 61% in Assam to 2% in Rajasthan. Table 4.15 presents the findings on the time taken to visit a health practitioner by those respondents who reported any or symptom of STD in last 12 months.

Nearly 45% of respondents visited a health practitioner within 1 week of experiencing a symptom of STD and about 39% visited a health practitioner more than 1 week but less than 1 month since symptom was recognized. Nearly 15% respondents who reported any symptoms of STD in last 12 months visited a health practitioner after more than a month had elapsed. The proportion was significantly higher in Jammu and Kashmir (68%).

Overall, more than 90% respondents took allopathic treatment for the symptoms of STD. About 12% took Ayurvedic/ Herbal treatment. However, this proportion exceeded 20% in the 4 states of Delhi, Kerala, Manipur and Tamil Nadu.

The proportion of those who took Homoeopathic medicine was very low (4%).

**Table-4.15: STD Treatment Seeing Behavior – Time Taken to Visit a Health Practitioner during the last Episode and Type of Medicine Taken**

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/ State Group	Time taken to visit Health Practitioner			Type of medicine		
		1 week or less	<1 month but >1 week	More than One month	Allopathic	Homeopathic	Ayurvedic/ Herbal
1	Andhra Pradesh	34.2	43.8	21.9	97.3	2.7	12.3
2	Assam	31.0	63.8	5.2	98.3	0.0	10.3
3	Bihar+	64.1	30.8	5.1	94.9	7.7	5.1
4	Delhi	72.0	20.4	6.5	91.4	6.5	24.7
5	Goa	80.0	6.7	3.3	70.0	3.3	16.7
6	Gujarat	42.7	24.0	29.3	88.0	4.0	9.3
7	Haryana	48.0	46.1	5.9	93.1	7.8	6.9
8	Himachal Pradesh	48.4	44.0	4.4	93.4	2.2	17.6
9	Jammu & Kashmir	18.9	11.3	67.9	81.1	15.1	5.7
10	Karnataka	43.1	45.9	11	87.2	0.0	13.8
11	Kerala	45.5	48.5	6.1	81.8	0.0	21.2
12	Madhya Pradesh +	47.3	21.8	30.9	94.5	0.0	3.6
13	Maharashtra	80.0	20.0	0.0	85.0	15.0	2.5
14	Manipur	39.6	50.0	6.3	77.1	10.4	20.8
15	Orissa	23.2	55.1	20.3	98.6	0.0	2.9
16	Other NE States+	35.7	39.3	14.3	92.9	0.0	7.1
17	Punjab	37.8	53.3	7.8	96.7	1.1	11.1
18	Rajasthan	40.0	32.6	27.4	89.5	3.2	7.4
19	Tamil Nadu+	35.0	51.3	13.7	95.7	2.6	22.2
20	Uttar Pradesh+	57.1	28.6	14.3	92.9	3.6	17.9
21	West Bengal	56.9	40.3	2.8	98.6	5.6	6.9
	<b>Client-Brothel Based</b>	58.0	30.0	10.8	92.5	4.9	10.6
	<b>Client-Non Brothel Based</b>	39.3	43.2	16.2	91.2	3.6	12.9
	<b>All India</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>39.2</b>	<b>14.5</b>	<b>91.6</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>12.2</b>

Base: Those who reported any or all symptoms of STD in last 12 months

\* Multiple responses allowed

**Table 4.16: STD Treatment Source Planned to be utilized for Future Episodes**

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl.No.	State/State Group	Pvt Hospital/ clinic	Go to Govt Hospital/ clinic	Others
1	Andhra Pradesh	81.2	14.8	4.0
2	Assam	31.0	48.3	20.7
3	Bihar+	59.2	33.6	7.2
4	Delhi	57.2	40.1	2.7
5	Goa	65.6	28.1	6.3
6	Gujarat	66.7	24.6	8.7
7	Haryana	61.6	32.8	5.6
8	Himachal Pradesh	56.2	41.6	2.2
9	Jammu & Kashmir	35.3	56.3	8.4
10	Karnataka	36.1	47.6	16.3
11	Kerala	56.3	30.4	13.3
12	Madhya Pradesh +	49.6	46.4	4.0
13	Maharashtra	74.1	25.2	0.7
14	Manipur	39.7	45.7	14.6
15	Orissa	29.0	62.7	8.3
16	Other NE States+	30.6	57.1	12.3
17	Punjab	49.1	47.6	3.3
18	Rajasthan	32.2	62.2	5.6
19	Tamil Nadu+	52.1	34.5	13.4
20	Uttar Pradesh+	52.1	43.1	4.8
21	West Bengal	46.1	32.7	21.2
	<b>Client-Brothel Based</b>	54.0	39.0	7.0
	<b>Client-Non Brothel Based</b>	48.7	41.4	9.9
	<b>All India</b>	<b>50.8</b>	<b>40.4</b>	<b>8.8</b>

Base: All respondents

Table 4.16 presents the preferred source of treatment for future episodes of STD related symptoms.

Nearly half the respondents reported that they would seek treatment from a Private hospital/clinic as compared to about 40% of respondents reporting Government hospital/clinic as their first preference if they suffered from any symptom of STD. In most States the respondents preferred a Private hospital/clinic to a Government

hospital/clinic except Assam, Jammu and Kashmir, Karnataka, Manipur, Orissa, the Other North Eastern States and Rajasthan.

Only 8% of respondents reported preference for other treatment modes including, no treatment, taking home based remedies, borrowing prescription from a friend/relative, taking medicine available at home, purchasing medicine from a chemist shop, consulting a traditional healer/quack or consulting a NGO peer educator/ NGO clinic

#### **4.5 Sexual Behavior and Condom Usage**

This section deals with the sexual history of clients of female sex workers. This includes information on age at first sex, age and type of first sex partner, sex with male partner, last time and consistent condom use with male partner(s), sex with commercial, non-regular and regular female partners, median age at first sex with any female partner and mean number of female sex partners in the last three months. This also includes last time condom use and consistent condom use with different types of female partners, person who suggested condom use at last sex, type of condom brands used at last sex, source of condom used at last sex and reasons for not using condom at last sex with any female partner.

##### **4.5.1 Age at first sex with any partner**

With a view to ascertain the age at first sex, all the respondents were asked about their age at first sexual intercourse (penetrative vaginal or anal sex) with any partner. Table 4.17 presents the age of respondents at first sex with any partner across the various States.

It was observed that a significant proportion (68%) of the respondents had their first sex at the age of 16-21 years. The mean age was 20 years (SD +/- 3.5).

No significant difference was observed in the mean age at first sex reported by clients of brothel or non-brothel based FSW

It is pertinent to observe that nearly one-fifth of the respondents interviewed in Haryana (20%) and Madhya Pradesh (19%) reportedly had their first sex at less than 16 years.

**Table 4.17: Age at First Sex with any Partner**

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/ State Group	Age Groups (In Years)					Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Range	
		<16 yrs	16-18 yrs	19-21 yrs	22-25 yrs	25+ yrs				Min	Max
1	Andhra Pradesh	2.2	29.6	52.7	15.2	0.4	19.5	2.1	20	14	26
2	Assam	6.6	35.8	32.1	21.8	3.7	19.5	3.2	19	14	30
3	Bihar+	13.1	38.1	26.0	16.3	6.6	19.2	3.5	18	14	31
4	Delhi	13.8	50.2	26.8	7.8	1.5	18.2	2.6	18	11	28
5	Goa	8.5	39.3	33.7	17.0	1.5	19.1	2.8	19	12	28
6	Gujarat	7.1	28.6	40.1	23.2	1.0	19.5	2.7	20	12	26
7	Haryana	19.6	50.9	24.7	4.4	0.4	17.5	2.3	17	12	26
8	Himachal Pradesh	3.7	29.2	52.8	14.2	0.0	19.4	2.2	19	12	25
9	Jammu & Kashmir	2.8	20.0	41.4	33.0	2.8	20.6	2.7	20	12	28
10	Karnataka	0.0	27.1	39.8	29.4	3.7	20.5	2.7	20	16	29
11	Kerala	4.1	22.2	26.3	30.7	16.7	21.3	3.8	21	12	30
12	Madhya Pradesh +	19.3	40.4	25.7	13.2	1.4	18.2	3.0	18	11	28
13	Maharashtra	4.1	29.3	35.9	26.3	4.4	20.0	2.9	20	11	28
14	Manipur	8.6	18.0	35.6	22.1	15.7	21.2	4.2	20	14	37
15	Orissa	0.4	25.7	34.4	29.7	9.8	21.1	3.4	20	14	38
16	Other NE States+	3.4	24.6	36.9	28.4	6.7	20.6	3.2	20	11	30
17	Punjab	8.8	43.2	37.4	10.3	0.4	18.5	2.4	18	10	26
18	Rajasthan	3.0	55.4	38.2	3.4	0.0	18.3	1.6	18	10	25
19	Tamil Nadu+	0.4	13.5	48.3	33.0	4.9	21.1	2.5	21	15	32
20	Uttar Pradesh+	15.4	43.1	26.2	13.1	2.2	18.4	3.1	18	8	35
21	West Bengal	8.8	29.6	27.5	25.7	8.5	20.1	3.5	20	12	30
	<b>Client-Brothel Based</b>	10.4	36.9	29.5	18.7	4.5	19.3	3.3	19	8	38
	<b>Client-Non Brothel Based</b>	5.5	30.8	38.9	20.5	4.3	19.8	3.0	20	10	37
	<b>All India</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>33.2</b>	<b>35.3</b>	<b>19.8</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>19.6</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>38</b>

Base: All respondents

#### 4.5.2 Age and type of first sex partner

All the respondents were asked about the age and type of their first sexual partner. The findings are presented in table 4.18.

The mean age of first sexual partner for all locations was 19 years, which ranged from 16 to 22 years across various States. The age of first sexual partner had been reported as 16-18 years by a considerable proportion (37%) of the respondents.

More than three-fourths of the respondents interviewed in Bihar and Haryana reported age of their first sexual partner as less than 19 years. The proportion of respondents reporting age of first sex partner below 16 years was considerably high in Bihar (47%), Haryana (35%), Kerala (29%) and Orissa (25%).

Nearly two-thirds of the respondents (65%) interviewed across the country reported that their first sexual partner was a “female (unpaid)”. The proportion of respondents reporting a female sex worker (female paid partner) as their first sex partner was 35%. Few respondents (2%) had reported male partner as their first sex partner.

No substantial difference was observed in the proportion of clients from brothel area and non-brothel area as far as type of their first sexual partner was concerned.

Table 4.18 reveals that more than three-fourths of the respondents interviewed reported their first sexual partner as “female (unpaid)” in the States of Bihar (80%), Assam (79%), other North Eastern States (78%), Orissa (76%) and Haryana (76%) whereas a significant proportion of the respondents in Karnataka (59%), Maharashtra (52%) West Bengal (47%), Jammu & Kashmir (45%) and Goa (45%) reported their first sexual partner as “female (paid)”.

#### **4.5.3 Sex with any male partner and condom usage**

All respondents were asked about their sexual experience (manual/oral/anal) with any male partner. The related data shown in table 4.19 reflects that overall, about one-tenth (11%) of the respondents reported sexual involvement with male partner.

About 7% of clients from brothel area reported to have sex with any male partner as against 13% of clients from non-brothel area.

Table 4.19 reveals that a significant proportion of respondents reported sex with any male partner at any point of their life, in Himachal Pradesh (35%), Punjab (27%), Haryana (23%) and Kerala (22%).

All respondents who reported sex with any male partner were questioned about their sexual involvement with a male partner in the last 12 months preceding the survey. A considerable proportion of respondents in Bihar, Gujarat, Orissa, Maharashtra, Delhi, and Rajasthan had sex with any male partner during last 12 months before the survey.



