



Female Sex Workers (FSWs) and their Clients



National Behavioural Surveillance Survey (BSS) 2006

Female Sex Workers (FSWs) and their Clients



National AIDS Control Organisation

**Ministry of Health and Family Welfare
Government of India**

© National AIDS Control Organisation
Ministry of Health and Family Welfare
Government of India

Design, Layout and Printing by:
New Concept Information Systems Pvt. Ltd.
New Delhi - 110 076
E-mail: nc.communication@gmail.com

Foreword



National AIDS Control Programme (NACP-III) aims to halt and reverse the spread of HIV epidemic in the country. To ensure the achievement of the set targets, the programme is based on thorough understanding of the current situation of the HIV epidemic and the direction in which the efforts have to be channeled. Evidence-based planning of strategic interventions to control HIV/AIDS requires a strong surveillance, monitoring and research activities which provide crucial information on the patterns of spread of the epidemic. With the evolution of National AIDS Control Programme (NACP) and its strategies, the need to focus on the more vulnerable population groups and communities with high risk behaviour has received greater attention.

The second generation Surveillance for HIV emphasises the significance of understanding the behavioural patterns and trends that increase the emergence of the HIV epidemic. They give direction to the programmatic efforts by showing the impact of the interventions and areas that need focus of different initiatives. Behavioural Surveillance aids national as well as sub-national planners and administrators in planning, implementation as well as monitoring the interventions to tackle the HIV epidemic.

In conformity with the National AIDS Prevention and Control Policy, National AIDS Control Organisation (NACO) commissioned the first Behavioural Surveillance Survey (BSS) in 2001 as a part of NACP-II. This provided the baseline information on high risk behavioural patterns, knowledge, awareness and practices related to spread of HIV/AIDS in the country. Towards the end of NACP-II, after a gap of five years since the first wave of BSS, NACO commissioned the second wave of BSS in 2006 to measure the changes in behavioural indicators. National Behavioural Surveillance Survey 2006 was conducted among general population and four high risk groups - Men who have Sex with Men (MSM), Injecting Drug Users (IDUs), Female Sex Workers (FSWs) and clients of FSWs.

NACO has constituted a Technical Resource Group (TRG) comprising experts from different national and international organisations. The technical and methodological inputs provided by the TRG members, Dr. Arvind Pandey, NIMS-ICMR, Dr. D.C.S. Reddy, WHO-India, Dr. Gurumurthy Rangaiyan, UNAIDS-India, Dr. Virginia Loo, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Dr. Vidya Ganesh, UNICEF, Ms. Deepali Nath, Clinton Foundation, Dr. Avina Sarna, Population Council and Ms. Anupama Appukuttam, RCSHA are invaluable. The TRG members have contributed substantially in monitoring and reviewing the study at every stage.

An independent review of the BSS reports done by two international experts, Dr. Prabhat Jha, CGHR, Canada and Dr. Tim Brown, East-West Centre, USA is duly acknowledged.

NACO would like to acknowledge the support provided by UNAIDS India in the preparation of these reports. Our special thanks to Dr. Gurumurthy Rangaiyan, UNAIDS for his support in coordinating and finalising these reports.

I congratulate Dr. Jotna Sokhey, Additional Project Director, NACO, Dr. Ajay Khara, Joint Director (Basic Services and Surveillance) and the surveillance team at NACO for their efforts in bringing out this document.

The survey was contracted to ORG Centre for Social Research, a division of ACNielsen ORG MARG Pvt. Ltd. which has experience of conducting the survey in 2001. The efforts of ORG Centre for Social Research to ensure quality at all stages of the study are deeply appreciated.

A survey of this magnitude would not have been possible without the unstinted cooperation from the thousands of respondents who participated in the study. Each one of them is greatly thanked for their willingness, patience and time.

I am sure this document would prove to be a rich source of information for national as well as state-level administrators for taking programmatic decisions and for planning interventions.



Ms. K. Sujatha Rao
Additional Secretary & Director General
National AIDS Control Organisation

Contents

<i>List of Tables</i>	<i>vii-ix</i>
<i>List of Figures</i>	<i>x-xi</i>
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	<i>xii</i>
<i>Executive Summary</i>	<i>xiii</i>
<i>Summary Sheet (FSWs)</i>	<i>xx</i>
<i>Summary Sheet (Clients of FSWs)</i>	<i>xxi</i>
CHAPTER 1	
Introduction	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Need for the Study	1
1.3 Objectives of the Study	2
CHAPTER 2	
Methodology and Sampling Design	3
2.1 Consultative Process in Planning the Survey	3
2.2 Target Population for the Study	3
2.3 Core Indicators	3
2.4 Coverage of the Survey	4
2.5 Development of Research Instruments and Manuals	4
2.6 Training of Field Teams	5
2.7 Sample Size Calculation	7
2.8 Sampling Procedure	9
2.9 Achieved Sample Size	10
2.10 Fieldwork	11
2.11 Data Management and Data Analysis	11
2.12 Quality Assurance Mechanisms	11
CHAPTER 3	
Clients of Female Sex Workers	13
3.1 Background	13
3.2 Profile of the Clients of FSWs	13
3.3 Awareness of HIV/AIDS	25
3.4 Awareness of STDs, Self-reported STD Prevalence and Treatment Seeking Behaviour	33
3.5 Sexual Behaviour and Condom Usage	42
3.6 Other Salient Observations	61

CHAPTER 4

Female Sex Workers 68

- 4.1 Background 68
- 4.2 Profile of the FSWs 68
- 4.3 Awareness of HIV/AIDS 78
- 4.4 Awareness of STDs, Self-reported STD Prevalence and Treatment Seeking Behaviour 85
- 4.5 Sexual Behaviour and Condom Usage 94
- 4.6 Other Salient Observations 109

ANNEXURE I

Questionnaire for Clients of Female Sex Workers 116

ANNEXURE II

Questionnaire for Female Sex Workers 129

List of Tables

Table 3.1	: Percentage distribution of respondents by age	14
Table 3.2	: Percentage distribution of respondents by education level	15
Table 3.3	: Percentage distribution of respondents by marital status and age at marriage	16
Table 3.4	: Percentage distribution of respondents by status of sexual partnership	18
Table 3.5	: Percentage distribution of respondents by main occupation	19
Table 3.6	: Percentage distribution of respondents by residential status and mobility pattern	21
Table 3.7	: Percentage distribution of respondents by alcohol intake in last four weeks	22
Table 3.8	: Percentage distribution of respondents by drug usage pattern	24
Table 3.9	: Percentage of respondents who were aware of HIV/AIDS	25
Table 3.10	: Percentage of respondents aware of different methods of preventing HIV infection	27
Table 3.11	: Percentage of respondents aware of various modes of HIV transmission	29
Table 3.12	: Percentage of respondents having no misconceptions about HIV transmission	31
Table 3.13	: Proportion of respondents with comprehensive correct knowledge about HIV transmission and prevention	33
Table 3.14	: Percentage of respondents who had ever heard of STDs and were aware of common STD symptoms among men and women	34
Table 3.15	: Percentage of respondents who reported to have suffered from STD symptoms in the last 12 months	36
Table 3.16	: Percentage distribution of respondents by treatment source during last episode of STD	38
Table 3.17	: Percentage distribution of respondents by time taken to visit a health practitioner and type of medicine taken during last episode of STD	40
Table 3.18	: Percentage distribution of respondents by preferred treatment source to be utilised for future episodes of STD	41
Table 3.19	: Percentage distribution of respondents by age at first sex with any partner	42
Table 3.20	: Percentage distribution of respondents by age and type of first sex partner	44
Table 3.21	: Percentage of respondents who reported sex with any male partner and condom usage behaviour with male partner	45
Table 3.22	: Percentage of respondents who reported having sex with non-regular/regular female partner in last three months	47
Table 3.23	: Median age of respondents at first sex with commercial/non-regular/regular female partner	48
Table 3.24	: Mean number of commercial/non-regular/regular female partner in the last three months	50

Table 3.25	: Percentage of respondents who reported condom usage during last sex with commercial/non-regular/regular female partner	51
Table 3.26	: Percentage of respondents who reported consistent condom use during sex with commercial/non-regular/regular female partner in the last three months	54
Table 3.27	: Percentage distribution of respondents by person who suggested condom use during last sex with commercial/non-regular/regular female partner	56
Table 3.28	: Percentage distribution of respondents by type of condom brands used at last sex with commercial/non-regular/regular female partner	57
Table 3.29	: Percentage distribution of respondents by source of condom used at last sex with commercial/non-regular/regular female partner	58
Table 3.30	: Percentage distribution of respondents by reasons for not using condom at last sex with commercial/non-regular/regular female partner	60
Table 3.31	: Percentage distribution of respondents by perception regarding risk of contracting HIV/AIDS	61
Table 3.32	: Percentage of respondents who reported possibility of confidential HIV testing, ever had HIV test and found out result	63
Table 3.33	: Percentage of respondents who received interpersonal communication on STD/HIV/AIDS in the last one year	66
Table 3.34	: Percentage of respondents who had ever heard of ICTC, PPTCT and ART centre	67
Table 4.1	: Percentage distribution of respondents by age	69
Table 4.2	: Percentage distribution of respondents by education level	70
Table 4.3	: Percentage distribution of respondents by marital status and age at marriage	71
Table 4.4	: Percentage distribution of respondents by status of sexual partnership	73
Table 4.5	: Percentage distribution of respondents by residential status and mobility pattern	74
Table 4.6	: Percentage distribution of respondents by alcohol intake in last four weeks	76
Table 4.7	: Percentage distribution of respondents by drug usage pattern	78
Table 4.8	: Percentage of respondents who were aware of HIV/AIDS	79
Table 4.9	: Percentage of respondents aware of different methods of preventing HIV infection	81
Table 4.10	: Percentage distribution of respondents having no misconceptions about HIV/AIDS transmission	83
Table 4.11	: Proportion of respondents with comprehensive correct knowledge about HIV transmission and prevention	84
Table 4.12	: Percentage of respondents who had ever heard of STD and were aware of common STD symptoms among men and women	86
Table 4.13	: Percentage of respondents who reported to have suffered from STD symptoms in the last 12 months	87
Table 4.14	: Percentage distribution of respondents who sought STD treatment - Took no treatment or went to informal health facility during last STD episode	89

Table 4.15	: Percentage distribution of respondents who sought STD treatment - Went to health practitioner during the last episode	90
Table 4.16	: Percentage distribution of respondents by time taken to visit a health practitioner and type of medicine taken during last episode of STD	92
Table 4.17	: Percentage distribution of respondents by preferred treatment source to be utilised for future episodes of STD	93
Table 4.18	: Percentage distribution of respondents by age at first sex	95
Table 4.19	: Percentage distribution of respondents by age when started sex work	96
Table 4.20	: Percentage distribution of respondents by number of paying clients and non-paying partners in the last seven days	97
Table 4.21	: Percentage distribution of respondents by number of paying clients on the last working day	99
Table 4.22	: Percentage of respondents who reported condom usage during last sex and consistent condom use in last 30 days with paying client and non-paying partners	101
Table 4.23	: Percentage distribution of respondents by person who suggested condom use at last sex with paying client/non-paying partners	104
Table 4.24	: Percentage distribution of respondents by type of condom brands used at last sex with paying client/non-paying partners	105
Table 4.25	: Percentage distribution of respondents by source of condom used at last sex with paying client/non-paying partners	107
Table 4.26	: Percentage distribution of respondents by reasons for not using condom at last sex with paying client/non-paying partners	108
Table 4.27	: Percentage distribution of respondents who reported condom negotiation with paying clients	110
Table 4.28	: Percentage distribution of respondents by perception regarding risk of contracting HIV/AIDS	111
Table 4.29	: Percentage of respondents reporting possibility of confidential HIV testing, ever had HIV test and found out result	112
Table 4.30	: Percentage of respondents who reported exposure to STI/HIV/AIDS programme interventions in the last one year	115

List of Figures

Figure 3.1	: Percentage distribution of clients of FSWs by status of sexual partnership	19
Figure 3.2	: Percentage of clients of FSWs who were aware of HIV/AIDS	26
Figure 3.3	: Percentage of clients of FSWs aware of two important methods of preventing HIV Infection	28
Figure 3.4	: Percentage of clients of FSWs aware of various modes of HIV transmission	30
Figure 3.5	: Percentage of clients of FSWs having no misconceptions about HIV transmission	32
Figure 3.6	: Percentage of clients of FSWs who reported to have suffered from at least one STD symptom in the last 12 months	37
Figure 3.7	: Percentage distribution of clients of FSWs by preferred STD treatment source to be utilised for future episodes	42
Figure 3.8	: Percentage of clients of FSWs who reported having sex with non-regular female partner in last three months	48
Figure 3.9	: Percentage of clients of FSWs who reported condom usage during last sex with commercial/non-regular/regular female partner	52
Figure 3.10	: Percentage of clients of brothel and non brothel-based FSWs who reported condom usage during last sex with commercial/non-regular/regular female partner	52
Figure 3.11	: Percentage distribution of clients of FSWs who reported condom usage during last sex with non-regular female partner: Interstate Comparison, 2006	53
Figure 3.12	: Percentage distribution of clients of FSWs by perception regarding risk of contracting HIV/AIDS	62
Figure 3.13	: Percentage of clients of FSWs reporting possibility of confidential HIV testing, ever had HIV test and found out result	64
Figure 3.14	: Percentage of clients of FSWs who have ever had HIV test: State-wise, 2006	65
Figure 3.15	: Percentage of clients of FSWs who received interpersonal communication on STD/HIV/AIDS in the last one year	66
Figure 4.1	: Percentage distribution of FSWs who are ever married	72
Figure 4.2	: Percentage distribution of FSWs by status of sexual partnership	74
Figure 4.3	: Percentage of FSWs who have ever heard of HIV or AIDS or both	80
Figure 4.4	: Percentage of FSWs aware of two important methods of HIV prevention	82
Figure 4.5	: Percentage of FSWs aware of two methods of preventing HIV infection : Interstate Comparison, 2006	82
Figure 4.6	: Percentage of FSWs who reported to have suffered from any one STD symptom in the last 12 months	88

Figure 4.7 : Percentage of FSWs who did not seek any treatment during the last episode of STD	90
Figure 4.8 : Percentage distribution of FSWs by preferred STD treatment source to be utilised for future episodes	94
Figure 4.9 : Percentage distribution of FSWs by age when first started sex work	97
Figure 4.10 : Percentage of FSWs who reported condom usage with paying client and non-paying partners	102
Figure 4.11 : Percentage of brothel and non brothel-based FSWs who reported condom usage with paying client and non-paying partners: 2006	102
Figure 4.12 : Percentage of FSWs who reported condom usage during last sex with paying clients: Interstate Comparison, 2006	103
Figure 4.13 : Percentage of FSWs reporting possibility of confidential HIV testing, ever had HIV test and found out result	113
Figure 4.14 : Percentage of FSWs who have ever had HIV test: State-wise, 2006	114
Figure 4.15 : Percentage of FSWs who received education on STD/HIV/AIDS in the last one year	115

List of Abbreviations

AIDS	:	Acquired Immuno Deficiency Syndrome
ART	:	Anti Retroviral Therapy
BSS	:	Behavioural Surveillance Survey
CFSWs	:	Clients of Female Sex Workers
FSWs	:	Female Sex Workers
HIV	:	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
HRGs	:	High Risk Groups
ICTC	:	Integrated Counselling and Testing Centre
IDUs	:	Injecting Drug Users
ISSA	:	Integrated System for Survey Analysis
MSM	:	Men who have Sex with Men
NACO	:	National AIDS Control Organisation
NACP	:	National AIDS Control Programme
NGO	:	Non Governmental Organisation
NIMS	:	National Institute of Medical Statistics, New Delhi
ORG CSR	:	ORG Centre for Social Research
PPTCT	:	Prevention of Parent-to-Child Transmission
RCSHA	:	Resource Centre for Sexual Health and HIV/AIDS
SACS	:	State AIDS Control Society
SPSS	:	Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
STD	:	Sexually Transmitted Disease
STI	:	Sexually Transmitted Infection
TRG	:	Technical Resource Group
UNAIDS	:	Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS
UNICEF	:	United Nations Children's Fund
UT	:	Union Territory
WHO	:	World Health Organization

Executive Summary

Background

- The main aim of NACP-III is to halt and reverse the tide of the HIV epidemic in India by 2012. The programme aims to reduce new infections in all categories and prevent spread of HIV from High Risk Groups (HRGs) to the general populations. NACP-III envisages to achieve the following objectives: Developing safe behaviours and attitudes particularly among the youth and high-risk groups and with a particular focus on most affected regions. It also aims to ensure that people infected and affected with HIV get easy access to a comprehensive package of services that include prevention, care, support and treatment. Establishing a world-class blood transfusion system in the country for bringing down the incidence of blood-transmissible diseases including HIV by actively promoting voluntary blood donation is another main objective. Finally, NACP-III aims to develop a systematic approach in order to integrate HIV/AIDS with the National Rural Health Mission, National TB Control Programme and health promotion aims at adopting healthy lifestyles. As the first step, NACO is adopting this process of integration at the district level by placing the District AIDS Prevention and Control units under the District Health Society.
- In order to develop strategic programme initiatives, NACP-III has given great importance to evidence based planning and strengthening of surveillance, research and monitoring. HIV Surveillance is a crucial component providing information for programmatic decision making and planning. HIV surveillance includes HIV Sentinel Surveillance, AIDS Case Surveillance, STI Surveillance and Behavioural Surveillance. While the initial three components assess the epidemic after it has emerged, Behavioural Surveillance provides an understanding of the high risk behaviours that predispose to the emergence of an epidemic. It also gives inputs on the knowledge, awareness and practices of different population groups that may make them vulnerable to HIV infection.
- NACO conducted the first National BSS in the year 2001 i.e. towards the beginning of NACP-II. After a gap of five years since the first BSS, NACO has commissioned BSS 2006 to measure the changes in behavioural indicators. BSS 2006 has been carried out among general population as well as HRGs (FSWs, MSM, IDUs and clients of FSWs) following similar approach adopted in BSS 2001.
- The aim of carrying out BSS 2006 was to assess current risk behaviour in specific population groups in India and to measure behavioural changes from BSS 2001 to BSS 2006.
- The present report details the observations of the National BSS 2006 among the FSWs and their clients, which was conducted in all states and union territories of the country.

Methodology and Sampling Design

- While planning for BSS, it was felt important that all the key stakeholders 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 of the planning stage of this survey. For BSS 2006, a Technical Resource Group (TRG) was constituted by NACO that included members from different organisations like UNAIDS,

UNICEF, WHO, NIMS, Clinton Foundation, RCSHA and Population Council. TRG meetings were held on a weekly basis at every stage of the study to review progress and plan for the effective use of the emerging data for BSS 2006. The TRG members contributed substantially in terms of providing ideas and shared their experiences throughout the study period.

- FSWs were defined in a similar manner as in BSS 2001, which is as follows:
 - ◆ Brothel-based FSWs - refers to women aged up to 49 years who have sold sex in the last one month within brothels.
 - ◆ Non-brothel based FSWs - refers to women aged up to 49 years who have sold sex in the last one month at defined sex access points outside brothels.

Among FSWs, 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. Clients of FSWs were defined as men who have bought sex in the last one month.

- All the states and union territories in the country were categorised in 25 sampling units for the purpose of BSS 2006. The smaller states were combined with adjacent large states. Goa and Daman & Diu were clubbed into one group, as were Gujarat and Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Kerala and Lakshadweep, Punjab and Chandigarh, Tamil Nadu and Puducherry, West Bengal and Andaman & Nicobar Islands and five north eastern states of Arunachal Pradesh, Nagaland, Meghalaya, Mizoram and Tripura. All the other states in country were taken as independent sampling units.
- The required information for the survey was collected through similar questionnaires used for BSS 2006 General Population Survey. A detailed manual was prepared for field teams for their ready reference. The manual highlighted the survey objectives, methodology, techniques for interviewing and recording the answers and detailed description of each question.
- A total of 6613 clients of sex workers and 7417 FSWs were interviewed across all the sampling units. A two-stage cluster sampling design was adopted for selecting respondents.
- The survey was conducted between July 2006 and September 2006.
- After field and office editing, the data was entered through a tailor made software module in Integrated System for Survey Analysis (ISSA version 7.0). After due cleaning of data, the analysis was carried out using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 10.0). Adequate checks were built in at data entry and data analysis stage to ensure data quality.

Key Findings for Clients of FSWs

Profile of Respondents

- Nearly half of the respondents covered in both BSS 2006 as well as BSS 2001 were in the age group of 26 to 35 years. Those aged between 20 and 25 years comprised about one-fourth (one-third in BSS 2001) of the respondents. At the national level the median age of the respondents was 30 years in BSS 2006 and 27 years in BSS 2001. The median age of the clients of brothel based FSWs was 29 years as compared to 30 years in case of clients of non-brothel based FSWs.
- Nearly two-fifths of the respondents in BSS 2006 as well as in BSS 2001 were either illiterate or had studied only up to class V. Another two-fifths of the respondents in both the surveys had attained education up to X standard. Only seven percent (11% in BSS 2001) of the respondents had completed Grade XII.

- Nearly two-thirds (64%) of the respondents covered in BSS 2006 were reported to be ever married. This proportion was significantly lower (54%) in BSS 2001. The proportion of ever married respondents from brothel (66%) and non-brothel (63%) area was more or less similar.
- Nearly two-thirds of the respondents were currently married (63%) and majority of the currently married respondents were living with their spouse. A significant increase in the proportion of currently married respondents was also observed when compared with BSS 2001 (2006 - 63%, 2001 - 52%). The proportion of respondents who were currently married and not living with spouse or other sexual partner had decreased considerably from BSS 2001 (2006 - 5%, 2001 - 9%).
- The highest proportion of respondents (23%) were local transport workers, followed by petty business or small shop owners (17%), truck drivers (16%) and non-agricultural workers (11%). About five percent of the respondents were engaged in service.
- Majority of the respondents (86% in BSS 2006 and 81% in BSS 2001) reported that they live in the same city where they were interviewed. Of the respondents who resided in the same city, 56 percent had been living in the city since birth.
- Nearly three-fourths of the respondents in BSS 2006 reported ever-drinking alcohol. Across the entire country, nearly one-fourth of the respondents reported that they had ever tried any drug.

Awareness of HIV/AIDS

- About 98 percent of the respondents reported that they had heard about HIV or AIDS or both.
- The proportion of respondents who were aware that consistent condom use could prevent HIV was 89 percent and the corresponding proportion was higher than BSS 2001 (85%). More than three-fourths (77%) of the respondents were aware that HIV can be prevented by having one faithful uninfected sex partner. About 71 percent of the respondents were aware of both the methods of prevention i.e. prevention by correct and consistent condom use and having one uninfected faithful sex partner. No significant difference was observed in awareness regarding different methods of prevention between clients of brothel and non-brothel FSWs.
- About 93 percent of respondents were aware that a person could get HIV/AIDS by sharing a needle that was already used by an infected person and 80 percent of the respondents were aware of vertical transmission (pregnant woman to her unborn child) of HIV. Two-thirds of the respondents in BSS 2006 reported that HIV could be transmitted from an infected mother to her newborn child through breast feeding.
- The proportion of respondents who were aware that HIV cannot be transmitted through sharing a meal with an infected person has significantly increased from 67 percent in BSS 2001 to 80 percent in BSS 2006. The awareness that HIV cannot be transmitted by mosquito bites was 74 percent and nearly three-fourths of the respondents were aware that a healthy looking person could be suffering from HIV. The proportion of respondents who had correct awareness on the two misconceptions (transmission of HIV through sharing a meal, mosquito bite) associated with the transmission of HIV and were aware that a healthy looking person could be infected with HIV was 51 percent in BSS 2006 against 39 percent in BSS 2001.

Awareness, Prevalence and Treatment Seeking Behaviour related to STDs

- About 78 percent (76% in BSS 2001) of the respondents had heard of STDs. About three-fourths of the respondents (66% in BSS 2001) were able to correctly identify at least one or the other STD symptoms among men and almost 76 percent of the respondents (68% in BSS 2001) were aware of at least one of the STD symptoms among women.

- About 20 percent of the Clients of FSWs reported incidence of burning pain during urination and 12 percent reported genital ulcer/sore in the last 12 months. The corresponding percentages were slightly higher in BSS 2001 (24% and 14% respectively). From the above, the proportion of respondents who did not seek any treatment was observed to decrease from 18 percent in BSS 2001 to 13 percent in BSS 2006. However the decline was not statistically significant.
- The proportion of the respondents visiting a government hospital/clinic for treatment of STDs was observed to decline marginally from 28 percent in BSS 2001 to 25 percent in BSS 2006. Further, the proportion of respondents seeking treatment from private hospital/clinic significantly declined from 38 percent in BSS 2001 to 24 percent in BSS 2006. Nearly one-fifth of the respondents in both the surveys tried to avoid seeking treatment and borrowed prescriptions from friends or relatives.
- Nearly 35 percent of the respondents reported that they would seek treatment from a private hospital/clinic as compared to about 50 percent of respondents who would seek treatment from a government hospital/clinic. The corresponding figure for BSS 2001 was significantly higher for the private facilities as compared to government facilities as the preferred source of STD treatment for future episode.

Sexual Behaviour and Condom Usage

- The age at first sex varied from 17 to 25 years. It was observed that a significant proportion (34%) of the respondents had their first sex at the age of 19-21 years followed by slightly less proportion (31%) of the respondents who had first sex at the age of 16-18 years. The median age was 20 years at the first sex with any partner. No substantial difference was observed in the median age reported by clients from brothel area vis-à-vis clients from non-brothel area. The mean age of first sexual partner for all locations was 22 years, which ranged from 18-30 years across various states. The age of first sexual partner had been reported as 16-18 years by a considerable proportion (36%) of the respondents.
- About 12 percent of the respondents reported sexual involvement with male partner. About 13 percent of clients from brothel area reported to have sex with any male partner as against 11 percent of clients from non-brothel area.
- The proportion of respondents who reported sex with any non-regular partner in the last three months was 24 percent in BSS 2006 against 16 percent in BSS 2001. The median age at first sex with any commercial female partner ranged from 19 to 26 years.
- The mean number and median number of commercial/non-regular/regular partner was observed to be the same as BSS 2001. Further, no significant difference was observed between clients from brothel area with those from non-brothel area. The mean number of commercial female partners was reported to be 4.4.
- About 85 percent of the respondents who had sex with commercial partner reported using condom last time, which is significantly higher from BSS 2001 (75%). This proportion was significantly high among those who had sex with commercial partner (85%) as compared to non-regular (50%) or regular partners (29%). The proportion of respondents who reported condom usage last time they had sex with non-regular partner has significantly increased from BSS 2001 to BSS 2006 among the brothel based clients (2006 60%, 2001-29%).
- Nearly three-fourths (74%) of respondents who had sex with commercial partner reported consistent condom use in the last three months, which is significantly higher as compared to BSS 2001 (57%).
- The main reason reported for not using a condom last time was 'think unnecessary' for commercial (30%), non-regular (20%) and regular (39%) partners. The other reasons for not using a condom with commercial partner were 'decreases pleasure' (16%) and 'don't like condoms' (14%).

Other Salient Observations

- About one-fifth (22%) of the respondents perceived 'very high' chances of getting HIV infection. Almost equal proportion of respondents reported 'moderate chance' (25%), 'low chance' (26%) and 'no chance' (24%) of contracting HIV infection. The proportion of respondents who perceived very high chances of contracting HIV infection has increased significantly from BSS 2001.
- Nearly three-fourths (72%) of the respondents reported that it was possible to get a confidential test to find out if they were HIV infected. Overall, more than one-third (38%) of the respondents interviewed had heard about ICTC, while 17 percent were aware of PPTCT and only nine percent had heard of ART centre.
- Nearly one-third (against one-fifth in BSS 2001) of the respondents reported that they have had interpersonal communication on STI/HIV/AIDS.

Key Findings for FSWs

Profile of Respondents

- About half of the respondents covered in both BSS 2006 as well as BSS 2001 were aged between 20-29 years. About five percent of the respondents in BSS 2006 against eight percent in BSS 2001 were aged 15-20 years. The median age of the respondents was 28 years in BSS 2006 and 27 years in BSS 2001.
- Two-fifths of the FSWs covered in BSS 2006 were illiterate and more than half (55%) had studied up to X standard. Only three percent of the FSWs reported to have studied beyond X standard. The education status of the non-brothel based FSWs was much better than that of the brothel based FSWs. There existed wide variation in the educational status of the FSWs covered in BSS 2006 and BSS 2001. Against 61 percent of the FSWs in BSS 2001, only 42 percent of those covered in BSS 2006 were illiterate.
- More than two-thirds (69%) of the FSWs covered in BSS 2006 were ever married. The corresponding percentage in BSS 2001 was relatively lower at 62 percent. The proportion of non-brothel based sex workers who had ever been married was higher (72%) than brothel based sex workers (62%). Against 32 percent of the brothel based FSWs, 13 percent of the non-brothel based FSWs got married before the age of 15. Considerably higher proportions of non-brothel based FSWs were married between the age of 19-21 years and 22-25 years as compared with brothel based FSWs. The median age at marriage of the FSWs was 18 years in both the surveys.

At the national level, 38 percent of FSWs are 'currently married and presently living with spouse' while 29 percent are 'not currently married, not living with sexual partner' and 14 percent are 'currently married, not living with spouse or other sexual partner'. However, about 10 percent of the FSWs were 'currently married, living with other sexual partner' and 8 percent 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 (42%) than brothel based FSWs (29%). The proportion of brothel based FSWs not currently married and not living with sexual partner was higher than non-brothel based FSWs (37% and 26% respectively).

- Most of the FSWs covered in BSS 2001 (90%) as well as in BSS 2006 (89%) were living in the same city/town where the interview was conducted. Overall, about 41 percent of the FSWs in BSS 2006 (against 32% in BSS 2001) reported to be living in the city/town since birth, where the interview was conducted. This finding indicates a high degree of mobility among the FSWs.

- Almost similar proportion of the FSWs in BSS 2001 (44%) as well as in BSS 2006 (46%) survey reported that they had at some point of time taken any drink containing alcohol. Both the surveys show that ever consumption of alcohol was higher among non-brothel based FSWs than brothel based FSWs. In BSS 2006, about 11 percent of FSWs (15% in BSS 2001) who had reported ever consuming alcohol in any form, reported to be drinking it always before having sex and about 79 percent (74% in BSS 2001) of the FSWs had reported that they consumed alcohol sometimes before having sex. Only one-tenth of the respondents reported that they had never taken alcohol before having sex. A very low proportion of FSWs had ever tried any drug (2006-7% and 2001-6%). This proportion was higher among non-brothel based FSWs than brothel based FSWs (8% and 5% respectively).