**Table 4.18: Age and Type of First Sex Partner**

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/ State Group	Age of first sexual partner					Mean	Standard Deviation	Type of first sexual partner		
		<16 yrs.	16-18 yrs	19-21 yrs	22-25 yrs	25+ yrs			Female-unpaid	Female-paid	Male
1	Andhra Pradesh	7.2	44.4	22.7	17.3	8.3	19.6	4.0	71.8	26.7	1.4
2	Assam	23.6	36.2	19.6	4.1	1.1	17.3	2.7	78.6	20.7	0.7
3	Bihar+	47.1	32.2	14.5	4.5	1.7	16.1	3.6	79.6	20.4	0.0
4	Delhi	20.8	42.4	23.4	9.7	3.3	18.4	5.8	68.4	29.4	1.9
5	Goa	15.9	39.3	28.1	14.1	2.2	18.6	3.4	55.2	44.8	0.0
6	Gujarat	12.1	28.6	33.3	15.5	10.4	20.1	4.6	70.0	29.6	0.3
7	Haryana	34.7	41.7	12.9	7.7	3.0	17.0	3.8	76.0	22.9	1.1
8	Himachal Pradesh	9.0	39.0	25.5	18.4	8.2	19.5	3.6	60.7	34.1	5.2
9	Jammu & Kashmir	6.5	25.6	31.6	28.4	7.0	20.3	3.5	52.6	45.1	2.3
10	Karnataka	6.7	35.3	20.8	13.8	17.8	20.3	6.8	40.9	59.1	0.0
11	Kerala	28.5	14.8	12.2	18.9	19.3	19.0	8.2	59.3	35.9	4.8
12	Madhya Pradesh +	35	36.1	14.6	9.6	2.1	17.1	3.7	60.4	37.1	2.5
13	Maharashtra	6.7	35.2	30	23.3	4.8	19.9	3.7	47.0	52.2	0.7
14	Manipur	9.0	34.5	29.6	20.6	6.0	19.7	3.7	55.8	43.8	0.0
15	Orissa	25.4	38.0	18.8	10.5	4.3	17.5	4.8	76.1	22.5	1.4
16	Other NE States+	12.7	35.4	35.1	11.2	3.4	18.7	3.9	77.6	22.4	0.0
17	Punjab	21.6	44.0	19.4	6.2	8.8	18.4	5.5	61.5	31.5	6.6
18	Rajasthan	12.7	55.8	10.5	9.0	1.5	17.5	3.2	72.7	25.5	1.9
19	Tamil Nadu+	0.4	30.0	23.2	22.8	23.6	21.8	4.9	70.4	29.6	0.0
20	Uttar Pradesh+	19.9	40.4	18.0	13.5	8.2	18.9	4.5	64.4	34.1	1.5
21	West Bengal	15.5	41.5	25	14.8	2.1	18.5	3.5	53.5	46.5	0.0
	<b>Client-Brothel Based</b>	23.5	38.1	21.5	12.4	3.6	18.1	4.3	63.2	35.8	1.0
	<b>Client-Non Brothel Based</b>	14.3	35.9	22.7	14.7	9.1	19.2	4.9	65.5	32.6	1.0
	<b>All India</b>	<b>17.9</b>	<b>36.8</b>	<b>22.3</b>	<b>13.8</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>18.8</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>64.6</b>	<b>33.8</b>	<b>1.5</b>

Base: All respondents

As regards the usage of condom, across the various States, nearly one-fourth (24%) of the respondents reportedly used condom while having anal sex with any male partner last time. Regarding consistent condom use, overall only 15% of respondents, who had anal sex with any male partner in the last 12 months preceding survey, across the various States, reported using condoms every time they had sex with their male partners in the last 12 months.

**Table 4.19: Sex with Any Male Partner and Condom Usage**

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl.No.	State/State Group	Ever had sex with any male partner*	Sex with any male partner in last 12 months**	Used condom last time***	Used condom consistently in last 12 months***
1	Andhra Pradesh	4.7	30.8	0.0	0.0
2	Assam	4.1	9.1	0.0	0.0
3	Bihar+	6.2	55.6	10.0	0.0
4	Delhi	10.4	42.9	8.3	0.0
5	Goa	2.2	50.0	100.0	100.0
6	Gujarat	5.1	53.3	50.0	37.5
7	Haryana	22.9	50.0	19.4	16.1
8	Himachal Pradesh	34.8	5.4	20.0	0.0
9	Jammu & Kashmir	16.3	8.6	100.0	0.0
10	Karnataka	3.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
11	Kerala	22.2	30.0	44.4	33.3
12	Madhya Pradesh +	13.2	24.3	22.2	33.3
13	Maharashtra	5.6	46.7	42.9	28.6
14	Manipur	7.1	15.8	0.0	0.0
15	Orissa	8.3	47.8	0.0	0.0
16	Other NE States+	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
17	Punjab	27.1	28.4	23.8	0.0
18	Rajasthan	9.4	40.0	0.0	0.0
19	Tamil Nadu+	13.9	32.4	33.3	33.3
20	Uttar Pradesh+	9.0	16.7	25.0	25
21	West Bengal	1.1	33.3	0.0	0.0
	<b>Client-Brothel Based</b>	7.0	37.0	19.3	15.8
	<b>Client-Non Brothel Based</b>	13.2	25.8	26.3	15.3
	<b>All India</b>	<b>10.8</b>	<b>28.6</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>15.4</b>

\* Base: All respondents

\*\* Base: Those ever reporting sex with any male partner

\*\*\* Base: Those reporting sex with any male partner in last 12 months

About 19% of clients from brothel areas reported using condom last time as against 26% of clients from non-brothel areas. However, no considerable difference was observed in the proportion of consistent use of condoms reported by clients from brothel area and non-brothel area.

#### 4.5.4 Sex with Commercial/Non-regular/Regular female partner

A “commercial partner” was defined as a partner with whom the respondent had sex in exchange for money.

A “non-regular partner” was defined as a sexual partner with whom the respondent was not married to or had never lived with and there was no exchange of money for sex. Overall, around 17% of the respondents reported sex with “non-regular partners” in the last 3 months.

The proportion of respondents reporting sex with any non-regular non-paying partner in the last 3 months was considerably high in Tamil Nadu (30%), Kerala (30%), Karnataka (27%), Andhra Pradesh (26%) and Punjab (25%) whereas low proportions were reported in Uttar Pradesh (4%), Gujarat (6%), Goa (9%) and Maharashtra (10%).

“Regular Partner” was defined as spouse or live-in partners. Nearly half the respondents (48%) had reported sex with any regular partner in the last 3 months. The proportion was comparatively high in Karnataka (68%) and Andhra Pradesh (65%) and low in Goa (22%) and Maharashtra (28%).

About 41% of clients from brothel areas reportedly had sex with regular female partners as against 52% of clients from non-brothel areas.

#### 4.5.5 Median Age at First Sex with any Commercial/Non-Regular/Regular Female Partner

Respondents, who had sex in the last three months, were asked about age at the time of their first sexual intercourse with different categories of partners.

Table 4.21 reveals that the median age at first sex with any commercial or regular female partners was 22 years, while it was 20 years in case of non-regular partners.

No difference in median age was observed between clients from brothel area vis-à-vis clients from non-brothel areas.

Respondents from Assam, Bihar, Tamil Nadu and other North Eastern states reported a higher age at first sex with any commercial female partner, whereas respondents from Delhi, Goa, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh reported relatively lower age at first sex with any commercial female partner. Median age at first sex with non-regular partners was highest in Maharashtra (22 years) and lowest in Haryana (17 years). Median age at first sex with regular partners was highest in Kerala (26 years).

**Table 4.20: Sex with Non-regular /Regular Female Partner in Last 3 Months**

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl.No.	State/ State Group	Had sex with any non-regular female partner in last 3 months	Had sex with any regular female partner in last 3 months
1	Andhra Pradesh	25.6	65.0
2	Assam	15.1	47.6
3	Bihar+	10.4	46.4
4	Delhi	13.0	33.1
5	Goa	8.5	21.5
6	Gujarat	6.1	56.9
7	Haryana	15.9	39.5
8	Himachal Pradesh	19.9	54.7
9	Jammu & Kashmir	11.2	57.2
10	Karnataka	26.8	67.7
11	Kerala	30.4	46.7
12	Madhya Pradesh +	20.0	48.2
13	Maharashtra	9.6	28.1
14	Manipur	17.2	49.1
15	Orissa	11.2	51.4
16	Other NE States+	10.8	35.8
17	Punjab	25.3	49.8
18	Rajasthan	21.0	50.2
19	Tamil Nadu+	30.0	54.3
20	Uttar Pradesh+	3.7	43.8
21	West Bengal	10.6	56.3
	<b>Client-Brothel Based</b>	10.9	41.3
	<b>Client-Non Brothel Based</b>	19.7	51.9
	<b>All India</b>	<b>16.3</b>	<b>47.8</b>

Base: All respondents

**Table -4.21 Median Age at First Sex with Commercial /Non-regular /Regular Female Partner**

Sl. No.	State/ State Group	Median age at first sex with any commercial female partner*	Median age at first sex with any non-regular female partner**	Median age at first sex with any regular female partner***
1	Andhra Pradesh	21 (14,37)	21 (16,35)	20 (15, 26)
2	Assam	25 (16,41)	19 (14,30)	23 (16,33)
3	Bihar+	24 (14,40)	19.5 (15,27)	20.5 (14,32)
4	Delhi	20 (12,36)	18 (12,24)	21 (16,33)
5	Goa	20 (13,41)	18 (14,26)	22 (16,30)
6	Gujarat	23 (10,40)	21 (14,32)	22 (12,38)
7	Haryana	20 (14,31)	17 (12,25)	20 (12,29)
8	Himachal Pradesh	21 (14,30)	19 (14,28)	22 (19,28)
9	Jammu & Kashmir	22 (16,32)	20.5 (12,28)	22 (12,32)
10	Karnataka	21 (12,21)	19 (18,34)	24 (10,33)
11	Kerala	23 (16,45)	20 (13,32)	26 (12,38)
12	Madhya Pradesh +	20 (13,35)	18 (12,23)	20 (14,32)
13	Maharashtra	21 (12,31)	21.5 (13,27)	22 (17, 32)
14	Manipur	22 (14,49)	19 (14,36)	23 (15,37)
15	Orissa	23 (17,41)	21 (12,35)	25 (16,32)
16	Other NE States+	24 (15,36)	20 (15,27)	22 (16,31)
17	Punjab	21 (15,35)	19 (10,35)	21.5 (12,27)
18	Rajasthan	20 (11,37)	18.5 (19,25)	20 (12,26)
19	Tamil Nadu+	24 (15,38)	21 (17,31)	25 (11,35)
20	Uttar Pradesh+	20 (12,44)	18 (12,25)	20 (14,62)
21	West Bengal	23 (16,43)	20 (15,45)	22 (14,32)
	<b>Client-Brothel Based</b>	21.0 (16,31)	19.0 (12,45)	22.0 (14,32)
	<b>Client-Non Brothel Based</b>	22.0 (11,31)	20.0 (18,36)	22.0 (11,38)
	<b>All India</b>	<b>22 (11,31)</b>	<b>20 (12,45)</b>	<b>22 (11,32)</b>

\* Base: All respondents

\* \*Base: Those who had sex with any non-regular female partner in last 3 months

\* \* \* Base: Those who had sex with any regular female partner in last 3 months

Ranges are given in parenthesis

**Table 4.22 Mean Number of Commercial /Non-regular /Regular Female Partner in the Last Three Months**

Sl.No.	State/ State Group	Number of Commercial Partner		Number of Regular Partners		Number of Non Regular Partner	
		Mean *	Median *	Mean **	Median **	Mean ***	Median ***
1	Andhra Pradesh	3.1 (2.6)	2 (1,19)	1.4 (1.4)	1 (1,14)	1.3 (0.8)	1 (1,6)
2	Assam	4.7 (3.3)	4 (1,25)	1 (0.1)	1 (1,2)	2.1 (1.3)	2 (1,5)
3	Bihar+	2.7 (2.3)	2 (1,15)	1 (0.0)	1 (1,1)	1.3 (0.6)	1 (1,3)
4	Delhi	3.9 (4.7)	2 (1,35)	1.1 (1.1)	1 (1,11)	2.3 (3.4)	2 (1,21)
5	Goa	2.9 (2.4)	2 (1,15)	1 (0.0)	1 (1,1)	1.3 (0.6)	1 (1,3)
6	Gujarat	6.2 (4.4)	6 (1,27)	1.1 (0.9)	1 (1,10)	1.3 (0.6)	1 (1,3)
7	Haryana	4.1 (3.2)	3 (1,24)	1 (0.0)	1 (1,1)	1.3 (0.8)	1 (1,5)
8	Himachal Pradesh	4 (2.8)	4 (1,23)	1 (0.0)	1 (1,1)	1.1 (0.6)	1 (1,5)
9	Jammu & Kashmir	3.6 (1.9)	3 (1,10)	1 (0.0)	1 (1,1)	1 (0.2)	1 (1,2)
10	Karnataka	4.4 (2.5)	4 (1,17)	1.2 (0.4)	1 (1,4)	1.5 (0.8)	1 (1,4)
11	Kerala	3.6 (2.7)	3 (1,18)	1.1 (1.0)	1 (1,12)	2.4 (4.4)	1 (1,28)
12	Madhya Pradesh +	3.8 (3.2)	3 (1,21)	1 (0.1)	1 (1,2)	1.2 (0.6)	1 (1,4)
13	Maharashtra	3.2 (2.8)	2 (1,30)	1 (0.3)	1 (1,3)	1.6 (1.8)	1 (1,10)
14	Manipur	1.6 (1.4)	1 (1,20)	1.1 (0.8)	1 (1,10)	1.2 (0.7)	1 (1,5)
15	Orissa	3.3 (2.4)	3 (1,20)	1 (0.0)	1 (1,1)	1.2 (0.4)	1 (1,2)
16	Other NE States+	5.2 (5.5)	3 (1,62)	1.2 (1.5)	1 (1,15)	1.3 (0.8)	1 (1,4)
17	Punjab	4.7 (3.4)	4 (1,18)	1.1 (0.3)	1 (1,4)	1.6 (0.8)	1 (1,4)
18	Rajasthan	4.9 (5.5)	4 (1,80)	1.1 (0.8)	1 (1,10)	1.4 (1.4)	1 (1,11)
19	Tamil Nadu+	4.6 (3.4)	4 (1,18)	1 (0.4)	1 (1,6)	1.6 (2.3)	1 (1,21)
20	Uttar Pradesh+	3.1 (2.3)	2 (1,15)	1 (0.0)	1 (1,1)	1.1 (0.3)	1 (1,2)
21	West Bengal	3.7 (2.7)	3 (1,20)	1 (0.1)	1 (1,2)	1.5 (1.7)	1 (1,10)
	<b>Client-Brothel Based</b>	3.3 (3.0)	2.0 (1,35)	1.0 (0.3)	1.0 (1,11)	1.5 (1.6)	1.0 (1,21)
	<b>Client-Non Brothel Based</b>	4.2 (3.7)	3.0 (1,80)	1.1 (0.8)	1.0 (1,15)	1.5 (1.9)	1.0 (1,28)
	<b>All India</b>	<b>3.9 (3.4)</b>	<b>3 (1,80)</b>	<b>1.1 (0.7)</b>	<b>1 (1,15)</b>	<b>1.5 (1.8)</b>	<b>1 (1,28)</b>

\* Base: All respondents

\*\* Base: Those who had sex with any non-regular female partner in last 3 months

\*\*\* Base: Those who had sex with any regular female partner in last 3 months

**4.5.6 Mean Number of Commercial/Non-Regular/Regular Female Partners in Last 3 Months**

The mean number of commercial, non-regular and regular female partner was reported as 3.9, 1.1 and 1.5 respectively (Table 4.22).

No major differences were observed between clients of FSW from brothel compared to non-brothel areas.

The mean number of commercial female partners in the last three months in Gujarat and other North Eastern States was as high as 6.2 and 5.2 respectively compared to a low of 1.6 in Manipur. No significant difference was observed in the number of regular and non-regular female partners across different states.

#### **4.5.7 Last Time Condom Use with Commercial/Non-Regular/Regular Female Partner**

Last time condom use is an important indicator in BSS.

Table 4.23 indicates that overall about three-fourths (75%) of the respondents, reported using a condom last time they had sex with any commercial partner.

There were considerable inter-state variations. The proportion of respondents reporting last time condom use with any commercial female partner was significantly high in Jammu & Kashmir (87%), Himachal Pradesh (86%), Kerala (83%), Karnataka (82%) and Maharashtra (81%). High usage rates were also recorded in Tamil Nadu, Goa and Delhi.

Overall about one-third (32.8%) of the respondents, who had sex with any non-regular partner in last 3 months, reported condom use the last time they had sex. A higher proportion of respondents reported last time condom use with any non-regular female partner in Jammu & Kashmir (55%), Assam (52%), Kerala (46%), Maharashtra (46%) and Karnataka (46%).

Only 17.7 per cent of the clients reported using condoms in their last sex with any regular partner in last 3 months before the survey. Last time condom use with any regular female partner was as low as 2.1 per cent in Tamil Nadu and as high as 36.4 per cent in Assam.

#### **4.5.8 Consistent Condom Use with All Commercial/Non-Regular/Regular Female Partners in Last 3 Months**

Another important indicator in BSS is consistent condom use with different types of partner i.e. the proportion of respondents reporting consistent condom use with all commercial, non-regular and regular partners during the last three months. Therefore, all the respondents, who reported sex with different type of partners in the past three months, were inquired about the frequency of use of condom in the last 12 months with different types of sex partners.

Table 4.24 reveals that overall more than half (57 percent) of the clients interviewed reported to using condoms every time they had sex with all their commercial partners during last 3 months before the survey.

**Table 4.23 Last time Condom use with Commercial /Non-regular /Regular Female Partner**

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl.No.	State/ State Group	Last time condom use with commercial female partner*	Last time condom use with non-regular female partner**	Last time condom use with regular female partner***
1	Andhra Pradesh	74.7	32.4	21.1
2	Assam	74.9	51.2	36.4
3	Bihar+	68.9	6.7	5.2
4	Delhi	79.2	22.9	16.9
5	Goa	79.3	39.1	25.9
6	Gujarat	70.0	11.1	25.4
7	Haryana	67.9	18.6	15.0
8	Himachal Pradesh	86.1	43.4	13.7
9	Jammu & Kashmir	86.5	54.2	31.7
10	Karnataka	82.2	45.8	26.9
11	Kerala	82.6	46.3	11.9
12	Madhya Pradesh +	71.8	37.5	22.2
13	Maharashtra	81.5	46.2	9.2
14	Manipur	67.4	19.6	10.7
15	Orissa	73.6	29.0	10.6
16	Other NE States+	70.5	37.9	26.0
17	Punjab	68.9	27.5	10.3
18	Rajasthan	67.8	26.8	12.7
19	Tamil Nadu+	79.8	22.5	2.1
20	Uttar Pradesh+	68.5	10.0	24.8
21	West Bengal	66.5	26.7	13.8
	<b>Client-Brothel Based</b>	73.6	29.0	15.4
	<b>Client-Non Brothel Based</b>	75.1	34.1	18.8
	<b>All India</b>	<b>74.5</b>	<b>32.8</b>	<b>17.7</b>

\* Base: All respondents

\*\* Base: Those who had sex with any non-regular female partner in last 3 months

\*\*\* Base: Those who had sex with any regular female partner in last 3 months

There was no variation in the proportion of clients from brothel area and non-brothel area reporting consistent condom use with commercial, non-regular and regular partners.



**Table 4.24 Consistent Condom Use with All Commercial /Non-regular /Regular Female Partner In the Last 3 Months**

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl.No.	State/ State Group	Consistent Condom Use With Commercial Female Partner*	Consistent Condom Use With Non-Regular Female Partner**	Consistent Condom Use With Regular Female Partner***
1	Andhra Pradesh	63.3	22.1	18.4
2	Assam	34.6	23.1	6.2
3	Bihar+	37.0	3.3	3.1
4	Delhi	58.7	22.9	0.0
5	Goa	67.4	34.8	8.6
6	Gujarat	61.6	5.9	20.6
7	Haryana	40.6	23.3	2.8
8	Himachal Pradesh	56.6	22.6	2.1
9	Jammu & Kashmir	72.1	29.2	2.4
10	Karnataka	68.7	26.9	9.7
11	Kerala	75.8	37.8	4.0
12	Madhya Pradesh +	57.0	25.0	3.0
13	Maharashtra	77.4	30.8	2.6
14	Manipur	53.8	15.6	6.3
15	Orissa	72.3	26.7	3.0
16	Other NE States+	40.6	17.2	5.4
17	Punjab	48.1	20.6	6.0
18	Rajasthan	44.2	18.2	3.0
19	Tamil Nadu+	64.3	10.0	6.2
20	Uttar Pradesh+	63.7	10.0	8.5
21	<b>West Bengal</b>	48.9	10.0	8.1
	<b>Client-Brothel Based</b>	60.1	21.3	4.7
	<b>Client-Non Brothel Based</b>	55.6	21.9	7.9
	<b>All India</b>	<b>57.3</b>	<b>21.8</b>	<b>6.8</b>

\* Base: All respondents

\*\* Base: Those who had sex with any non-regular female partner in last 3 months

\*\*\* Base: Those who had sex with any regular female partner in last 3 months

Inter-state variations in consistent condom use, reveals that the proportion of respondents reporting consistent condom use with all their commercial female partners during last 3 months before the survey was significantly high in Maharashtra

(77%), Kerala (75%), Jammu & Kashmir (72%), Orissa (72%), Karnataka (69%) and Goa (67%). Comparatively a low proportion of respondents reported consistent condom use in Assam (35%), Bihar (37%) and Other North East States (41%).

About one-fifth (22%) of the respondents, who had sex with non-regular female partners in the last three months, reported using condom every time they had sex with all their non-regular female partners during the last 3 months. The consistent condom use among the respondents of various States falls ranged from 3% in Bihar to 38% in Kerala. Except for Kerala, the proportion of respondents in all the States reporting consistent use of condom was less than 30%.

A very small proportion (7%) of the respondents reported consistent condom use with their regular partners during last 3 months before the survey. However, in Gujarat about one-fifth (21%) of the clients, who had sex with any regular female partner in last 3 months, reported consistent condom use with their regular female partners followed by Andhra Pradesh where it was 18%. In rest of the states, consistent condom use ranged between 3% to 9%.

#### **4.5.8 Person Suggesting Condom Use at Last Sex with Commercial/Non-Regular/Regular Female Partner**

Table 4.25 presents data on persons who suggested condom use at last sex with commercial, non-regular and regular female partners.

About 66% of the respondents reported that they themselves suggested the use of condom last time while having sex with any commercial female partner. About one-fourth (24%) of them reported that their commercial partner suggested use of a condom last time.

Nearly half of clients from brothel area reported that they themselves had suggested use of condom last time with commercial partner as against three-fourth of the clients from non-brothel area.

The inter-state variations indicate that the proportion of those who themselves suggested condom use with commercial partners was highest in Assam (89%) and lowest in Delhi (44%).

Overall, slightly more than half (54%) of the respondents reported that they themselves suggested the use of condom last time with their non-regular female partner.

There was a wide variation across the different states in terms of self-suggested condom use with non-regular female partners i.e. 26.7 per cent in Rajasthan to 100%

**Table 4.25 Person Suggested Condom Use at Last Sex with Commercial / Non-regular/ Regular Female Partner**

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/ State Group	With commercial female partner*			With non-regular partner**			With regular partner***		
		Self	Partner	Joint decision	Self	Partner	Joint decision	Self	Partner	Joint decision
1	Andhra Pradesh	83.1	10.6	6.3	39.1	17.4	43.5	71.4	10.7	17.9
2	Assam	88.7	2.0	9.4	28.6	9.5	61.9	40.4	2.1	57.4
3	Bihar+	71.9	17.1	11.1	0.0	0.0	100.0	71.4	0.0	28.6
4	Delhi	44.1	32.4	23.5	50.0	0.0	50.0	46.7	13.3	40.0
5	Goa	53.7	30.8	15.4	55.6	11.1	22.2	46.7	0.0	53.3
6	Gujarat	73.1	26.4	0.5	100.0	0.0	0.0	48.8	7.0	44.2
7	Haryana	74.5	21.2	4.3	75.0	12.5	12.5	50.0	6.3	43.8
8	Himachal Pradesh	86.1	7.8	6.1	78.3	4.3	17.4	60.0	10.0	30.0
9	Jammu & Kashmir	81.7	12.4	5.9	61.5	7.7	30.8	59.0	12.8	28.2
10	Karnataka	63.3	26.2	10.4	33.3	15.2	51.5	53.1	12.2	34.7
11	Kerala	63.7	23.3	13.0	57.9	13.2	28.9	26.7	13.3	53.3
12	Madhya Pradesh +	53.2	32.8	13.9	61.9	23.8	14.3	53.3	3.3	43.3
13	Maharashtra	46.8	32.7	20.5	25.0	16.7	58.3	71.4	0.0	28.6
14	Manipur	77.8	13.9	8.3	44.4	22.2	33.3	50.0	21.4	28.6
15	Orissa	60.1	37.4	2.5	77.8	22.2	0.0	86.7	6.7	6.7
16	Other NE States+	82.5	10.1	7.4	81.8	9.1	9.1	44.0	4.0	52.0
17	Punjab	68.6	20.2	11.2	63.2	21.1	15.8	42.9	7.1	50.0
18	Rajasthan	55.8	37.6	6.1	26.7	26.7	46.7	29.4	11.8	58.8
19	Tamil Nadu+	59.2	32.9	8.0	83.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
20	Uttar Pradesh+	51.4	34.4	14.2	100.0	0.0	0.0	58.6	0.0	41.4
21	West Bengal	49.7	32.3	18.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	54.5	0.0	45.5
	<b>Client-Brothel Based</b>	53.8	31.3	15.0	52.9	14.3	31.4	58.6	2.9	38.6
	<b>Client-Non Brothel Based</b>	73.7	18.8	7.5	54.1	14.2	31.8	49.5	9.2	41.0
	<b>All India</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>23.6</b>	<b>10.4</b>	<b>53.8</b>	<b>14.2</b>	<b>31.7</b>	<b>52.2</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>40.3</b>

\* Base: Those who used condom last time with commercial female partner

\*\* Base: Those who used condom last time with non-regular female partner

\*\*\* Base: Those who used condom last time with regular female partner

In Gujarat. However, data should be interpreted cautiously, as the base was very small in many of the states.

More than half (52%) of the respondents reported that they themselves suggested condom use with regular partner. A careful interpretation of data is required, as here also the base was very small, across many states.

#### **4.5.10 Type of Condom Brands Used at Last Sex with Commercial/Non-Regular/Regular Female Partner**

Table 4.26 represents the data on type of condom brands used at last sex with commercial/non-regular/regular sex partner. To confirm the type of condom brands used the interviewers showed the package covers of all popular brands to the respondents.

As a whole, about one-third (32%) of the respondents interviewed reported use of Nirodh brand of condom followed by another one-fourth (25%) who reported use of Deluxe Nirodh brand. The remaining respondents reported Kamsutra, Masti, Kohinoor brands etc. with their commercial partner. There was a noticeable variation in the use of Nirodh with commercial partner across the different states ranging from 10% in Uttar Pradesh to 70% in Madhya Pradesh. In case of Deluxe Nirodh the usage ranged from 5% in Gujarat to 74% in Uttar Pradesh.

With regard to use of different brands of condoms with non-regular partner, the proportion was almost equal in case of Nirodh, Deluxe Nirodh and Kamsutra brands of condom.

Overall, 29 %, 22% and 20% of the respondents respectively as commonly used brands reported Nirodh, Deluxe Nirodh and Kamsutra with the regular female partners.