Awareness of HIV/AIDS

- About 72 percent of FSWs covered in BSS 2006 affirmed that they had ever heard of HIV. The level of awareness among the FSWs about either HIV or AIDS or both is almost universal in almost all the states. Overall, 98 percent of FSWs in BSS 2006 as compared to 94 percent in BSS 2001 had heard of HIV/AIDS.
- About 90 percent of FSWs were aware of consistent and correct use of condom as a mode of prevention from HIV/AIDS. This proportion was 83 percent in BSS 2001. About 89 percent of the FSWs in BSS 2006 compared to 76 percent in BSS 2001 were aware that one could be protected from HIV/AIDS, if he/she had one faithful and uninfected sexual partner. About 81 percent of FSWs in BSS 2006 compared to BSS 2001 estimate of 66 percent knew both the methods of prevention i.e. consistent condom use and having faithful and uninfected sexual partner. Nearly 84 percent and 80 percent of brothel and non-brothel based FSWs respectively, were aware of both modes of prevention.
- The proportion of FSWs who were aware that a person would not get HIV/AIDS by sharing a meal with an infected person has increased from 63 percent in BSS 2001 to 77 percent in BSS 2006. About 70 percent of FSWs (66% in BSS 2001) were aware that mosquito bites do not transmit HIV. The awareness that a healthy looking person could be suffering from HIV has increased from 58 percent in BSS 2001 to 72 percent in BSS 2006.

Awareness, Prevalence and Treatment Seeking Behaviour related to STDs

- About 89 percent of FSWs in BSS 2006 reported that they had ever heard of sexually transmitted diseases and this proportion was lower at 83 percent in BSS 2001. The proportion of the FSWs aware of symptoms of STDs among women has declined from 83 percent in BSS 2001 to 77 percent in BSS 2006. About 63 percent of the FSWs in BSS 2006 against 68 percent in BSS 2001 were aware of any one symptom of STD among men.
- About half of the FSWs had suffered from any one symptom of STD during last 12 months prior to the survey. The corresponding percentage was relatively lower at 46 percent in BSS 2001. A higher proportion of non-brothel based FSWs (53%) were suffering at the time of survey from one or the other symptom of STD as compared with brothel based FSWs (44%). The overall proportion of FSWs suffering from more than one of the symptoms of STD has gone up from 31 percent in BSS 2001 to 38 percent in BSS 2006.
- The proportion of FSWs who did not undergo any treatment has declined significantly from 14 percent in BSS 2001 to eight percent in BSS 2006. Around 15 percent of the FSWs in both the surveys had sought home based treatment. About four percent tried to avoid seeking treatment and borrowed prescriptions from friends or relatives based on self-diagnosis of symptoms and medicated themselves accordingly. Another six percent took medicines already available with them. About 14 percent of the FSWs bought medicines from a chemist shop. This proportion in BSS 2001 was 19 percent. The proportion of the

FSWs visiting a government hospital/clinic for treatment of STDs has increased from 28 percent in BSS 2001 to 32 percent in BSS 2006. About 31 percent (35% in BSS 2001) of the FSWs went to a private hospital/clinic for the treatment of the problem. Treatment from NGO peer educator/clinic was sought by 21 percent (compared to 12% in BSS 2001) of the FSWs. A few of the FSWs (3%) reportedly sought treatment from the traditional healers.

Sexual Behaviour and Condom Usage

- Nearly half of the FSWs had first sex between the ages of 16 and 18 years. The age at first sex reported by the FSWs in BSS 2006 and BSS 2001 was more or less similar. The median age at first sex was 17 years in both the surveys. Nearly half of the FSWs contacted in BSS 2001 as well as BSS 2006 had reportedly started sex work between 16 and 21 years of age. Only eight percent (10% in BSS 2001) of the FSWs started sex work when they were aged 15 years or less. The median age at starting sex work was 20 years in both the surveys.
- The FSWs covered in BSS 2006 had 10 paying clients (11 in BSS 2001) in last seven days prior to the survey. The mean number of paying clients in the last seven days among brothel based FSWs was 12 compared with 9 among non-brothel based FSWs. In the last seven days prior to the survey, 43 percent of the FSWs did not have any non-paying regular partners. A higher proportion of non-brothel based FSWs (45%) did not have any non-paying partner in the last seven days as compared with brothel based FSWs (37%).
- The proportion of FSWs reporting use of condom last time when they had sex with the paying clients has gone up from 76 percent in BSS 2001 to 88 percent in BSS 2006. Against 94 percent of the brothel based FSWs, 85 percent of the non-brothel based FSWs reported condom usage in the last occasion when they had sex with a paying client. About 54 percent of FSWs in BSS 2006 against 39 percent in BSS 2001 used condom last time when they had sex with non-paying partners.
- Overall, nearly three-fourths of the FSWs in BSS 2006 compared to half of those in BSS 2001 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 (85%) as compared with non-brothel based FSWs (69%). Only 37 percent of the FSWs (21% in BSS 2001) reported consistent use of condom with non-paying partner during the last 30 days.
- ‘Partner objection’ was reported as the main reason for not using condom at last sex with paying client and it has declined from 68 percent in BSS 2001 to 45 percent in BSS 2006. Significant decline is also noticed with respect to the proportion of FSWs reporting “non-availability of condoms” and “did not think it was necessary” as the reason for not using condom at last sex with the paying client. Overall, 87 percent of FSWs in BSS 2006 against 81 percent in BSS 2001 reported that they usually insisted their clients to use a condom.

Other Salient Observations

- A significant increase since BSS 2001 can be seen in the proportion of FSWs who reported high risk of contracting HIV/AIDS (2001 - 17%, 2006 - 30%).
- More than three-fourths (77%) of the respondents reported that it was possible to get a confidential test to find out if they were HIV infected. Overall, nearly three-fifths (62%) of the FSWs reported that they had never undergone any HIV test. The corresponding percentage was higher (72%) in BSS 2001. Among the FSWs who had ever undergone HIV tests, over three-fourths had gone for the test voluntarily. A significantly high proportion (91%) of FSWs who had undergone test, reported to have got the result of their test.
- Overall, 56 percent of the FSWs reported that someone had approached them in the last one year for educating on STI/HIV/AIDS. This proportion was significantly higher for the brothel based FSWs (70%) than the non-brothel based FSWs (50%).

Summary Sheet (FSWs)

Indicators		2006	CI	2001
1.	Profile of Respondents			
1.1	Median age of respondents	28	23-33	27
1.2	Percentage of illiterate respondents	41.8	36.4-47.2	61.0
1.3	Percentage of respondents received interpersonal communication on HIV/AIDS	56.1	50.6-61.6	46.9
2.	Awareness about HIV/AIDS and Knowledge on HIV Transmission			
2.1	Percentage of respondents who had ever heard of HIV/AIDS	98.1	96.6-99.6	93.5
2.2	Percentage of respondents reporting HIV/AIDS cannot be transmitted through sharing a meal with HIV infected person	77.3	72.7-81.9	63.4
2.3	Percentage of respondents reporting HIV/AIDS cannot be transmitted through mosquito bites	70.3	65.3-75.3	65.8
2.4	Percentage of respondents aware that a healthy looking person could be infected with HIV	71.9	66.9-76.9	58.1
3.	Awareness about HIV/AIDS and Knowledge on HIV Prevention			
3.1	Percentage of respondents reporting HIV/AIDS can be prevented by having one faithful uninfected partner	88.9	85.4-92.4	76.1
3.2	Percentage of respondents reporting HIV/AIDS can be prevented through consistent condom use	90.3	87.0-93.6	82.7
3.3	Percentage of respondents knowing both the methods of HIV prevention	81.0	76.7-85.3	65.7
4.	Awareness of STDs, Self-reported Prevalence and Treatment Seeking Behaviour			
4.1	Percentage of respondents ever heard of STDs	88.9	85.4-92.4	82.8
4.2	Percentage of respondents reporting at least one STD symptom in last 12 months	50.4	44.9-55.9	45.8
4.3	Percentage of respondents reporting STD treatment in a govt. hospital/clinic during last episode	31.9	26.8-37.0	27.8
5.	Sexual Behaviour and Condom Usage			
5.1	Median age of respondents at first sex	17	13-21	17
5.3	Percentage of respondents reporting last time condom use with non-regular sex partner	87.5	83.9-91.1	76.0
5.4	Percentage of respondents reporting consistent condom usage with paying clients in the last three months	73.4	68.5-78.3	50.3
5.5	Percentage of respondents reporting their usual insistence on client using a condom	86.7	83.0-90.4	80.5

Summary Sheet (Clients of FSWs)

Indicators		2006	CI	2001
1.	Profile of Respondents			
1.1	Median age of respondents	30	44.7-55.7	27
1.2	Percentage of illiterate respondents	16.6	12.5-20.7	21.2
1.3	Percentage of currently married respondents	62.5	57.2-67.8	52.0
1.4	Percentage of respondents received interpersonal communication on HIV/AIDS	32.0	26.9-37.1	20.7
2.	Awareness about HIV/AIDS and Knowledge on HIV Transmission			
2.1	Percentage of respondents ever heard of HIV/AIDS	98.5	97.2-99.8	95.9
2.2	Percentage of respondents reporting HIV/AIDS can be transmitted through needle sharing	92.7	89.8-95.6	94.2
2.3	Percentage of respondents reporting HIV/AIDS can be transmitted through vertical transmission	79.9	75.5-84.3	86.3
2.4	Percentage of respondents had no incorrect belief on transmission of HIV/AIDS	50.6	45.1-56.1	38.5
3.	Awareness about HIV/AIDS and Knowledge on HIV Prevention			
3.1	Percentage of respondents reporting HIV/AIDS can be prevented by having one faithful uninfected partner	77.4	72.8-82.0	74.2
3.2	Percentage of respondents reporting HIV/AIDS can be prevented through consistent condom use	70.7	65.7-75.7	68.2
3.3	Percentage of respondents knowing both the methods of HIV prevention	89.0	85.6-92.4	85.1
4.	Awareness of STDs, Self-reported Prevalence and Treatment Seeking Behaviour			
4.1	Percentage of respondents ever heard of STDs	77.5	72.9-82.1	75.6
4.3	Percentage of respondents reporting at least one STD symptom in last 12 months	24.8	20.0-29.6	29.9
4.4	Percentage of respondents reporting STD treatment in a govt. hospital/clinic during last episode	24.9	20.1-29.7	27.6
5.	Sexual Behaviour and Condom Usage			
5.1	Median age of respondents at first sex	20	15-23	19
5.2	Percentage of respondents reporting sex with non-regular partner in last three months	23.9	19.2 – 28.6	16.3
5.3	Percentage of respondents reporting last time condom use with non-regular sex partner	49.6	44.1-55.1	32.8
5.4	Percentage of respondents reporting consistent condom use with all non-regular sex partners	39.8	34.4-35.2	21.8



Introduction

1.1 Background

India has seen an increase in the number of its people living with Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV), which causes Acquired Immuno Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS), from a few thousand in the early 1990s to around 2.47 million in 2006 out of which 39 percent are women and 3.8 percent are children. A total of 1,99,453 AIDS cases have been reported since 1986 till 31st December 2007. Many of the AIDS cases in India go unreported due to low level of awareness regarding HIV and AIDS.

The epidemic in India is of concentrated nature. HIV prevalence among the high risk groups such as Female Sex Workers (FSWs), Men who have Sex with Men (MSM) and Injecting Drug Users (IDUs) is six to eight times higher than among the general population. Heterosexual mode continues to be the prime mode of HIV transmission in the country.

Sex work is widespread in India, and occurs on a much larger scale than in many other countries. Women often get involved in sex work due to poverty, marital break-up or because they are forced into it. In India, sexual transmission is responsible for 87 percent of reported AIDS cases. HIV prevalence rates are high among sex workers and their clients. When surveyed, 68 percent of commercial sex workers in India who have not used condom reported that their main reason for not using condoms was because their customers objected. A national study reveals that 42 percent of sex workers believe that they can tell whether a client has HIV on the basis of their physical appearance. In Mumbai, which has a larger brothel-based sex industry than any other area of India, HIV prevalence among sex workers has remained very high for the last many years.

Male STD patients would be largely Clients of FSWs (CFSWs) and this bridge group will drive the epidemic forward. The majority of male clients are seasonal economic migrants from rural to urban centres and other neighbouring states in search of work during the lean period. While staying in urban areas they have the opportunity to visit FSWs and the risk of contracting HIV infection. When they return to their families they transmit the infection to their wives, which further gets transmitted to their children. The infection thus spreads from the core group population to the rest of the low risk general population and from urban centres to many villages.

Behavioural Surveillance is one of the four components of surveillance for HIV infection. The second generation surveillance for HIV emphasises the significance of understanding the behavioural patterns and trends that increase the emergence of HIV epidemic. Behavioural Surveillance not only gives a warning signal for newly emerging pockets of infection but also provides rich inputs to plan preventive interventions and awareness campaigns. Behavioural Surveillance is identified as an essential part of HIV Surveillance in the country that will aid national as well as sub-national planners and administrators for taking appropriate and evidence-based programmatic decisions to tackle the HIV epidemic. National AIDS Prevention and Control Policy of Government of India also advocates periodic Behavioural Surveillance Surveys in the country.

1.2 Need for the Study

The expanding epidemic of HIV demands that evaluation of intervention programmes and impact of interventions on the awareness and perception of people are very essential. The reason being

that HIV prevention depends on changing risk behaviour. This includes increasing condom usage and reducing number of sex partners among sexually active people, reducing needle sharing behaviour among IDUs and delaying the onset of first sexual intercourse among young people - to name a few.

Undertaking Behavioural Surveillance Survey (BSS) helps in monitoring changes in behavioural aspects of specific population groups vulnerable to HIV infection. Thus, it is imperative to conduct BSS at certain periodicity to track behaviour change in a systematic way. The objective of conducting BSS may thus be summarised as follows:

- Identifying sub-populations with high risk behaviour
- Identifying specific behaviour in need of change
- Providing indicators to monitor programme success and identifying persistent problem areas
- Serving as an advocacy and policy tool
- Providing data to be used for cross country and cross regional comparisons of behavioural risks.

The conceptual premise of BSS is based on classical HIV and STD serologic surveillance methods that comprise repeated cross-sectional sentinel surveys of key population groups. The purpose of this survey is to systematically monitor trends in behavioural indicators over a period of time that helps implementers to understand the outcome of interventions being carried out among the select population sub-groups.

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 behavioural indicators over time. The entire approach is designed to allow for reliable tracking of trends over time. Thus, the aim of carrying out National BSS 2006 was to assess and measure behavioural changes from BSS 2001 and also to know the current risk behaviour in specific populations in India.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The present study was commissioned by the National AIDS Control Organisation (NACO) for establishing parameters related to:

- Trends of behavioural indicators so as to inform programme development for the expansion of interventions leading to reduction in the transmission of HIV/AIDS and STDs in India.
- Assess the level of awareness, knowledge, attitude and behaviour with regards to STD/HIV/AIDS among the target population groups.

The present report provides detailed findings of BSS 2006 conducted among two high-risk population groups of FSWs and CFSWs, seeking their present status on awareness, knowledge, attitude and behaviour with regards to STD/HIV/AIDS. The detailed methodology/sampling design of this National BSS 2006 has been discussed in Chapter II.



Methodology and Sampling Design

This chapter presents an overview of the methodology and sampling design of National HIV/AIDS risk Behavioural Surveillance Survey (BSS) 2006 among Female Sex Workers (FSWs) and Clients of Female Sex Workers (CFSWs).

2.1 Consultative Process in Planning the Survey

While planning for BSS, it was important that all the key stakeholders 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 from the initiation of the planning stage of the survey. A Technical Resource Group (TRG) was constituted by NACO which included members from different key organisations such as UNAIDS, UNICEF, WHO, NIMS, Clinton Foundation, RCSHA, and Population Council. TRG meetings were held on a weekly basis to review progress and plan for the effective use of the emerging data. The TRG members continued to contribute ideas and exchange experiences throughout the survey.

2.2 Target Population for the Study

The Female Sex Workers were defined in a similar manner as in BSS 2001, which is as follows:

- Brothel based FSWs - refer to women aged up to 49 years who have sold sex in the last one month within brothels.
- Non-brothel based FSWs - refer to women aged up to 49 years who have sold sex in the last one month at defined sex access points outside brothels.

Among FSWs, 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.

Client of FSWs were defined as men who have bought sex in the last one month.

2.3 Core Indicators

All the key knowledge and behavioural indicators had to be estimated for each target group covered. Some of the key indicators measured are given below:

- Awareness of HIV/AIDS
- Knowledge of HIV prevention methods
- No incorrect beliefs about HIV transmission
- Awareness of Sexually Transmitted Diseases (STDs)
- Knowledge and prevalence of STD symptoms
- Age at first sex
- Sex with different types of sex partners
- Last time condom use with different types of sex partners
- Consistent condom use with different types of sex partners
- HIV risk perception
- Exposure to interventions.

Some additional indicators covered for FSWs were on number of clients on last working day, sexual behaviour with clients and regular partners. For their clients, the additional indicators covered were sexual behaviour and condom usage with commercial partners as well as regular partners.

2.4 Coverage of the Survey

The survey among FSWs and their clients was carried out across the 25 states/group of states. As in BSS 2001, the smaller states were combined with adjacent large states. The list of states/group of states covered is as follows:

1. Andhra Pradesh
2. Arunachal Pradesh + Nagaland + Meghalaya + Mizoram + Tripura
3. Assam
4. Bihar
5. Jharkhand
6. Delhi
7. Goa + Daman & Diu
8. Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli
9. Haryana
10. Himachal Pradesh
11. Jammu & Kashmir
12. Karnataka
13. Kerala + Lakshadweep
14. Madhya Pradesh
15. Chhattisgarh
16. Manipur
17. Maharashtra
18. Orissa
19. Punjab + Chandigarh
20. Rajasthan
21. Sikkim
22. Tamil Nadu + Puducherry
23. Uttar Pradesh
24. Uttarakhand
25. West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands

The control group for the FSW category was covered in Delhi, Mumbai, Kolkata and Andhra Pradesh. Non-brothel based FSWs, as the control group, were covered in Delhi, Mumbai and Kolkata whereas the brothel based FSWs were the control group in Andhra Pradesh.

2.5 Development of Research Instruments and Manuals

Besides developing the entire BSS methodology and indicators, the standard BSS tools have also been developed over the past decade. The consolidation of the questionnaires was undertaken after carrying out BSS in many developing countries. Since BSS is conducted over time to produce trends of behavioural indicators, it is vital that the tools set out to produce such trends remain the same every time. Minor changes in the questionnaires used in different phases and the order of questions can significantly influence responses and in turn might widen the gap between observed changes and real changes in behaviour.

With this in view, structured questionnaires used for BSS 2001 were adopted for BSS 2006 to collect the necessary information. The questionnaire was modified as per the responses to different questions in BSS 2001 questionnaires. Existing questions were modified and additional questions were added in discussion with the Technical Resource Group (TRG) constituted by NACO.

A detailed manual was prepared for field teams for their ready reference. The manual highlighted the survey objectives, methodology, techniques for interviewing and recording the answers.

Pre-testing of Tools

The questionnaire was finalised in consultation with TRG. Previous experiences showed that 'guilt' and 'cultural barrier' of discussing about 'sex and sexuality' remains high in this age group especially among females and in rural areas. In the context of Indian religion-cultural scenario, people are not very outspoken on sexual issues. A questionnaire that attempts to capture information on personal sexual practices needs to be developed to especially focus on the psyche of the respondents and probing techniques used should be appropriate to this cultural context. Thus pre-testing of the questionnaire had significant importance.

In addition to the above, the questionnaire was pre-tested to check the following:

- The understandability of the questions in terms of lucidity of the translated language, the level of ease with which the respondent could identify with the terminology used in the questionnaire
- The logical flow in the questionnaire and sequence of questions
- Skipping orders in the questionnaires
- Exhaustiveness of the pre-coded responses, new responses.

In order to ascertain the suitability of questionnaires in actual field conditions, the questionnaire was pre-tested in the field across three states - Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan and Orissa. The pre-test results were shared with TRG and after taking their suggestions, the same were incorporated in the questionnaire.

Translation of Questionnaires

The finalised questionnaires were translated into the regional languages. The earlier version of translation done during BSS 2001 was also consulted. The questionnaires were back-translated into English to ensure that the meaning of the questions does not change while translating into regional languages. The bilingual questionnaires were printed in the required quantity.

2.6 Training of Field Teams

Orientation Meeting of Professionals and Field Executives

A three-day training workshop was organised in Delhi for all the study team members from 26th to 28th April 06. The entire study team, which would be involved in the study, research professionals as well as all state field coordinators, participated in it. Residential training workshop was organised for all the participants so that they spend maximum time understanding the questionnaires, methodology and survey protocols without any disturbances.

Observers from NACO, RCSHA and Population Council were also present to observe the proceedings and guide the teams. The objectives of the workshop were as follows:

- To develop the participants' understanding of the objectives of BSS and areas of enquiry covered by the assessment

- To explain to participants the correct method of completing the assessment
 - ◆ Method of sampling the respondent
 - ◆ Method of approaching and rapport building
 - ◆ Process of seeking consent
 - ◆ Method of asking questions/interviewing
- To develop the participants' understanding of issues related to sexuality, STIs and HIV/AIDS
- To sensitise participants about the importance of informed consent, empathy and confidentiality
- To plan the field logistics and brainstorm on possible problems and what efforts to be made to solve these problems.

The major outcomes of the workshop were:

- An informed, sensitised, prepared and motivated field team
 - ◆ *Informed* about the objectives of the assessment and “correct ways of doing things” (protocols)
 - ◆ *Sensitised* about the nature of respondents, topics to be discussed and larger significance of the survey
 - ◆ *Prepared* to handle complex and unexpected problems in field
 - ◆ *Motivated* to complete the work despite challenges, initial refusals and failures
- Clear and uniform understanding among all participants about the various issues and protocols to be followed
- Finalised field plan.

Recruitment of Field Staff

While selecting field workers, it was ensured that skilled investigators with prior experience of social research are recruited. Further, efforts were made to recruit fieldworkers having prior experience of BSS or mapping studies. ORG CSR has a panel of investigators who have received training on BSS earlier and took part in the previous waves. The field executives and supervisors, who were involved in BSS 2001, were preferably involved in BSS 2006. In addition to the regular staff, key informants and members from the target groups and NGOs working with these target groups were also involved.

Involvement of NGO outreach workers was felt important to gain access to FSWs' communities and very hard to reach target groups. Moreover, it was found out during the pilot survey that respondents belonging to these target categories, particularly FSWs, were much comfortable with an interviewer belonging to the same community. However, for avoiding any subjective/objective bias in interviews, all outreach workers were thoroughly trained during the training workshop, supervised very closely by field supervisors in the field and sent to a site (for fieldwork) where they were not known or not involved in any intervention project.

It may be mentioned here that irrespective of best efforts to deploy an experienced team, it has been observed that supervision and the depth of training received by the field team makes the actual difference in fieldwork quality. A good training and team spirit makes all the difference in field quality. While selecting fieldworkers, ORG CSR emphasises much on the ‘aptitude and attitude’ of the person. Unlike other studies, the sexual health related studies require good communication skills and such interviewers should be sensitive and bold enough to deal with the unforeseen situations in the field, many of which might appear as ‘cultural shock’ to the common man. The previous experience of conducting BSS in different part of the country suggested that ‘training’ and continuous debriefing is the best strategy to mould investigators, enabling them to work effectively. Keeping in mind the dropout rate, 20 percent extra investigators were recruited and trained.

Training of Field Staff

‘Training’ has a very special connotation and is a rigorous affair in BSS. This training for the investigators and supervisors was designed to impart and develop all round understanding of the relevant issues and necessary skills to objectively interact with the members of the select population groups. Thus, it does not merely let the participant understand the inquiry areas of the survey but it also shapes up ‘attitude and skills’ of the fieldworkers to work among the target populations.

The training programme was organised across all locations. A five-day intensive training workshop for the study team was organised to train them thoroughly on scientific interview techniques and appropriate recording of responses. Training included interactive sessions in the classroom and field exposure visit in course of the training. Training was provided in regional languages. Guest speaker/resource persons from SACS and NGOs were invited to discuss issues on HIV/AIDS, STIs and ongoing prevention activities.

Most importantly, the issues of how to gain access to these target groups and how to speak to them to elicit the required information were also discussed. The cooperation and active participation of the experts created the desired interactive ambiance in the training programme and it helped the participants to delve into the information areas and skills required to work in BSS.

A detailed training agenda was prepared and shared with all field executives. The main issues addressed in the training were:

- Understanding the concepts of Sex and Sexuality, HIV/AIDS, Sexually Transmitted Diseases.
- Understanding and familiarising with the lifestyles of the target population groups
- Self-introspection of one’s own ability and attitude to work with the ‘hard to reach populations’ and clarifications on the same
- Inquiry areas of the questionnaires, administration techniques
- Approach and probing techniques: How to approach, language, non-verbal expressions, documentation techniques, skills to handle agitated situation/respondents.
- Selection of respondent and sampling techniques
- Other fieldwork protocols.

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 the resource person in each location to sensitise investigators and supervisors on STD.

2.7 Sample Size Calculation

The sampling design was finalised with the TRG constituted by NACO. While calculating the required sample sizes, the following points were considered:

- The procedures presented were intended for surveys where the primary objective is to measure changes in selected behavioural indicators over time.
- Sample size requirements were addressed with respect to indicators measured as proportions.

To calculate the sample size required in a survey round for the measurement of change on a given indicator, five factors are considered:

- the initial or starting level of the key variable

- the magnitude of change that needs to be detected reliably
- the level of significance
- the power of estimation
- 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 given by:

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

Where,

- n = the required sample size
D = design effect
P₁ = the estimated proportion at the time of the first survey
P₂ = the target proportion at some future date, so that (P₂ - P₁) is the magnitude of change to be detected
P = (P₁ + P₂)/2
Z_{1-α} = the Z - score corresponding to the desired level of significance
Z_{1-β} = the Z - score corresponding to the desired level of power

Using the above formula, the state-wise sample size per target group was calculated. The following table shows different target groups covered in the survey, key variables to be measured, estimated value in BSS 2001 and sample size.

Target Groups	Key variable	Value in 2001 (P ₁)	Domains	Value in 2006 (P ₂)	Sample size
Clients of Female Sex Workers	Consistent condom use with commercial partners in last three months	Value in 2001	Each State/Group of States	Value in 2001 +15%	267
Female Sex Workers	Consistent condom use with clients in last one month	50%	Each State/Group of States	65%	267
Control Group for Female Sex Workers	Consistent condom use with clients in last one month	Value in 2001	Delhi, Mumbai, Kolkata, Andhra Pradesh	Value in 2001 +15%	267

While calculating the sample per target group, the following assumptions are made in the above formula:

- D = 2
Z_{1-α} = 1.645 (Corresponding to 95% confidence level)
Z_{1-β} = 0.84 (Corresponding to 80% power of estimate)

2.8 Sampling Procedure

Two stage cluster sampling design was adopted for selecting target respondents in each location:

Stage I : Selection of Sites

Stage II : Selection of Target Respondents

Stage I: Selection of Sites (clusters)

The steps followed in the selection of sites for high risk target groups were as follows:

Step 1 : The list of sites was prepared and revalidated from the existing mapping information.

Step 2 : The sampling interval (SI) was calculated by dividing the total number of sites (M) by the number of sets to be selected (a) i.e. $SI = M/a$.

Step 3 : A random number (R) between 1 and SI was selected using random number tables. The site on the numbered list corresponding to the random number was the first selected set.

Step 4 : Subsequent units were selected by adding the sampling interval (SI) to the number identified in step 3.

Step 5 : This procedure was continued until the list finished.

Stage II: Selection of Target Respondents

The field teams reached the selected site at the beginning of the peak hour. If the number of high risk target respondents 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. However, 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 interview.

The list of sites prepared at the time of mapping exercise in the state was updated before the selection of sites and the final list of selected sites was shared with both NACO and TRG before the start of the survey.

2.9 Achieved Sample Size

The following table presents achieved sample sizes of the target respondents across different locations:

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	FSWs	Clients of FSWs
1.	Andhra Pradesh	536	267
2.	Assam	270	270
3.	Bihar	272	269
4.	Delhi	273	275
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	268	270
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	276	271
7.	Haryana	270	270
8.	Himachal Pradesh	272	270
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	272	272
10.	Karnataka	270	271
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	269	270
12.	Madhya Pradesh	267	268
13.	Maharashtra	541	268
14.	Manipur	269	270
15.	Orissa	270	270
16.	Other North Eastern States	270	270
17.	Punjab+ Chandigarh	273	278
18.	Rajasthan	270	282
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	270	264
20.	Uttar Pradesh	274	275
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	540	270
22.	Jharkhand	268	270
23.	Chhattisgarh	267	264
25.	Sikkim	120	119
26.	Uttarakhand	270	270
	Brothel based	2190	2171
	Non-brothel based	5227	4442
	Total	7417	6613

2.10 Fieldwork

The fieldwork was simultaneously launched across the country. It was initiated in mid July 2006 and was completed in September 2006. Each state/group of states had three to five teams, each consisting of four field investigators and one supervisor.

The core research team members made a number of field visit across different locations for ensuring high quality of survey data. Field supervisors made at least 20 percent spot checks to ensure completeness and accuracy of the filled up questionnaires. Detailed manual scrutiny of the filled up questionnaires as well as the coding exercise was initiated by field supervisors during the fieldwork itself. NACO representatives and TRG members also made several field visits across different parts of the country and provided their valuable inputs.

2.11 Data Management and Data Analysis

Data Scrutiny

Before data entry each and every questionnaire was first scrutinised at the respective state field offices and then in the data entry locations. About 20 coders and four coding supervisors were recruited across India. All coders and supervisors were briefed about study objectives. Professionals supervised the entire scrutiny operation for monitoring the quality output.

Data Management

In view of the large volume of data, the entire data entry was handled at five centres namely Delhi, Kolkata, Lucknow, Baroda and Hyderabad where facilities to handle large volumes of data were available. Data were entered in the Integrated System for Survey Analysis (ISSA) package. This package was preferred due to its in-built capacity of making range and consistency checks. A senior system analyst with the support of a programmer monitored the data entry. About 10 percent of the questionnaires were entered twice and it was ensured that error levels are below 0.5 percent. The results of the double data entry were shared with the TRG members on a regular basis.