**Table 4.26 Type of Condom Brands Used at Last Sex with Commercial / Non-regular/ Regular Female Partner (All figures are in percentage)**

Sl.No.	State/ State Group	With Commercial Female partner*			With Non-regular Female partner**			With regular female partner***					
		Nirodh	Deluxe Nirodh	Kamsutra Kohinor	Nirodh	Kamsutra Nirodh	Kohinor	Nirodh	Deluxe Nirodh	Kamsutra Kohinor			
1	Andhra Pradesh	30.4	19.8	34.3	12.1	17.4	34.8	17.4	17.4	31.6	23.7	28.9	5.3
2	Assam	19.2	20.7	16.7	25.1	19.0	19.0	23.8	19.0	10.6	25.5	23.4	29.8
3	Bihar+	17.6	49.2	5.0	8.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	28.6	0.0	0.0	28.6
4	Delhi	27.2	50.2	2.8	8.5	0.0	12.5	25.0	50.0	6.7	46.7	6.7	26.7
5	Goa	32.2	7.5	28.0	15.0	11.1	33.3	33.3	0.0	13.3	26.7	46.7	13.3
6	Gujarat	59.1	5.3	6.3	11.5	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	65.1	2.3	11.6	4.7
7	Haryana	30.4	27.2	8.7	6.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	62.5	50.0	12.5	6.3	6.3
8	Himachal Pradesh	10.0	25.2	23.0	25.2	13.0	26.1	17.4	21.7	10.0	20.0	25.0	30
9	Jammu & Kashmir	29.6	27.4	22.0	7.5	15.4	23.1	15.4	23.1	23.1	38.5	17.9	7.7
10	Karnataka	34.4	18.1	27.1	14.9	51.5	42.4	0.0	6.1	46.9	8.2	36.7	8.2
11	Kerala	17.9	14.3	26.5	27.4	13.2	34.2	23.7	13.2	13.3	13.3	53.3	13.3
12	Madhya Pradesh +	70.1	7.0	6.0	5.0	38.1	9.5	4.8	33.3	40.0	13.3	13.3	6.7
13	Maharashtra	68.2	12.7	6.8	5.5	0.0	16.7	8.3	50.0	14.3	42.9	28.6	0.0
14	Manipur	18.9	14.4	25.0	21.7	11.1	44.4	22.2	0.0	14.3	7.1	28.6	21.4
15	Orissa	22.7	32.5	1.0	4.4	11.1	0.0	11.1	33.3	33.3	26.7	0.0	6.7
16	Other NE States+	26.5	21.7	22.2	13.2	27.3	9.1	27.3	18.2	48.0	16.0	28.0	4.0
17	Punjab	20.7	23.4	10.6	12.2	15.8	0.0	26.3	26.3	7.1	21.4	7.1	28.6
18	Rajasthan	37.0	19.3	7.7	12.7	6.7	13.3	26.7	13.3	11.8	11.8	5.9	41.2
19	Tamil Nadu+	31.5	25.4	24.4	15.5	55.6	5.6	5.6	22.2	66.7	0.0	33.3	0.0
20	Uttar Pradesh+	9.8	73.8	1.1	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.8	51.7	6.9	3.4
21	West Bengal	44.4	40.7	5.8	3.2	25.0	0.0	37.5	25.0	27.3	45.5	9.1	9.1
	<b>Client-Brothel Based</b>	37.1	33.4	7.3	6.6	17.1	11.4	15.7	32.9	23.6	33.6	12.9	10.0
	<b>Client-Non Brothel Based</b>	28.0	20.1	19.9	16.1	22.7	24.0	17.2	17.6	31.8	17.4	23.5	14.4
	<b>All India</b>	<b>31.5</b>	<b>25.2</b>	<b>15.1</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>21.5</b>	<b>21.1</b>	<b>16.8</b>	<b>21.1</b>	<b>29.4</b>	<b>22.1</b>	<b>20.4</b>	<b>13.1</b>

\* Base: Those who used condom last time with commercial female partner; \*\* Base: Those who used condom last time with non-regular female partner \*\*\* Base: Those who used condom last time with regular female partner



#### **4.5.11 Source of Condom Used at Last Sex with Commercial/Non-regular/Regular Female Partner**

All respondents who used condom last time were asked to report source of condom used at last sex with commercial, non-regular and regular partner (Table 4.27).

A significant proportion (43%) of the respondents reported chemist shop as the source of condom used at last sex with commercial partner. About one-third (32.5%) of the respondents obtained condom used at last sex from the person they had sex with i.e. from commercial female partner. The rest (one-fourth) of the respondents reported other sources like health worker/clinic, friend, pan shop etc.

About 54% of the clients from brothel area reported 'partner' as a source of condom used with commercial partner as against only 19% of the clients from non-brothel area, while 27% of the clients from brothel area reported 'chemist shops' as source of condom used with commercial partner as against 52% of the clients from non-brothel area.

The proportion of respondents reporting chemist shop as source of condom ranges from 17% in Madhya Pradesh to 75% in Andhra Pradesh. Similarly proportion of respondents reporting partner as source of obtaining condom ranged from 7% in Himachal Pradesh to 71% in Maharashtra.

Nearly three-fifths of the respondents reported chemist shop as source of condom used at last sex with non-regular partner. The rest of the respondents reported other sources like Pan shop, health worker/clinic, friend, etc. The proportion of respondents reporting chemist shop as source of condom used with non-regular partner was found to be as high as 89% in Goa to as low as 33% in Madhya Pradesh and Manipur.

A significant proportion (61%) of the respondents reported chemist shop as the main source of condom used at last sex with regular partner as well. The rest of the respondents reported other sources like health worker/clinic, friend, Pan shop etc. Comparison between states indicates that the proportion of respondents reporting chemist shop as the main source of condom used with regular partner was found to be as high as 93% in Assam to as low as 40% in Madhya Pradesh and Orissa.

#### **4.5.12 Reasons for Not Using Condom at Last Sex with Commercial/Non-Regular/Regular Partner**

All the respondents who did not use condom last time with their commercial or non-regular or regular sex partners were asked to mention the main reasons for not using condom last time. The findings are presented in Table 4.28. Since it was a multiple response question, the percentages across three commonest answers, given in the table, add up to more than 100% for a number of states. The main reasons reported for not using condom with commercial partner were "it decreases pleasure" (51%), "don't like condoms" (38%), "didn't think it was necessary" (37%) and not available (33%).

**Table 4.27 Source of Condom Used at Last Sex with Commercial / Non-regular/ Regular Female Partner**

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/ State Group	Source of condom – Commercial partner*			Source of condom – Non-regular partner**			Source of condom - Regular partner***		
		Chemist Shop	Partner	Pan Shop	Chemist Shop	Pan shop	Friend	Chemist Shop	Health Worker	Pan shop
1	Andhra Pradesh	74.9	15.9	2.4	73.9	0.0	8.7	50.0	21.1	5.3
2	Assam	61.1	17.7	14.8	61.9	14.3	14.3	93.6	2.1	0.0
3	Bihar+	36.7	18.6	38.7	50.0	0.0	0.0	42.9	0.0	28.6
4	Delhi	33.8	59.6	0.9	62.5	0.0	12.5	66.7	13.3	6.7
5	Goa	37.4	53.3	6.1	88.9	0.0	11.1	80.0	0.0	13.3
6	Gujarat	30.8	30.3	10.6	50.0	50.0	0.0	32.6	32.6	11.6
7	Haryana	51.6	22.8	7.1	62.5	0.0	0.0	62.5	31.3	0.0
8	Himachal Pradesh	46.1	7.0	19.6	56.5	21.7	13.0	70.0	5.0	10
9	Jammu & Kashmir	55.4	15.1	12.4	84.6	7.7	0.0	76.9	12.8	7.7
10	Karnataka	51.6	16.7	10.9	72.7	6.1	6.1	61.2	12.2	10.2
11	Kerala	42.6	24.7	18.4	50	31.6	2.6	60.0	0.0	20.0
12	Madhya Pradesh +	16.9	64.7	9.5	33.3	19	14.3	40.0	30.0	10.0
13	Maharashtra	23.6	70.9	4.5	83.3	8.3	8.3	57.1	14.3	14.3
14	Manipur	48.9	23.3	1.7	33.3	0.0	22.2	57.1	7.1	0.0
15	Orissa	18.2	51.2	21.2	66.7	22.2	0.0	40.0	26.7	20.0
16	Other NE States+	57.1	12.7	4.8	45.5	9.1	0.0	56.0	32.0	0.0
17	Punjab	59.6	22.3	2.1	57.9	10.5	10.5	85.7	0.0	7.1
18	Rajasthan	51.4	29.8	2.8	86.7	0.0	6.7	82.4	5.9	0.0
19	Tamil Nadu+	46.9	13.1	26.3	44.4	33.3	5.6	0.0	33.3	33.3
20	Uttar Pradesh+	25.7	56.3	9.3	0.0	0.0	100.0	69.0	13.8	6.9
21	<b>West Bengal</b>	18.5	55.0	18.0	37.5	50.0	0.0	40.9	0.0	40.9
	<b>Client-Brothel Based</b>	26.5	53.9	13.3	57.1	15.2	10.0	54.3	14.3	16.4
	<b>Client-Non Brothel Based</b>	51.9	19.1	10.7	61.4	14.2	7.3	64.1	15.0	6.5
	<b>All India</b>	<b>42.2</b>	<b>32.5</b>	<b>11.7</b>	<b>60.4</b>	<b>14.5</b>	<b>7.9</b>	<b>61.3</b>	<b>14.8</b>	<b>9.4</b>

\* Base: Those who use condom last time with commercial female partner

\*\* Base: Those who use condom last time with non-regular female partner

\*\*\* Base: Those who use condom last time with regular female partner



Table 4.28 indicates considerable variations in reported reasons for not using condom across different states. A major proportion of respondents in West Bengal (88%), Rajasthan (87%) and Orissa (79%) stated “decreases pleasure” as main reason for not using condom at last sex with commercial partner. Whereas, “Don’t like condom” and “didn’t think condom was necessary” were main reasons reported by the most of the respondents in Kerala, Assam and Madhya Pradesh.

As far as reasons for not using condom with non-regular partners in concerned, a significant proportion in Bihar (89%), Kerala (84%) and West Bengal (88%) mentioned decrease of sexual pleasure as the main reason, while most of the non-users of condom (with non-regular partner) did not think that condom use was necessary. The main reasons reported for not using condom with regular partner were “didn’t think necessary” (52%) ‘Decreases pleasure” (43%), “wanted child” (37%), “don’t like condoms” (35%), and “used other contraceptive” (25%).

Data should be interpreted cautiously as the base is small across the different states.

#### **4.4 Other Salient Observations**

##### **4.6.1 Risk perception of getting infected with HIV/AIDS**

Self reported data given in Table 4.29 points out that about one-third (35%) of the respondents perceived “no chance” of getting HIV infection. Almost equal proportion of the respondents (32%) reported “low chance” of getting HIV infection and one-fifth perceived their risk as “moderate”. Only 13% of the respondents reported a “very high” chance of getting HIV infection.

Inter-state variation in respondents’ perceived risk presented in Table 4.29, indicates that “Very high chances” of contracting HIV infection was perceived by a significant proportion of the respondents from Delhi (36%) followed by Karnataka (30%), Uttar Pradesh (29%) and Orissa (25%).

A significant proportion of respondents in Tamil Nadu (51%) and Assam (30%) felt that they had a moderate chance of contracting HIV/AIDS.

“Low chances” were perceived by a fairly high proportion of the respondents in Manipur (49%) followed by Bihar (44%) and Goa (43%).

“No chances” of getting HIV/AIDS infection were perceived by 66% of the respondents from Himachal Pradesh followed by Andhra Pradesh (55%), Jammu & Kashmir (49%) and Punjab (46%).

**Table-4.28: Reasons of Not Using Condom at Last Sex with Commercial / Non-regular / regular Female Partner**

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/ State Group	With commercial female partner *			With non-regular female partner**			With regular female partner***		
		Decreases Pleasure	Don't like them	Think Unnecessary	Decreases Pleasure	Think Unnecessary	Don't Like Condom	Think Unnecessary	Decreases Pleasure	Wanted Child
1	Andhra Pradesh	27.0	50.8	57.1	26.7	40.0	60.0	61.7	31.9	40.4
2	Assam	63.5	74.6	74.6	77.8	72.2	50.0	89.0	75.6	20.7
3	Bihar+	63.4	45.1	43.9	89.3	57.1	64.3	53.3	50.8	43.3
4	Delhi	51.8	57.1	21.4	34.3	34.3	45.7	27.0	33.8	41.9
5	Goa	48.2	3.6	3.6	57.1	71.4	14.3	74.4	23.3	51.2
6	Gujarat	81.0	1.2	32.1	60.0	26.7	20.0	41.0	53.3	18.9
7	Haryana	55.2	49.4	69.0	58.1	74.4	46.5	72.5	42.9	46.2
8	Himachal Pradesh	18.9	21.6	16.2	0.0	13.2	0.0	31.7	16.7	38.1
9	Jammu & Kashmir	10.3	10.3	17.2	0.0	12.5	4.2	26.2	6.0	58.3
10	Karnataka	6.9	1.9	3.1	52.9	14.7	2.9	44.1	7.9	18.1
11	Kerala	87.0	91.3	78.3	84.1	81.8	68.2	77.3	75.5	12.7
12	Madhya Pradesh +	73.7	69.7	68.4	65.7	54.3	37.1	77.7	56.3	50.5
13	Maharashtra	58.0	16.0	0.0	14.3	50.0	7.1	62.3	42.0	55.1
14	Manipur	25.0	29.8	58.3	30.6	66.7	19.4	54.5	16.1	41.1
15	Orissa	78.9	63.2	35.1	38.1	14.3	19.0	44.1	39.8	20.3
16	Other NE States+	63.1	55.4	38.5	55.6	50.0	61.1	57.4	47.1	36.8
17	Punjab	58.8	55.0	50.0	47.1	39.7	38.2	35.3	38.7	41.2
18	Rajasthan	87.2	31.4	53.5	61.8	47.3	23.6	65.0	76.9	37.6
19	Tamil Nadu+	60.4	58.5	54.7	53.2	69.4	62.9	100.0	55.0	75.0
20	Uttar Pradesh+	46.4	25.0	13.1	20.0	50.0	40.0	48.9	20.5	22.7
21	West Bengal	88.4	4.0	84.0	86.4	50.0	50.0	68.8	71.7	21.0
	Client-Brothel Based	64.9	46.8	31.1	44.7	46.4	38.5	57.0	46.1	35.6
	Client-Non Brothel Based	44.0	33.1	39.8	54.4	48.0	36.3	49.7	41.0	37.3
	All India	51.3	37.9	36.8	48.1	47.6	36.9	52.2	42.8	36.7

\* Base: Those who did not use condom last time with commercial female partner \* \* Base: Those who did not use condom last time with non-regular female partner  
 \*\*\* Base: Those who did not use condom last time with regular female partner

**Table-4.29: Perception Regarding Risk of Contracting HIV/AIDS**

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl.No.	State/ State Group	Very high	Moderate	Low	No chance
1	<b>Andhra Pradesh</b>	1.1	8.3	35.7	54.9
2	Assam	7.0	35.1	38.0	19.9
3	Bihar+	8.0	11.1	43.6	37.4
4	Delhi	36.4	21.6	18.6	23.4
5	Goa	5.9	18.1	43.3	32.6
6	Gujarat	9.4	15.2	41.4	34.0
7	Haryana	6.3	24.0	35.4	34.3
8	Himachal Pradesh	2.2	1.9	30.0	65.9
9	Jammu & Kashmir	14	14.9	22.3	48.8
10	Karnataka	30.1	17.1	33.8	19.0
11	Kerala	5.9	20.4	30.0	43.7
12	Madhya Pradesh +	16.8	26.1	24.6	32.5
13	Maharashtra	13.0	18.9	35.2	33.0
14	Manipur	8.6	23.2	48.7	19.5
15	Orissa	24.6	15.2	19.2	40.9
16	Other NE States+	14.6	23.1	31.0	31.3
17	Punjab	5.5	15.0	33.3	46.2
18	Rajasthan	3.4	27.0	24.7	44.9
19	Tamil Nadu+	16.9	50.6	23.2	9.4
20	Uttar Pradesh+	29.2	15.7	17.6	37.5
21	<b>West Bengal</b>	13.0	29.9	29.2	27.8
	<b>Client-Brothel Based</b>	18.2	19.6	29.0	33.2
	<b>Client-Non Brothel Based</b>	9.5	21.2	33.1	36.1
	All India	<b>12.9</b>	<b>20.6</b>	<b>31.5</b>	<b>35</b>

Base: All respondents

#### 4.6.1 Availability of confidential HIV testing in the area

Table 4.30, indicates that about two-third (69%) of the respondents surveyed reported that it was possible for them to get a confidential test to find out if they were infected with HIV.

In all the States the possibility of getting confidential HIV test was reported by more than half of the respondents and the range varied from 57% to 85% except for West Bengal (43%) and North East States (46%).

Overall, 10% of respondents reported having undergone an HIV test.

With the exception of Tamil Nadu (44%) and Goa (33%), in all the other States less than one-fourth of the respondents had reported undergoing an HIV test.

A significant proportion (82%) of the respondents who reportedly underwent testing did it voluntarily.

Due to small base available, in some states, the proportion of those who reported voluntary testing was 100%.

Most of the respondents (95%), who had undergone test, reported that they collected the results of their test.

#### 4.6.1 Exposure to STI / HIV / AIDS Programme Interventions in the Past 1 year

Table 3.31 presents the data on exposure to STI/HIV/AIDS Programmes.

Overall nearly a fifth (22%) of the respondents reported that someone to educate on spread of STI/HIV/AIDS in the last one year approached them.

While comparing proportion of clients from brothel area with that of clients from non-brothel area in terms of inter personal communication on STI/HIV/AIDS, no considerable difference was observed.

The exposure was as high as 42 per cent in Delhi and as low as 4.4 per cent in Assam. A significant proportion (more than one-fourth) of the respondents in the States like Orissa, Manipur, Tamil Nadu, and Goa were found to have being exposed to such programmes on STI/HIV/AIDS.

Table-4.30: HIV Testing

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl.No.	State/ State Group	Possibility of Confidential HIV Testing	Ever had HIV test	Voluntarily / required HIV Test *		Ever found out result of test*
				Voluntary	Required	
1	Andhra Pradesh	57.8	6.9	73.7	26.3	100.0
2	Assam	56.5	6.6	100.0	0.0	100.0
3	Bihar+	59.5	2.1	66.7	33.3	100.0
4	Delhi	76.2	10.8	75.9	24.1	93.1
5	Goa	83.7	32.6	86.4	13.6	97.7
6	Gujarat	67.3	7.7	56.5	43.5	87.0
7	Haryana	67.2	2.2	100.0	0.0	83.3
8	Himachal Pradesh	80.9	1.1	100.0	0.0	100.0
9	Jammu & Kashmir	80.9	4.7	80.0	20.0	20.0
10	Karnataka	75.1	18.2	77.6	22.4	100.0
11	Kerala	57.0	9.6	65.4	34.6	96.2
12	Madhya Pradesh +	74.3	10.7	56.7	43.3	83.3
13	Maharashtra	85.2	22.2	95.0	5.0	98.3
14	Manipur	63.7	7.5	55.0	45.0	95.0
15	Orissa	78.6	3.6	60.0	40.0	80.0
16	Other NE States+	45.9	7.1	94.7	5.3	100.0
17	Punjab	75.8	5.9	75.0	25.0	93.8
18	Rajasthan	73.0	4.5	75.0	25.0	91.7
19	Tamil Nadu+	80.5	43.8	92.3	7.7	100.0
20	Uttar Pradesh+	68.9	6.4	82.4	17.6	88.2
21	West Bengal	42.6	4.6	92.3	7.7	92.3
	<b>Client-Brothel Based</b>	70.9	11.5	82.2	17.8	94.1
	<b>Client-Non Brothel Based</b>	67.6	9.7	81.4	18.6	95.3
	<b>All India</b>	<b>68.9</b>	<b>10.4</b>	<b>81.7</b>	<b>18.3</b>	<b>94.8</b>

Base: All respondents

\* Base: Those respondents who underwent HIV testing

**Table- 4.31: Exposure to STI/HIV/AIDS Programme Interventions in the Past 1-Year**  
(All figures are in percentage)

Sl.No.	State/ State Group	Interpersonal Communication on STI/ HIV/ AIDS
1	Andhra Pradesh	22.0
2	Assam	4.4
3	Bihar+	5.2
4	Delhi	42.0
5	Goa	28.5
6	Gujarat	24.2
7	Haryana	10.3
8	Himachal Pradesh	22.8
9	Jammu & Kashmir	24.2
10	Karnataka	20.4
11	Kerala	23.3
12	Madhya Pradesh +	13.6
13	Maharashtra	17.8
14	Manipur	31.1
15	Orissa	37.0
16	Other NE States+	19.4
17	Punjab	12.5
18	Rajasthan	10.1
19	Tamil Nadu+	31.1
20	Uttar Pradesh+	17.2
21	West Bengal	19.4
	<b>Client-Brothel Based</b>	22.4
	<b>Client-Non Brothel Based</b>	19.6
	<b>All India</b>	<b>20.7</b>

Base: All respondents

**Study on Monitoring and Evaluation of National AIDS Control Project, Phase II**  
NATIONAL HIV/AIDS RISK BEHAVIOURAL SURVEILLANCE SURVEY (BSS)  
2001-2002  
**FOR USE WITH FEMALE SEX WORKERS (FSWs)**  
*FINAL –Oct 8, 2001*

**Operational Definition of the respondent**

**Women aged up to 49 years who have sold sex in the past one month**

**Introduction:** “My name is... I’m working for a social research organization. We’re interviewing people here in (name of city, region or site) in order to find out about the present health scenario in your (State/UT). We are trying to understand peoples’ common health problems, health seeking behavior and their knowledge, attitude, opinion and practice regarding some specific diseases. Importantly, the results of this study would help us in designing appropriate strategies for the future. Have you been interviewed in the past few weeks for this study? **IF THE RESPONDENT HAS BEEN INTERVIEWED DURING BASELINE SURVEY, DO NOT INTERVIEW THIS PERSON AGAIN.** Tell her you cannot interview her a second time, thank her, and end the interview. If she has not been interviewed before, continue:

**Confidentiality and consent** –I am going to ask you some very personal questions that some people find difficult to answer. Your answers are completely confidential. Your name will not be written on this form, and will never be used in connection with any of the information you tell me. You do not have to answer any questions that you do not want to answer and you may end this interview at any time you want to. However, your honest answer to these questions will help us better understand what people think, say and do about certain kinds of behaviour. We would greatly appreciate your help in responding to this survey. However, if you feel uncomfortable at any point of time, you could discontinue the proceedings. The interview will take about 30 minutes to ask the questions. Would you be willing to participate?

---

I certify that the nature and purpose, the potential benefits and possible risks associated with participating in this research have been explained to the volunteer.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of interviewer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**Important Instruction: The identification section has to be filled up for all the respondents approached for an interview. That means even in case of refusal, in-completed interview or non-availability of respondents the identification page must be filled up.**

**IDENTIFICATION**

Sl. No.	Details	For office use
001	SCHEDULE NUMBER	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
002	TYPE OF FSW BROTHEL BASED FSW 1 (Women selling sex within brothels) NON-BROTHEL BASED FSW 2 (Women selling sex at defined sex access points outside of brothels)	<input type="checkbox"/>
003	STATE _____	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
004	URBAN .....1      RURAL.....2	<input type="checkbox"/>
005	CITY/TOWN/VILLAGE _____	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
006	SITE _____	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>

007 RESULT CODE:

Result codes : Completed 1 ; Partially completed 2 ; Refused 3 ; Respondent available for the interview 4 ; Respondent not available for the interview

008 INTERVIEWER: Name \_\_\_\_\_

009 DATE OF INTERVIEW:      
D D M M Y Y

010 TIME: Starting Time \_\_\_\_\_   Completion Time \_\_\_\_\_    
Hrs Min Hrs Min

011. PLACE OF INTERVIEW: \_\_\_\_\_

012. INTERVIEW SETTING: One to One Interview 1 Interview in presence of others 2

013. SUPERVISOR: Name \_\_\_\_\_  Signature \_\_\_\_\_

014. ACCOMPANIED INTERVIEW ? 1. Yes 2. No



**SECTION 1: BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS**

Q No.	Questions and filters	Coding categories	Skip to	Coding Boxes
Q101	How old are you?	Age in Completed Years ____ Others (Specify)_____		<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
Q102	What has been your highest level of educational attainment?	Illiterate Literate but no formal education 1 – 5 <sup>th</sup> 6 – 8 <sup>th</sup> 9 – 10 <sup>th</sup> 11 – 12 <sup>th</sup> 12 + Others (Specify)_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q103	Do you live in this city / town ?	Yes No Others (Specify)_____	1 2	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q104	How long have you been living in/visiting this city/town?	No. of completed years _____ If less than 1 year...Record 00 Since Birth .....Record 97 Others (Specify)_____		<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
Q105	Were you engaged in this profession at any place before coming here?	Yes No Others (Specify)_____	1 2	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q106	Do you also travel to other places for sex work?	Yes No Others (Specify)_____	1 2	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q107	Have you ever had drinks containing alcohol?	Yes No Others (Specify)_____	1 2	Q110	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q108	During the last 4 weeks how often have you had drinks containing alcohol? Would you say...  <b>(READ RESPONSES AND CIRCLE ONE)</b>	Every day At least once a week Less than once a week Did not drink in the last 4 weeks  Others (Specify)_____	1 2 3 4		<input type="checkbox"/>
Q109	How frequently do you take alcoholic drinks before having sex with your clients / partners?  <b>(READ RESPONSES AND CIRCLE ONE)</b>	Always Sometimes Rarely Never  Others (Specify)_____	1 2 3 4		<input type="checkbox"/>