Data Analysis

The core team members and the system analyst under the guidance of the team leader prepared the analysis/tabulation plan. The tabulation plan was finalised in consultation with the TRG members. Estimates of all the key variables including the core indicators have been presented in the following chapters. The required tables were generated using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

2.12 Quality Assurance Mechanisms

Although the mechanisms were mentioned in the earlier sections, they are summarized here as follows:

- Recruitment of professionals with prior experience of working in similar projects
- National level training programme for all the key research professionals and field staff
- State level training workshops for field interviewers and supervisors in all states
- Pre-testing of tools and back translation of questionnaires from regional languages to English

- Regular field visits by senior professionals, TRG members and representatives from NACO
- 20 percent spot checks for ensuring accuracy of the collected information during field visits
- Double data entry of 10 percent questionnaires
- Data analysis in consultation with TRG.



Clients of Female Sex Workers

3.1 Background

Being identified as a critical bridge group in HIV/AIDS the transmission, the clients of Female Sex Workers are one of the key target groups for any intervention project. BSS 2006 among high risk and bridge groups has undertaken a detailed study of this population, in terms of their demographic profile, their awareness of STDs and HIV/AIDS, drug use, needle and syringe sharing behaviour, self reported prevalence of STDs, treatment seeking behaviour, sexual behaviour and condom usage, besides other salient observations pertaining to their risk behaviour, knowledge of transmission and prevention of HIV/AIDS.

Each of these issues is discussed in detail in the ensuing sections. The discussion would present the national and state scenario. Also, the difference in the pattern between clients of brothel based and non-brothel based sex workers would be discussed. In addition, an attempt has also been made to compare the findings of BSS 2006 with that of BSS 2001 in all states where BSS 2001 was undertaken to ascertain the trends in the selected indicators.

3.2 Profile of the Clients of FSWs

This section presents the background information pertaining to age, literacy status of the respondents, marital status, main occupation, residential status and substance use like alcohol and drugs, in the following sub-sections.

3.2.1 Age of the Respondents

All the respondents were asked to mention their actual age in years at the time of survey. The age distribution and median age of the clients of the FSWs is presented in Table 3.1. Nearly half of the respondents covered in both 2006 as well as BSS 2001 were in the age group of 26 to 35 years. Those aged between 20 to 25 years comprised about one-fourth (one-third in BSS 2001) of the respondents. At the national level the median age of the respondents was 30 years in BSS 2006 and 27 years in BSS 2001. The median age of the clients of brothel based FSWs was 29 years as compared to 30 years in case of clients of non-brothel based FSWs.

As compared to 37-47 percent of the respondents in Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Rajasthan, Bihar and Delhi, less than one-fifth of the respondents in Punjab, Assam, Tamil Nadu and Gujarat were in the age group of 15 to 25 years. The median age of the respondents was lowest in Delhi (26 years) and highest in Andhra Pradesh, Assam and Gujarat (32 years). The respondents aged 20-35 years account for almost three-fourths of the total number of respondents at national level. The pattern was more or less same in majority of the states. However, in five states the percentage exceeded 80 percent.

3.2.2 Educational Profile

All the respondents were asked to tell their educational status. As shown in Table 3.2 nearly two-fifths of the respondents in BSS 2006 as well as in BSS 2001 were either illiterate or had studied only up to class V. Another two-fifths of the respondents in both the surveys had attained education between VI and X standard. Only six percent (11% in BSS 2001) of the respondents had completed Grade XII.

Table 3.1: Percentage distribution of respondents by age

(All figures except median age are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Age groups (in years)					
		15-20	20-25	26-35	36-45	> 45	Median age (in years)
1.	Andhra Pradesh	1.5	19.4	47.4	29.9	1.9	32
2.	Assam	0.7	14.1	53.7	27.8	3.7	32
3.	Bihar	11.9	29.0	33.1	22.3	3.7	28
4.	Delhi	13.8	33.5	42.9	9.8	0.0	26
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	1.5	20.7	55.2	21.9	0.7	30
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	1.1	15.1	59.0	23.6	1.1	32
7.	Haryana	6.3	26.3	40.0	25.2	2.2	28
8.	Himachal Pradesh	6.3	25.6	52.6	15.2	0.4	28
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	4.0	26.8	55.9	13.2	0.0	28
10.	Karnataka	0.4	26.6	50.9	20.3	1.8	30
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	3.7	18.5	44.4	31.1	2.2	31
12.	Madhya Pradesh	4.5	32.2	53.2	9.7	0.4	28
13.	Maharashtra	1.5	19.4	50.7	25.4	3.0	31
14.	Manipur	1.9	31.5	45.2	20.7	0.7	29
15.	Orissa	1.5	35.6	46.7	15.6	0.7	28
16.	Other North Eastern States	0.8	24.8	46.0	26.8	1.6	30
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	0.0	14.4	65.5	19.8	0.4	30
18.	Rajasthan	6.7	30.5	50.0	12.1	0.7	28
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	0.8	14.4	63.6	19.3	1.9	31
20.	Uttar Pradesh	5.8	20.0	54.5	17.8	1.8	30
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	2.3	20.5	50.0	22.7	4.5	30
22.	Jharkhand	2.2	34.4	48.1	14.4	0.7	28
23.	Chhattisgarh	6.1	29.9	47.3	15.5	1.1	28
24.	Sikkim	0.0	21.8	51.3	24.4	2.5	30
25.	Uttarakhand	5.2	21.1	50.7	21.5	1.5	30
All India (2006)		3.8	24.5	50.2	20.1	1.5	30
CI		1.7 - 5.9	19.8 – 29.2	44.7 – 55.7	15.7 – 24.5	0.2 – 2.8	25 – 35
All India (2001)		5.4	34.3	46.3	12.8	1.1	27
Client-Brothel Based (2006)		6.3	25.4	46.8	19.5	2.0	29
Client-Non-brothel Based (2006)		2.6	24.0	51.8	20.4	1.3	30

Base: All respondents

The proportion of illiterates was higher among the clients of brothel based FSWs (25%) than those of non-brothel based FSWs (13%), while the proportion of the respondents reporting education up to Grade VI to X was higher among the clients of non-brothel based FSWs (47%) as compared to the clients of brothel based FSWs (37%). Nearly one-third of the respondents in Uttar Pradesh and Andhra Pradesh and over one-fourth in Chhattisgarh, Bihar, Delhi, Haryana and West Bengal were illiterates. The education level of the respondents was comparatively higher in the states of Sikkim, Goa, Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, Manipur and Assam.

Table 3.2: Percentage distribution of respondents by education level

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Education Level									
		Illiterate*		Grade I-V		Grade VI-X		Grade XI-XII		Grade XII+	
		2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	31.7	18.1	27.2	16.6	34.0	38.6	3.4	13.0	3.7	13.7
2.	Assam	7.8	22.5	19.3	18.1	42.6	39.9	20.0	9.2	10.4	10.3
3.	Bihar	25.7	26.0	11.2	15.6	43.5	35.6	12.3	12.5	7.4	10.4
4.	Delhi	28.2	21.9	14.4	15.2	31.4	36.8	18.1	10.0	7.9	16.0
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	7.5	8.1	18.8	11.9	39.4	44.8	21.9	14.1	12.5	21.1
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	7.7	18.9	24.4	27.9	49.1	35.7	10.3	12.1	8.5	5.4
7.	Haryana	27.4	19.2	22.6	17.3	43.3	45.4	2.2	8.9	4.4	9.2
8.	Himachal Pradesh	11.1	14.6	18.9	13.1	50.7	50.9	13.3	10.9	5.9	10.5
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	14.0	17.2	19.5	25.1	55.5	46.0	9.9	9.8	1.1	1.9
10.	Karnataka	19.0	27.1	36.4	17.1	39.0	35.3	4.5	14.5	1.1	5.9
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	10.9	6.7	17.5	12.2	55.6	50.0	10.9	15.6	5.1	15.6
12.	Madhya Pradesh	19.1	14.6	34.8	22.5	33.3	41.4	7.1	10.4	5.6	11.1
13.	Maharashtra	10.5	14.8	21.1	13.3	42.5	42.2	12.8	15.9	13.2	13.7
14.	Manipur	11.5	21.3	6.3	7.5	41.5	31.8	21.1	18.4	19.6	21.0
15.	Orissa	8.9	27.2	20.4	23.6	55.6	34.4	11.5	8.7	3.7	6.2
16.	Other North Eastern States	10.4	29.9	15.7	14.9	49.8	40.7	11.2	7.1	12.9	7.5
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	14.0	37.0	34.2	24.2	41.4	28.9	5.8	5.9	4.7	4.0
18.	Rajasthan	20.2	11.6	27.7	14.6	39.4	43.8	8.5	6.4	4.3	23.6
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	8.8	15.7	23.0	16.5	55.2	50.2	10.7	7.9	2.3	9.7
20.	Uttar Pradesh	32.7	42.7	21.5	14.2	36.4	23.6	5.8	9.0	3.6	10.5
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	27.5	28.9	27.1	28.5	34.9	32.0	4.6	5.6	6.0	4.9
22.	Jharkhand	13.3		11.9		46.7		21.5		6.7	
23.	Chhattisgarh	25.1		33.3		28.1		9.7		3.7	
24.	Sikkim	2.6		9.6		47.8		22.6		17.4	
25.	Uttarakhand	14.9		23.4		51.3		7.8		2.6	
All India (2006)		16.6		21.7		43.9		11.1		6.7	
CI		12.5 – 20.7		17.2 – 26.2		38.4 – 49.4		7.6 – 14.6		3.9 – 9.5	
All India (2001)		21.2		17.6		39.3		10.7		11.1	
Client–Brothel Based		24.7	23.0	22.7	18.2	36.7	36.4	9.5	10.7	6.4	11.7
Client–Non-brothel Based		12.6	20.0	21.3	17.3	47.4	41.2	11.9	10.8	6.9	10.7

Base: All respondents

*Includes those respondents who are literate but no formal education

3.2.3 Marital Status of Respondents and Age at Marriage

The results for marital status and the age at marriage of the respondents are presented in Table 3.3. All the respondents were asked whether they have been ever married to a female. Nearly two-thirds (64%) of the respondents covered in BSS 2006 were reported to be ever

Table 3.3: Percentage distribution of respondents by marital status and age at marriage

(All figures except median age are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Ever married*		Age at marriage (in years)**					
				< 18	19-21	22-25	26-30	30+	Median age at marriage
		2006	2001	%	%	%	%	%	(Years)
1.	Andhra Pradesh	82.1	53.1	6.8	46.8	43.2	3.2	0.0	21
2.	Assam	54.1	59.0	1.4	6.8	29.5	51.4	11.0	28
3.	Bihar	68.4	53.3	38.0	32.1	26.1	3.8	0.0	20
4.	Delhi	51.6	47.6	11.9	31.5	46.9	9.8	0.0	22
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	60.0	25.9	2.1	22.9	51.0	24.0	0.0	24
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	80.1	61.6	8.8	39.2	47.0	5.1	0.0	22
7.	Haryana	70.0	56.5	41.3	28.0	25.4	5.3	0.0	20
8.	Himachal Pradesh	62.2	61.0	22.0	40.5	35.7	1.8	0.0	20
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	50.7	69.8	2.9	20.3	42.0	31.2	3.6	24
10.	Karnataka	71.2	65.1	5.2	15.0	46.1	31.1	2.6	24
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	52.2	51.1	1.4	11.3	37.6	44.0	5.7	25
12.	Madhya Pradesh	67.4	51.8	31.1	47.2	21.1	0.6	0.0	20
13.	Maharashtra	70.6	36.7	4.2	30.5	52.6	8.9	0.0	22
14.	Manipur	44.4	55.1	0.8	11.7	46.7	35.8	5.0	25
15.	Orissa	53.3	56.2	2.8	21.5	49.3	26.4	0.0	24
16.	Other North Eastern States	58.4	45.9	1.4	15.8	46.6	32.2	2.1	25
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	82.4	71.4	4.4	32.3	55.5	7.9	0.0	22
18.	Rajasthan	66.0	55.4	32.3	40.9	22.0	3.8	1.1	20
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	67.0	55.8	0.0	5.1	51.4	43.5	0.0	25
20.	Uttar Pradesh	71.3	47.6	38.8	40.3	20.4	0.5	0.0	19
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	61.8	62.0	25.7	24.3	36.0	11.0	0.0	22
22.	Jharkhand	61.8		1.4	17.1	49.3	28.8	2.7	22
23.	Chhattisgarh	61.0		25.2	38.7	31.3	3.7	0.6	20
24.	Sikkim	74.8		0.0	32.6	53.9	13.5	0.0	23
25.	Uttarakhand	68.1		18.5	33.7	38.0	9.8	0.0	21
All India (2006)		64.2		13.9	28.9	39.7	15.9	1.4	22
CI		58.9–69.5		10.1–17.7	23.9–33.9	34.3–45.1	11.9–19.9	0.1–2.7	17–27
All India (2001)		54.3		14.6	28.3	40.3	15.5	1.3	22
Client-Brothel Based		66.4	47.8	22.3	35.8	34.3	6.3	0.8	21
Client-Non-brothel Based		63.2	58.4	9.6	25.3	42.4	20.8	1.7	23

*Base: All respondents for “Ever married”

**Base: Married respondents for “Age at marriage”

married. This proportion was significantly lower (54%) in BSS 2001. The proportion of ever married respondents from brothel (66%) and non-brothel (63%) area was more or less similar.

Overall, majority of respondents (69%) in BSS 2001 as well as in BSS 2006 were married between the ages of 19-25 years. The median age at marriage of clients of the FSWs was 22 years in both the surveys. There were considerable variations in age at marriage of respondents across all the states/group of states. A very high proportion of respondents in Haryana (41%), Uttar Pradesh (39%), Bihar (38%) and Rajasthan (32%) were married at an age less than 18 years. While in states like Tamil Nadu and Sikkim, no respondent reported getting married at an age below 18 years. In BSS 2006, the median age at marriage ranged from 28 years in Assam to 19 years in Uttar Pradesh.

3.2.4 Status of Sexual Partnership

The respondents were asked whether they are currently married or living with or having a female sexual partner. Table 3.4 reveals that nearly two-thirds of the respondents were currently married (63%) and majority of the currently married respondents were living with their spouse. A significant increase in the proportion of currently married respondents was also observed when compared with BSS 2001 (2006-63%, 2001-52%).

The proportion of respondents who were currently married and not living with spouse or other sexual partner had decreased considerably from BSS 2001 (2006-5%, 2001-9%). Further, 33 percent of respondents in BSS 2006 were “not currently married and not living with sexual partner”, as against 46 percent in BSS 2001. While comparing sexual partnership status of clients from brothel and non-brothel based FSWs, no substantial difference was observed.

The inter-state variation indicates that the proportion of “currently married” respondents has significantly increased in Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Goa, Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra, while in Jammu & Kashmir it showed a significant decline from BSS 2001. The proportion of respondents who were “currently married and living with spouse” was high in Punjab (78%), Sikkim (73%), Gujarat (70%) and Andhra Pradesh (69%) and lowest in Delhi (39%), Manipur (40%), Orissa (41%) and Himachal Pradesh (42%).

Table 3.4: Percentage distribution of respondents by status of sexual partnership


(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	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	
		2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	68.7	37.5	7.1	10.5	4.5	4.0	80.3	52.0	0.7	10.5	17.2	37.5
2.	Assam	48.5	29.5	1.1	0.4	3.7	28.4	53.3	58.3	4.4	1.5	41.5	40.2
3.	Bihar	56.5	40.8	2.2	0.7	4.5	7.3	63.2	48.8	3.7	0.3	30.5	50.9
4.	Delhi	39.0	18.2	0.7	4.1	11.2	23.4	50.9	45.7	3.6	0.7	44.8	53.5
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	53.1	22.2	0.0	0.0	6.3	3.7	59.4	25.9	1.3	3.3	39.4	70.7
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	70.1	52.2	1.5	0.3	2.6	5.1	74.2	57.6	10.0	3.4	11.4	39.1
7.	Haryana	56.3	33.9	0.4	1.5	8.5	19.9	65.2	55.4	2.2	1.1	29.6	43.5
8.	Himachal Pradesh	41.9	54.3	0.7	0.0	15.2	6.4	57.8	60.7	1.9	0.4	39.6	39.0
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	47.4	60.5	0.7	0.0	2.6	8.4	50.7	68.8	2.2	0.5	47.1	30.7
10.	Karnataka	66.1	54.6	4.4	5.6	1.8	2.2	72.4	62.5	12.9	2.2	14.0	35.3
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	44.1	44.4	0.7	1.5	7.0	4.1	51.9	50.0	1.9	1.5	45.9	48.5
12.	Madhya Pradesh	63.3	47.1	3.0	0.4	0.0	1.4	66.3	48.9	0.7	1.8	32.6	49.3
13.	Maharashtra	54.6	28.5	3.3	0.4	7.8	2.2	65.7	30.7	4.1	0.7	26.0	68.5
14.	Manipur	39.6	44.2	0.4	2.6	4.4	0.4	44.4	47.2	0.4	4.9	55.2	47.9
15.	Orissa	40.7	36.2	3.3	9.1	9.3	10.9	53.3	56.2	6.7	4.0	40.0	39.9
16.	Other North Eastern States	46.8	33.2	0.8	3.0	10.4	4.1	58.0	40.3	1.2	1.9	39.2	57.8
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	77.7	47.3	0.4	0.4	2.9	23.8	81.0	71.4	0.0	0.0	18.0	28.6
18.	Rajasthan	60.6	41.6	1.1	0.7	5.0	10.1	66.7	52.4	0.7	1.1	32.3	46.4
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	57.6	47.9	10.2	1.9	1.5	5.2	69.3	55.1	2.7	3.7	28.0	41.2
20.	Uttar Pradesh	59.6	39.7	0.7	1.5	5.1	6.7	65.4	46.8	0.4	1.1	33.8	52.1
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	52.3	53.9	5.5	0.7	4.5	5.3	62.3	59.9	3.2	0.4	34.5	39.8
22.	Jharkhand	44.8		2.6		5.6		53.0		1.9		44.4	
23.	Chhattisgarh	56.2		0.4		4.5		61.1		0.4		38.6	
24.	Sikkim	73.1		0.0		1.7		74.8		3.4		21.8	
25.	Uttarakhand	56.3		3.0		2.6		61.9		4.4		33.3	
All India (2006)		55.1		2.2		5.3		62.5		3.1		33.4	
CI		49.6 – 60.6		0.6 – 3.8		2.8 – 7.8		57.2 – 67.8		1.2 – 5.0		28.2 – 38.6	
All India (2001)		41.2		2.1		8.7		52.0		2.2		45.8	
Client-Brothel Based		56.0	36.0	2.5	2.0	5.8	7.6	64.3	45.5	2.0	1.5	32.5	52.9
Client-Non-brothel Based		54.6	44.5	2.0	2.2	5.0	9.4	61.6	56.1	3.6	2.6	33.9	41.3

Base: All respondents

Status of Sexual Partnership

Figure 3.1: Percentage distribution of clients of FSWs by status of sexual partnership



3.2.5 Main Occupation of the Respondents

The clients of sex workers were asked about their main occupation and findings on the five commonly mentioned occupations are presented in Table 3.5.

Table 3.5 indicates that the highest proportion of respondents (23%) were local transport workers, followed by petty business or small shop owners (17%), truck drivers (16%) and non-agricultural workers (11%). About five percent of the respondents were engaged in service. The proportion of “local transport worker” was highest in Punjab (37%), followed by Orissa (36%), Uttarakhand (33%) and Tamil Nadu (32%) and lowest was reported in Andhra Pradesh (3%), Bihar and Sikkim (8%) and Jharkhand (13%).

Table 3.5: Percentage distribution of respondents by main occupation

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Main Occupation (Top Five)				
		Local transport worker	Petty business	Non-agricultural labourer	Services	Truck driver
1.	Andhra Pradesh	3.4	6.7	19.0	3.4	26.5
2.	Assam	18.5	17.4	7.8	10.7	22.2
3.	Bihar	8.2	21.6	11.2	7.8	23.8
4.	Delhi	22.7	18.1	9.7	10.5	9.7
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	16.7	21.9	14.4	3.1	11.5
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	27.7	17.3	6.3	10.7	6.3
7.	Haryana	31.5	15.6	30.0	2.6	30.0
8.	Himachal Pradesh	24.4	17.4	15.9	0.4	15.9
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	28.7	26.5	16.9	3.7	16.9
10.	Karnataka	30.6	13.3	4.1	5.9	20.3
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	21.1	6.3	1.1	2.6	13.3
12.	Madhya Pradesh	29.1	16.1	26.6	1.1	4.9
13.	Maharashtra	14.1	17.1	8.6	3.7	11.9
14.	Manipur	14.4	16.3	1.5	7.8	15.6
15.	Orissa	35.6	22.6	9.6	3.3	12.6

(Contd.)

(Contd.)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Main Occupation (Top Five)				
		Local transport worker	Petty business	Non-agricultural labourer	Services	Truck driver
16.	Other North Eastern States	19.2	11.6	2.8	5.6	34.0
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	36.7	11.2	7.9	0.4	21.2
18.	Rajasthan	16.3	16.7	11.7	1.8	16.7
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	32.2	10.2	6.8	18.6	6.8
20.	Uttar Pradesh	27.6	22.5	9.1	0.7	6.9
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	14.5	22.7	19.1	5.9	7.7
22.	Jharkhand	13.0	22.6	3.7	10.4	12.6
23.	Chhattisgarh	28.1	12.4	11.2	1.1	15.7
24.	Sikkim	8.4	19.3	8.4	14.3	17.6
25.	Uttarakhand	33.0	22.5	9.1	0.7	7.0
All India (2006)		22.5	16.7	10.6	5.3	15.5
CI		17.9 – 27.1	12.6 – 20.8	7.2 – 14.0	2.8 – 7.8	11.5 – 19.5
All India (2001)		21.4	15.8	12.3	11.6	9.7
Client-Brothel Based (2006)		16.7	16.9	11.8	4.4	14.7
Client-Non-brothel Based (2001)		25.4	16.6	10.0	5.8	15.8

Base: All respondents

Note: Due to other responses in the question total percentage does not add up to 100.

The proportion of non-agricultural labourer was highest in Haryana (30%) followed by Madhya Pradesh, West Bengal, Andhra Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir and Himachal Pradesh (between 15-27%). In Orissa, majority of the respondents were local transport workers (36%) and petty business owners (23%), while in Punjab, the local transport workers constituted more than one-third of the respondents. Petty business owners were more than one-fifth in Jammu & Kashmir (27%), West Bengal, Orissa and Jharkhand (23%). No significant difference was observed with regard to the main occupation of the clients from brothel and non-brothel FSWs, except for the local transport workers.

3.2.6 Residential Status of the Respondents

An attempt was also made to understand the residential status of the respondents. All the respondents were asked whether they lived in the same city where the interview was conducted, with whom do they stay and where do they stay. The detailed findings are depicted in Table 3.6.

At the national level, majority of the respondents (86% in BSS 2006 and 81% in BSS 2001) reported that they live in the same city where they were interviewed. Of the respondents who resided in the same city, 56 percent had been living in the city since birth. The proportion of respondents who had lived in the same city since birth was in the range of 80 percent in Punjab to 32 percent in West Bengal. There existed significant differences in this respect between the clients of brothel (46%) and non-brothel based FSWs (60%).

Among the states, the proportion of respondents who were staying in the same city/town was highest in Manipur (99%), Haryana (96%), followed by Jammu & Kashmir (95%) and lowest in Uttarakhand and Uttar Pradesh (61%) and Bihar (65%). Also, the proportion of respondents staying alone was 11 percent for the entire country. This proportion was highest in Delhi (24%) and lowest in Madhya Pradesh and Chhattisgarh (5%). Around 11 percent of the respondents were not staying at a regular residence, with highest proportion reported in Delhi (22%), Manipur, Orissa (20%) and lowest in Madhya Pradesh (2%).

Table 3.6: Percentage distribution of respondents by residential status and mobility pattern

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	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	
		2006	2001	2006	2006	2006	2006	2001	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	82.5	89.5	62.7	10.8	4.9	7.8	4.3	29.5	7.2
2.	Assam	92.6	87.8	60.0	12.6	18.5	7.0	5.2	10.7	4.4
3.	Bihar	64.7	63.3	39.8	13.8	11.5	7.8	9.7	12.6	6.6
4.	Delhi	92.1	87.7	40.8	24.2	22.4	6.1	9.3	4.3	6.3
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	89.4	53.7	61.3	9.4	15.6	13.1	15.9	6.9	9.3
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	92.3	83.8	73.4	8.5	5.2	11.1	6.4	6.6	8.1
7.	Haryana	95.6	90.4	51.9	13.0	7.4	7.4	10.0	2.2	3.3
8.	Himachal Pradesh	84.1	92.5	50.0	7.8	11.5	8.5	10.5	8.1	11.2
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	95.2	79.5	66.2	6.6	15.4	21.0	17.7	11.0	7.4
10.	Karnataka	94.5	81.4	39.5	6.3	5.5	19.9	12.3	17.7	17.0
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	73.3	59.3	66.3	18.5	16.3	16.3	5.2	8.9	8.5
12.	Madhya Pradesh	91.0	57.9	68.2	4.5	2.2	6.4	6.4	7.5	8.6
13.	Maharashtra	88.8	85.9	35.3	12.3	13.0	16.4	3.3	7.4	3.3
14.	Manipur	98.9	71.5	67.8	9.6	20.0	18.9	3.7	11.1	2.6
15.	Orissa	84.1	86.6	40.7	17.0	19.6	7.0	9.4	6.7	5.4
16.	Other North Eastern States	90.0	85.1	48.0	13.6	6.8	27.2	7.8	14.0	5.2
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	91.7	89.0	79.5	8.3	6.5	8.6	5.5	12.9	1.5
18.	Rajasthan	72.7	85.0	50.0	13.8	13.8	20.9	14.6	19.9	3.4
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	93.9	94.0	60.2	8.3	9.1	8.3	2.6	13.6	4.1
20.	Uttar Pradesh	60.7	90.6	42.2	10.9	12.0	11.3	2.2	8.0	0.4
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	84.5	80.3	32.3	15.9	3.6	12.7	8.1	4.1	7.7
22.	Jharkhand	85.6		71.9	16.3	8.9	14.4		5.9	
23.	Chhattisgarh	81.6		65.9	5.2	5.6	11.2		19.1	
24.	Sikkim	95.0		74.8	9.2	5.0	6.7		4.2	
25.	Uttarakhand	60.7		42.2	10.9	12.0	11.3		8.0	
All India (2006)		85.8		55.8	11.1	10.6	12.6		10.8	
CI		82.0 – 89.6		50.3 – 61.3	7.6 – 14.6	7.2 – 14.0	8.9 – 16.3		7.4 – 14.2	
All India (2001)		80.6		38.3	15.2	12.9	8.0		6.3	
Client-Brothel Based		78.3	75.6	46.3	13.1	11.0	12.5	8.1	13.5	6.0
Client-Non-brothel Based		89.4	83.8	60.4	10.1	10.3	12.7	8.0	9.5	6.5

Base: All respondents

*Base: All those who stay at residence

Overall, 13 percent of the respondents in BSS 2006 had been away from home at least once a week in the last 12 months, as compared to eight percent in BSS 2001. The proportion of respondents staying away from home at least once a week was comparatively higher in Other North Eastern States, Jammu & Kashmir, Rajasthan and Karnataka (27 to 20%). Overall, 11 percent of the respondents were reportedly staying away from home on a fortnightly basis. These respondents were mostly from the states of Andhra Pradesh (30%), Rajasthan (20%), Chhattisgarh (19%) and Karnataka (18%).

3.2.7 Substance Use (Alcohol/Drug/Injecting Drug)

The respondents were probed on different type of intoxicating substances they might be using, frequency of intake and consumption of such intoxicating substances prior to sexual intercourse. The responses are presented in Tables 3.7 and 3.8.

Nearly three-fourths of the respondents in BSS 2006 reported ever-drinking alcohol. The proportion of respondents ever consuming alcohol was highest in Goa and Manipur (93%) followed by Other North Eastern States (90%) and Madhya Pradesh (89%). Less than two-thirds of the respondents in Gujarat (61%) and Delhi (63%) reported ever having any alcoholic drink. When compared to BSS 2001, no significant difference was observed in the proportion of respondents who ever had alcoholic drink. The ever consumption of alcohol was relatively higher among the clients of non-brothel based FSWs (80%) than the brothel based FSWs (73%). There was no significant difference in the proportion of the respondents reporting ever consumption of alcohol in BSS 2001 (73%) and BSS 2006 (78%).

Table 3.7: Percentage distribution of respondents by alcohol intake in last four weeks

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Ever consumed alcohol		Drinking every day*	Drinking at least once in a week*	Drinking infrequently before sex *	Regularly drinking before sex *	
		2006	2001	2006	2006	2006	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	76.9	79.1	30.1	51.5	73.3	26.7	9.6
2.	Assam	75.9	80.1	18.5	53.2	84.4	15.6	8.3
3.	Bihar	77.3	60.9	34.6	29.8	78.8	21.2	17.6
4.	Delhi	63.2	65.1	32.0	29.7	86.3	13.7	12.0
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	93.1	77.8	35.6	51.7	76.5	23.5	13.8
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	60.9	58.6	26.1	46.1	86.7	13.3	9.8
7.	Haryana	86.7	77.5	21.8	47.4	80.3	19.7	4.3
8.	Himachal Pradesh	76.3	89.9	26.2	45.6	83.0	17.0	1.7
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	77.2	51.6	13.3	57.6	94.3	5.7	5.4
10.	Karnataka	73.8	74.7	31.0	54.0	19.5	80.5	17.4
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	80.0	85.9	20.8	37.0	10.2	89.8	16.4
12.	Madhya Pradesh	88.8	59.3	11.0	61.6	70.0	30.0	10.2
13.	Maharashtra	67.7	67.0	35.2	44.0	79.7	20.3	18.8
14.	Manipur	93.0	76.0	31.1	51.0	73.3	26.7	8.9
15.	Orissa	79.6	84.8	40.9	39.5	74.0	26.0	30.8

(Contd.)

(Contd.)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Ever consumed alcohol		Drinking every day*	Drinking at least once in a week*	Drinking infrequently before sex *	Regularly drinking before sex *	
		2006	2001	2006	2006	2006	2006	2001
16.	Other North Eastern States	90.4	81.3	30.5	46.9	69.9	30.1	25.2
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	85.6	85.0	37.0	45.8	80.7	19.3	7.3
18.	Rajasthan	70.9	65.5	21.0	57.0	83.5	16.5	14.9
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	79.5	87.3	12.9	61.4	18.1	81.9	8.2
20.	Uttar Pradesh	73.5	45.3	12.4	45.5	87.6	12.4	11.6
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	81.8	81.0	34.4	40.6	79.4	20.6	21.7
22.	Jharkhand	67.4		17.6	46.7	90.1	9.9	
23.	Chhattisgarh	76.0		37.4	45.3	60.1	39.9	
24.	Sikkim	79.0		4.3	23.4	95.7	4.3	
25.	Uttarakhand	77.8		23.8	47.6	84.8	15.2	
All India (2006)		77.8		25.8	47.2	80.7	19.3	
CI		73.2 – 82.4		21.0 – 30.6	41.7 – 52.7	76.4 – 85.0	15.0 – 23.6	
All India (2001)		73.2		22.8	44.8	32.4	13.3	
Client-Brothel Based		72.9	67.7	29.0	42.7	78.8	21.2	18.0
Client-Non-brothel Based		80.2	76.6	24.3	49.2	81.5	18.5	10.6

Base: All respondents for ever had alcoholic drinks

*Base: All those who ever had alcoholic drinks for drinking every day, drinking at least once in a week, drinking infrequently and regular drinking before sex

Nearly one-fourth of the clients of FSWs in both the surveys reported daily intake of drinks containing alcohol. Around 35 to 40 percent of the respondents in Bihar, Maharashtra, Goa, Punjab, Chhattisgarh and Orissa reported daily consumption of alcohol. The proportion was less than 15 percent in Sikkim, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and Jammu & Kashmir.

About 81 percent of respondents reported drinking infrequently before sex and this proportion was above 90 percent in Sikkim, Jammu & Kashmir and Jharkhand and lowest in Kerala (10%), Tamil Nadu (18%) and Karnataka (20%).

The proportion of respondents who regularly drink before sex was less than one-fifth (19%), while it was reported to be highest in Kerala (90%), Tamil Nadu (82%), Karnataka (81%). The proportion was lowest in Sikkim (4%), Jammu & Kashmir (6%) and Jharkhand (10%). No major difference was observed with regard to the alcohol intake behaviour of clients of brothel and non-brothel FSWs.

The findings on drug use pattern of the respondents is presented in Table 3.8. Across the entire country, nearly one-fourth of the respondents reported that they had ever tried any drug. This proportion was observed to be highest in Manipur (50%), Madhya Pradesh (46%) and Orissa (45%). Among those who had ever tried any drug, the most commonly used drugs were Ganja (70%), Bhang (50%), Charas (14%) and Afim (9%). The proportion of the respondents reporting use of drugs was more or less similar in BSS 2001 (24%) and BSS 2006 (22%).

Table 3.8: Percentage distribution of respondents by drug usage pattern

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Ever tried any drug*		Type of drugs**				Injected drug in last 12 months**	
		2006	2001	Ganja	Bhang	Afim	Charas	2006	2001
				2006	2006	2006	2006		
1.	Andhra Pradesh	3.0	5.8	87.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3
2.	Assam	28.9	17.0	57.7	74.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2
3.	Bihar	29.0	29.1	76.9	66.7	0.0	2.6	1.3	2.4
4.	Delhi	18.8	13.4	73.1	63.5	9.6	42.3	0.0	0.0
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	21.9	4.8	68.6	51.4	0.0	20.0	5.7	0.0
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	9.6	7.7	69.2	46.2	26.9	26.9	3.8	13
7.	Haryana	31.5	28.8	94.1	95.3	22.4	1.2	1.2	1.3
8.	Himachal Pradesh	27.0	46.8	72.6	38.4	27.4	26.0	2.8	2.4
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	39.0	8.8	8.5	39.6	29.2	91.5	7.5	5.3
10.	Karnataka	8.1	8.6	40.9	45.5	4.5	4.5	22.7	0.0
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	14.1	14.4	89.5	0.0	0.0	10.5	23.7	17.9
12.	Madhya Pradesh	46.3	11.8	83.1	62.1	1.6	4.8	0.8	33.3
13.	Maharashtra	17.5	11.1	46.8	55.3	19.1	6.4	4.3	3.3
14.	Manipur	49.6	37.5	79.1	5.2	0.0	12.7	33.6	30.0
15.	Orissa	45.2	52.5	73.0	61.5	12.3	2.5	4.1	4.8
16.	Other North Eastern States	20.4	25.0	76.5	35.3	0.0	3.9	24.5	32.8
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	32.4	40.3	37.8	68.9	26.7	4.4	3.3	6.4
18.	Rajasthan	12.1	28.1	82.4	58.8	2.9	0.0	0.0	9.3
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	3.8	19.9	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.1
20.	Uttar Pradesh	30.9	14.2	81.2	57.6	1.2	8.2	3.5	2.6
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	23.6	28.2	73.1	3.8	0.0	11.5	0.0	0.0
22.	Jharkhand	28.9		84.6	64.1	5.1	6.4	6.4	
23.	Chhattisgarh	30.0		82.5	63.8	8.8	12.5	7.5	
24.	Sikkim	3.4		75.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
25.	Uttarakhand	19.6		79.2	34.0	0.0	9.4	0.0	
All India (2006)		23.9		69.9	50.3	9.4	14.4	7.0	
CI		19.2 – 28.6		64.8 – 75.0	44.8 – 55.8	6.2 – 12.6	10.5 – 18.3	4.2 – 9.8	
All India (2001)		21.7		62.4	44.2	13.4	12.1	9.2	
Client-Brothel Based		20.1	20.8	75.3	53.4	5.3	11.4	2.7	4.8
Client-Non-brothel Based		25.8	22.2	67.8	49.1	11.0	15.5	8.7	11.8

*Base: All respondents for “Ever tried any drug”

**Base: All those who ever tried any drug for “Type of drugs tried” and “injected drug in last 12 months”

The respondents were also asked if they had ever injected any non-medical/illegal drug in last 12 months. Table 3.8 reveals that only seven percent (9% in BSS 2001) of respondents across the country reported injecting such drugs in last 12 months. The proportion was significantly high in Manipur (34%), Other North Eastern States (25%), Kerala (24%) and Karnataka (23%). State/Group of states where no respondent reported injecting drugs in last 12 months were Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Delhi, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, West Bengal, Sikkim and Uttarakhand. The proportion of respondents from brothel area (3%) who reported using injecting drugs was lower than clients of non-brothel area (9%).

3.3 Awareness of HIV/AIDS

The following sections present the awareness levels among the clients of FSWs with respect to prevention of HIV/AIDS and knowledge on common myths associated with HIV/AIDS.

3.3.1 Ever Heard of HIV/AIDS

In BSS 2001 a single question was asked to ascertain the level of awareness on HIV/AIDS. Both the terms in medical terminology have different connotations, however in common man's mind, they go together. Thus, in BSS 2006 two separate questions - one on HIV and the other on AIDS have been asked to assess the exposure of the respondents to these two terms. While asking this question proper care was taken not to mix HIV and AIDS. The interviewers provided no description about this disease or its symptoms and a spontaneous answer to this question was recorded. Table 3.9 provides the level of awareness among the respondents about HIV/AIDS.

Table 3.9: Percentage of respondents who were aware of HIV/AIDS

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Ever heard of HIV/AIDS	Ever heard of HIV	Ever heard of HIV or AIDS or both	Ever heard of HIV and AIDS
		2001	2006	2006	2006
1.	Andhra Pradesh	96.0	99.3	100.0	98.5
2.	Assam	93.0	93.0	100.0	92.6
3.	Bihar	93.4	70.3	96.3	70.3
4.	Delhi	97.8	91.0	98.9	89.5
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	99.3	99.4	100.0	83.3
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	93.6	65.7	97.8	64.6
7.	Haryana	94.1	70.0	98.9	69.6
8.	Himachal Pradesh	99.6	83.0	98.9	83.0
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	97.2	75.7	98.9	75.0
10.	Karnataka	91.4	98.9	100.0	95.9
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	99.3	93.7	98.1	93.0
12.	Madhya Pradesh	95.7	88.8	100.0	87.7
13.	Maharashtra	99.6	92.2	100.0	91.8
14.	Manipur	97.8	100.0	100.0	100.0
15.	Orissa	94.2	60.7	98.9	60.7
16.	Other North Eastern States	88.8	77.6	97.6	78.1
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	96.3	39.9	96.4	39.6
18.	Rajasthan	98.9	75.5	99.6	75.2

(Contd.)

(Contd.)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Ever heard of HIV/AIDS	Ever heard of HIV	Ever heard of HIV or AIDS or both	Ever heard of HIV and AIDS
		2001	2006	2006	2006
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	100.0	80.3	99.6	78.0
20.	Uttar Pradesh	92.9	50.9	90.9	50.9
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	95.8	83.6	98.2	78.5
22.	Jharkhand		86.3	98.9	85.9
23.	Chhattisgarh		56.9	98.5	55.8
24.	Sikkim		93.3	100.0	93.3
25.	Uttarakhand		60.4	98.5	59.3
All India		95.9	78.3	98.5	98.5
CI		93.7 – 98.1	73.8 – 82.8	97.2 – 99.8	97.2 – 99.8
Client-Brothel Based		96.1	76.8	97.5	76.3
Client-Non-brothel Based		95.8	79.0	98.9	78.2


Base: All respondents

More than three-fourths (78%) of the respondents reported that they had heard about HIV. All respondents in Manipur and more than 90 percent of the respondents in Goa, Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala, Sikkim, Assam, Maharashtra and Delhi reported to have heard of HIV. The level of awareness about HIV was comparatively lower (less than 60%) in Punjab, Uttar Pradesh and Chhattisgarh.

As observed in BSS 2001, BSS 2006 also shows that the level of awareness among the clients of FSWs about either HIV or AIDS or both was almost universal in almost all the states.

3.3.2 Awareness of Prevention through Consistent Condom Use

The respondents were asked “can people protect themselves from HIV by using a condom correctly every time they have sex?” The interviewers emphasised both ‘correct’ and ‘consistent’ condom usage. (Table 3.10).



The proportion of respondents who were aware that consistent condom use could prevent HIV was 89 percent for the entire country. The corresponding proportion was higher than BSS 2001 (85%). Awareness level was above 95 percent in Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra, Sikkim, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, Goa, Punjab and Rajasthan. Further, the proportion was lowest in Madhya Pradesh (69%) and Jharkhand (75%).

3.3.3 Awareness of Prevention by having One Faithful Uninfected Sex Partner

The respondents were asked if “people can protect themselves from HIV by having one faithful uninfected sex partner”. The responses to this question provided insights into the risk perceptions among the respondents regarding contracting of HIV through multiple sex partnerships.

More than three-fourths (77%) of the respondents were aware that HIV can be prevented by having one faithful uninfected partner. This proportion was highest in Goa and Manipur (92%), Maharashtra (91%), Tamil Nadu and Rajasthan (89%) and lowest in Chhattisgarh (48%), Orissa (63%), Delhi (66%) and Madhya Pradesh (66%). This proportion showed an increase in clients from non-brothel area when compared with BSS 2001 (Table 3.10).

3.3.4 Knowing Both the Methods of Prevention

Table 3.10 indicates that overall, 71 percent of the respondents were aware of both the methods of prevention i.e. prevention by correct and consistent condom use and having one uninfected faithful partner. The levels of awareness ranged from 89 percent in Goa to 42 percent in Chhattisgarh. More than 80 percent of the respondents were aware of both the methods across the states of Goa (89%), Maharashtra (88%), Tamil Nadu (85%), Rajasthan (85%), Sikkim (84%), Manipur (84%), Assam (83%), Karnataka (81%), and Punjab (81%).

No significant difference was observed regarding in awareness of different methods of prevention between clients of brothel area and non-brothel area.

Table 3.10: Percentage of respondents aware of different methods of preventing HIV infection

(All figures are in percentage)


Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Awareness about different methods of prevention				Knowing two methods of prevention i.e. consistent condom use and having one faithful sex partner	
		Consistent Condom Use		Having one uninfected faithful sex partner			
		2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	98.5	88.8	68.7	84.8	68.3	78.7
2.	Assam	92.2	89.7	89.3	76.4	83.3	73.4
3.	Bihar	81.8	84.1	72.2	85.8	61.0	78.5
4.	Delhi	89.2	90.0	65.7	68.8	61.7	64.3
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	95.0	93.7	91.9	79.6	88.8	75.6
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	93.7	83.8	66.8	68.0	62.7	62.3
7.	Haryana	85.9	79.0	74.5	62.0	66.7	52.4
8.	Himachal Pradesh	86.3	85.0	81.3	89.1	76.3	84.6
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	89.0	80.9	81.8	77.2	75.0	74.9
10.	Karnataka	95.2	78.8	85.6	57.6	81.2	48.3
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	87.0	79.3	72.8	71.5	65.9	61.1

(Contd.)

(Contd.)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Awareness about different methods of prevention				Knowing two methods of prevention i.e. consistent condom use and having one faithful sex partner	
		Consistent Condom Use		Having one uninfected faithful sex partner			
		2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001
12.	Madhya Pradesh	68.9	86.8	65.9	50.7	52.1	47.9
13.	Maharashtra	95.9	91.1	91.4	83.3	87.7	78.5
14.	Manipur	91.1	77.9	91.9	73.4	83.7	65.5
15.	Orissa	89.6	89.5	62.9	86.6	55.2	83.7
16.	Other North Eastern States	91.2	82.1	82.0	84.3	74.8	78.0
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	95.0	81.0	86.6	70.0	80.9	62.3
18.	Rajasthan	95.0	74.9	88.6	67.0	85.1	52.8
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	95.5	95.9	89.4	83.1	85.2	79.4
20.	Uttar Pradesh	81.8	88.0	71.6	65.2	60.4	62.2
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	85.5	86.6	73.1	73.6	62.3	69.4
22.	Jharkhand	75.2		71.9		61.1	
23.	Chhattisgarh	86.1		47.5		41.9	
24.	Sikkim	95.8		86.6		84.0	
25.	Uttarakhand	88.1		88.0		78.1	
All India		89.0	85.1	77.4	74.2	70.7	68.2
CI		85.6 – 92.4		72.8 – 82.0		65.7 – 75.7	
Client-Brothel Based		89.3	88.7	73.0	74.2	66.7	70.0
Client-Non-brothel Based		88.9	82.9	79.5	74.1	72.7	67.1

Base: All respondents



3.3.5 Awareness of HIV Transmission through Needle Sharing/Mother to Child/Breast Feeding

To assess the awareness level regarding modes of transmission of HIV, the respondents were asked three questions on transmission of HIV. The questions were:


1. Can a person get HIV/AIDS by getting injections with a needle that was already used by someone else who was infected?
2. Can a pregnant woman infected with HIV or AIDS transmit the virus to her unborn child?
3. Can a woman with HIV or AIDS transmit virus to her newborn child through breast feeding?

Table 3.11: Percentage of respondents aware of various modes of HIV transmission

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Awareness of HIV transmission through					
		Needle sharing		Mother to child		Breast feeding	
		2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	96.6	98.1	85.1	91.4	84.3	86.1
2.	Assam	90.4	98.8	83.3	89.7	68.5	62.3
3.	Bihar	96.5	97.4	83.0	87.4	80.7	76.7
4.	Delhi	96.0	95.1	84.3	87.5	74.1	81.4
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	95.6	97.8	89.4	93.7	50.6	88.4
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	80.0	91.7	68.3	84.5	53.2	61.2
7.	Haryana	95.1	87.5	79.8	63.9	67.0	52.2
8.	Himachal Pradesh	98.9	86.5	88.0	69.9	52.8	54.1
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	96.7	88.0	92.2	85.2	61.7	65.6
10.	Karnataka	91.9	94.3	79.7	89.4	71.6	78.0
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	90.9	92.5	83.3	90.3	73.2	79.1
12.	Madhya Pradesh	76.0	92.5	66.7	71.6	45.7	58.6
13.	Maharashtra	91.4	95.5	75.8	90.7	52.4	72.9
14.	Manipur	95.9	98.5	64.4	94.6	67.0	76.6
15.	Orissa	98.5	97.3	82.0	80.4	56.2	50.8
16.	Other North Eastern States	97.5	98.3	94.3	94.1	82.0	83.6
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	97.0	90.9	69.4	85.2	50.4	57.0
18.	Rajasthan	93.6	96.2	73.0	87.9	76.9	51.1
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	91.3	92.1	81.0	89.5	75.3	80.9
20.	Uttar Pradesh	86.0	92.7	77.6	86.7	57.6	72.2
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	97.2	96.3	88.9	98.5	76.4	90.1
22.	Jharkhand	97.0		88.4		82.0	
23.	Chhattisgarh	91.3		80.2		60.1	
24.	Sikkim	93.3		99.2		91.6	
25.	Uttarakhand	88.3		58.3		45.5	
All India		92.7	94.2	79.9	86.3	65.8	70.5
CI		89.8 – 95.6		75.5 – 84.3		60.6 – 71.0	
Client-Brothel Based		93.7	95.6	80.5	87.1	69.9	74.0
Client-Non-brothel Based		92.2	93.4	79.6	85.8	63.8	68.2

Base: All respondents



Overall, 93 percent of respondents were aware that a person could get HIV/AIDS by sharing a needle that was already used by an infected person. Inter-state variation indicated that more than 90 percent of the respondents in all the states except Uttarakhand (88%), Uttar Pradesh (86%), Gujarat (80%) and Madhya Pradesh (76%), reported needle sharing as a mode of transmission for HIV.

All the national level, nearly 80 percent of the respondents were aware of vertical transmission (pregnant woman to her unborn child) of HIV, with significantly high proportion in Sikkim (99%), followed by Other North Eastern States (94%) and Jammu & Kashmir (92%). This proportion was lowest in Uttarakhand (58%) and Manipur (64%).

Overall, 66 percent of the respondents in BSS 2006 against 71 percent in BSS 2001 reported that HIV could be transmitted from an infected mother to her newborn child through breast feeding. The proportion was lowest in Uttarakhand and Madhya Pradesh (46%) and highest in Sikkim (92%) followed by Andhra Pradesh (84%), Other North Eastern States (82%), Jharkhand (82%) and Bihar (81%).

No significant difference was observed with regard to awareness about transmission of HIV through needle sharing and mother to child between the clients of brothel and non-brothel based FSWs, while awareness of breast feeding as a mode of transmission is greater among clients of brothel-based FSW. (Table 3.11).

3.3.6 No Misconceptions about HIV Transmission

Those who were aware of HIV/AIDS were asked three questions on misconceptions related to spread of HIV/AIDS to ascertain the level of correct knowledge on HIV/AIDS. The questions were:

1. Can a person get HIV/AIDS by sharing a meal with someone who is infected?
2. Can a person get HIV/AIDS from mosquito bite?
3. Do you think that a healthy looking person could be suffering from HIV?


The data presented in Table 3.12 shows that the proportion of respondents who were aware that HIV cannot be transmitted through sharing a meal with an infected person has significantly increased from 67 percent in BSS 2001 to 80 percent in BSS 2006. This proportion was highest in Manipur (98%) and lowest in Sikkim (28%). The respondents from brothel and non-brothel area did not differ much in this respect.

Table 3.12: Percentage of respondents having no misconceptions about HIV transmission

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	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		2006	2001	2006	2001
		2006	2001	2006	2001				
1.	Andhra Pradesh	91.8	79.4	89.6	76.2	73.5	65.0	59.3	41.2
2.	Assam	86.3	57.2	80.0	63.8	85.2	67.1	65.2	29.9
3.	Bihar	82.6	49.8	75.7	58.1	76.8	56.7	52.0	31.5
4.	Delhi	82.1	66.2	78.1	64.3	82.1	76.0	54.9	43.5
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	81.9	76.7	74.8	73.3	78.5	49.3	54.4	28.9
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	70.6	62.6	67.2	70.4	49.1	55.8	28.4	30.3
7.	Haryana	83.5	64.6	53.2	61.6	62.2	50.6	32.6	32.5
8.	Himachal Pradesh	91.4	69.3	82.0	54.7	77.9	37.2	63.7	15.4
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	75.5	80.9	43.1	81.9	83.3	62.2	29.8	44.7
10.	Karnataka	83.4	58.0	85.2	78.8	77.9	64.6	61.3	37.5
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	79.6	67.4	67.2	70.0	90.6	72.4	54.4	45.9
12.	Madhya Pradesh	76.5	50.0	77.6	58.2	56.3	39.2	41.8	17.9
13.	Maharashtra	81.8	86.3	69.1	85.9	87.7	65.4	56.1	54.8
14.	Manipur	98.1	92.1	97.8	82.4	68.9	77.4	65.6	65.2
15.	Orissa	84.3	58.0	91.0	68.8	81.3	70.8	67.0	44.9
16.	Other North Eastern States	75.8	63.8	73.9	65.3	84.5	73.9	58.5	41.8
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	78.0	54.9	82.5	57.5	65.3	57.8	53.6	33.0
18.	Rajasthan	86.1	87.6	71.2	79.4	84.0	56.8	57.8	43.8
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	69.0	78.3	84.7	91.0	74.3	76.0	44.2	55.8
20.	Uttar Pradesh	68.4	55.4	64.4	59.6	59.6	68.1	34.9	27.3
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	68.5	60.2	52.8	65.1	90.7	91.5	40.9	46.1
22.	Jharkhand	77.9		79.0		77.2		50.0	
23.	Chhattisgarh	81.7		82.1		76.4		55.1	
24.	Sikkim	27.7		22.7		71.4		11.8	
25.	Uttarakhand	72.2		66.5		67.7		47.8	
All India		79.6	67.3	73.8	69.6	75.4	63.5	50.6	38.5
CI		75.2 – 84.0		69.0 – 78.6		70.7 – 80.1		45.1 – 56.1	
Client-Brothel Based		81.2	62.6	73.4	66.6	78.9	64.6	51.8	36.8
Client-Non-brothel Based		78.8	70.2	73.9	71.6	73.7	62.7	50.1	39.6

Base: All respondents



The awareness that HIV cannot be transmitted by mosquito bites was 74 percent for the country and was above 90 percent in Manipur (98%) and Orissa (91%). No significant difference in the proportion of respondents from brothel and non-brothel area was observed on this issue.

Nearly three-fourths of the respondents at national level were aware that a healthy looking person could be suffering from HIV. This proportion was significantly high in West Bengal and Kerala (91%), Maharashtra (88%) and Assam (85%). However, it was low in Gujarat (49%), followed by Madhya Pradesh (56%), Uttar Pradesh (60%) and Haryana (62%).

The proportion of respondents who had correct awareness on the two misconceptions (transmission of HIV through sharing a meal, mosquito bite) associated with the transmission of HIV and were aware that a healthy looking person could be infected with HIV was 51 percent in BSS 2006 against 39 percent in BSS 2001. The proportion of such respondents was lower in Sikkim (12%), Gujarat (28%), Jammu & Kashmir (30%), Haryana (33%) and Uttar Pradesh (35%). The proportion of respondents who had no incorrect beliefs about HIV transmission has increased from 39 percent in BSS 2001 to 51 percent in BSS 2006. There was no considerable difference in the proportion of clients from brothel area and non- brothel area reporting correct belief about HIV transmission.

3.3.7 Comprehensive Correct Knowledge about HIV Transmission and Prevention

Based on the information collected on awareness of different prevention methods, and misconceptions regarding HIV/AIDS, a composite indicator that indicates comprehensive correct knowledge about HIV transmission and Prevention is constructed as 'Percentage of Clients of Female Sex Workers years who could correctly identify the two major ways of preventing the sexual transmission of HIV (Consistent condom use and having one faithful uninfected sex partner), reject the two most common local misconceptions about HIV transmission (transmission of HIV/AIDS through mosquito bites and sharing of meals with HIV/AIDS patients), and who know that a healthy-looking person can transmit HIV. The composite indicator constructed on the basis of above information is presented for both BSS 2001 and BSS 2006 in Table 3.13.

The proportion of respondents with comprehensive correct knowledge about HIV transmission and prevention has increased significantly from 29 percent in BSS 2001 to 38 percent in BSS 2006. Forty seven to sixty percent of the respondents in Goa, Maharashtra, Himachal Pradesh, Rajasthan, Karnataka, Manipur and Assam against only 10 to 25 percent in Sikkim, Gujarat, Jammu & Kashmir, Chhattisgarh, Uttar Pradesh and Haryana have such awareness.

Table 3.13: Proportion of respondents with comprehensive correct knowledge about HIV transmission and prevention

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl.No.	State/Group of States	BSS 2006	BSS 2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	38.8	31.8
2.	Assam	60.0	38.8
3.	Bihar	30.1	27.3
4.	Delhi	32.7	27.7
5.	Goa	47.0	29.7
6.	Gujarat	19.9	23.7
7.	Haryana	25.2	23.6
8.	Himachal Pradesh	52.2	19.6
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	21.0	13.9
10.	Karnataka	54.2	33.5
11.	Kerala	37.8	21.2
12.	Madhya Pradesh	26.6	29.6
13.	Maharashtra	50.4	8.2
14.	Manipur	55.2	48.3
15.	Orissa	34.8	44.8
16.	Other NE States	44.8	41.7
17.	Punjab	46.0	24.9
18.	Rajasthan	53.5	21.7
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	38.3	46.8
20.	Uttar Pradesh	22.5	17.6
21.	West Bengal	31.9	38.7
22.	Jharkhand	34.1	
23.	Chhattisgarh	22.3	
24.	Sikkim	10.1	
25.	Uttarakhand	42.2	
All India		37.9	29.1

Base: All respondents

3.4 Awareness of STDs, Self-reported STD Prevalence and Treatment Seeking Behaviour

The section related to STD awareness, self-reported STD prevalence and treatment seeking behaviour comprises an important component of the survey. The following sections provide an insight into these issues for all the states/group of states.

3.4.1 Ever Heard of STDs

A prompted question on whether the respondents 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.

Table 3.14 indicates that at the all India level, about 78 percent (76% in BSS 2001) of the respondent had heard of STDs. This proportion was significantly high in Punjab (99%), Madhya Pradesh (98%), Rajasthan (96%) and Assam (91%). The states where the proportion was significantly lower were Sikkim (37%) and Other North Eastern States (47%). Almost the same proportion of clients of brothel based (78%) and non-brothel based (77%) FSWs had heard of STDs.

3.4.2 Awareness of STD Symptoms

Respondents were asked two prompted questions on awareness of ‘other STD symptoms’ (apart from three mentioned earlier) for both men and women. For awareness of ‘other STDs among men’, the symptoms included swelling in the groin area, warts, and unable to retract foreskin.

Overall, three-fourths of the respondents (66% in BSS 2001) were able to correctly identify at least one of the ‘other STD symptoms’ among men. This proportion was significantly high in Punjab (99%), Madhya Pradesh (96%), Rajasthan (96%) and Haryana (85%). Whereas, the states where the proportion was lowest were Sikkim (35%) and Other North Eastern States (41%).

For awareness of at least one of the ‘other STDs among women’, the symptoms included lower abdominal pain, swellings in the groin area, pain during sexual intercourse, and warts. At national level, almost 76 percent of the respondents (68% in BSS 2001) were aware of at least one of the ‘other STD symptoms among women’. This proportion was significantly high in Punjab (99%), Madhya Pradesh (97%), Rajasthan (95%) and Assam (90%), whereas the proportion was significantly lower in Sikkim (35%) and Other North Eastern States (46%). Similar proportion of clients of brothel and non-brothel based FSWs were aware of at least one of the ‘other STD symptoms’ among women and men.

Table 3.14: **Percentage of respondents who had ever heard of STDs and were aware of common STD symptoms among men and women**

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Ever heard of STDs		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	
		2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	82.5	79.1	82.1	77.6	81.3	62.8
2.	Assam	91.1	68.3	89.6	48.3	80.4	57.6
3.	Bihar	80.3	47.8	79.9	44.6	79.9	43.3
4.	Delhi	73.3	79.2	72.6	74.7	72.2	72.9
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	73.8	58.9	73.1	50.7	73.1	51.5
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	76.4	89.2	75.3	74.7	75.6	76.1
7.	Haryana	87.8	93.7	85.2	87.8	85.2	78.6
8.	Himachal Pradesh	75.9	93.3	75.6	86.9	75.9	92.9
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	74.6	82.3	73.5	80.5	72.1	81.4
10.	Karnataka	64.2	39.0	63.8	34.6	58.7	19.3
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	79.6	95.2	78.9	90.0	77.4	90.7

(Contd.)

(Contd.)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Ever heard of STDs		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	
12.	Madhya Pradesh	98.1	52.1	97.0	43.6	96.3	40.0
13.	Maharashtra	74.0	87.0	72.9	84.1	71.7	80.4
14.	Manipur	74.8	64.8	73.3	61.8	70.4	50.9
15.	Orissa	85.9	97.1	85.2	75.4	82.2	62.0
16.	Other North Eastern States	47.2	59.3	46.0	39.9	41.2	43.3
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	98.9	81.0	98.9	74.0	98.9	78.4
18.	Rajasthan	95.7	83.5	95.4	81.3	95.7	80.5
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	72.3	93.6	64.0	86.9	70.5	84.3
20.	Uttar Pradesh	85.1	46.8	84.7	45.7	84.7	45.7
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	69.5	97.5	67.3	92.3	62.3	87.3
22.	Jharkhand	67.0		65.9		65.9	
23.	Chhattisgarh	72.7		71.2		67.8	
24.	Sikkim	37.0		35.3		34.5	
25.	Uttarakhand	83.7		79.3		79.6	
All India		77.5	75.6	76.2	68.2	74.9	65.5
CI		72.9 – 82.1		71.5 – 80.9		70.1 – 79.7	
Client-Brothel Based		77.9	70.8	77.0	63.9	75.9	60.3
Client-Non-Brothel Based		77.4	78.7	75.7	71.0	74.4	68.8

Base: All respondents

3.4.3 Self-reported STD Prevalence

Table 3.15 presents self reported STD prevalence among the respondents. During the survey the respondents were asked if they ever suffered the following symptoms in the last 12 months:

- Ulcer/Sore in the Genital area
- Burning Pain during Urination

Table 3.15 shows that overall, 20 percent of the Clients of FSWs reported incidence of burning pain during urination and 12 percent reported genital ulcer/sore in the last 12 months. The corresponding percentages were slightly higher in BSS 2001 (24% and 14% respectively). Manipur (24%), Haryana (19%) and Rajasthan (18%) had highest proportion of respondents reporting ulcer/sore. Sikkim (5%), Uttar Pradesh (4%) and Himachal Pradesh (3%) were the states with the lowest proportion of respondents who reported ulcer/sore in the Genital area in the last 12 months.