Q110	Some people take a range of different types of intoxicating drugs. Have you ever tried any?	Yes No  Others (Specify) _____  (If “Can not remember” or “No response” is mentioned in Others, Skip to Q201)	1 2	Q 201	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q.No.	Questions and filters	Coding categories		Skip to	Coding Boxes
Q111	Which ones have you tried?  <b>(DON'T READ OUT THE LIST. MULTIPLE RESPONSES POSSIBLE)</b>	Charas Ganja Bhang Afim Brown-sugar Heroin Others (specify) _____	01 02 03 04 05 06		<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Q112	Some people have tried injecting drugs using a syringe. Have you injected any drug without a doctor's prescription in the last 12 months?  <b>(DRUGS INJECTED FOR MEDICAL PURPOSES OR TREATMENT OF AN ILLNESS DO NOT COUNT)</b>	Yes No  Others (Specify) _____	1 2		<input type="checkbox"/>

**SECTION 2: KNOWLEDGE, OPINION AND ATTITUDE TOWARDS STI / HIV / AIDS**

Q.No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories		Skip to	Coding Boxes
Q201	Have you heard of problems like genital discharge or genital ulcer/ sore or pain during intercourse or lower abdominal pain or burning pain during urination, which people get through sexual intercourse?  <b>(IT'S A PROMPTED QUESTION. PLEASE MAKE SURE THAT THE RESPONDENT UNDERSTANDS THE SYMPTOMS WE ARE TALKING ABOUT. USE LOCAL /POPULAR TERMINOLOGIES, IF ANY)</b>	Yes No Others (Specify) _____  (If “Can not remember” or “No response” is mentioned in Others, Skip to Q204)	1 2	→ Q204	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q.No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories	Skip to	Coding Boxes
Q202	Can you describe any other (beside the symptoms mentioned in the earlier question) symptoms of STI in <b>WOMEN</b> ...? Any others?  <b>(PLEASE READ OUT ALL THE OPTIONS AND CIRLE THE APPROPRIATE CODE)</b>	Swellings in groin area Itching/reddening Warts Skin rashes Other (Specify)_____	Y N DK NR 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Q203	Can you describe any other (beside the symptoms like genital discharge, genital ulcer/sore and burning pain during urination mentioned in the earlier question) symptoms of STI in <b>MEN</b> ...? Any others?  <b>(PLEASE READ OUT ALL THE OPTIONS AND CIRLE THE APPROPRIATE CODE)</b>	Swellings in groin area Itching/reddening Warts Skin rashes Can't retract foreskin Other (Specify)_____	Y N DK NR 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

**SECTION 2: KNOWLEDGE, OPINION AND ATTITUDE TOWARDS STI / HIV / AIDS (Continued)**

Q.No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories	Skip to	Coding Boxes
Q204	Have you ever heard of HIV/AIDS?	Yes No Others (Specify)_____ (If "Can not remember" or "No response" is mentioned in Others, Skip to Q213)	1 2 <b>→Q 213</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q205	Can a person get HIV/AIDS from mosquito bites?	Yes No Others (Specify)_____	1 2	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q206	Can people protect themselves from HIV/AIDS by having one uninfected faithful sex partner?	Yes No Others (Specify)_____	1 2	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q207	Can people protect themselves from HIV/AIDS by abstaining from sexual intercourse?	Yes No Others (Specify)_____	1 2	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q208	Can a person get HIV/AIDS by sharing a meal with someone who is infected?	Yes No Others (Specify)_____	1 2	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q209	Can a person get HIV/AIDS by getting injections with a needle that was already used by someone else who was infected?	Yes No Others (Specify)_____	1 2	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q.No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories	Skip to	Coding Boxes
Q210	Do you think that a healthy-looking person can be infected with HIV, the virus that causes AIDS?	Yes No Others (Specify)_____	1 2	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q211	Can a pregnant woman infected with HIV or AIDS transmit the virus to her unborn child?	Yes No Others (Specify)_____	1 2	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q212	Can a woman with HIV or AIDS transmit virus to her newborn child through breastfeeding?	Yes No Others (Specify)_____	1 2	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q213	Have you had a thick yellowish/greenish <b>discharge</b> with a foul smell from your vagina in the <b>past 12 months</b> ?	Yes No Others (Specify)_____	1 2	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q214	Have you had an <b>ulcer/sore</b> in your genital area during the <b>past 12 months</b> ?	Yes No Others (Specify)_____	1 2	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q215	Have you had <b>pain during intercourse</b> in the <b>past 12 months</b> ?	Yes No Others (Specify)_____	1 2	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q216	Have you had <b>lower abdominal pain</b> during the <b>past 12 months</b> ?	Yes No Others (Specify)_____	1 2	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q217	Have you had <b>burning pain during urination</b> in the <b>past 12 months</b> ?	Yes No Others (Specify)_____	1 2	<input type="checkbox"/>

**SECTION 2: KNOWLEDGE, OPINION AND ATTITUDE TOWARDS STI / HIV / AIDS (Continued)**

<p><b>FILTER: CHECK Q213 to Q217</b>                  Reported any symptom of STI [<u>  </u>1<u>  </u>]                  ↓</p>		<p>Not reported any symptom of STI [<u>  </u>2<u>  </u>]→</p>		<p>→Q221</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q.No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories	Skip to	Coding Boxes	
Q218	What did you do the last time you had any of these problems?  <b>(READ OUT ALL THE CODING OPTIONS)</b>  <b>(MULTIPLE RESPONSES POSSIBLE)</b>	No treatment 01 Took home based remedy 02 Borrowed prescription from friend/relative 03 Took medicine I had at home 04 Purchased medicine from a Chemist Shop 05 Went to a traditional healer/quack 06 <b>Went to NGO Peer Educator / NGO Clinic</b> 07 08 09 Went to a Private hospital / clinic Went to a Govt. Hospital /clinic  Others _____ (Specify)	→Q221	<input type="checkbox"/>  <input type="checkbox"/>  <input type="checkbox"/>	

Q219	What type of medicine did you take last time?  <b>(MULTIPLE RESPONSES POSSIBLE)</b>	Allopathic Homoeopathic Ayurvedic / Herbal Other (Specify) _____	1 2 3		<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Q220	How much time did you take to visit a health practitioner last time after you experienced a STI symptom?	1 week or less Less than 1 month but more than 1 week One month or more Others (Specify) _____	1 2 3		<input type="checkbox"/>
Q221	In case you have any of the symptoms of STI whom would you prefer to approach?  (PLEASE READ OUT STI SYMPTOMS TO MAKE RESPONDENT UNDERSTAND CLEARLY ABOUT STI)  <b>(READ OUT ALL THE CODING OPTIONS AND CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE)</b>	No treatment Take home based remedy Borrow prescription from friend/relative Take medicine I had at home Purchase medicine from a Chemist Shop Go to a traditional healer/quack <b>Go to NGO Peer Educator / NGO Clinic</b> Go to a Private hospital / clinic Go to a Govt. Hospital /clinic  Others _____ (Specify)	01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09		<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

**SECTION 3: MARRIAGE, FAMILY, INCOME**

Q.No.	Questions and filters	Coding categories	Skip to	Coding Boxes
Q301	Have you ever been married?	Yes No Others (Specify) _____ (If “No response” is mentioned in Others, Skip to Q303)	1 2 →Q303	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q302	How old were you when you got married for the first time?	Age in completed years ____  Others (Specify) _____		<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Q303	Are you currently married or living with a sexual partner?	Currently married, living with spouse Currently married, having or living with other sexual partner Currently married, not living with spouse or having any other sexual partner Not currently married, living with / having sexual partner Not currently married, not living with / having sexual partner Other (Specify) _____	1 2 3 4 5	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q.No.	Questions and filters	Coding categories	Skip to	Coding Boxes
Q304	Do you have any other source of income? <b>(ASK THIS QUESTION TO ONLY NON-BROTHEL BASED FEMALE SEX WORKERS)</b>	Yes No Others (Specify) _____  (If “No response” is mentioned in Others, Skip to Q401)	1 2 →Q401	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q305	What is / are your additional sources of income?  <b>(MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE)</b>	Work as maid servant Work as bar girl Work in a beauty/ massage parlor Work in an office Have a petty business Work as a factory worker Other (specify) _____	01 02 03 04 05 06	<input type="checkbox"/>  <input type="checkbox"/>  <input type="checkbox"/>

**SECTION 4: NUMBER AND TYPES OF PARTNERS**

Q. No.	Questions and filters	Coding categories	Skip to	Coding Boxes
Q401	How old were you when you had your first sex (penetrative)?	In completed years ____  Others (Specify) _____		<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Q402	How old were you when you first sold sex (penetrative)?	In completed years ____  Others (Specify) _____		<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Q403	Among all of your partners in the last seven days (one week), how many were:  <b>a) PAYING CLIENTS:</b> Partners with whom you had sex in exchange of money  <b>b) NON-PAYING REGULAR PARTNERS:</b> Regular partners who did not pay any money to have sex with you <b>(INCLUDE SPOUSE, LIVE-IN SEXUAL PARTNERS)</b>  <b>c) NON-PAYING NON-REGULAR PARTNERS:</b> Non-regular partners who did not pay any money to have sex with you <b>(INCLUDE POLICE, BROKERS AND OTHERS)</b>	<b>Paying Clients</b> _____  Can not remember No response  <b>Non-paying regular partners</b> _____  (Include spouse and live-in partners)  Can not remember No response  Non-paying non-regular partners _____  (Include pimp, broker, police etc)  Can not remember No response	88 99     88 99    88 99	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>  <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>  <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Q404	In total, with how many <i>different</i> sexual partners			<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

have you had sex during the last seven days (one week)?  <b>INCLUDE SPOUSE (S), LIVE IN SEXUAL PARTNER (S)</b>  <b>NOTE: CHECK TOTAL NUMBERS OF PARTNERS IN Q403 TO MAKE SURE THE NUMBERS MATCH.</b>	Number in last 7 days _____	88		
	Can not remember	99		
	No response			

**SECTION 5: SEXUAL HISTORY- PAYING CLIENTS**

Q.No.	Questions and Filters	Coding categories	Skip to	Coding Boxes
Q501	On the <i>last day</i> you worked, how many clients did you have?	Number of clients _____ Others (Specify) _____		<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
Q502	The last time you had sex with a client, did your client use a condom?	Yes No Not aware of condom Others (Specify) _____ (If “Can not remember” or “No response” is mentioned in Others, Skip to Q506)	1 2 7  →Q506 →Q601	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q503	Who suggested using a condom that time?	Myself Client Joint decision Others (Specify) _____	1 2 3	<input type="checkbox"/>

**SECTION 5: SEXUAL HISTORY- PAYING CLIENTS (Continued)**

Q.No.	Questions and Filters	Coding categories	Skip to	Coding Boxes
Q504	Which brand of condom did your partner use last time? <b>[SHOW PACKAGE COVERS OF POPULAR BRANDS]</b>	Nirodh Kamsutra Deluxe Masti Kohinor Others (specify) _____	01 02 03 04 05	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
Q505	From where did you get this condom?	Person had sex with Govt. Health worker/ clinic Friend Purchased at chemist shop/ pharmacy Pan shop Purchase at other type of outlet (i.e. grocery etc) NGOs/Peer educator Aanganwadi worker/VHW Other (specify) _____	01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 →Q507 →Q507 →Q507 →Q507 →Q507 →Q507 →Q507 →Q507	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>

Q506	Why wasn't a condom used at that time?  (READ AND CIRCLE ALL ANSWERS MENTIONED)  (IF "NOT AWARE OF CONDOM" IS MENTIONED IN OTHERS, SKIP TO Q601)	Not available Too expensive Partner objected Don't like them Used other contraceptive Didn't think it was necessary Decreases pleasure Didn't think of it Place was inappropriate Other (specify) _____	Y N DK NR 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9			
Q507	Do you generally use condom with your paying clients?	Yes No Other (specify) _____	1 2			<input type="checkbox"/>
Q508	In general, with what frequency did your clients use condoms over the last 30 days?	Every Time Sometimes Never Other (specify) _____	1 2 3	→601 →601		<input type="checkbox"/>
Q509	Have you ever heard or seen a condom? (SHOW PICTURE OR SAMPLE OF ONE)	Yes No Other (specify) _____	1 2			<input type="checkbox"/>

**SECTION 6: SEXUAL HISTORY: NON-PAYING PARTNERS**

Q.No.	Questions and Filters	Coding categories	Skip to	Coding Boxes	
Q601	<b>FILTER: CHECK Q403</b> HAS NON-PAYING PARTNER ..... [1] ↓	HAS NO NON-PAYING PARTNER...	[2]→	→Q701	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q602	The last time you had sex with this non-paying partner, did your partner use a condom?	Yes No Not aware of condom Other (specify) _____ (If "Can not remember" or "No response" is mentioned in Others, Skip to Q605)	1 2 7	→Q606 →Q701	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q603	Who suggested using a condom that time?	Myself My partner Joint decision Others (Specify) _____	1 2 3		<input type="checkbox"/>
Q604	Which brand of condom did your partner use last time? [SHOW PACKAGE COVERS OF POPULAR BRANDS]	Nirodh Kamsutra Deluxe Masti Kohinor Others (specify) _____	01 02 03 04 05		<input type="checkbox"/>
Q605	From where did you get this condom?	Person you had sex with Govt. Health worker/ clinic Friend	01 02 03	→Q607 →Q607 →Q607	<input type="checkbox"/>