Karnataka (35%) and Andhra Pradesh (33%) had the largest proportion of respondents who had burning pain during urination during the last 12 months. West Bengal (12%), Himachal Pradesh (9%) and Sikkim (4%) had lowest proportion of respondents reporting burning pain during urination. The analysis of responses presented in Table 3.15 indicates that almost one-fourth of the respondents suffered from at least one of the two symptoms mentioned above and eight percent suffered from both the symptoms. The proportion of respondents reporting at least one symptom was observed to be highest in Karnataka (40%), Haryana (37%), Andhra Pradesh

Table 3.15: Percentage of respondents who reported to have suffered from STD symptoms in the last 12 months

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Reporting symptoms in last 12 months		Reporting at least one symptom in last 12 months	Reporting both the symptoms in last 12 months	Reporting symptoms in last 12 months		Reporting at least any one symptom in last 12 months	Reporting both symptoms in last 12 months
		Genital ulcer/ Sore	Burning pain during urination			Genital ulcer/ Sore	Burning pain during urination		
		2001	2001			2006	2006		
1.	Andhra Pradesh	16.2	19.5	28.2	46.2	15.7	33.2	36.6	12.3
2.	Assam	19.2	21.4	24.4	74.2	13.7	18.1	30.0	1.9
3.	Bihar	6.9	11.1	15.2	25.0	10.8	17.5	21.2	7.1
4.	Delhi	23.4	36.4	43.5	58.1	8.3	14.4	15.9	6.9
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	4.8	7.8	12.6	17.6	15.6	22.5	23.1	15.0
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	16.2	29.0	35.4	34.3	17.3	30.3	35.4	12.2
7.	Haryana	22.9	34.7	50.2	54.4	19.3	29.3	36.7	11.9
8.	Himachal Pradesh	10.5	42.3	49.1	25.2	3.3	8.5	11.1	0.7
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	22.8	20.9	26.5	75.4	11.4	15.8	26.5	0.7
10.	Karnataka	18.2	39.4	45.0	57.9	16.6	35.1	39.5	12.2
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	3.7	10.0	13.0	31.4	10.4	14.1	18.1	6.3
12.	Madhya Pradesh	13.2	22.9	31.8	36.0	10.5	22.5	28.5	4.5
13.	Maharashtra	7.4	13.3	18.9	15.7	15.6	22.3	28.6	9.3
14.	Manipur	9.0	16.1	22.1	47.5	23.7	23.3	25.2	21.9
15.	Orissa	12.0	24.6	26.8	51.4	7.8	26.3	29.6	4.4
16.	Other North Eastern States	5.2	8.2	11.6	45.2	6.8	21.6	23.2	5.2
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	16.1	30.0	41.0	28.6	11.5	13.7	22.3	2.9
18.	Rajasthan	10.1	44.6	49.4	31.8	18.1	21.6	25.5	14.2
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	26.2	43.8	47.9	53.1	5.7	13.6	15.5	3.8
20.	Uttar Pradesh	4.5	6.0	10.9	27.6	4.0	13.8	17.1	0.7
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	16.9	12.3	25.4	30.6	13.6	12.3	16.8	9.1
22.	Jharkhand					9.6	13.7	17.4	5.9
23.	Chhattisgarh					14.6	26.6	28.1	13.1
24.	Sikkim					5.0	4.2	7.6	1.7
25.	Uttarakhand					12.6	27.0	30.7	8.9
All India		13.5	23.5	29.9	42.9	12.0	20.4	24.8	7.6
CI						8.4 – 15.6	16.0 – 24.8	20.0 – 29.6	4.7 – 10.5
Client-Brothel Based		11.2	16.8	23.1	37.8	12.3	19.9	23.3	8.9
Client-Non-brothel Based		15.0	27.8	34.2	45.0	11.8	20.6	25.5	7.0

Base: All respondents



(37%) and Gujarat (35%), whereas the proportion was reported lowest in Sikkim (8%), Himachal Pradesh (11%) and Tamil Nadu (16%). This proportion has declined from 30 percent in 2001 to 25 percent in 2006. No significant difference is observed between clients of brothel & non-brothel-based FSW.

3.4.4 STD Treatment Seeking Behaviour

Table 3.16 presents data on the action taken for treatment of STDs by the clients of the FSWs, who reportedly suffered from one or more symptoms of STDs during the last 12 months. Overall, the proportion of respondents who did not seek any treatment was observed to decrease from 18 percent in BSS 2001 to 13 percent in BSS 2006. However, the decline was not statistically significant. Across states, higher proportion of respondents suffering from STDs did not seek any treatment in Manipur (52%), and Kerala (31%).

The proportion of the respondents visiting a government hospital/clinic for treatment during last episode of STDs was observed to decline marginally from 28 percent in BSS 2001 to 25 percent in BSS 2006. Further, the proportion of respondents seeking treatment from private hospital/clinic significantly declined from 38 percent in BSS 2001 to 24 percent in BSS 2006. Nearly one-fifth of the respondents in both the surveys tried to avoid seeking treatment and borrowed prescriptions from friends or relatives.

Across states, higher proportion of clients of FSWs in Jammu & Kashmir (57%), Orissa (48%), Assam and Chhattisgarh (43%) went to government hospital for the treatment of STDs. Higher proportion of the clients of FSWs in Delhi (47%) Punjab (46%), Uttar Pradesh (40%), Goa (39%), Rajasthan (36%) and Uttarakhand (35%) availed treatment from private facilities. Compared to other states, higher proportion of respondents in Andhra Pradesh (58%), Rajasthan (36%), Himachal Pradesh (33%), Bihar (32%) and Punjab (31%) purchased medicines from chemist shops for the treatment of STDs.

Table 3.16: Percentage distribution of respondents by treatment source during last episode of STD

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Treatment source during last episode of STD									
		Went to pvt hospital/clinic		Went to govt. hospital/clinic		Purchased medicine from chemist shop		No treatment		Took home based remedy	
		2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	16.2	48.7	14.1	29.5	57.6	28.2	2.0	6.4	1.0	1.3
2.	Assam	14.8	27.3	43.2	19.7	25.9	60.6	9.9	12.1	0.0	9.1
3.	Bihar	28.9	47.7	13.2	25.0	31.6	34.1	10.5	11.4	9.2	15.9
4.	Delhi	46.7	54.7	13.3	17.1	28.9	6.8	15.6	21.4	26.7	4.3
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	39.3	41.2	11.5	14.7	23.0	2.9	1.6	11.8	3.3	20.6
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	26.4	33.3	20.0	20.0	15.5	14.3	8.2	28.6	16.4	14.3
7.	Haryana	28.7	42.6	13.9	11.0	21.8	25.7	12.9	25.0	16.8	8.8
8.	Himachal Pradesh	23.3	32.8	40.0	23.7	33.3	16.0	0.0	30.5	13.3	9.9
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	29.2	26.3	56.9	29.8	12.5	29.8	5.6	7.0	9.7	5.3
10.	Karnataka	30.4	27.3	35.8	41.3	2.7	11.6	12.2	9.9	9.5	7.4
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	8.4	51.4	9.5	20.0	0.0	20.0	30.5	5.7	16.8	8.6
12.	Madhya Pradesh	24.2	29.2	15.4	23.6	17.6	4.5	19.8	38.2	15.4	2.2
13.	Maharashtra	26.5	49.0	25.7	21.6	4.4	9.8	8.0	21.6	5.3	2.0
14.	Manipur	4.0	37.3	14.0	10.2	5.0	28.8	52.0	22.0	1.0	18.6
15.	Orissa	15.0	32.4	47.5	67.6	22.5	9.5	7.5	6.8	8.8	18.9
16.	Other North Eastern States	19.4	25.8	19.4	32.3	19.4	29.0	16.1	9.7	24.2	6.5
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	46.2	34.8	29.2	30.4	30.8	25.9	1.5	19.6	43.1	8.9
18.	Rajasthan	35.6	29.5	15.6	32.6	35.6	2.3	8.9	28.0	24.4	2.3
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	24.1	47.7	25.9	43.8	25.9	41.4	13.0	8.6	9.3	10.2
20.	Uttar Pradesh	40.4	58.6	21.3	27.6	19.1	10.3	23.4	3.4	10.6	17.2
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	21.1	34.0	15.8	18.0	10.5	10.0	2.6	0.0	10.5	8.0
22.	Jharkhand	14.3		30.4		14.3		23.2		16.1	
23.	Chhattisgarh	10.2		42.9		6.1		9.2		38.8	
24.	Sikkim	33.3		33.3		8.3		8.3		0.0	
25.	Uttarakhand	34.9		36.1		21.7		12.0		7.2	
All India		24.3	38.3	24.9	27.6	18.4	19.7	13.3	18	13.3	8.8
CI		19.6 – 29.0		20.1 – 29.7		14.1 – 22.7		9.6 – 17.0		9.6 – 17.0	
Client-Brothel Based		26.2	44.1	21.6	28.2	24.5	10.4	9.1	16.7	15.7	9.6
Client-Non-brothel Based		23.5	35.9	26.4	27.4	15.7	23.7	15.2	18.6	12.3	8.5

Base: Those who reported to have suffered from any symptom of STD in last 12 months

3.4.5 Time taken to Visit a Health Practitioner and Type of Medicine taken during Last Episode of STD

Table 3.17 presents the findings on the time taken to visit a health practitioner by those respondents who reported any symptom of STD in last 12 months. Nearly 45 percent of respondents visited a health practitioner within one week of experiencing symptoms of STDs and about 33 percent visited a health practitioner more than one week but less than one month since symptoms were observed.

Nearly eight percent respondents who reported any symptom of STDs in last 12 months visited a health practitioner after more than a month from the last time they experienced a symptom of STD. The proportion was significantly higher in Manipur (48%) followed by Sikkim (36%).

The corresponding proportions for respondents visiting any health practitioner within one week of experiencing STD symptom, in BSS 2001 and BSS 2006 were identical (45%). The proportion of respondents who visited a health practitioner after more than one week but less than one month since symptom was reported has declined from 39 percent in BSS 2001 to 33 percent in BSS 2006. Against 15 percent of the respondents in BSS 2001, eight percent in BSS 2006 delayed the treatment for more than a month.

Overall, almost 74 percent respondents took allopathic treatment for the treatment of symptoms of STDs. Most of the respondents in all the states except Kerala, Gujarat, Maharashtra, Goa and Tamil Nadu took allopathic medicines for treatment of STDs. About 12 percent took Ayurvedic/Herbal treatment. However, this proportion is reported highest in Chhattisgarh (46%) followed by Haryana (23%), Madhya Pradesh (21%) and Gujarat (17%).

The proportion of those who took Homeopathic medicine for treatment of symptoms of STD was highest in Kerala (58%), Other North Eastern States (50%) and Tamil Nadu (40%). None of the respondents in Jammu & Kashmir, Orissa, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Chhattisgarh and Sikkim depended on homeopathic medicines. This proportion has increased from 200 (4%) to 2006 (10%).

3.4.6 STD Treatment Source Preferred to be Utilised for Future Episodes of STD

Table 3.18 presents the preferred source of treatment for STD related symptoms in the future. Nearly 35 percent of the respondents reported that they would seek treatment from a private hospital/clinic as compared to about 50 percent of respondents reporting government hospital/clinic. The corresponding figure for BSS 2001 was significantly higher for the private facilities as compared to government facilities as the preferred source of STD treatment for future episode.

Table 3.17: Percentage distribution of respondents by time taken to visit a health practitioner and type of medicine taken during last episode of STD

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	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	
		2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	77.3	34.2	17.5	43.8	5.2	21.9	91.8	97.3	2.1	2.7	3.1	12.3
2.	Assam	37.0	31.0	30.1	63.8	5.5	5.2	90.4	98.3	4.1	0.0	6.8	10.3
3.	Bihar	39.7	64.1	27.9	30.8	4.4	5.1	70.6	94.9	2.9	7.7	2.9	5.1
4.	Delhi	52.6	72.0	39.5	20.4	2.6	6.5	94.7	91.4	15.8	6.5	2.6	24.7
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	20.0	80.0	26.7	6.7	11.7	3.3	55.0	70.0	16.7	3.3	10.0	16.7
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	45.5	42.7	33.7	24.0	3.0	29.3	53.5	88.0	13.9	4.0	16.8	9.3
7.	Haryana	61.4	48.0	28.4	46.1	9.1	5.9	72.7	93.1	3.4	7.8	22.7	6.9
8.	Himachal Pradesh	63.3	48.4	33.3	44.0	0.0	4.4	86.7	93.4	3.3	2.2	10.0	17.6
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	83.8	18.9	14.7	11.3	1.5	67.9	97.1	81.1	0.0	15.1	4.4	5.7
10.	Karnataka	60.0	43.1	38.5	45.9	0.8	11.0	76.9	87.2	6.2	0.0	15.4	13.8
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	22.7	45.5	69.7	48.5	4.5	6.1	36.4	81.8	57.6	0.0	1.5	21.2
12.	Madhya Pradesh	50.7	47.3	23.3	21.8	1.4	30.9	67.1	94.5	1.4	0.0	20.5	3.6
13.	Maharashtra	40.4	80.0	19.2	20.0	3.8	0.0	53.8	85.0	22.1	15.0	16.3	2.5
14.	Manipur	22.9	39.6	25.0	50.0	47.9	6.3	81.3	77.1	10.4	10.4	10.4	20.8
15.	Orissa	31.1	23.2	48.6	55.1	20.3	20.3	93.2	98.6	0.0	0.0	8.1	2.9
16.	Other North Eastern States	42.3	35.7	40.4	39.3	15.4	14.3	67.3	92.9	50.0	0.0	7.7	7.1
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	46.9	37.8	42.2	53.3	9.4	7.8	95.3	96.7	1.6	1.1	6.3	11.1
18.	Rajasthan	52.4	40.0	23.2	32.6	0.0	27.4	75.6	89.5	0.0	3.2	0.0	7.4
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	27.7	35.0	59.6	51.3	10.6	13.7	59.6	95.7	40.4	2.6	2.1	22.2
20.	Uttar Pradesh	66.7	57.1	25.0	28.6	8.3	14.3	91.7	92.9	0.0	3.6	13.9	17.9
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	38.2	56.9	50.0	40.3	11.8	2.8	97.1	98.6	2.9	5.6	0.0	6.9
22.	Jharkhand	46.5		37.2		14.0		83.7		4.7		14.0	
23.	Chhattisgarh	19.1		37.1		16.9		65.2		0.0		46.1	
24.	Sikkim	9.1		54.5		36.4		100.0		0.0		0.0	
25.	Uttarakhand	47.9		38.4		12.3		94.5		2.7		12.3	
All India		45.4	45.0	33.0	39.2	8.2	14.5	73.8	91.6	10.2	4.0	11.6	12.2
CI		39.9 – 50.9		27.8 – 38.2		5.2 – 11.2		69.0 – 78.6		6.9 – 13.5		8.1 – 15.1	
Client-Brothel Based		47.7	58.0	27.1	30.0	6.4	10.8	75.8	92.5	6.2	4.9	12.6	10.6
Client-Non-brothel Based		44.3	39.3	35.8	43.2	9.1	16.2	72.8	91.2	12.2	3.6	11.1	12.9

Base : Those who reported to have suffered from any symptom of STDs in last 12 months

Multiple responses allowed

Table 3.18: Percentage distribution of respondents by preferred treatment source to be utilised for future episodes of STD

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Pvt hospital/clinic		Govt hospital/clinic		Others*	
		2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	39.9	81.2	18.7	14.8	41.4	4.0
2.	Assam	22.6	31.0	64.1	48.3	13.3	20.7
3.	Bihar	44.6	59.2	37.9	33.6	17.5	7.2
4.	Delhi	43.0	57.2	32.9	40.1	24.2	2.7
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	53.1	65.6	28.1	28.1	25.2	6.3
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	32.5	66.7	33.6	24.6	33.9	8.7
7.	Haryana	37.0	61.6	58.9	32.8	4.1	5.6
8.	Himachal Pradesh	18.5	56.2	79.3	41.6	2.2	2.2
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	26.1	35.3	67.3	56.3	6.6	8.4
10.	Karnataka	29.5	36.1	36.9	47.6	33.6	16.3
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	13.3	56.3	31.5	30.4	55.2	13.3
12.	Madhya Pradesh	43.8	49.6	49.1	46.4	7.1	4.0
13.	Maharashtra	50.9	74.1	40.1	25.2	8.9	0.7
14.	Manipur	14.4	39.7	74.8	45.7	10.7	14.6
15.	Orissa	14.8	29.0	78.9	62.7	6.3	8.3
16.	Other North Eastern States	31.6	30.6	48.0	57.1	19.3	12.3
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	60.1	49.1	34.2	47.6	5.8	3.3
18.	Rajasthan	47.2	32.2	39.0	62.2	13.8	5.6
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	50.0	52.1	41.3	34.5	8.7	13.4
20.	Uttar Pradesh	37.5	52.1	60.7	43.1	1.8	4.8
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	27.3	46.1	45.0	32.7	23.0	21.2
22.	Jharkhand	41.9		43.7		14.4	
23.	Chhattisgarh	26.6		64.8		8.6	
24.	Sikkim	20.2		79.0		0.8	
25.	Uttarakhand	36.3		58.9		4.8	
All India		34.6	50.8	49.5	40.4	16.0	8.8
CI		29.4 – 39.8		44.0 – 55.0		12.0 – 20.0	
Client-Brothel Based		39.6	54.0	43.0	39.0	17.4	7.0
Client-Non-brothel Based		32.1	48.7	52.6	41.4	15.3	9.9


Base: All respondents

*Others include - Take home based remedy, borrow prescription from friend, take medicine available at home, purchase medicine from chemist shop, consult traditional healer, consult peer educator, no treatment and others.

In most of the states, the respondents preferred a government hospital/clinic to a private hospital/clinic except in Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Delhi, Goa, Maharashtra, Punjab, Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu (Table 3.18). Overall, 16 percent of the clients preferred other sources for any future episode of STDs. These included home based remedy, borrowing prescriptions, taking medicines available at home, purchasing medicines from chemist shop and others.

Treatment Seeking Behaviour for STDs

Figure 3.7: Percentage distribution of clients of FSWs by preferred STD treatment source to be utilised for future episodes



Base: All respondents

3.5 Sexual Behaviour and Condom Usage

This section presents the sexual behaviour of clients of FSWs. This includes information on age at first sex, age and type of first sex partner, sex with commercial, non-regular and regular female partners. It also presents findings on condom use during last sex and consistent condom use with different type of female partners and person who suggested condom use at last sex.

3.5.1 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 3.19 presents the age of respondents at first sex with any partner across various states.

Table 3.19: Percentage distribution of respondents by age at first sex with any partner

(All figures except the median age are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Age at first sex (in years)					Median age at first sex (in years)	
		<16	16-18	19-21	22-25	> 25	2006	2001
		%	%	%	%	%		
1.	Andhra Pradesh	4.1	46.6	38.8	9.7	0.7	18	20
2.	Assam	0.7	7.4	20.4	39.3	32.2	24	19
3.	Bihar	26.0	50.2	14.5	7.4	1.9	17	18
4.	Delhi	13.4	40.1	22.4	17.3	6.9	18	18
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	0.0	19.4	47.5	32.5	0.6	20	19
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	1.8	33.9	45.4	18.1	0.7	19	20
7.	Haryana	27.0	42.2	23.3	5.2	2.2	17	17
8.	Himachal Pradesh	7.0	40.4	33.3	19.3	0.0	19	19
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	1.1	29.0	42.3	23.9	3.7	20	20
10.	Karnataka	1.5	10.3	29.9	39.9	18.5	20	20
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	2.6	18.5	28.5	36.3	14.1	25	21
12.	Madhya Pradesh	18.4	53.2	26.6	1.9	0.0	18	18
13.	Maharashtra	0.4	17.5	45.0	31.2	5.9	20	20
14.	Manipur	0.0	13.3	39.3	28.9	18.5	21	20

(Contd.)

(Contd.)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Age at first sex (in years)					Median age at first sex (in years)	
		<16	16-18	19-21	22-25	> 25	2006	2001
		%	%	%	%	%		
15.	Orissa	0.4	35.6	26.3	33.3	4.4	20	20
16.	Other North Eastern States	0.4	26.0	42.8	25.6	5.2	20	20
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	0.4	33.5	44.2	18.7	3.2	20	18
18.	Rajasthan	4.6	46.1	38.3	10.6	0.4	18	18
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	0.0	13.3	51.5	32.2	3.0	0	21
20.	Uttar Pradesh	19.3	54.2	22.2	4.4	0.0	17	18
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	10.0	28.6	31.4	20.0	10.0	20	20
22.	Jharkhand	1.1	11.9	33.0	42.6	11.5	22	
23.	Chhattisgarh	9.0	47.6	31.8	10.9	0.7	18	
24.	Sikkim	1.7	10.1	39.5	42.9	5.9	21	
25.	Uttarakhand	3.0	29.6	35.6	28.1	3.7	20	
All India (2006)		6.2	30.8	34.2	22.3	6.5	20	
CI		3.5 – 8.9	25.7 – 35.9	29.0 – 39.4	17.7 – 26.9	3.8 – 9.2	15 – 23	
All India (2001)		7.4	33.2	35.3	19.8	4.4	19	
Client-Brothel Based		10.6	40.9	30.4	13.9	4.3	18	19
Client-Non-brothel Based		4.1	25.9	36.1	26.4	7.5	20	20

Base: All respondents

Overall, the age at first sex varied from 17 to 25 years. It was observed that a significant proportion (34%) of the respondents had their first sex at the age of 19-21 years followed by slightly less proportion (31%) of the respondents who had first sex at the age of 16-18 years. The median age was 20 years at first sex with any partner. The median age of first sex reported by clients from brothel area is less by 2 years than that reported by clients of non-brothel based FSW.

About one-fifth of the respondents interviewed in Haryana (27%), Bihar (26%), Uttar Pradesh (19%) and Madhya Pradesh (18%) reportedly had their first sex at less than 16 years.

3.5.2 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 3.20.

The mean age of first sexual partner for all locations was 22 years, which ranged from 18 to 30 years across various states. The age of first sexual partner had been reported as 16-18 years by a considerable proportion (36%) of the respondents.

Significantly higher proportion of respondents from brothel area (16%) than the non-brothel area (8%) reported that the age of their first sex partner was less than 16 years. The proportion of the respondents reporting the age of first sex partner as 16-18 years was also higher in case of the brothel areas (brothel area 42%, non-brothel area 33%). The proportion of respondents reporting age of first sex partner below 16 years was considerably high in Madhya Pradesh (38%), Bihar (35%), Haryana (29%) and Uttar Pradesh (28%).

Nearly 66 percent of the respondents 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 31 percent.

Table 3.20: Percentage distribution of respondents by age and type of first sex partner

(All figures except mean age are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Age of first sexual partner (in years)					Mean age of first sex partner (in years)		Type of first sexual partner			
		<16	16-18	19-21	22-25	> 25			Female-unpaid	Female-paid	Male unpaid	Male paid
		%	%	%	%	%	2006	2001	%	%	%	%
1.	Andhra Pradesh	11.2	48.1	23.5	13.4	3.7	18.7	19.6	48.1	51.5	0.0	0.4
2.	Assam	3.7	25.6	30.7	23.3	16.7	24.3	17.3	69.6	30.4	0.0	0.0
3.	Bihar	35.3	39.8	15.6	4.5	4.8	18.7	16.1	67.3	30.5	1.1	0.7
4.	Delhi	17.7	37.5	25.6	11.2	7.9	20.6	18.4	66.4	31.4	0.7	0.0
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	1.5	29.6	37.8	18.9	12.2	20.9	18.6	56.3	43.0	0.0	0.0
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	5.9	39.9	34.3	13.3	6.6	19.8	20.1	79.3	11.1	3.3	0.4
7.	Haryana	29.3	34.4	11.9	8.1	16.3	25.3	17.0	64.4	28.9	4.4	0.7
8.	Himachal Pradesh	11.5	45.9	24.8	14.1	3.7	19.3	19.5	77.0	18.5	2.2	0.7
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	4.4	44.1	32.0	15.4	4.0	19.3	20.3	61.4	38.6	0.0	0.0
10.	Karnataka	3.7	29.9	43.9	14.8	7.7	21.9	20.3	64.2	33.2	0.4	0.0
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	3.0	19.3	16.3	11.9	49.6	30.2	19.0	73.0	21.9	3.3	0.4
12.	Madhya Pradesh	38.4	36.9	6.3	7.5	10.8	17.7	17.1	75.0	23.5	0.4	0.0
13.	Maharashtra	5.9	34.6	23.8	13.8	21.9	29.6	19.9	66.5	28.6	0.0	0.0
14.	Manipur	0.0	26.3	22.6	32.2	18.9	26.0	19.7	55.6	44.4	0.0	0.0
15.	Orissa	9.6	40.4	27.0	18.5	4.4	19.3	17.5	58.5	41.1	0.0	0.0
16.	Other North Eastern States	7.4	36.3	30.7	17.8	7.8	22.4	18.7	83.3	16.7	0.0	0.0
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	2.5	36.3	34.5	16.2	10.4	24.2	18.4	77.0	22.7	0.0	0.0
18.	Rajasthan	8.2	51.4	28.7	9.9	1.8	18.5	17.5	65.2	32.6	1.1	0.0
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	1.1	19.3	24.2	26.5	28.8	23.1	21.8	63.6	32.6	0.8	0.0
20.	Uttar Pradesh	28.0	44.0	9.8	7.3	10.9	18.6	18.9	77.5	20.4	1.8	0.0
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	11.1	22.6	22.2	25.6	18.5	25.0	18.5	56.7	43.3	0.0	0.0
22.	Jharkhand	3.3	22.2	37.8	26.3	10.4	21.6		60.7	37.0	1.5	0.4
23.	Chhattisgarh	14.2	53.6	19.5	5.6	7.1	20.0		66.3	30.7	3.0	0.0
24.	Sikkim	4.2	39.5	42.0	11.8	2.5	20.1		41.2	58.0	0.8	0.0
25.	Uttarakhand	7.0	40.4	29.6	15.9	7.0	19.6		70.4	27.8	0.7	0.0
All India		10.9	35.9	25.9	15.4	12.0	21.8	18.8	66.4	31.3	1.0	0.2
CI		7.5 – 14.3	30.6 – 41.2	21.1 – 30.7	11.4 – 19.4	8.4 – 15.6	17.3 – 26.3		61.2 – 71.6	26.2 – 36.4	0.0 – 2.1	0.5 – 3.5
Client-Brothel Based		16.4	41.5	21.1	11.4%	9.6	21.2	18.1	21.2	11.0	0.3	0.0
Client-Non-brothel Based		8.1	33.1	28.2%	17.4	13.1	22.1	19.2	45.2	20.3	0.7	0.1

Base: All respondents

About 21 percent of the clients of brothel based FSWs reported first sexual partner was “female” (unpaid) whereas the corresponding percentage for clients of non-brothel area was 45 percent. More than three-fourths of the respondents reported their first sexual partner as “female (unpaid)” in Other North Eastern States (83%), Gujarat (79%) and Uttar Pradesh (78%).

3.5.3 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 3.21 reflects that overall, about 12 percent of the respondents reported sexual involvement with male partner. About 13 percent of clients from brothel area reported to have sex with any male partner as against 11 percent of clients from non-brothel area.

Table 3.21: Percentage of respondents who reported sex with any male partner and condom usage behaviour with male partner

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Ever had sex with any male partner*		Sex with any male partner in last 12 months**		Used condom during last sex with male partner***		Used condom consistently in last 12 months***	
		2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	17.5	4.7	23.4	30.8	45.5	0.0	54.5	0.0
2.	Assam	1.9	4.1	80.0	9.1	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
3.	Bihar	18.2	6.2	38.8	55.6	36.8	10.0	26.3	0.0
4.	Delhi	13.0	10.4	52.8	42.9	57.9	8.3	36.8	0.0
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	19.6	2.2	24.5	50.0	84.6	100.0	84.6	100.0
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	31.0	5.1	22.6	53.3	42.1	50.0	10.5	37.5
7.	Haryana	12.2	22.9	36.4	50.0	33.3	19.4	25.0	16.1
8.	Himachal Pradesh	17.8	34.8	54.2	5.4	3.8	20.0	3.8	0.0
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	12.9	16.3	8.6	8.6	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
10.	Karnataka	5.5	3.0	73.3	25.0	90.9	0.0	72.7	0.0
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	17.8	22.2	31.3	30.0	26.7	44.4	33.3	33.3
12.	Madhya Pradesh	3.7	13.2	20.0	24.3	0.0	22.2	0.0	33.3
13.	Maharashtra	10.0	5.6	44.4	46.7	83.3	42.9	75.0	28.6
14.	Manipur	13.7	7.1	32.4	15.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
15.	Orissa	10.4	8.3	50.0	47.8	21.4	0.0	21.4	0.0
16.	Other North Eastern States	2.6	2.2	14.3	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	14.7	27.1	14.6	28.4	16.7	23.8	0.0	0.0
18.	Rajasthan	14.5	9.4	14.6	40.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	3.0	13.9	12.5	32.4	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3
20.	Uttar Pradesh	17.1	9.0	29.8	16.7	7.1	25.0	7.1	25
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	4.4	1.1	58.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
22.	Jharkhand	7.0		42.1		50.0		50.0	
23.	Chhattisgarh	6.4		35.3		16.7		16.7	
24.	Sikkim	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	
25.	Uttarakhand	12.2		21.2		42.9		0.0	
All India		11.8	10.8	31.8	28.6	36.3	24.0	28.6	15.4
CI		8.2 – 15.4		26.7 – 36.9		31.0 – 41.6		23.6 – 33.6	
Client-Brothel Based		12.7	7.0	34.1	37.0	40.4	19.3	34.0	15.8
Client-Non-brothel Based		11.3	13.2	30.6	25.8	33.8	26.3	25.3	15.3

*Base: All respondents

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

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

The proportion of respondents reporting to have had sex with any male partner was highest in Gujarat (31%), Goa (20%), Bihar (18%), Himachal Pradesh (18%) and Kerala (18%).

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. This proportion was observed to be highest across the states of Assam, Karnataka, West Bengal, Himachal Pradesh and Orissa (Table 3.21). About 34 percent of clients from brothel area reported to have sex with any male partner in the last 12 months as against 31 percent of clients from non-brothel area.

As regards the usage of condom, nearly one-third (36%) of the respondents reportedly used condom during last anal sex experience with male partner and this proportion has increased significantly from 2001 (24%). Consistent condom use was reported by 29 percent of the respondents who had anal sex with any male partner in the last 12 months against 15 percent in 2001. However, about 34 percent of client from brothel area consistently used condom as against 25 percent of clients from non-brothel area. The state-wise figures presented in Table 3.21 should be used with caution due to low cell frequencies.

3.5.4 Sex with Non-regular/Regular Female Partner in Last Three Months

All respondents were asked if they had sex with any non-regular/regular partner in last three months. A “non-regular partner” was defined as a sexual partner to whom the respondent was not married or had never lived with and did not pay for sexual intercourse. (Table 3.22).

The proportion of respondents who reported sex with any non-regular partner was 24 percent in BSS 2006 against 16 percent in BSS 2001. Inter-state variation indicates that the proportion of respondents who had sex with non-regular partner was highest in Maharashtra (46%), Other North East States (45%), followed by Tamil Nadu (44%) and Jammu & Kashmir (44%). Significantly lower proportion of the respondents from the brothel (18%) than the non-brothel (27%) area had sex with non-regular partner in the last three months.

A “Regular Partner” was defined as spouse or live-in partners. Overall 61 percent of the respondents in BSS 2006 against 48 percent in BSS 2001 had sex with any regular female partner in the last three months. The respondents who reported sex with regular partner was above 70 percent in Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Karnataka and Punjab. A significant increase was observed in proportion of clients of brothel area who had sex with regular partner in last three months (2006-63%, 2001-41%).

3.5.5 Median Age at First Sex with Commercial/Non-regular/Regular Female Partner

The respondents who had sex with any commercial/non-regular/regular partner in last three months were asked to remember the age at which they first had sex with any female partner. The median age at first sex with any commercial female partner ranged from 19 to 26 years. In Assam and Uttarakhand, the highest median age reported was 26 years and 25 years respectively, while in Andhra Pradesh clients reported lowest median age at first sex with any commercial 20 years as female partner (19 years). Clients of brothel-based FSWs reported 20 years as median age at first sex with commercial partners against 23 years reported by clients of non-brothel based FSWs (Table 3.23).

Table 3.22: Percentage of respondents who reported having sex with non-regular/ regular female partner in last three months

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Had sex with any non-regular female partner in last 3 months		Had sex with any regular female partner in last 3 months	
		2006	2001	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	25.0	25.6	77.2	65.0
2.	Assam	22.6	15.1	57.0	47.6
3.	Bihar	10.4	10.4	66.2	46.4
4.	Delhi	23.5	13.0	44.8	33.1
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	19.3	8.5	66.3	21.5
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	31.7	6.1	74.2	56.9
7.	Haryana	25.2	15.9	62.2	39.5
8.	Himachal Pradesh	17.4	19.9	45.2	54.7
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	43.8	11.2	50.0	57.2
10.	Karnataka	22.9	26.8	70.8	67.7
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	15.9	30.4	51.1	46.7
12.	Madhya Pradesh	31.0	20.0	66.8	48.2
13.	Maharashtra	45.7	9.6	61.7	28.1
14.	Manipur	33.3	17.2	43.7	49.1
15.	Orissa	18.5	11.2	49.6	51.4
16.	Other North Eastern States	44.8	10.8	53.3	35.8
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	29.9	25.3	81.7	49.8
18.	Rajasthan	12.1	21.0	69.5	50.2
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	44.3	30.0	67.4	54.3
20.	Uttar Pradesh	5.8	3.7	62.5	43.8
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	5.9	10.6	61.1	56.3
22.	Jharkhand	22.6		58.5	
23.	Chhattisgarh	13.9		59.6	
24.	Sikkim	21.0		69.7	
25.	Uttarakhand	10.7		63.7	
All India		23.9	16.3	61.2	47.8
CI		19.2 – 28.6		55.8 – 66.6	
Client-Brothel Based		17.7	10.9	62.8	41.3
Client-Non-brothel Based		26.9	19.7	60.4	51.9

Base: All respondents




Table 3.23: Median age of respondents at first sex with commercial/non-regular/regular female partner

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Median age at first sex with any commercial female partner* (in years)		Median age at first sex with any non-regular female partner** (in years)		Median age at first sex with any regular female partner*** (in years)	
		2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	19	21	20	21	21	20
2.	Assam	26	25	25	19	27	23
3.	Bihar	20	24	18	19	19	21
4.	Delhi	20	20	18	18	22	21
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	21	20	20	18	24	22
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	24	23	22	21	21	22
7.	Haryana	20	20	19	17	20	20
8.	Himachal Pradesh	23	21	19	19	20	22
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	22	22	20	21	24	22
10.	Karnataka	24	21	20	19	24	24
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	24	23	21	20	25	26
12.	Madhya Pradesh	20	20	17	18	20	20
13.	Maharashtra	23	21	21	22	23	22
14.	Manipur	24	22	21	19	25	23
15.	Orissa	22	23	18	21	24	25
16.	Other North Eastern States	23	24	20	20	25	22
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	23	21	21	19	22	22
18.	Rajasthan	21	20	19	19	20	20
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	24	24	20	21	25	25
20.	Uttar Pradesh	21	20	18	18	20	20
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	21	23	21	20	21	22
22.	Jharkhand	23		24		24	

(Contd.)

(Contd.)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Median age at first sex with any commercial female partner* (in years)		Median age at first sex with any non-regular female partner** (in years)		Median age at first sex with any regular female partner*** (in years)	
		2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001
23.	Chhattisgarh	20		18		20	
24.	Sikkim	22		24		23	
25.	Uttarakhand	25		22		21	
All India		22	22	20	20	22	22
CI		17 – 27		16 – 24		17 – 27	
Client-Brothel Based		20	21	20	19	21	22
Client-Non-brothel Based		23	22	20	20	23	22

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

**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

In case of median age at first sex with non-regular partner, highest was 25 years in Assam and lowest was 17 years in Madhya Pradesh. Median age at first sex with regular partner was highest in Assam (27 years), followed by Kerala, Manipur, Other North East States and Tamil Nadu (25 years) and lowest in Bihar (19 years).

The median age at first sex with any commercial/non-regular/regular partner, when compared with BSS 2001 was almost the same for clients from brothel area as well as those from non-brothel area.

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

All the respondents who reportedly had sex with commercial/non-regular/regular partner in last three months were asked to remember the number of partners with whom they had sex in the last three months. The mean number and median of number of commercial/non-regular/regular partner was observed to be the same as in BSS 2001. Further, no significant difference was observed between clients from brothel area and those from non-brothel area (Table 3.24).

The mean number of commercial female partners was reported to be 4.4. The median number of commercial partners ranged from one in Sikkim to six in Assam.

Mean and median number of regular partners was same in BSS 2001 and BSS 2006. The mean number of regular partners was highest in Gujarat (1.7), Karnataka (1.4), Bihar and Tamil Nadu (1.2). The median number of regular partner was reported to be one across all the states. The mean number of non-regular partners was highest in Haryana (2.5), followed by Andhra Pradesh (2.4), Delhi (2.1), Bihar (2.0) and Other North East States and Rajasthan (1.8) and lowest in Assam and Uttar Pradesh (1.1) and Goa and Sikkim (1.0).

3.5.7 Condom Use during Last Sex with Commercial/Non-regular/Regular Female Partner

The respondents who had sex with any female partner were asked whether they used condom during last sex with commercial/non-regular/regular partners (Table 3.25). Overall, 85 percent of the respondents who had sex with commercial partner reported using condom last time, which is significantly higher from BSS 2001 (75%). This proportion was above 90 percent in Goa

Table 3.24: Mean number of commercial/non-regular/regular female partner in the last three months

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	No. of commercial partners				No. of regular partners				No. of non-regular partners			
		Mean*		Median*		Mean**		Median**		Mean***		Median***	
		2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	8.0	3.1	5.0	2.0	1.1	1.4	1.0	1.0	2.4	1.3	1.0	1.0
2.	Assam	6.0	4.7	6.0	4.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1	2.1	1.0	2.0
3.	Bihar	4.6	2.7	3.0	2.0	1.2	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.3	2.0	1.0
4.	Delhi	6.5	3.9	5.0	2.0	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.0	2.1	2.3	1.0	2.0
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	5.3	2.9	5.0	2.0	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.3	1.0	1.0
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	6.0	6.2	5.0	6.0	1.7	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.4	1.3	1.0	1.0
7.	Haryana	6.8	4.1	5.0	3.0	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.5	1.3	2.0	1.0
8.	Himachal Pradesh	3.7	4.0	3.0	4.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.3	1.1	1.0	1.0
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	2.5	3.6	2.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.2	1.0	1.0	1.0
10.	Karnataka	3.6	4.4	3.0	4.0	1.4	1.2	1.0	1.0	1.5	1.5	1.0	1.0
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	3.7	3.6	2.0	3.0	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.3	2.4	1.0	1.0
12.	Madhya Pradesh	4.6	3.8	3.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.2	1.2	1.0	1.0
13.	Maharashtra	3.9	3.2	3.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.4	1.6	1.0	1.0
14.	Manipur	2.6	1.6	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.7	1.2	1.0	1.0
15.	Orissa	3.9	3.3	3.0	3.0	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.2	1.2	1.0	1.0
16.	Other North Eastern States	4.7	5.2	4.0	3.0	1.0	1.2	1.0	1.0	1.8	1.3	1.0	1.0
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	4.9	4.7	4.0	4.0	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.7	1.6	1.0	1.0
18.	Rajasthan	3.7	4.9	3.0	4.0	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.8	1.4	1.0	1.0
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	5.1	4.6	5.0	4.0	1.2	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.3	1.6	1.0	1.0
20.	Uttar Pradesh	2.5	3.1	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.0
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	5.2	3.7	4.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.3	1.5	1.0	1.0
22.	Jharkhand	3.6		2.0		1.1		1.0		1.3		1.0	
23.	Chhattisgarh	4.3		3.0		1.0		1.0		1.2		1.0	
24.	Sikkim	1.7		1.0		1.0		1.0		1.0		1.0	
25.	Uttarakhand	2.7		2.0		1.0		1.0		1.2		1.0	
All India		4.4	3.9	3.0	3.0	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.5	1.5	0.0	1.0
CI		2.1 – 6.7		1.1 – 4.9		0.0 – 2.2		0.0 – 2.1		0.2 – 3.0		0.0	
Client-Brothel Based		4.8	3.3	3.0	2.0	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.7	1.5	0.0	1.0
Client-Non-brothel Based		4.3	4.2	3.0	3.0	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.5	1.5	0.0	1.0

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

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

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

(98%), Assam and Maharashtra (96%), Delhi (95%), Andhra Pradesh (94%) and Karnataka (93%) and lowest in Uttarakhand and Madhya Pradesh (73%). There is a significant increase among clients of brothel and non-brothel FSWs when compared with BSS 2001.

This proportion was significantly high among those who had sex with commercial partner (85%) as compared to non-regular (50%) or regular partners (29%). The proportion of respondents who reported condom usage last time they had sex with non-regular partner has significantly increased from BSS 2001 to BSS 2006 among the brothel based clients (2006-60%, 2001-29%). This proportion was less than one-third in Kerala, Uttar Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and Orissa; and highest in Assam (82%). This proportion is higher among clients of brothel-based (60%) than clients of non-brothel-based FSWs (47%).

Table 3.25: Percentage of respondents who reported condom usage during last sex with commercial/non-regular/regular female partner

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Condom use during last sex with commercial female partner*		Condom use during last sex with non-regular female partner**		Condom use during last sex with regular female partner***	
		2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	93.7	74.7	64.7	32.4	27.5	21.1
2.	Assam	96.3	74.9	82.0	51.2	56.5	36.4
3.	Bihar	84.0	68.9	53.6	6.7	20.2	5.2
4.	Delhi	94.6	79.2	53.7	22.9	47.6	16.9
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	98.1	79.3	78.8	39.1	20.0	25.9
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	87.0	70.0	42.4	11.1	43.5	25.4
7.	Haryana	82.2	67.9	36.2	18.6	37.5	15.0
8.	Himachal Pradesh	81.1	86.1	55.3	43.4	25.4	13.7
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	76.5	86.5	42.9	54.2	30.9	31.7
10.	Karnataka	93.2	82.2	57.1	45.8	9.6	26.9
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	87.4	82.6	25.6	46.3	17.4	11.9
12.	Madhya Pradesh	73.0	71.8	36.1	37.5	33.1	22.2
13.	Maharashtra	96.3	81.5	64.4	46.2	48.5	9.2
14.	Manipur	84.7	67.4	52.2	19.6	22.9	10.7
15.	Orissa	78.1	73.6	18.0	29.0	11.9	10.6
16.	Other North Eastern States	85.6	70.5	43.1	37.9	23.1	26.0
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	81.7	68.9	48.2	27.5	18.0	10.3
18.	Rajasthan	90.3	67.8	65.7	26.8	11.2	12.7
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	87.1	79.8	20.5	22.5	4.5	2.1
20.	Uttar Pradesh	74.2	68.5	25.0	10.0	26.7	24.8
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	87.3	66.5	50.0	26.7	22.6	13.8
22.	Jharkhand	83.7		75.4		29.1	
23.	Chhattisgarh	76.8		59.5		43.4	
24.	Sikkim	81.2		76.0		91.6	
25.	Uttarakhand	72.6		62.1		34.9	
All India		84.9	74.5	49.6	32.8	29.2	17.7
CI		81.0 – 88.8		44.1 – 55.1		24.2 – 34.2	
Client-Brothel Based		87.1	73.6	59.5	29.0	30.0	15.4
Client-Non-brothel Based		83.9	75.1	46.5	34.1	28.8	18.8


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

**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

Condom Usage


Figure 3.9: Percentage of clients of FSWs who reported condom usage during last sex with commercial/non-regular/regular female partner



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

Condom Usage


Figure 3.10: Percentage of clients of brothel and non brothel-based FSWs who reported condom usage during last sex with commercial/non-regular/regular female partner



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

Condom Usage

Figure 3.11: Percentage distribution of clients of FSWs who reported condom usage during last sex with non-regular female partner: Interstate Comparison, 2006



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

When compared with BSS 2001, proportion of respondents who reported condom usage with regular partner has increased from 18 to 29 percent in 2006. Among clients from brothel area and non-brothel area also, an increase in condom usage with regular partners was observed.

3.5.8 Consistent Condom Use during Sex with Commercial/Non-regular/Regular Female Partner in Last Three Months

An important indicator in BSS is consistent condom use with different type of partners i.e. proportion of respondents reporting consistent condom use with all commercial, non-regular and regular partners. All respondents who reported sex with any partner were inquired about the frequency of use of condom in last three months with different partners. The proportion of respondents who reported using condom every time they had sex in the last three months is presented in Table 3.26.

Table 3.26: Percentage of respondents who reported consistent condom use during sex with commercial/non-regular/regular female partner in the last three months

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Consistent condom use with commercial female partner*		Consistent condom use with non-regular female partner**		Consistent condom use with regular female partner***	
		2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	82.5	63.3	47.1	22.1	21.3	18.4
2.	Assam	92.6	34.6	73.8	23.1	34.4	6.2
3.	Bihar	73.9	37.0	53.6	3.3	12.9	3.1
4.	Delhi	84.8	58.7	43.3	22.9	33.1	0.0
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	98.1	67.4	69.7	34.8	2.2	8.6
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	77.2	61.6	30.4	5.9	17.0	20.6
7.	Haryana	70.3	40.6	30.9	23.3	14.4	2.8
8.	Himachal Pradesh	74.0	56.6	42.6	22.6	4.9	2.1
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	65.8	72.1	37.6	29.2	9.7	2.4
10.	Karnataka	87.4	68.7	48.5	26.9	7.5	9.7
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	76.7	75.8	23.3	37.8	10.9	4.0
12.	Madhya Pradesh	64.8	57.0	32.5	25.0	5.1	3.0
13.	Maharashtra	95.5	77.4	68.9	30.8	32.9	2.6
14.	Manipur	74.1	53.8	41.6	15.6	12.8	6.3
15.	Orissa	62.8	72.3	16.0	26.7	3.8	3.0
16.	Other North Eastern States	69.6	40.6	31.0	17.2	10.4	5.4
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	75.5	48.1	28.9	20.6	11.8	6.0
18.	Rajasthan	84.2	44.2	65.7	18.2	5.1	3.0
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	58.2	64.3	1.7	10.0	0.6	6.2
20.	Uttar Pradesh	71.2	63.7	25.0	10.0	10.1	8.5
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	78.5	48.9	43.8	10.0	9.5	8.1
22.	Jharkhand	79.5		63.9		17.2	
23.	Chhattisgarh	65.2		45.9		19.5	
24.	Sikkim	8.5		4.0		3.7	
25.	Uttarakhand	45.9		53.6		7.6	
All India		74.0	57.3	39.8	21.8	13.4	6.8
CI		69.2 – 78.8		34.4 – 35.2		9.6 – 17.2	
Client-Brothel Based		79.6	60.1	54.7	21.3	17.2	4.7
Client-Non-brothel Based		71.2	55.6	35.0	21.9	11.5	7.9

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

**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

Nearly three-fourths (74%) of respondents who had sex with commercial partner reported consistent condom use in last three months, which is significantly higher as compared to BSS 2001 (57%). This proportion was highest in Goa (98%), Maharashtra (96%) and Assam (93%) and lowest in Sikkim (9%), followed by Uttarakhand (46%) and Tamil Nadu (58%). There was a significant increase among the clients from brothel area and non-brothel area when compared with BSS 2001.

At the national level, consistent condom use with non-regular partners during last 3 months has significantly increased from BSS 2001 (22%) to BSS 2006 (40%). Inter-state variation indicates that the proportion of respondents reporting consistent condom use with non-regular partner during last three months before the survey was more than two-thirds in Assam (74%), Goa (70%) and Maharashtra (69%). The proportion was as low as two percent in Tamil Nadu and four percent in Sikkim. This proportion is higher among clients of brothel-based FSWs compared to non-brothel area.

A very small proportion (13%) of respondents reported consistent condom use while having sex with their regular partner in last three months. About one-third of the respondents in Assam (34%), Delhi and Maharashtra (33%) reported consistent condom use with regular partners in last three months, followed by Andhra Pradesh (21%).

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

More than half of the respondents (59%) reported that they themselves decided to use a condom last time with commercial partner. This proportion was highest in Jammu & Kashmir (93%), followed by Uttarakhand (82%), Madhya Pradesh and Other North Eastern States (76%). The proportion of respondents who reported that condom use was their own decision was significantly high among clients from non-brothel area as compared to those from brothel area. About one-fourth of the respondents having sex with commercial partners in last three months reported that their partner had suggested to use condom.

The proportion of respondents who themselves decided to use a condom during sex with commercial, non-regular and regular partner was reported to be 59 percent, 56 percent and 51 percent respectively. Nearly three-fourths of the respondents in Karnataka, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal reported that they themselves suggested condom use during last sex with non-regular partners, with highest proportion reported in Chhattisgarh (91%). Further, less than one-fourth of respondents in Orissa (22%), Himachal Pradesh (19%) and Sikkim (5%) reported self-suggested condom use with non-regular partner.

Proportion of respondents who reported suggested condom use themselves with regular partner was highest in Haryana, Other North Eastern States and Karnataka, while lowest in Sikkim and Himachal Pradesh. The proportion of joint decision of condom use was reported to be high in Sikkim and Himachal Pradesh. (Table 3.27).

3.5.10 Type of Condom Brands Used at Last Sex with Commercial/Non-regular/Regular Female Partner

Table 3.28 presents the various brands of condom used during last sex with commercial/non-regular/regular partners. To confirm the type of condom brands used, the interviewer showed the package covers of all popular brands to the respondents.

Overall, about one-third (34%) of the respondents interviewed reported use of Nirodh brand followed by nearly one-fourth (24%) who reported use of Delux Nirodh brand of condom with their commercial partners. There was a noticeable variation in the use of Nirodh brand of condom with commercial partners across different states. It was reported to be highest in Chhattisgarh (64%), Bihar (56%) and Karnataka (50%) and less than one-fifth in Uttar Pradesh (17%), Orissa (13%) and Jammu & Kashmir (6%).

Table 3.27: Percentage distribution of respondents by person who suggested condom use during last sex with commercial/non-regular/regular female partner

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	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	47.0	37.8	15.1	50.0	20.5	29.5	42.1	15.8	42.1
2.	Assam	70.0	11.9	18.1	72.0	16.0	12.0	74.7	4.6	20.7
3.	Bihar	51.6	24.0	24.4	46.7	33.3	20.0	69.4	19.4	11.1
4.	Delhi	27.5	50.4	22.1	41.7	22.2	36.1	49.2	11.9	39.0
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	66.2	31.2	2.5	26.9	30.8	42.3	61.1	38.9	0.0
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	53.4	31.6	14.1	59.0	20.5	20.5	58.9	11.1	28.9
7.	Haryana	58.1	31.5	9.9	64.0	16.0	20.0	82.5	1.6	15.9
8.	Himachal Pradesh	68.5	6.8	24.7	19.2	7.7	73.1	22.6	0.0	74.2
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	93.3	2.9	3.8	54.9	11.8	33.3	38.1	11.9	50.0
10.	Karnataka	49.2	33.3	16.3	75.0	8.8	13.2	75.0	15.0	10.0
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	39.8	43.2	16.1	54.5	18.2	27.3	37.5	12.5	50.0
12.	Madhya Pradesh	75.9	16.9	7.2	60.0	13.3	26.7	47.5	1.7	50.8
13.	Maharashtra	63.8	15.2	20.6	63.2	10.3	26.4	60.5	13.6	25.9
14.	Manipur	54.2	30.0	15.4	36.2	21.3	42.6	44.4	18.5	37.0
15.	Orissa	55.5	28.9	15.2	22.2	44.4	33.3	31.3	31.3	37.5
16.	Other North Eastern States	75.7	10.3	14.0	70.0	18.0	12.0	77.4	6.5	16.1
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	60.4	19.4	20.3	67.5	25.0	7.5	34.1	9.8	56.1
18.	Rajasthan	55.2	29.8	15.1	65.2	8.7	26.1	59.1	4.5	36.4
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	73.9	14.3	11.7	62.5	16.7	20.8	62.5	12.5	25.0
20.	Uttar Pradesh	55.4	35.8	8.8	75.0	0.0	25.0	71.7	2.2	26.1
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	31.8	44.8	23.4	75.0	25.0	0.0	51.6	16.1	32.3
22.	Jharkhand	58.2	19.1	22.3	56.5	23.9	19.6	41.3	21.7	37.0
23.	Chhattisgarh	70.7	19.0	10.2	90.9	9.1	0.0	59.4	2.9	36.2
24.	Sikkim	25.3	10.5	64.2	5.3	21.1	73.7	2.6	2.6	94.7
25.	Uttarakhand	81.6	11.7	6.6	33.3	22.2	44.4	46.7	15.0	38.3
All India (2006)		58.6	25.4	15.8	56.3	17.2	26.3	51.0	9.7	39.0
CI		53.2 – 64.0	20.6 – 30.2	11.8 – 19.8	50.8 – 61.8	13.0 – 21.4	21.4 – 31.2	45.5 – 56.5	6.4 – 13.0	33.6 – 44.4
All India (2001)		66	23.6	10.4	53.8	14.2	31.7	52.2	7.3	40.3
Client-Brothel Based (2006)		49.5	33.0	17.4	59.8	15.5	24.7	56.0	10.5	33.3
Client-Non-brothel Based (2006)		63.2	21.5	14.9	54.9	17.9	26.9	48.3	9.4	42.1

*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 3.28: Percentage distribution of respondents by type of condom brands used at last sex with commercial/non-regular/regular female partner

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	With commercial female partner*			With non-regular female partner**			With regular female partner***		
		Nirodh	Delux Nirodh	Kamasutra	Kohinoor	Nirodh	Kamasutra	Delux Nirodh	Nirodh	Kohinoor
1.	Andhra Pradesh	47.0	45.4	6.0	0.8	31.8	4.5	56.8	45.6	2.3
2.	Assam	49.6	11.5	18.8	11.2	48.0	24.0	2.0	58.6	20.0
3.	Bihar	55.6	12.4	3.1	5.8	53.3	6.7	0.0	41.7	0.0
4.	Delhi	29.4	48.1	5.3	5.7	41.7	11.1	22.2	39.0	5.6
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	40.8	17.2	22.3	4.5	11.5	26.9	30.8	22.2	11.5
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	35.5	17.9	15.4	11.5	17.9	23.1	33.3	17.9	7.7
7.	Haryana	36.9	18.0	1.8	6.8	32.0	0.0	24.0	20.6	0.0
8.	Himachal Pradesh	22.4	20.5	14.6	20.1	3.8	19.2	15.4	35.5	19.2
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	5.8	22.1	12.5	15.9	5.9	17.6	21.6	7.1	19.6
10.	Karnataka	50.4	23.2	15.4	2.4	61.8	20.6	11.8	55.0	2.9
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	26.7	20.8	22.5	9.7	9.1	27.3	18.2	20.8	9.1
12.	Madhya Pradesh	27.7	14.4	5.6	13.8	20.0	10.0	20.0	16.9	20.0
13.	Maharashtra	31.1	20.2	11.3	6.6	10.3	12.6	23.0	29.6	14.9
14.	Manipur	37.9	14.1	18.5	9.3	2.1	6.4	25.5	37.0	19.1
15.	Orissa	13.3	24.2	10.4	12.8	0.0	11.1	11.1	12.5	11.1
16.	Other North Eastern States	26.6	19.2	22.9	19.6	38.0	16.0	20.0	54.8	20.0
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	34.8	14.5	9.3	10.1	17.5	22.5	15.0	19.5	12.5
18.	Rajasthan	38.1	25.8	7.9	5.2	26.1	21.7	30.4	22.7	8.7
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	27.8	13.0	21.7	11.3	20.8	33.3	16.7	0.0	8.3
20.	Uttar Pradesh	17.2	43.1	2.0	6.4	0.0	25.0	75.0	28.3	0.0
21.	Chhattisgarh	63.9	5.4	6.3	7.8	59.1	13.6	0.0	66.7	9.1
22.	Uttarakhand	22.4	41.8	6.1	7.1	27.8	5.6	38.9	25.0	16.7
23.	Jharkhand	51.8	7.3	12.7	7.7	43.5	6.5	6.5	30.4	10.9
24.	Sikkim	11.6	25.3	14.7	3.2	21.1	26.3	31.6	13.2	5.3
25.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	13.0	60.4	2.1	6.3	0.0	0.0	37.5	9.7	50.0
All India (2006)		33.6	23.6	11.7	8.8	26.9	15.5	21.4	32.1	12.2
CI		28.4 – 38.8	18.9 – 28.3	8.2 – 15.2	5.7 – 11.9	22.0 – 1.8	11.5 – 19.5	16.9 – 25.9	27.0 – 37.2	8.6 – 15.8
All India (2001)		31.5	25.2	15.1	12.5	21.5	21.1	21.1	29.4	16.8
Client-Brothel Based (2006)		36.7	33.2	5.8	5.3	27.2	27.6	11.3	39.2	10.0
Client-Non-brothel Based (2006)		32.1	18.7	14.7	10.6	26.7	18.9	17.2	28.3	13.1

*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

Note: Due to other responses in the question total percentage does not add up to 100.

Table 3.29: Percentage distribution of respondents by source of condom used at last sex with commercial/non-regular/regular female partner

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	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	43.0	28.3	9.6	63.6	0.0	2.3	47.4	26.3	0.0
2.	Assam	11.2	38.1	23.5	60.0	8.0	2.0	33.3	44.8	20.7
3.	Bihar	52.4	29.8	8.9	46.7	13.3	13.3	50.0	27.8	11.1
4.	Delhi	72.5	23.7	0.0	88.9	0.0	0.0	71.2	13.6	0.0
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	45.9	43.3	6.4	80.8	3.8	7.7	94.4	0.0	5.6
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	32.5	28.2	12.4	35.9	10.3	28.2	55.6	24.4	3.3
7.	Haryana	28.8	55.9	1.4	60.0	12.0	0.0	76.2	12.7	1.6
8.	Himachal Pradesh	8.7	71.2	1.4	88.5	0.0	3.8	77.4	16.1	0.0
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	2.4	59.1	3.4	76.5	5.9	2.0	81.0	2.4	4.8
10.	Karnataka	33.7	48.8	2.0	38.2	7.4	0.0	40.0	30.0	0.0
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	36.4	48.3	1.7	72.7	0.0	0.0	50.0	20.8	0.0
12.	Madhya Pradesh	20.0	39.5	20.0	56.7	30.0	6.7	62.7	3.4	11.9
13.	Maharashtra	35.8	32.3	17.1	52.9	20.7	3.4	49.4	21.0	11.1
14.	Manipur	44.9	41.0	0.9	80.9	0.0	10.6	55.6	14.8	0.0
15.	Orissa	18.5	43.1	34.1	66.7	22.2	0.0	50.0	12.5	0.0
16.	Other North Eastern States	7.5	58.4	10.7	62.0	2.0	22.0	64.5	6.5	12.9
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	29.5	37.9	4.0	52.5	7.5	2.5	68.3	14.6	0.0
18.	Rajasthan	40.5	41.7	7.1	73.9	21.7	0.0	63.6	18.2	4.5
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	40.0	27.0	18.3	25.0	41.7	4.2	37.5	0.0	0.0
20.	Uttar Pradesh	47.1	42.2	5.4	75.0	0.0	0.0	82.6	30.4	6.5
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	7.3	80.7	2.1	12.5	25.0	0.0	22.6	3.2	0.0
22.	Jharkhand	36.4	29.5	11.4	54.3	15.2	2.2	56.5	6.5	13.0
23.	Chhattisgarh	33.7	24.9	16.6	40.9	4.5	13.6	46.4	30.4	8.7
24.	Uttarakhand	47.1	42.2	5.4	50.0	0.0	11.1	45.0	28.3	6.7
25.	Sikkim	11.6	0.0	8.4	21.1	15.8	0.0	2.6	90.8	3.9
All India (2006)		38.6	33.4	9.6	58.2	10.0	6.1	53.4	23.3	6.8
CI		33.2 – 44.0	28.0 – 38.6	6.4 – 2.8	52.8 – 63.6	6.7 – 13.3	3.5 – 8.7	47.9 – 58.9	18.6 – 28.0	4.0 – 9.6
All India (2001)		42.2	32.5	11.7	60.4	14.5	7.9	61.3	14.8	9.4
Client-Brothel Based (2006)		30.0	49.5	8.4	59.8	11.7	3.8	54.5	19.2	6.3
Client-Non-brothel Based (2006)		42.9	25.1	10.3	57.6	9.4	7.0	52.8	25.5	7.1

*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

Note: Due to other responses in the question total percentage does not add up to 100.