		Purchased at chemist shop/ pharmacy Pan shop Purchase at other type of outlet (i.e. grocery etc) NGO's/Peer educator / VHW/Aanganwadi worker Other (specify) _____ (If Can not remember or no response is mentioned in Others, Skip to Q606)	04 05 06 07 08	→Q607 →Q607 →Q607 →Q607 →Q607	
Q606	Why didn't your partner use a condom that time?  <b>(READ AND CIRCLE ALL ANSWERS MENTIONED)</b>  <b>( IF "NOT AWARE OF CONDOM" MENTIONED IN OTHERS, SKIP TO Q701)</b>	Not available Too expensive Partner objected Don't like them Used other contraceptive Didn't think it was necessary Decreases pleasure Didn't think of it Place was inappropriate Other (specify) _____	Y N DK NR 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9		<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Q607	Do you generally use condom with your non-paying partners?	Yes No Other (specify) _____		1 2	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q608	In general, with what frequency did your non-paying partner(s) use a condom over the last 3 months?	Every Time Sometimes Never Other (specify) _____		1 2 3	<input type="checkbox"/>

**SECTION 7: RISK PERCEPTION AND EXPOSURE TO INTERVENTION**

Q.No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories	Skip to	Coding Boxes
Q701	Can people protect themselves from HIV by using a condom correctly every time they have sex?	Yes No Not aware of condom Other (specify) _____	1 2 7 → Q705	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q702	Do you usually insist your clients to use condom?	Yes No Other (specify) _____	1 2	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q703	Has any of your clients refused to use condom in the last 3 months?	Yes No Other (specify) _____	1 2 → Q705	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q704	What did you do when your client refused to use a condom last time?	Refused to have sex Charged extra amount Persuaded successfully Failed to persuade Did not do anything Others (specify) _____	1 2 3 4 5	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q.No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories	Skip to	Coding Boxes
Q705	In your opinion, what are the chances of a person like you contracting HIV/AIDS infection?  <b>(READ OUT ALL THE OPTIONS AND CIRCLE ONE)</b>	Very high Moderate Low No chance Other (specify) _____	1 2 3 4	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q706	Is it possible someone like you to get a confidential test to find out whether you are infected with HIV? (By confidential, I mean that no one will know the result if you don't want them to know it.)	Yes No Other (specify) _____	1 2	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q707	I do not want to know the result, but have you ever had an HIV test?	Yes No Other (specify) _____ (If "Can not remember" or "No response" is mentioned in Others, Skip to Q710)	1 2 →	Q710 <input type="checkbox"/>
Q708	Did you voluntarily undergo the HIV test, or were you required to have the test?	Voluntary Required Others (Specify) _____	1 2	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q709	Please do not tell me the result, but did you find out the result of your test?	Yes No Others (Specify) _____	1 2	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q710	Did anyone in the past one year approach you to educate you on spread of STI/HIV/AIDS?	Yes No Others (Specify) _____	1 2	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q711	Did you attend / participate in any campaign / meeting on STI / HIV / AIDS in the past one year?	Yes No Others (Specify) _____	1 2	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q712	If we ask you to recall only one message about HIV / AIDS, which one would you easily remember? <b>(RECORD THE ANSWER IN VERBATIM)</b>	Message: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

THANK YOU

Interview Completion Time \_\_\_\_\_ Interviewer's Signature \_\_\_\_\_

ORG Center for Social Research

**Study on Monitoring and Evaluation of National AIDS Control Project, Phase II**  
NATIONAL HIV/AIDS RISK BEHAVIOURAL SURVEILLANCE SURVEY (BSS)  
2001-2002

**FOR USE WITH CLIENT OF FEMALE SEX WORKER**

*FINAL – Oct 8, 2001*

**Operational Definition of the respondent**

**Men who have bought sex in the past one month**

**Introduction:** “My name is..... I’m working for a social research organization. We’re interviewing people here in [name of city, region or site] in order to find out about the present health scenario in your (State/UT). We are trying to understand peoples’ common health problems, health seeking behavior and their knowledge, attitude, opinion and practice regarding some specific diseases. Importantly, the results of this study would help us in designing appropriate strategies for the future. Have you been interviewed in the past few weeks for this study? **IF THE RESPONDENT HAS BEEN INTERVIEWED DURING THIS ROUND OF BSS, DO NOT INTERVIEW THIS PERSON AGAIN.** Tell him you cannot interview him a second time, thank him, and end the interview. If he has not been interviewed before, continue:

**Confidentiality and Consent:** I’m going to ask you some very personal questions that some people find difficult to answer. Your answers are completely confidential. Your name will not be written on this form, and will never be used in connection with any of the information you tell me. You do not have to answer any questions that you do not want to answer, and you may end this interview at any time you want to. However, your honest answers to these questions will help us better understand what people think, say and do about certain kinds of behaviors. We would greatly appreciate your help in responding to this survey. The survey will take about 30 minutes. Would you be willing to participate?

---

I certify that the nature and purpose, the potential benefits and possible risks associated with participating in this research have been explained to the volunteer.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of interviewer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**Important Instruction: The identification section has to be filled up for all the respondents approached for an interview. That means even in case of refusal, in-completed interview or non-availability of respondents the identification page must be filled up.**

**IDENTIFICATION**

Sl. No.	Details	For office use
001	SCHEDULE NUMBER	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
002	STATE _____	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
003	TYPE OF SETTLEMENT Urban.....1 Rural.....2	<input type="checkbox"/>
004	CITY/TOWN/VILLAGE _____	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
005	SITE _____	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>

006 RESULT CODE:

Result codes : Completed 1 ; Partially completed 2 ; Refused 3 ; Respondent not available for the interview 4

007 INTERVIEWER: Name \_\_\_\_\_

008 DATE OF INTERVIEW:      
D D M M Y Y

009 TIME: Starting Time \_\_\_\_\_   Completion Time \_\_\_\_\_    
Hrs Min Hrs Min

010. PLACE OF INTERVIEW : \_\_\_\_\_

011. INTERVIEW SETTING: One to One Interview 1 Interview in presence of others 2

012 SUPERVISOR: Name \_\_\_\_\_  Signature \_\_\_\_\_

013 ACCOMPANIED INTERVIEW ? 1. Yes 2. No

**SECTION 1: BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS**

Q No.	Questions and filters	Coding categories	Skip to	Coding Boxes
Q101	How old are you?	Age in completed years____ Others (Specify)_____		<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
Q102	What has been your highest level of educational attainment?	Illiterate Literate but no formal education 1-5th 6-8 <sup>th</sup> 9-10th 11-12th 12+ Others (Specify)_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q103	What is your main occupation?	Unemployed/not working/retired Student Non-agricultural /casual labourer Domestic servant Agricultural labor Skilled/semi-skilled labourer in manufacturing/processing industry Cultivator Petty business/small shop owner Small artisan in HH and cottage industry Truck drivers/ cleaners Local transport workers (auto/taxi drivers, hand cart pullers, rikshaw pullers etc) Self employed professional Service (pvt. / govt.) Large business/medium to large shop owner Other (Specify)_____	01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10 11 12 13 14	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
Q104	Do you live in this city / town?	Yes No Others (Specify)_____	1 2	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q105	How long have you been living in/visiting this city/town?	No. of completed years _____ If less than 1 year...Record 00 Since Birth .....Record 97 Others (Specify)_____		<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
Q106	With whom do you stay?	Alone With spouse / Live in partner With parents With other relatives With employer With co-worker / students Others (Specify) _____	1 2 3 4 5 6	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q107	Where do you stay?	Residence Hostel / Mess Labor Camp Footpath / Railway Stn / Bus terminus / other public places Others (specify)_____	1 2 3 4		<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------	--	------------------	--	--------------------------

**SECTION 1: BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS (Continued)**

Q No.	Questions and filters	Coding categories		Skip to	Coding Boxes
Q108	In last 12 months, how often have you been away from home?  <b>(DON'T INCLUDE THOSE WORKING AWAY FROM HOME BUT RETURNING HOME EVERY EVENING)</b>	Weekly Fortnightly Monthly Once in 3 months Once in 6 months Once in a year Not been away from home Others (Specify)_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		<input type="checkbox"/>

Q109	Have you ever had any drinks containing alcohol?	Yes No Others (Specify)_____ (If “Can not remember” or “No response” is mentioned in Others, skip to Q112)	1 2	Q112	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--	---	--------	------	--------------------------

Q110	During the last 4 weeks how often have you had drinks containing alcohol? Would you say ...  <b>(READ RESPONSES AND CIRCLE ONE)</b>	Every day At least once a week Less than once a week Did not drink in the last 4 weeks Others (Specify)_____	1 2 3 4		<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--	--	------------------	--	--------------------------

Q111	How frequently do you take alcoholic drinks before having sex with your commercial sex partners?	Always Sometimes Rarely Never Others (Specify)_____	1 2 3 4		<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--	---	------------------	--	--------------------------

Q112	Some people have tried different types of intoxicating drugs. Have you tried any?	Yes No Others (Specify)_____  (If “Can not remember” or “No response” is mentioned in Others, skip to Q201)	1 2	Q201	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	---	---	--------	------	--------------------------

Q113	Which drugs have you tried?  <b>(DON'T READ OUT THE LIST MULTIPLE RESPONSES POSSIBLE)</b>	Charas Ganja Bhang Afim Brown-sugar Heroin  Others (Specify) _____	01 02 03 04 05 06		<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Q114	Some people have tried injecting drugs using a syringe. Have you injected any drug without a doctor's prescription in the last 12 months?  <b>(DRUGS INJECTED FOR MEDICAL PURPOSES OR TREATMENT OF AN ILLNESS DO NOT COUNT)</b>	Yes No  Others (Specify) _____	1 2		<input type="checkbox"/>

**SECTION 2: KNOWLEDGE, OPINION AND ATTITUDE TOWARDS STI / HIV / AIDS**

Q.No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories	Skip to	Coding Boxes
Q201	Have you heard of problems like genital discharge or genital ulcer/ genital sore or burning while passing urine, which people get through sexual intercourse?  <b>(IT'S A PROMPTED QUESTION. PLEASE MAKE SURE THAT THE RESPONDENT UNDERSTANDS THE SYMPTOMS WE ARE TALKING ABOUT. USE LOCAL /POPULAR TERMINOLOGIES, IF ANY)</b>	Yes No  Others (Specify) _____  (If "Can not remember" or "No response" is mentioned in Others, skip to Q204)	1 2 → Q204	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q202	Can you describe any other (beside the three symptoms mentioned in the earlier question) symptoms of STI in <b>WOMEN</b> ...? Any others?  <b>(PLEASE READ OUT ALL THE OPTIONS AND CIRLE THE APPROPRIATE CODE)</b>	Lower abdominal pain Swellings in groin area Pain during sexual intercourse Itching/reddening Warts Skin rashes Other (Specify) _____	Y N DK NR 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Q203	Can you describe any other (beside the three symptoms mentioned in the earlier question) symptoms of STI in <b>MEN</b> ...? Any others?  <b>(PLEASE READ OUT ALL THE OPTIONS AND CIRLE THE APPROPRIATE CODE)</b>	Swellings in groin area Itching/reddening Warts Skin rashes Can't retract foreskin Other (Specify) _____	Y N DK NR 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>





**SECTION 2: KNOWLEDGE, OPINION AND ATTITUDE TOWARDS STI / HIV / AIDS (Continued)**

<b>FILTER: CHECK Q213 to Q215</b> <b>Reported any symptom of STI [ 1 ]</b>		<b>Not reported any symptom of STI [ 2 ] →</b>		<b>→Q219</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q.No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories		Skip to	Coding Boxes
Q216	What did you do the last time you had any of these problems?  <b>(READ OUT ALL THE CODING OPTIONS)</b>  <b>(MULTIPLE RESPONSES POSSIBLE)</b>	No treatment Took home based remedy Borrowed prescription from friend/relative Took medicine I had at home Purchased medicine from a Chemist Shop Went to a traditional healer/quack <b>Went to NGO Peer</b>  <b>Educator / NGO Clinic</b> Went to a Private hospital / clinic Went to a Govt. Hospital /clinic  Others _____ (Specify)	01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09	<b>→Q219</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>  <input type="checkbox"/>  <input type="checkbox"/>
Q217	What type of medicine did you take last time?  <b>(MULTIPLE RESPONSES POSSIBLE)</b>	Allopathic Homoeopathic Ayurvedic / Herbal Other (Specify) _____	1 2 3		<input type="checkbox"/>  <input type="checkbox"/>  <input type="checkbox"/>
Q218	How much time did you take to visit a health practitioner last time after you experienced a STI symptom?	1 week or less Less than 1 month but more than 1 week One month or more Others (Specify) _____	1 2 3		<input type="checkbox"/>
Q219	In case you have any of the symptoms of STI whom would you prefer to approach?  (PLEASE READ OUT STI SYMPTOMS TO MAKE RESPONDENT UNDERSTAND CLEARLY ABOUT STI)  <b>(READ OUT ALL THE CODING OPTIONS AND CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE)</b>	No treatment Take home based remedy Borrow prescription from friend/relative Take medicine I had at home Purchase medicine from a Chemist Shop Go to a traditional healer/quack <b>Go to NGO Peer</b>  <b>Educator / NGO Clinic</b> Go to a Private hospital / clinic Go to a Govt. Hospital /clinic  Others _____ (Specify)	01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09		<input type="checkbox"/>  <input type="checkbox"/>

**SECTION 3: MARRIAGE AND LIVE-IN PARTNERSHIPS**

Q.No.	Questions and filters	Coding categories	Skip to	Coding Boxes
Q301	Have you ever been married?	Yes No Others (Specify) _____  (If “No response” is mentioned in Others, skip to Q303)	1 2 →Q303	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q302	How old were you when you got married for the first time?	Age in completed years ____ Others (Specify) _____		<input type="text"/>
Q303	Are you currently married or living with a sexual partner?	Currently married, living with spouse Currently married, having or living with other sexual partner Currently married, not living with spouse or having any other sexual partner Not currently married, living with / having sexual partner Not currently married, not living with / having sexual partner Other (Specify) _____	1 2 3 4 5	<input type="checkbox"/>

**SECTION 4: SEXUAL HISTORY: NUMBER AND TYPES OF PARTNERS**

Q No.	Questions and filters	Coding categories	Skip to	Coding Boxes
Q401	At what age did you first have sexual intercourse? (Sexual intercourse is defined here as penetrative vaginal or anal sex)	Age in completed years _____ Others (Specify) _____		<input type="text"/>
Q402	Who was your first sexual partner?	A female (unpaid) A female (paid) A male (unpaid) A male (paid) Others (specify) _____	1 2 3 4	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 403	What was the age of your first sexual partner?	Age in completed years _____ Others (Specify) _____		<input type="text"/>
Q404	Did you ever have sex (manual/oral/anal) with any male partner/hijra?	Yes No Others (Specify) _____  (If “Can not remember” or “No response” is mentioned in Others, skip to Q408)	1 2 →Q408	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q405	Did you have anal sex with any male partner/ hijra in last 12 months?	Yes No  Others (Specify)_____  (If “Can not remember” or “No response” is mentioned in Others, skip to Q408)	1 2	→Q408	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q406	Did you use condom last time you had anal sex with any male partner/ hijra?	Yes No Others (Specify)_____	1 2		<input type="checkbox"/>
Q407	How frequently did you use condom with all your male partners/hijras in last 12 months?	Every time Sometimes Never Others (Specify)_____	1 2 3		<input type="checkbox"/>

**SECTION 4: SEXUAL HISTORY: NUMBER AND TYPES OF PARTNERS**

Q No.	Questions and filters	Coding categories	Skip to	Coding Boxes
Q408	Think about the <i>female</i> sexual partners you’ve had in the <b>last 3 months</b> . How many were:  - Partners with whom you had sex in exchange for money <b>(“COMMERCIAL” PARTNERS)</b>  - Your spouse(s) or live-in sexual partners <b>(“REGULAR” PARTNERS)</b>  - Sexual partners that you are not married to and have never lived with and did not pay <b>(“NON-REGULAR PARTNERS”) – DO NOT INCLUDE CURRENT SPOUSE (S) OR LIVE-IN SEXUAL PARTNERS)</b>	<i>COMMERCIAL</i> [_____] Can not remember 88 No response 99  <i>REGULAR</i> [_____] Can not remember 88 No response 99  <b>NON REGULAR</b> [_____] Can not remember 88 No response 99		<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>  <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>  <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

**SECTION 5 SEXUAL HISTORY: COMMERCIAL PARTNERS**  
*COMMERCIAL PARTNERS: Partners with whom had sex in exchange for money*

Q No.	Questions and Filters	Coding categories		Skip to	Coding boxes
Q501	<b>FILTER: CHECK Q408</b>  HAD SEX WITH COMMERCIAL FEMALE PARTNER DURING <u>PAST 3 MONTHS</u> .... [_1_] ↓	DID NOT HAVE SEX WITH COMMERCIAL FEMALE PARTNER DURING <u>PAST 3 MONTHS</u> [_2_] →		→Q601	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q502	At what age did you first have sexual intercourse with any commercial female partner? (Sexual intercourse is defined here as penetrative vaginal or anal sex)	Age in completed years _____  Others (Specify) _____			<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Q503	The last time you had sex with a commercial partner, did you use a condom?	Yes No Not aware of condom Others (Specify) _____ (If “Can not remember” or “No response” is mentioned in Others, skip to Q507)	1 2 7	→Q507 →Q601	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q504	Who suggested condom use that time?	Myself My partner Joint decision Others (specify) _____ _____	1 2 3		<input type="checkbox"/>
Q505	Which brand of condom did you use last time? [SHOW PACKAGE COVERS OF POPULAR BRANDS]	Nirodh Kamsutra Deluxe Masti Kohinor Others (specify) _____	01 02 03 04 05		<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

**SECTION 5 SEXUAL HISTORY: COMMERCIAL PARTNERS (Continued)**

Q No.	Questions and Filters	Coding categories				Skip to	Coding boxes
Q506	From where did you get this condom?  <b>AFTER ASKING THIS QUESTION GO TO Q 508</b>	Person had sex with	01				
		Health worker/ clinic	02				
		Friend	03				
		Purchased at chemist shop	04				
		Purchased at Pan shop	05				
		Purchased at other type of outlet (grocery etc)	06				<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
		Other (specify)_____					
Q507	Why didn't you use a condom that time?  <b>(READ AND CIRCLE ALL ANSWERS MENTIONED)</b>  <b>( IF "NOT AWARE OF CONDOM" MENTIONED IN OTHERS, SKIP TO Q601)</b>		Y	N	DK	NR	
		Not available	1	2	8	9	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Too expensive	1	2	8	9	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Partner objected	1	2	8	9	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Don't like them	1	2	8	9	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Used other	1	2	8	9	<input type="checkbox"/>
		contraceptives					<input type="checkbox"/>
		Didn't think it was necessary	1	2	8	9	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Decreases pleasure	1	2	8	9	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Other (specify)_____					<input type="checkbox"/>
			1	2	8	9	<input type="checkbox"/>
							<input type="checkbox"/>
Q508	Do you generally use condom with your commercial partners?	Yes				1	
		No				2	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Others (Specify)_____					
Q509	In general, with what frequency did you use a condom with your commercial partner during <b>the past 3 months</b> ?	Every time				1	<b>→Q601</b>
		Sometimes				2	<b>→Q601</b>
		Never				3	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Others (Specify)_____					
Q510	Have you ever heard or seen a condom?  <b>(SHOW PICTURE OR SAMPLE OF ONE)</b>	Yes				1	
		No				2	<input type="checkbox"/>
		No response				9	

**SECTION 6 SEXUAL HISTORY: REGULAR PARTNERS**

*Regular partner: Includes only spouse or live-in sexual partners*

Q No.	Questions and Filters	Coding categories	Skip to	Coding Boxes
Q601	<b>FILTER: CHECK Q408</b> HAD SEX WITH REGULAR FEMALE PARTNER DURING PAST 3 MONTHS. [ <u>  1  </u> ] ↓	DID NOT HAVE SEX WITH REGULAR FEMALE PARTNER DURING PAST 3 MONTHS [ <u>  2  </u> →	→Q701	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q602	At what age did you first have sexual intercourse with any female regular partner? (Sexual intercourse is defined here as penetrative vaginal or anal sex)	Age in completed years _____ Others (Specify) _____		<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Q603	The last time you had sex with a regular partner, did you use a condom?	Yes No Not aware of condom Others (Specify) _____ (If can not remember or No response is mentioned in Others, skip to Q607)	1 2 7 →Q607 →Q701	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q604	Who suggested using a condom that time?	Myself My partner Joint decision Other (specify) _____	1 2 3	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q605	Which brand of condom did you use last time? [SHOW PACKAGE COVERS OF POPULAR BRANDS]	Nirodh Kamsutra Deluxe Masti Kohinor Others (specify) _____	01 02 03 04 05	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Q606	From where did you get this condom?  (AFTER ASKING THIS QUESTION GO TO Q 608)	Partner had sex with Health worker/ clinic Friend Purchased at chemist shop Purchased at pan shop Purchase at other type of outlet ( grocery etc) Other (specify) _____	01 02 03 04 05 06	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Q607	Why didn't you use a condom that time?  (READ AND CIRCLE ALL ANSWERS MENTIONED)  ( IF "NOT AWARE OF CONDOM" MENTIONED IN OTHERS, SKIP TO Q701)	Not available Too expensive Partner objected Don't like them Used other contraceptives Didn't think it was necessary Wanted to have child Decreases pleasure	<b>Y N DK</b> <b>NR</b> 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

		Other (specify) _____	1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9		
Q608	Do you generally use condom with your regular partners?	Yes No Others (Specify) _____	1 2		<input type="checkbox"/>
Q609	In general, with what frequency did you use a condom with your regular partner during the <b>past 3 months</b> ?	Every time Sometimes Never Others (Specify) _____	1 2 3		<input type="checkbox"/>

**SECTION 7 SEXUAL HISTORY: NON-REGULAR (NON-PAYING) SEXUAL PARTNERS**  
*Non-regular: Sexual partners respondent is not married to and has never lived with and did not pay*

Q No.	Questions and Filters	Coding categories	Skip to	Coding Boxes
Q701	<b>FILTER: CHECK Q408</b>  HAD SEX WITH NON-REGULAR NON PAYING FEMALE PARTNER DURING LAST <u>3</u> MONTHS...[_ 1_] ↓	DID NOT HAVE SEX WITH NON-REGULAR NON-PAYING FEMALE PARTNER DURING <u>LAST 3</u> MONTHS	[_ 2_] →	→Q801 <input type="checkbox"/>
Q702	At what age did you first have sexual intercourse with any non-regular (non-paying) female partner?	Age in completed years _____ Others (Specify) _____		<input type="checkbox"/>
Q703	Who was your first non-regular (non-paying) female sex partner?	Girlfriend Relative Neighbor Domestic maid Any other person (Specify) _____	1 2 3 4 5	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q704	The last time you had sex with a non-regular (non-paying) female partner did you use a condom?	Yes No Not aware of condom Others (Specify) _____ (If can not remember or No response is mentioned in Others, skip to Q708)	1 2 7	→Q708 →Q801 <input type="checkbox"/>
Q705	Who suggested condom use that time?	Myself My partner Joint decision Others (specify) _____	1 2 3	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q706	Which brand of condom did you use	Nirodh	01	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

	last time? [ <b>SHOW PACKAGE COVERS OF POPULAR BRANDS</b> ]	Kamsutra Deluxe Masti Kohinor Others (specify)_____	02 03 04 05		
Q707	From where did you get this condom?  <b>(AFTER ASKING THIS QUESTION GO TO Q709)</b>	Person had sex with Health worker/ clinic Friend Purchased at chemist shop Purchased at pan shop Purchase at other type of outlet ( grocery etc) Other (specify)_____	01 02 03 04 05 06		<input type="checkbox"/>

**SECTION 7 SEXUAL HISTORY: NON-REGULAR (NON-PAYING) SEXUAL PARTNERS**  
**(Continued)**

Q No.	Questions and Filters	Coding categories			Skip to	Coding Boxes
	Why didn't you use a condom that time?  <b>(READ AND CIRCLE ALL ANSWERS MENTIONED)</b>  <b>( IF "NOT AWARE OF CONDOM" MENTIONED IN OTHERS, SKIP TO Q801)</b>	Not available Too expensive Partner objected Don't like them Used other contraceptives Didn't think it was necessary Wanted to have child Decreases pleasure Other (specify)_____	<b>Y N DK</b> <b>NR</b> 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9			
Q709	Do you generally use condom with non-regular partners?	Yes No Others (Specify)_____	1 2			
Q710	In general, with what frequency did you use a condom during the <b>past 3 months</b> ?	Every time Sometimes Never Others (Specify)_____	1 2 3			



**SECTION 8: RISK PERCEPTION AND EXPOSURE TO INTERVENTION**

Q.No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories	Skip to	Coding Boxes
Q801	Can people protect themselves from HIV by using a condom correctly every time they have sex?	Yes No Not aware of condom Others (Specify)_____	1 2 7	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q802	In your opinion, what are the chances of a person like you contracting HIV/AIDS infection?  (READ OUT ALL THE OPTIONS AND CIRCLE ONE)	Very high Moderate Low No chance Others (Specify)_____	1 2 3 4	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q803	Is it possible for someone like you to get a confidential test to find out whether you are infected with HIV?  By confidential, I mean that no one will know the result if you don't want them to know it.	Yes No Others (Specify)_____	1 2	<input type="checkbox"/>  <input type="checkbox"/>
Q804	I do not want to know the result, but have you ever had an HIV test?	Yes No Others (Specify)_____ (If can not remember or No response is mentioned in Others, skip to Q807)	1 2	→  Q807
Q805	Did you voluntarily undergo the HIV test, or were you required to have the test?	Voluntary Required Others (Specify)_____	1 2	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q806	Please do not tell me the result, but did you find out the result of your test?	Yes No Others (Specify)_____	1 2	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q807	Did anyone in the past one year approach you to educate you on spread of STI/HIV/AIDS?	Yes No Others (Specify)_____	1 2	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q808	Did you attend / participate in any campaign / meeting on STI / HIV / AIDS in the past one year?	Yes No Others (Specify)_____	1 2	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q809	If we ask you to recall only one message about HIV / AIDS, which one would you easily remember? <b>(RECORD THE ANSWER IN VERBATIM)</b>	Message: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

**THANK YOU**

**Interview Completion Time** \_\_\_\_\_

**Signature of the Interviewer** \_\_\_\_\_