As compared to BSS 2001, no significant change was observed in different brands of condoms used and also between clients from brothel area and those from non-brothel area. With regard to the use of brands of condoms used with non-regular partners, the highest proportion of respondents (27%) reported use of Nirodh condom. While in Orissa and Uttar Pradesh no respondent reported use of Nirodh brand during sex with non-regular partners.

Nearly one-third (32%) of the respondents reported use of Nirodh brand of condom with regular partner followed by one-fifth (21%) who reported use of Delux Nirodh brand. Inter-state variation indicated that the proportion of respondents who used Nirodh with regular partners was significantly high in Chhattisgarh (67%), followed by Assam (59%), Karnataka and Other North Eastern States (55%) and lowest in Tamil Nadu (0%), Jammu & Kashmir (7%) and Orissa (13%).

3.5.11 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 3.29) More than one-third (39%) of the respondents reported the Chemist shop as the source during last sex with commercial partner. A similar proportion (33%) of respondents obtained condom used at last sex from the person they had sex with. A significant difference was observed in the proportion of respondents from brothel area and non-brothel area who obtained condom from a chemist shop and commercial partner.

Nearly three-fifths (58%) of the respondents who had sex with non-regular partner reported 'chemist shop' as a source of condom, about 10 percent obtained condom from a 'pan shop' and only six percent reported 'friend' as a source of procuring condom. The proportion of respondents reporting chemist shop as a source ranged from 89 percent in Delhi and Himachal Pradesh and as low as 13 percent in West Bengal.

A significant proportion (53%) of 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 and pan shop. 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 94 percent in Goa and 83 percent in Uttar Pradesh to as low as three percent in Sikkim followed by 23 percent in West Bengal.

3.5.12 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 partners were further asked the reason for not using condom last time. Table 3.30 presents the findings of three main reasons for not using condom last time.

The main reason reported for not using a condom last time was 'think unnecessary' for commercial (30%), non-regular (20%) and regular (39%) partners. The other reasons for not using a condom with commercial partner were 'decreases pleasure' (16%) and 'don't like condoms' (14%).

Table 3.30 indicates considerable variations in reported reasons for not using condom across different states. A major proportion of respondents in Bihar (58%), Orissa (52%) and Manipur (51%) 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 most of the respondents in Andhra Pradesh, Goa, Karnataka and Rajasthan

Table 3.30: Percentage distribution of respondents by reasons for not using condom at last sex with commercial/non-regular/regular female partner

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	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
1.	Andhra Pradesh	23.5	47.1	17.6	8.3	45.8	33.3	32.7	5.3
2.	Assam	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	9.1	36.4	55.2	6.0
3.	Bihar	58.1	14.0	18.6	38.5	30.8	23.1	49.3	26.1
4.	Delhi	33.3	6.7	33.3	16.1	16.1	22.6	50.8	21.5
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	33.3	33.3	33.3	28.6	42.9	28.6	51.4	22.2
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	26.5	23.5	26.5	22.6	15.1	24.5	34.5	31.9
7.	Haryana	20.5	18.2	20.5	9.3	14.0	9.3	32.7	14.4
8.	Himachal Pradesh	28.0	6.0	28.0	23.8	4.8	19.0	17.6	26.4
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	23.0	14.8	23.0	15.2	12.1	4.5	20.7	27.2
10.	Karnataka	0.0	46.7	26.7	5.6	11.1	33.3	43.1	10.5
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	14.7	32.4	17.6	6.3	12.5	15.6	75.4	4.4
12.	Madhya Pradesh	8.3	22.2	25.0	11.3	20.8	15.1	31.9	21.8
13.	Maharashtra	30.0	20.0	0.0	2.1	16.7	6.3	47.7	16.3
14.	Manipur	51.3	2.6	2.6	23.8	16.7	2.4	41.1	20.0
15.	Orissa	51.7	3.4	19.0	39.0	26.8	9.8	42.2	25.9
16.	Other North Eastern States	22.2	16.7	16.7	22.7	33.3	19.7	52.4	33.0
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	39.2	13.7	0.0	16.3	9.3	2.3	28.3	35.3
18.	Rajasthan	22.2	25.9	37.0	8.3	25.0	8.3	36.2	19.5
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	15.2	0.0	15.2	4.3	31.2	5.4	44.7	2.4
20.	Uttar Pradesh	47.8	25.4	9.0	8.3	25.0	14.8	32.0	22.1
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	22.2	25.9	22.2	25.0	37.5	28.3	33.0	8.5
22.	Uttarakhand	33.3	11.1	4.2	10.0	10.0	2.7	30.9	9.1
23.	Chhattisgarh	24.2	4.8	3.2	26.7	20.0	4.4	27.8	34.4
24.	Jharkhand	34.9	20.9	7.0	13.3	6.7	8.1	28.8	34.2
25.	Sikkim	22.7	27.3	9.1	16.7	33.3	33.3	16.7	16.7
All India (2006)		15.9	13.7	29.7	15.9	20.0	13.0	38.9	19.6
CI		11.9 – 19.9	9.9 – 17.5	24.7 – 34.7	11.9 – 19.9	15.6 – 24.4	9.3 – 16.7	33.5 – 44.3	15.2 – 24.0
All India (2001)		51.3	37.9	36.8	48.1	47.6	36.9	52.2	42.8
Client-Brothel Based (2006)		36.1	19.3	14.2	12.9	22.1	16.6	38.4	18.4
Client-Non-brothel Based (2001)		27.2	14.5	13.5	16.6	19.5	12.1	39.1	20.2

*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

Note: Due to other responses to the question total percentage does not add up to 100.

for not using condom with commercial partner. As far as reasons for not using condom with non-regular partners is concerned, a significant proportion of respondents, who did not use condom last time with non-regular partners, in Orissa and Bihar (39%), Goa (29%) and Chhattisgarh (27%) mentioned decrease of sexual pleasure as the main reason. The main reasons reported for not using condom with regular partner were “didn’t think necessary” (39%) and ‘decreases pleasure’ (20%). No significant difference was observed among clients from brothel area and non- brothel area.

3.6 Other Salient Observations

3.6.1 Risk Perception of Getting Infected with HIV/AIDS

All respondents were asked to measure their perception of getting HIV/AIDS infection against a four-point scale varying from “very high” to “no chance”. The responses are presented in Table 3.31. About one-fifth (22%) of the respondents perceived ‘very high’ chances of getting HIV infection. Almost equal proportion of respondents reported ‘moderate chance’ (25%), ‘low chance’ (26%) and ‘no chance’ (24%) of contracting HIV infection. The proportion of respondents who perceived very high chances of contracting HIV infection has increased significantly from BSS 2001 (13%).

Table 3.31: Percentage distribution of respondents by perception regarding risk of contracting HIV/AIDS

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Very high		Moderate		Low		No chance	
		2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	47.4	1.1	16.0	8.3	25.0	35.7	11.6	54.9
2.	Assam	15.2	7.0	22.6	35.1	20.4	38.0	41.5	19.9
3.	Bihar	14.5	8.0	19.7	11.1	25.3	43.6	36.4	37.4
4.	Delhi	40.1	36.4	34.3	21.6	12.6	18.6	11.2	23.4
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	6.3	5.9	25.0	18.1	35.6	43.3	32.5	32.6
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	5.2	9.4	10.0	15.2	42.1	41.4	30.3	34.0
7.	Haryana	7.4	6.3	16.3	24.0	19.3	35.4	54.4	34.3
8.	Himachal Pradesh	48.9	2.2	27.8	1.9	13.7	30.0	2.6	65.9
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	54.8	14	24.6	14.9	11.0	22.3	7.7	48.8
10.	Karnataka	15.1	30.1	25.8	17.1	44.6	33.8	11.4	19.0
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	26.7	5.9	29.6	20.4	18.1	30.0	25.2	43.7
12.	Madhya Pradesh	12.4	16.8	22.8	26.1	24.7	24.6	35.2	32.5
13.	Maharashtra	33.5	13.0	29.0	18.9	16.4	35.2	16.4	33.0
14.	Manipur	13.3	8.6	15.9	23.2	38.9	48.7	31.9	19.5
15.	Orissa	12.2	24.6	24.1	15.2	34.4	19.2	28.9	40.9
16.	Other North Eastern States	11.2	14.6	18.8	23.1	25.2	31.0	35.6	31.3
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	17.3	5.5	47.8	15.0	18.0	33.3	14.7	46.2
18.	Rajasthan	15.2	3.4	23.0	27.0	31.9	24.7	29.1	44.9
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	12.9	16.9	45.5	50.6	36.4	23.2	4.5	9.4
20.	Uttar Pradesh	27.3	29.2	24.0	15.7	19.6	17.6	13.5	37.5
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	28.2	13.0	21.8	29.9	23.2	29.2	23.6	27.8
22.	Jharkhand	11.1		17.4		31.1		38.5	
23.	Chhattisgarh	16.9		19.9		18.0		42.3	
24.	Sikkim	8.4		47.9		38.7		5.0	

(Contd.)

(Contd.)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Very high		Moderate		Low		No chance	
		2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001
25.	Uttarakhand	28.9		37.0		19.6		12.6	
All India		21.5	12.9	25.2	20.6	25.9	31.5	24.2	35
CI		17.0 – 26.0		20.4 – 30.0		21.1 – 30.7		19.5 – 28.9	
Client-Brothel Based		27.4	18.2	23.6	19.6	22.8	29.0	22.6	33.2
Client-Non-brothel Based		18.6	9.5	26.0	21.2	27.4	33.1	25.0	36.1

Base: All respondents

Nearly half of the respondents in Jammu & Kashmir (55%) and Himachal Pradesh (49%) reported a very high chance of getting HIV infection. This proportion was reported to be less than 10 percent in Sikkim (8%), Haryana (7%), followed by Goa (6%) and Gujarat (5%). A significant proportion of respondents in Sikkim and Punjab (48%) and Tamil Nadu (46%) felt they had a moderate chance of contracting HIV/AIDS.

“No chances” was perceived by more than half (54%) of the respondents in Haryana followed by Chhattisgarh and Assam (42%) and Jharkhand (39%) and lowest in Himachal Pradesh (3%) and Tamil Nadu and Sikkim (5%). Perception of ‘very high’ chance of contracting HIV/AIDS is higher among clients of brothel based FSWs (27%) than clients of non-brothel based FSWs (19%).

3.6.2 Testing for HIV

Nearly three-fourths (72%) of the respondents reported that it was possible to get a confidential test to find out if they were HIV infected. 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 53 to 91 percent except for Sikkim (20%). (Table 3.32).

Overall, 14 percent of the respondents reported having undergone any HIV test, with more than one-fourth in Karnataka (31%), Manipur and Maharashtra (28%) and highest proportion of respondents was reported in Andhra Pradesh (40%). Greater proportion of clients of brothel based FSWs have ever had HIV test (18%) than clients of non-brothel based FSW.





Table 3.32: Percentage of respondents who reported possibility of confidential HIV testing, ever had HIV test and found out result

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Possibility of confidential HIV testing		Ever had HIV test		Voluntary/Required HIV test *				Ever found out result of test*	
		2006	2001	2006	2001	Voluntary		Required		2006	2001
						2006	2001	2006	2001		
1.	Andhra Pradesh	81.0	57.8	39.6	6.9	53.8	73.7	46.2	26.3	96.2	100.0
2.	Assam	82.2	56.5	4.8	6.6	84.6	100.0	15.4	0.0	100.0	100.0
3.	Bihar	58.7	59.5	18.6	2.1	92.0	66.7	6.0	33.3	100.0	100.0
4.	Delhi	63.5	76.2	13.4	10.8	54.1	75.9	29.7	24.1	64.9	93.1
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	69.4	83.7	21.3	32.6	67.6	86.4	32.4	13.6	94.1	97.7
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	78.6	67.3	13.7	7.7	86.5	56.5	13.5	43.5	91.9	87.0
7.	Haryana	91.1	67.2	17.8	2.2	93.8	100.0	6.3	0.0	95.8	83.3
8.	Himachal Pradesh	83.7	80.9	5.2	1.1	78.6	100.0	21.4	0.0	92.9	100.0
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	60.3	80.9	12.5	4.7	91.2	80.0	8.8	20.0	88.2	20.0
10.	Karnataka	64.6	75.1	31.4	18.2	89.4	77.6	10.6	22.4	92.9	100.0
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	73.3	57.0	16.3	9.6	53.3	65.4	42.2	34.6	88.9	96.2
12.	Madhya Pradesh	56.2	74.3	5.2	10.7	85.7	56.7	7.1	43.3	100.0	83.3
13.	Maharashtra	82.9	85.2	27.9	22.2	93.3	95.0	6.7	5.0	93.3	98.3
14.	Manipur	75.2	63.7	27.8	7.5	61.3	55.0	38.7	45.0	94.7	95.0
15.	Orissa	73.3	78.6	5.9	3.6	68.8	60.0	31.3	40.0	100.0	80.0
16.	Other North Eastern States	53.2	45.9	10.4	7.1	34.6	94.7	57.7	5.3	57.7	100.0
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	76.3	75.8	8.6	5.9	83.3	75.0	16.7	25.0	95.8	93.8
18.	Rajasthan	90.1	73.0	15.2	4.5	88.4	75.0	11.6	25.0	95.3	91.7
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	60.6	80.5	19.3	43.8	52.9	92.3	47.1	7.7	90.2	100.0
20.	Uttar Pradesh	81.5	68.9	1.5	6.4	100.0	82.4	0.0	17.6	100.0	88.2
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	74.5	42.6	21.4	4.6	85.1	92.3	14.9	7.7	89.4	92.3
22.	Jharkhand	61.5		5.6		80.0		13.3		80.0	
23.	Chhattisgarh	83.1		9.7		65.4		34.6		61.5	
24.	Sikkim	20.2		8.4		80.0		20.0		40.0	
25.	Uttarakhand	81.9		4.4		41.7		58.3		100.0	
All India		72.1	68.9	14.4	10.4	74.0	81.7	24.6	18.3	90.2	94.8
CI		67.2 – 77.0		10.5 – 18.3		69.2 – 78.8		19.9 – 29.3		86.9 – 93.5	
Client-Brothel Based		75.6	70.9	17.9	11.5	75.3	82.2	22.9	17.8	90.0	94.1
Client-Non-brothel Based		70.4	67.6	12.7	9.7	73.0	81.4	25.7	18.6	90.3	95.3

Base: All respondents

*Base: Those respondents who underwent HIV testing



The proportion of respondents who had undergone voluntary testing was more than 90 percent in Haryana (94%), Maharashtra (93%), Bihar (92%) and Jammu & Kashmir (91%) and all respondents in Uttar Pradesh. A significantly higher proportion (90%) of respondents who had undergone HIV test, reported to have got the result of their test.

3.6.3 Exposure to STI/HIV/AIDS Programme Interventions in the Last One Year

All the respondents were asked whether they had attended any STI/HIV/AIDS intervention programme in the last one year and the proportion of those who attended any are presented in Table 3.33. Nearly one-third (against one-fifth in BSS 2001) of the respondents reported that they have received interpersonal communication on STI/HIV/AIDS. This proportion was reported to be above 50 percent in Manipur (69%), Andhra Pradesh (61%), followed by West Bengal (57%), Karnataka (52%) and Gujarat (51%). The exposure was reported as low as eight percent in Madhya Pradesh.

The Proportion of clients from brothel area (39%) who received interpersonal communication on STI/HIV/AIDS was higher than that from non-brothel area. (29%)


3.6.4 Heard of ICTC, PPTCT and ART Centre

Overall, more than one-third (38%) of the respondents interviewed had heard about ICTC, while only 17 percent were aware of PPTCT and only nine percent had heard of ART centre. The proportion of respondents aware of ICTC was highest in Manipur (87%), followed by Tamil Nadu (69%), Andhra Pradesh (67%), Karnataka (57%) and lowest in Punjab (11%), Uttarakhand (12%) and Haryana (15%).

A significantly high proportion of respondents in Manipur (63%) had heard of PPTCT. This proportion ranged from as high as 49 percent in Andhra Pradesh to one percent in Haryana and Orissa. A very low proportion of respondents were aware of ART centres and this ranged from 0.4 percent to 27 percent across states. No significant difference was observed between the clients from brothel and non-brothel area with respect to the awareness about ICTC, PPTCT and ART centres.

Attitude towards HIV Testing

Figure 3.14: Percentage of clients of FSWs who have ever had HIV test: State-wise, 2006



Base: All respondents

Table 3.33: Percentage of respondents who received interpersonal communication on STD/HIV/AIDS in the last one year

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Interpersonal communication on STI/ HIV/AIDS	
		2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	60.8	22.0
2.	Assam	15.9	4.4
3.	Bihar	33.8	5.2
4.	Delhi	36.1	42.0
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	25.0	28.5
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	51.3	24.2
7.	Haryana	21.1	10.3
8.	Himachal Pradesh	20.0	22.8
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	15.4	24.2
10.	Karnataka	51.7	20.4
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	35.6	23.3
12.	Madhya Pradesh	7.9	13.6
13.	Maharashtra	29.7	17.8
14.	Manipur	69.3	31.1
15.	Orissa	14.8	37.0
16.	Other North Eastern States	21.6	19.4
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	16.5	12.5
18.	Rajasthan	45.0	10.1
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	18.9	31.1
20.	Uttar Pradesh	16.0	17.2
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	57.3	19.4
22.	Jharkhand	41.5	
23.	Chhattisgarh	39.0	
24.	Sikkim	12.6	
25.	Uttarakhand	23.0	
All India		32.0	20.7
CI		26.9 – 37.1	
Client-Brothel Based		38.6	22.4
Client-Non-brothel Based		28.7	19.6

Base: All respondents




Table 3.34: Percentage of respondents who had ever heard of ICTC, PPTCT and ART centre

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Heard of ICTC	Heard of PPTCT	Heard of ART centre
1.	Andhra Pradesh	67.2	48.9	10.8
2.	Assam	30.4	14.8	2.2
3.	Bihar	30.5	12.4	8.9
4.	Delhi	30.3	21.5	5.1
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	48.5	9.6	27.4
6.	Gujarat	47.9	12.8	14.0
7.	Haryana	14.6	0.7	1.5
8.	Himachal Pradesh	55.4	6.7	0.7
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	24.2	4.5	1.1
10.	Karnataka	56.5	36.2	26.6
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	54.0	23.4	23.3
12.	Madhya Pradesh	16.0	6.7	9.0
13.	Maharashtra	49.4	39.8	26.8
14.	Manipur	87.0	63.0	22.6
15.	Orissa	20.2	1.1	2.2
16.	Other North Eastern States	31.8	18.9	2.6
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	11.2	2.2	0.7
18.	Rajasthan	55.9	11.4	9.9
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	68.8	19.8	6.8
20.	Uttar Pradesh	20.4	1.6	0.4
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	44.8	8.1	3.0
22.	Jharkhand	26.6	15.4	5.6
23.	Chhattisgarh	20.9	14.8	13.5
24.	Sikkim	21.8	9.2	2.5
25.	Uttarakhand	11.7	2.6	0.7
All India (2006)		38.3	16.5	9.2
CI		32.9 – 43.7	12.4 – 20.6	6.0 – 12.4
Client-Brothel Based (2006)		40.2	20.0	9.7
Client-Non-brothel Based (2006)		37.4	14.8	9.0

Base: All respondents



Female Sex Workers

4.1 Background

Being identified as the critical group in HIV/AIDS transmission, Female Sex Workers (FSWs) are one of the key target groups for any intervention project. The National BSS 2001 as well as BSS 2006 among high risk and bridge groups thus had undertaken a detailed study of this population, in terms of their demographic profile, their awareness of STDs and HIV/AIDS, prevalence of STDs among the FSWs, their treatment seeking behaviour, their sexual behaviour and condom usage, beside other salient observations pertaining to their risk behaviour and knowledge of transmission 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.

4.2 Profile of the FSWs

This section presents the socio-economic 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 and drugs.

4.2.1 Age Distribution

The age distribution of the FSWs presented in Table 4.1 shows that about half of the respondents covered in both BSS 2006 as well as BSS 2001 were aged between 20-29 years. About five percent of the respondents in BSS 2006 against eight percent in BSS 2001 were aged 15-20 years. The median age of the respondents was 28 years in BSS 2006 and 27 years in BSS 2001.

Nearly half of the FSWs in Sikkim and Rajasthan against less than one-tenth in Tamil Nadu were aged 15-24 years. In majority of the states/group of states, the corresponding proportion varied between 20 and 40 percent. Overall, only around eight percent of the FSWs were aged over 40 years. The proportion of FSWs over 40 years was the highest in Kerala (23%).

4.2.2 Educational Profile

Overall, two-fifths of the FSWs covered in BSS 2006 were illiterate and more than half (55%) had studied up to X standard. Only three percent of the FSWs reported to have studied beyond X standard. The educational status of the non-brothel based FSWs was much better than that of the brothel based FSWs.

There existed wide variation in the educational status of the FSWs covered in BSS 2006 and BSS 2001. Against 61 percent of the FSWs in BSS 2001 only 42 percent of those covered in BSS 2006 were illiterate. The proportion of FSWs attaining education till V standard (2006-28%, 2001-21%) as well as till X standard (2006-27%, 2001-17%) was significantly higher in BSS 2006.

The proportion of illiterate FSWs was highest (60 to 74%) in Bihar, Jammu & Kashmir, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Andhra Pradesh and Orissa. The educational profile of the FSWs in states like Kerala, Tamil Nadu, Gujarat, Goa, Manipur and Other North Eastern States was much better than those of other states.

Table 4.1: Percentage distribution of respondents by age

(All figures except median age are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Age group (in years)					Median age (in years)	
		15-20	20-24	25-29	30-39	40-49	2006	2001
		2006	2006	2006	2006	2006		
1.	Andhra Pradesh	3.9	19.6	23.9	42.5	10.1	30	25
2.	Assam	0.7	23.7	37.4	33.7	4.4	27	26
3.	Bihar	12.1	27.6	25.0	28.7	6.6	26	25
4.	Delhi	4.8	27.1	35.5	26.7	5.5	27	26
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	1.1	9.3	40.3	45.5	3.7	29	24
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	0.7	10.9	35.1	48.9	4.3	30	29
7.	Haryana	5.2	12.2	26.3	41.9	14.4	30	29
8.	Himachal Pradesh	7.4	23.5	34.9	31.3	2.9	27	27
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	0.4	11.4	34.2	48.5	5.5	30	26
10.	Karnataka	4.4	20.4	22.6	41.9	10.7	30	28
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	3.3	10.8	20.1	43.1	22.7	32	34
12.	Madhya Pradesh	3.4	10.5	38.6	43.1	4.5	29	25
13.	Maharashtra	6.3	22.0	33.5	32.0	6.3	28	25
14.	Manipur	11.2	24.2	30.5	30.5	3.7	27	27
15.	Orissa	7.4	14.4	28.5	39.6	10.0	29	25
16.	Other North Eastern States	4.1	23.7	43.0	27.4	1.9	27	25
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	2.6	8.4	26.7	56.4	5.9	31	28
18.	Rajasthan	9.3	42.6	25.6	19.6	3.0	24	24
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	0.4	3.7	30.7	57.4	7.8	31	33
20.	Uttar Pradesh	2.2	16.8	27.4	43.8	9.9	30	30
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	4.4	19.1	25.9	38.7	11.9	30	27
22.	Jharkhand	7.8	32.1	29.9	26.5	3.7	26	
23.	Chhattisgarh	14.6	13.5	24.7	36.7	10.5	28	
24.	Sikkim	15.8	35.0	34.2	12.5	2.5	24	
25.	Uttarakhand	10.4	22.2	28.5	33.3	5.6	28	
All India (2006)		5.4	19.2	30.1	37.8	7.5	28	
CI		2.9–7.9	14.9–23.5	25.0–35.2	32.5–43.1	4.6–10.4	23–33	
All India (2001)		8.3	23.3	31.1	31.3	5.9	27	
Brothel Based		6.7	23.4	28.2	33.1	8.6	28	26
Non-brothel Based		4.9	17.4	31.0	39.8	7.0	29	28

Base: All respondents

Table 4.2: Percentage distribution of respondents by education level

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Education level									
		Illiterate ¹		Grade I-V		Grade VI-X		Grade XI- XII		Grade XII+	
		2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	65.9	44.8	19.2	31.2	13.6	21.9	0.9	1.8	0.4	0.4
2.	Assam	21.5	78.9	54.1	16.3	23.3	4.4	0.7	0.4	0.0	0.0
3.	Bihar	73.5	83.7	14.0	11.1	12.1	5.2	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0
4.	Delhi	52.4	67.7	24.2	20.4	22.3	11.9	0.7	0.0	0.4	0.0
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	19.8	63.3	35.8	17.0	38.1	18.5	4.5	0.4	0.7	0.7
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	19.2	61.5	45.7	20.8	30.1	15.3	2.5	2.1	0.7	0.3
7.	Haryana	42.6	57.4	23.7	24.4	29.3	17.0	3.3	0.4	1.1	0.7
8.	Himachal Pradesh	26.5	43.2	30.5	20.3	34.2	28.4	6.3	6.6	2.6	1.5
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	72.1	59.6	13.6	20.2	13.2	20.2	0.7	0.0	0.4	0.0
10.	Karnataka	49.3	48.3	29.6	25.5	19.3	23.6	1.1	2.2	0.7	0.4
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	17.8	15.2	30.9	34.1	44.6	45.6	4.1	3.0	1.9	2.2
12.	Madhya Pradesh	44.9	81.2	30.7	13.0	23.6	5.8	0.4	0.0	0.4	0.0
13.	Maharashtra	32.5	82.9	27.2	11.2	30.9	5.6	5.0	0.0	2.0	0.0
14.	Manipur	19.7	51.3	20.8	22.1	51.3	24.3	5.2	1.1	2.6	1.1
15.	Orissa	60.4	68.4	25.6	21.0	13.3	10.3	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.4
16.	Other North Eastern States	17.8	48.9	27.0	19.9	47.4	25.0	5.2	4.0	1.9	2.2
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	28.6	65.9	35.5	18.4	34.8	14.2	1.1	1.5	0.0	0.0
18.	Rajasthan	66.7	64.9	23.7	20.3	9.3	14.0	0.0	0.4	0.4	0.4
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	16.3	21.9	33.0	45.0	50.4	30.9	0.4	1.5	0.0	0.7
20.	Uttar Pradesh	66.8	89.7	17.5	7.7	15.0	2.6	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	52.2	78.0	28.3	12.1	18.0	9.6	1.1	0.0	0.2	0.4
22.	Jharkhand	42.5		28.0		27.2		2.2		0.0	
23.	Chhattisgarh	42.7		33.3		19.5		3.4		1.1	
24.	Sikkim	26.7		20.0		50.0		2.5		0.8	
25.	Uttarakhand	34.1		31.9		32.6		1.5		0.0	
All India (2006)		41.8		28.0		26.9		2.2		0.8	
CI		36.4 – 47.2		23.1 – 32.9		22.0 – 31.8		0.6 – 3.8		0.0 – 1.8	
All India (2001)		61.0		20.5		16.7		1.2		0.6	
Brothel Based		58.0	76.9	24.1	14.1	16.3	8.6	0.8	0.0	0.3	0.2
Non-brothel Based		35.0	50.5	29.6	24.7	31.3	22.0	2.8	2.0	1.0	0.8

Base: All respondents

¹ Includes those respondents who are literate but don't have formal education

4.2.3 Marital Status of the Respondents

Overall, more than two-thirds (69%) of the FSWs covered in BSS 2006 were ever married. The corresponding percentage in BSS 2001 was relatively lower at 62 percent. The proportion of non-brothel based sex workers who had ever been married was higher (72%) than brothel based sex workers (62%).

Of all the states, the proportion of ever married FSWs was highest in Haryana (91%) followed by Punjab, Gujarat, Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir and Tamil Nadu (83-86%). Less than two-fifths of the respondents in Delhi, Assam and Rajasthan were reportedly ever married. The proportion of ever married FSWs covered in the two rounds of the survey differed substantially in the states of Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Orissa and Assam (Table 4.3).


Table 4.3: Percentage distribution of respondents by marital status and age at marriage

(All figures except median age are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Ever married %		Age at marriage (in years)*					Median age at marriage (in years)*	
				Up to 15	15-18	19-21	22-25	> 25		
		2006	2001	2006	2006	2006	2006	2006	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	84.7	59.1	40.7	40.3	17.4	1.1	0.4	16	18
2.	Assam	39.3	83.7	2.8	17.0	35.8	19.8	24.5	21	16
3.	Bihar	65.8	53.1	28.5	53.6	15.1	2.8	0.0	17	16
4.	Delhi	37.7	46.5	7.8	46.6	32.0	13.6	0.0	18	17
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	74.3	56.7	8.5	22.1	47.7	17.1	4.5	20	16
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	85.5	78.5	3.0	27.5	53.8	14.0	1.7	20	18
7.	Haryana	90.7	84.1	22.0	53.5	22.0	2.4	0.0	17	17
8.	Himachal Pradesh	73.2	77.9	11.6	49.7	26.1	12.1	0.5	18	19
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	84.6	92.1	6.5	47.0	28.3	14.3	3.9	18	19
10.	Karnataka	77.8	73.0	24.8	37.1	32.4	3.8	1.9	18	19
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	81.4	75.6	15.1	39.7	28.3	13.7	3.2	18	19
12.	Madhya Pradesh	84.6	37.0	15.0	69.0	14.6	1.3	0.0	17	17
13.	Maharashtra	52.7	38.7	5.3	54.7	29.1	9.5	1.4	18	16
14.	Manipur	61.3	53.2	8.5	28.5	32.1	23.6	7.3	20	20
15.	Orissa	77.8	52.2	20.0	48.6	25.2	4.8	1.4	18	16
16.	Other North Eastern States	45.9	45.2	7.3	23.4	34.7	29.0	5.6	20	19
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	86.4	81.6	3.4	22.0	50.8	22.9	0.8	20	18
18.	Rajasthan	39.3	42.8	22.6	40.6	25.5	10.4	0.9	18	16
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	83.0	84.4	0.9	21.0	54.9	23.2	0.0	20	20
20.	Uttar Pradesh	56.6	30.8	47.7	41.3	10.3	0.6	0.0	16	19
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	80.4	68.8	45.4	33.6	16.6	4.1	0.2	16	14
22.	Jharkhand	52.2		4.3	15.7	48.6	24.3	7.1	20	
23.	Chhattisgarh	76.8		21.5	48.8	21.0	8.3	0.5	17	
24.	Sikkim	53.3		0.0	20.3	53.1	25.0	1.6	20	
25.	Uttarakhand	59.6		8.7	46.0	29.2	14.3	1.9	18	
All India (2006)		69.0		18.2	39.3	29.6	10.8	2.1	18	
CI		25.9 – 36.1		13.9 – 22.5	33.9 – 44.7	24.6 – 34.6	7.4 – 14.2	0.5 – 3.7	14 – 22	
All India (2001)		61.8		22.9	36.5	28.2	10.7	1.6	18	
Brothel Based		61.5	48.1	32.0	45.2	16.9	5.3	0.4	17	16
Non-brothel Based		72.1	70.7	13.3	37.1	34.1	12.8	2.7	18	18

Base: All respondents for “Ever Married”

*Base: Married respondents for “Age at Marriage”



Against 32 percent of the brothel based FSWs, 13 percent of the non-brothel based FSWs were married before the age of 15. Considerably higher proportions of non-brothel based FSWs were married between the age of 19-21 years and 22-25 years as compared with brothel based FSWs.

Overall, the median age at first marriage of the FSWs was 18 years in both the surveys. In the states of Uttar Pradesh (48%), West Bengal (45%) and Andhra Pradesh (41%), the reported age at first marriage was less than 15 years for the FSWs. None of the sex workers in Sikkim and less than five percent in Jharkhand, Punjab, Gujarat, Assam and Tamil Nadu had married before the age of 15 years. The median age at marriage is highest in Assam (21 years) and lowest in Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal and Andhra Pradesh (16 years).

4.2.4 Status of Sexual Partnership

Table 4.4 indicates that at the all India level, three types of sexual partnership among FSWs are most common. These are 'currently married and presently living with spouse' (38%) followed by 'not currently married, not living with sexual partner' (29%) and 'currently married, not living with spouse or other sexual partner' (14%).

However, about 10 percent of the FSWs were 'currently married, living with other sexual partner' and eight percent 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 (42%) than brothel based FSWs (29%). However, the proportion of brothel based FSWs not currently married and not living with sexual partner was higher than non-brothel based FSWs (37% and 26% respectively).

The proportion of 'currently married and presently living with spouse' was significantly higher in BSS 2006 (2006-38%, 2001-29%) whereas the proportion of FSWs who were 'not currently married, not living with sexual partner' was significantly higher in BSS 2001 (2006-29%, 2001-38%).


The states where a high proportion of FSWs are not currently married and not living with any sexual partner were Delhi (77%), Rajasthan (62%) and Other North Eastern States (50%). The corresponding proportion was lower (11-14%) in the states of Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Punjab and

Table 4.4: Percentage distribution of respondents by status of sexual partnership

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Status of sexual partnership									
		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	
		2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	45.1	13.3	20.7	12.9	18.5	22.9	4.1	21.1	11	29.7
2.	Assam	26.7	50.7	3.0	4.1	8.5	23.0	16.7	6.7	37	15.6
3.	Bihar	35.7	33.3	2.9	1.4	8.1	10.1	10.7	3.1	42.6	52.1
4.	Delhi	5.9	3.3	1.8	2.2	7.0	23.4	8.1	2.2	76.6	68.8
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	54.1	3.0	8.2	5.2	7.1	45.9	6.7	8.9	22	37.0
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	57.2	50.0	9.1	3.1	2.5	11.8	17	6.3	13.4	28.8
7.	Haryana	66.3	54.1	3.3	3.3	5.6	23.0	4.4	0.7	20.0	18.9
8.	Himachal Pradesh	50	59.4	2.9	4.4	4.4	14.4	12.9	3.7	29.0	18.1
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	73.5	82.5	0.7	0.9	4.0	9.6	0.7	0.0	20.2	7.0
10.	Karnataka	28.9	31.1	18.5	16.1	25.2	18.4	5.2	8.6	16.3	25.8
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	27.1	15.9	12.6	20.7	34.2	27.0	3.7	13.0	21.6	23.3
12.	Madhya Pradesh	41.9	28.3	12.4	0.7	21.7	2.2	5.6	19.2	18.4	49.6
13.	Maharashtra	18.9	5.9	24.8	3.0	8.5	3.7	23.7	4.5	23.5	82.9
14.	Manipur	14.1	15.4	12.3	16.9	33.5	8.6	5.2	18.0	34.9	41.2
15.	Orissa	35.6	28.7	8.1	16.9	23	10.3	7.4	13.2	22.2	30.9
16.	Other North Eastern States	14.8	14.0	2.2	5.5	21.9	13.6	1.1	5.1	50.4	61.8
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	83.2	62.9	0.0	3.0	2.6	16.1	0.0	2.2	13.6	15.7
18.	Rajasthan	34.4	28.0	0.4	4.4	2.2	4.8	1.5	7.7	61.5	55.0
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	29.3	32.0	17.8	18.2	30.7	32.0	3.7	6.3	13.7	11.5
20.	Uttar Pradesh	38.3	16.5	2.6	2.6	5.5	12.1	6.6	5.9	47.1	63.0
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	32.6	6.7	22.2	17.0	21.7	9.9	4.8	25.2	18.1	41.1
22.	Jharkhand	34		6.0		6.7		7.1		44.4	
23.	Chhattisgarh	55.4		6.4		14.2		2.6		21.3	
24.	Sikkim	18.3		5.8		10		20.8		44.2	
25.	Uttarakhand	41.5		2.6		3.7		4.8		46.7	
All India (2006)		38.2		9.9		13.6		7.5		29.1	
CI		32.8 – 43.6		6.6 – 13.2		9.8 – 17.4		4.6 – 10.4		24.1 – 34.1	
All India (2001)		28.8		7.9		16.5		8.9		37.9	
Brothel Based		29	15.9	12.0	6.1	12.8	14.6	8.5	10.3	36.5	53.1
Non-brothel Based		42.1	37.2	9.0	9.1	13.9	17.7	7.1	8.0	26	28.1

Base: All respondents



Tamil Nadu. The proportion of the FSWs who were currently married and living with spouse was highest in Punjab (83%) followed by Jammu & Kashmir (74%), Haryana (66%) and Gujarat (57%).

4.2.5 Residential Status of the Respondents

Table 4.5 reveals that most of the FSWs covered in BSS 2001 (90%) as well as BSS 2006 (89%) were living in the same city/town where the interview was conducted.

Overall, about 41 percent of the FSWs in BSS 2006 (against 32% in BSS 2001) reported to be living in the city/town since birth, where the interview was conducted. This finding indicates a high degree of mobility among the FSWs. The proportion of respondents living in the city/town since birth, where the interview was conducted was highest in Rajasthan (69%) followed by Kerala (62%) and Jharkhand (60%) and lowest in West Bengal (9%) and Delhi (11%). A higher proportion of non-brothel based FSWs were living in the city/town since birth than brothel based FSWs (43% and 38% respectively).

Table 4.5: **Percentage distribution of respondents by residential status and mobility pattern**

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	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	
		2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	97.0	94.6	52.6	41.2	31.3	45.2	45.1	73.1
2.	Assam	98.1	83.7	40.4	0.0	13.7	20.4	18.9	23.3
3.	Bihar	96.7	96.9	50.0	42.4	16.9	16.0	15.8	12.8
4.	Delhi	97.8	98.9	11.0	0.7	11.7	18.6	20.9	21.2
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	68.3	95.6	26.5	1.9	36.9	20.7	41.4	19.6
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	79.0	86.8	46.4	34.4	20.3	18.1	45.7	31.3

(Contd.)

(Contd.)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	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	
		2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001
7.	Haryana	98.9	91.1	40.4	35.9	10.4	16.3	27.8	16.3
8.	Himachal Pradesh	94.1	84.5	40.8	38.4	16.2	18.8	41.2	43.2
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	97.1	93.0	30.5	52.6	19.5	18.4	22.4	43.9
10.	Karnataka	97.4	80.5	49.3	33.0	17.4	55.1	35.2	63.3
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	77.0	54.4	62.1	25.2	18.6	30.4	52.4	42.6
12.	Madhya Pradesh	93.6	96.0	47.2	80.4	16.5	4.3	40.8	0.4
13.	Maharashtra	88.5	98.9	30.9	1.5	25.1	22.7	41.8	4.5
14.	Manipur	93.3	85.0	47.6	39.7	25.3	37.1	64.7	47.2
15.	Orissa	98.9	98.9	33.0	22.4	14.4	46.7	31.9	86.8
16.	Other North Eastern States	95.2	84.2	52.2	42.3	20.7	19.9	30.0	27.2
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	98.2	88.4	38.8	30.3	34.4	21.3	28.2	52.1
18.	Rajasthan	97.4	91.5	69.3	56.8	9.6	21.0	39.3	41.7
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	92.2	93.3	57.4	46.1	8.1	14.9	56.3	39.4
20.	Uttar Pradesh	92.7	97.4	40.1	51.3	24.5	18.3	46.0	6.6
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	61.5	100.0	8.7	2.1	36.1	25.5	41.1	10.6
22.	Jharkhand	88.1		60.1		12.7		40.3	
23.	Chhattisgarh	94.8		52.4		18.0		33.7	
24.	Sikkim	34.2		19.2		52.5		78.3	
25.	Uttarakhand	71.9		42.6		13.3		75.9	
All India (2006)		88.5		41.2		21.4		40.0	
CI		85.0 – 92.0		35.8 – 46.6		16.9 – 25.9		34.6 – 45.4	
All India (2001)		90.2		31.8		24.4		33.3	
Brothel Based		95.0	97.8	37.6	25.6	20.8	21.6	27.3	20.2
Non-brothel Based		85.8	85.2	42.7	35.9	21.7	26.2	45.4	41.8

Base: All respondents

More than one-fifth of the respondents in both BSS 2001 and BSS 2006 were involved in this profession before migrating to the city/town where they are currently living. This percentage was highest in Sikkim (53%) followed by Goa, West Bengal, Punjab and Andhra Pradesh (37 to 31%).

Overall, two-fifths of the respondents in BSS 2006 compared to one-third in BSS 2001 reported travelling to other places for sex work. In line with BSS 2001 findings, BSS 2006 also shows that the non-brothel based FSWs are more likely than brothel based FSWs to travel to other places for sex work. The mobility of FSWs was found to be especially high in Sikkim (78%), Uttarakhand (76%) and Manipur (65%). Of all the states, the lowest mobility was in Bihar (16%) followed by Assam (19%), Delhi (21%) and Jammu & Kashmir (22%).

4.2.6 Use of Alcohol and Drugs

All FSWs interviewed were asked whether they had ever consumed alcohol. They were also asked whether they had ever taken any drug or injecting any non-medical/illegal drug in last 12 months. The findings relating to consumption of alcohol and drug use among the FSWs has been presented in the following sections.

Table 4.6 indicates that almost similar proportion of the FSWs in BSS 2001 (44%) as well as in 2006 (46%) survey reported that they had at some point of time taken any drink containing alcohol. Both the surveys show that ever consumption of alcohol was higher among non-brothel based FSWs than brothel based FSWs (Table 4.6). Across states/group of states, the “ever consumption” of alcohol was high in Manipur (83%) and Sikkim (75%) and low in Jammu & Kashmir (13%) and Punjab (22%).

Overall, about one-fifth of FSWs in both the surveys reported consuming alcohol everyday during last four weeks. The proportion of respondents reporting intake of alcoholic drink at least once in a week during last four weeks was 44 percent in BSS 2006 against 38 percent in BSS 2001. The proportion of brothel based FSWs consuming alcohol daily was lower than non-brothel based FSWs, however the proportions were reversed among those who consumed alcohol at least once a week. The proportion of the FSWs reporting daily consumption of alcohol was highest in Orissa (59%) followed by Andhra Pradesh (44%), Delhi (36%) and Manipur (36%). Around one-third to three-fourths of the FSWs in Uttarakhand, Punjab, Bihar, Other North Eastern States and Rajasthan reported intake of alcoholic drink at least once in a week during last four weeks.

In BSS 2006, about 11 percent of FSWs (15% in BSS 2001) who had reported ever consuming alcohol in any form, reported to be drinking it always before having sex and about 79 percent (74% in BSS 2001) of the FSWs had reported that they consumed alcohol sometimes

Table 4.6: Percentage distribution of respondents by alcohol intake in last four weeks

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Percent reporting ever drinking		Of those reporting ever drinking						
				Percent drinking daily*	Percent drinking at least once in a week*	Percent drinking in frequently*	Percent regularly drinking before sex*		Percent occasionally drinking before sex*	
		2006	2001	2006	2006	2006	2006	2001	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	42.2	73.1	43.8	38.9	15.0	17.7	25.5	80.1	74.0
2.	Assam	60.0	29.3	11.1	69.1	11.1	1.2	24.1	95.1	73.4
3.	Bihar	31.3	14.9	17.6	28.2	29.4	9.4	4.7	72.9	67.5
4.	Delhi	59.7	45.4	36.2	24.5	28.8	12.3	1.6	71.2	68.8
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	54.9	65.2	17.7	61.9	12.9	6.8	4.0	82.3	69.9
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	35.1	27.4	11.3	43.3	30.9	3.1	12.7	76.3	68.3
7.	Haryana	44.4	36.3	5.0	56.7	23.3	8.3	8.2	79.2	90.9
8.	Himachal Pradesh	32.7	36.9	6.7	40.4	36.0	5.6	1.0	75.3	87.0
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	13.2	6.1	0.0	22.2	63.9	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
10.	Karnataka	43.3	61.4	12.8	75.2	8.5	8.5	20.7	90.6	75.6
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	48.3	57.8	20	27.7	20.0	9.2	19.9	72.3	75.7
12.	Madhya Pradesh	45.7	29.7	7.4	49.2	33.6	5.7	18.3	89.3	64.7
13.	Maharashtra	26.2	26.4	16.9	50.7	20.4	7.0	7.0	76.1	66.2
14.	Manipur	82.5	73.8	36	49.5	10.4	30.6	36.0	64.9	63.4
15.	Orissa	59.3	43.4	59.4	29.4	8.1	31.9	25.4	66.3	66.1

(Contd.)

(Contd.)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Percent reporting ever drinking		Of those reporting ever drinking						
				Percent drinking daily*	Percent drinking at least once in a week*	Percent drinking in frequently*	Percent regularly drinking before sex*		Percent occasionally drinking before sex*	
		2006	2001	2006	2006	2006	2006	2001	2006	2001
16.	Other North Eastern States	61.5	62.9	19.3	39.8	28.9	12.7	21.6	83.7	74.3
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	21.6	43.1	3.4	62.7	18.6	0.0	3.5	81.4	80.8
18.	Rajasthan	27.8	21.4	5.3	49.3	38.7	2.7	6.9	89.3	74.2
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	59.6	67.7	6.8	62.1	21.7	5.0	11.5	92.5	84.6
20.	Uttar Pradesh	33.6	8.8	8.7	33.7	33.7	4.3	12.5	75.0	54.2
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	61.7	76.2	14.4	29.4	32.7	7.2	7.0	74.5	81.4
22.	Jharkhand	28.7		15.6	32.5	27.3	10.4		75.3	
23.	Chhattisgarh	54.3		25.5	41.4	29.0	24.8		72.4	
24.	Sikkim	75.0		4.4	26.7	64.4	5.6		81.1	
25.	Uttarakhand	63.7		8.7	54.7	29.1	7.0		87.2	
All India (2006)		45.7		19.5	44.1	24.6	11.1		79.1	
CI		40.2 – 51.2		15.1 – 23.9	38.6–49.6	19.9 – 29.3	7.6 – 14.6		74.6 – 83.6	
All India (2001)		44.2		22.2	37.7	39.9	15.1		74.4	
Brothel Based		43.2	38.7	25.4	35.6	24.1	12.4	9.3	73.2	70.7
Non-brothel Based		46.7	47.7	17.3	47.4	24.7	10.6	18.1	81.3	76.4

Base: All respondents

* Base: Those respondents reporting ever drinking

before having sex. There was not much difference in the brothel (12%) and non-brothel (11%) based FSWs who always consumed alcohol before sex. Overall, one-tenth of the respondents reported that they had never taken alcohol before having sex. The proportion of such FSWs was highest in Uttar Pradesh and Gujarat (21%).

At the national level, a very low proportion of FSWs had ever tried any drug (2006-7% and 2001-6%). This proportion was higher among non-brothel based FSWs than brothel based FSWs (8% and 5% respectively). The drug use was relatively high in Manipur (37%), Sikkim (18%) Other North Eastern States (18%), Delhi (12%), Kerala (11%) and Orissa (11%). Among the FSWs who had ever taken any drugs, majority had tried Bhang and Ganja. (Table 4.7)

Information about injecting drugs was collected only from those respondents who had ever used any type of intoxicating drugs. Table 4.7 indicates that 23 percent of FSWs who had ever tried any drug had taken some injectable drug in the 12 months prior to the survey. The corresponding proportion in BSS 2001 was 32 percent. The FSWs who had reportedly injected drugs were mostly non-brothel based FSWs (brothel based 7% and non-brothel based 28%). As high as 77 percent of FSWs who had ever used drugs in Manipur had injected drugs in last 12 months prior to the survey followed by 27 percent each in Other North Eastern States and Kerala. These percentages should be interpreted with caution, as bases are small.

Table 4.7: Percentage distribution of respondents by drug usage pattern

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Ever tried any drug*		Type of drugs tried**				Injected drugs in last 12 months **	
				Ganja	Bhang	Afim	Charas		
		2006	2001	2006	2006	2006	2006	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	3.5	6.1	36.8	15.8	0.0	31.6	10.5	35.3
2.	Assam	4.4	3.0	50.0	50.0	33.3	0.0	8.3	0.0
3.	Bihar	0.7	2.1	50.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
4.	Delhi	12.1	2.6	90.9	72.7	15.2	39.4	3.0	0.0
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	5.2	1.5	50.0	64.3	0.0	7.1	7.1	0.0
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	2.9	1.4	50.0	62.5	25.0	12.5	0.0	0.0
7.	Haryana	2.2	7.4	100.0	66.7	50.0	16.7	0.0	15.0
8.	Himachal Pradesh	3.3	4.4	22.2	44.4	33.3	33.3	0.0	16.7
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	3.3	0.0	33.3	55.6	22.2	55.6	0.0	0.0
10.	Karnataka	2.6	4.5	28.6	42.9	14.3	14.3	14.3	41.7
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	11.2	5.6	83.3	6.7	3.3	10.0	26.7	26.7
12.	Madhya Pradesh	9.0	1.4	45.8	87.5	4.2	4.2	4.2	25.0
13.	Maharashtra	6.5	1.1	28.6	45.7	0.0	5.7	17.1	0.0
14.	Manipur	37.2	30.3	39.0	7.0	0.0	1.0	77.0	64.2
15.	Orissa	10.7	10.3	37.9	79.3	6.9	6.9	10.3	7.1
16.	Other North Eastern States	18.1	14.0	49.0	10.2	0.0	8.2	26.5	63.2
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	5.5	13.9	6.7	73.3	0.0	0.0	6.7	13.5
18.	Rajasthan	1.9	5.5	60.0	40.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	6.7
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	0.4	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	13.3
20.	Uttar Pradesh	3.3	2.9	55.6	55.6	11.1	0.0	0.0	12.5
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	5.7	1.1	87.1	12.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
22.	Jharkhand	10.1		66.7	59.3	0.0	3.7	7.4	
23.	Chhattisgarh	7.9		38.1	61.9	4.8	0.0	9.5	
24.	Sikkim	18.3		95.5	4.5	0.0	0.0	4.5	
25.	Uttarakhand	1.9		40.0	80.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	
All India (2006)		7.0		52.3	37.4	5.6	9.0	23.4	
CI		4.2 – 9.8		46.8 – 57.8	32.1 – 42.7	3.1 – 8.1	5.8 – 12.2	18.7 – 28.1	
All India (2001)		6.0		2.2	1.7	0.8	0.6	32.0	
Brothel Based		5.1	2.9	55.0	58.6	5.4	15.3	7.2	6.3
Non-brothel Based		7.9	8.1	51.6	31.6	5.6	7.3	27.7	38.0

*Base : All respondents for “Ever tried any drug”

**Base: All those who ever tried any drug for “Type of drugs tried” and “injected drug in last 12 months”

4.3 Awareness of HIV/AIDS

This section presents the awareness of FSWs about HIV/AIDS. In order to capture the extent of awareness among the FSWs, a set of questions relating to HIV/AIDS, and its methods of prevention were asked to all the FSWs covered in the survey. The following sub-sections present the responses to these key questions.

4.3.1 Ever Heard of HIV/AIDS

It needs to be mentioned here that in BSS 2001, a single question was asked to ascertain the level of awareness on HIV/AIDS. Both the terms in medical terminology have different connotations, however in common man's mind, they go together. Thus, in BSS 2006 two separate questions - one on HIV and the other on AIDS have been asked to assess the exposure of the respondents to these two terms. While asking this question proper care was taken not to mix HIV and AIDS. The interviewers provided no description about this disease or its symptoms and a spontaneous answer to this question was recorded. Table 4.8 provides the level of awareness among the FSWs about HIV/AIDS.


Overall, 72 percent of FSWs covered in BSS 2006 affirmed that they had ever heard of HIV. The proportion of FSWs was more than 90 percent in Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Delhi, Maharashtra, Manipur and Madhya Pradesh. The awareness in this respect was lowest in Punjab (21%), Jammu & Kashmir (30%), Orissa (35%) and Uttarakhand (39%).

Table 4.8: Percentage of respondents who were aware of HIV/AIDS

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Ever heard of HIV/AIDS	Ever heard of HIV	Ever heard of AIDS	Ever heard of HIV or AIDS or both	Ever heard of HIV and AIDS
		2001	2006	2006	2006	2006
1.	Andhra Pradesh	97.1	97.0	96.4	97.6	94.6
2.	Assam	96.7	82.2	99.6	100.0	81.9
3.	Bihar	87.8	60.7	97.8	97.4	60.4
4.	Delhi	98.9	97.8	99.6	100.0	97.4
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	97.4	86.9	100.0	100.0	86.9
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	84.0	58.7	94.9	95.7	56.8
7.	Haryana	79.3	65.9	97.8	99.3	64.4
8.	Himachal Pradesh	97.0	65.8	98.9	98.9	65.8
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	89.5	30.1	93.0	93.4	29.8
10.	Karnataka	88.0	97.8	99.3	100.0	97.0
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	98.9	99.3	96.7	99.6	96.3
12.	Madhya Pradesh	92.8	92.5	100.0	100.0	92.5
13.	Maharashtra	98.9	94.8	99.4	100.0	94.3
14.	Manipur	97.4	99.6	100.0	100.0	99.6
15.	Orissa	92.3	35.2	92.2	93.3	34.1
16.	Other North Eastern States	87.9	83.0	97.4	98.5	81.9
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	90.6	20.5	98.9	99.3	20.1
18.	Rajasthan	93.7	54.8	98.1	98.1	54.8
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	99.3	71.1	97.8	99.3	69.6
20.	Uttar Pradesh	95.6	49.3	94.9	94.9	49.3
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	99.3	80.9	98.9	98.9	80.9
22.	Jharkhand		69.0	92.5	92.9	68.7
23.	Chhattisgarh		44.6	98.5	98.5	44.6
24.	Sikkim		70.0	95.8	95.8	70.0
25.	Uttarakhand		39.3	97.4	97.4	39.3
All India		93.5	72.1	97.6	98.1	71.4
CI		90.8 – 96.2	67.2 – 77.0	95.9 – 99.3	96.6 – 99.6	66.4 – 76.4
Brothel Based		95.3	77.4	98.1	98.5	76.9
Non-brothel Based		92.4	69.9	97.3	97.9	69.1

Base: All respondents



The level of awareness among the FSWs about either HIV or AIDS or both is almost universal in almost all the states. Overall, 98 percent of FSWs in BSS 2006 as compared to 94 percent in BSS 2001 had heard of HIV/AIDS. Table 4.8 also presents the proportion of respondents who had ever heard of both HIV and AIDS. Overall, 71 percent of the FSWs (brothel based 77%, non-brothel based 69%) reported that they had heard of HIV as well as AIDS. The corresponding percentage was significantly higher (over 90%) in the states of Madhya Pradesh, Delhi, Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Karnataka and Manipur.

4.3.2 Awareness of Methods of Prevention of HIV/AIDS

In order to assess the level of knowledge among the FSWs on methods of prevention of HIV/AIDS, their knowledge relating to prevention of HIV/AIDS through consistent condom use and having one uninfected faithful sex partner was sought from all the FSWs contacted for the study.

Consistent condom use is the widely accepted prevention method, prescribed to avert HIV transmission through the sexual route. To capture knowledge on this particular aspect, the respondents were asked a question that read as 'Can people protect themselves from HIV/AIDS by using a condom correctly every time they have sex?' The analysis of responses to the above question has been presented in Table 4.9.1.

At the national level, 90 percent of FSWs were aware of consistent and correct use of condom as a mode of prevention from HIV/AIDS. This proportion was 83 percent in BSS 2001. More or less, similar proportion of brothel and non-brothel based FSWs were aware about consistent and correct use of condoms as a method of prevention of HIV/AIDS. States in which the awareness about consistent and correct use of condoms has improved substantially since BSS 2001 were Punjab, Rajasthan, Assam, Karnataka and Haryana. However, the corresponding percentage has declined marginally (by 1 to 3%) in the states like Uttar Pradesh, Delhi, Orissa and Maharashtra.

Table 4.9 indicates that overall, about 89 percent of the FSWs in BSS 2006 compared to 76 percent in BSS 2001 were aware that one could be protected from HIV/AIDS, if he/she had one faithful and uninfected sexual partner. Awareness in this respect is relatively lower in Other North Eastern States (54%), Sikkim (61%), Jharkhand (77%) and Jammu & Kashmir (80%).

Table 4.9: Percentage of respondents aware of different methods of preventing HIV infection

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Awareness about different methods of prevention				Knowing two methods of prevention i.e. consistent condom use and faithful sex partner	
		Consistent use of condoms		Having one uninfected faithful sex partner		2006	2001
		2006	2001	2006	2001		
1.	Andhra Pradesh	93.7	85.3	83.6	86.0	79.1	74.6
2.	Assam	97.4	74.8	93.7	75.5	91.9	68.9
3.	Bihar	85.7	79.2	89.7	83.4	77.2	67.4
4.	Delhi	91.6	94.4	97.4	68.8	90.5	66.2
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	96.6	95.2	91.4	79.8	88.4	77.0
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	93.8	83.0	85.1	83.5	80.4	69.4
7.	Haryana	87.0	60.4	96.7	69.2	84.1	46.7
8.	Himachal Pradesh	86.8	70.1	92.3	75.3	79.4	65.7
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	73.9	70.2	79.8	75.5	57.7	63.2
10.	Karnataka	98.9	74.9	83.0	60.9	82.2	46.8
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	92.6	87.0	90.7	68.2	86.2	63.0
12.	Madhya Pradesh	75.3	84.8	98.1	74.6	73.8	63.0
13.	Maharashtra	96.5	97.8	89.8	78.9	86.7	77.0
14.	Manipur	99.6	82.4	98.1	79.2	97.8	67.0
15.	Orissa	81.5	83.8	93.3	78.9	77.4	66.5
16.	Other North Eastern States	90.0	78.3	54.4	79.9	50.4	63.6
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	94.1	74.2	99.6	71.1	93.8	55.4
18.	Rajasthan	93.0	71.2	95.9	69.7	89.6	52.0
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	98.9	98.9	87.8	79.4	86.7	77.7
20.	Uttar Pradesh	89.4	92.3	92.7	72.8	83.2	66.3
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	93.1	90.4	93.3	84.6	87.2	79.8
22.	Jharkhand	82.8		76.9		68.3	
23.	Chhattisgarh	84.6		85.8		71.9	
24.	Sikkim	74.2		60.8		50.0	
25.	Uttarakhand	85.2		96.7		83.0	
All India		90.3	82.7	88.9	76.1	81.0	65.7
CI		87.0–93.6		85.4–92.4		76.7–85.3	
Brothel Based		91.9	89.6	90.8	77.8	84.0	70.4
Non-brothel Based		89.6	78.1	88.1	75.0	79.7	62.7

Base: All respondents


Table 4.9 indicates that overall, about 81 percent of FSWs in BSS 2006 compared to BSS 2001 estimate of 66 percent knew both the methods of prevention i.e. consistent condom use and having faithful and uninfected sexual partner. Nearly 84 and 80 percent of brothel and non-brothel based FSWs respectively, were aware of both modes of prevention. The awareness level of respondents about both the methods of prevention was especially high (over 90%) in Delhi, Assam, Punjab and Manipur. It was low in Sikkim (50%), Other North Eastern States (50%) and Jammu & Kashmir (58%).

4.3.3 No Misconceptions about HIV/AIDS Transmission

The proportion of the FSWs who were aware that a person would not get HIV/AIDS by sharing a meal with an infected person has increased from 63 percent in BSS 2001 to 77 percent in BSS 2006. This proportion was highest in Manipur (98%) and lowest in Jammu & Kashmir (58%).

Prevention of HIV/AIDS


Figure 4.4: Percentage of FSWs aware of two important methods of HIV prevention



Base: All respondents

Prevention of HIV/AIDS

Figure 4.5: Percentage of FSWs aware of two methods of preventing HIV infection: Interstate Comparison, 2006



Base: All respondents

Table 4.10: Percentage distribution of respondents having no misconceptions about HIV/AIDS transmission

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	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					
		2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	83.7	69.4	82.4	64.2	73.2	64.2	51.1	31.2
2.	Assam	75.9	65.5	51.9	57.9	85.9	67.8	44.4	32.2
3.	Bihar	72.6	53.4	69.9	71.9	76.3	63.2	46.0	25.7
4.	Delhi	88.3	73.3	82.8	72.6	72.5	55.6	60.1	33.1
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	81.7	85.9	73.1	76.0	79.9	54.8	56.7	38.5
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	68.0	57.9	64.7	69.0	56.4	51.7	30.4	19.4
7.	Haryana	79.5	39.3	54.5	50.9	60.8	31.8	31.1	12.2
8.	Himachal Pradesh	83.3	49.0	65.4	39.9	62.5	26.2	44.1	7.7
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	57.9	67.6	33.1	76.5	65.7	32.4	10.7	21.1
10.	Karnataka	86.3	54.5	82.2	77.0	80.0	50.6	63.7	21.7
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	82.1	60.7	81.3	70.4	91.0	71.2	65.1	41.5
12.	Madhya Pradesh	79.4	37.1	78.7	52.3	47.6	51.2	36.0	12
13.	Maharashtra	83.9	78.9	69.9	68.0	85.8	64.3	54.9	37.2
14.	Manipur	97.8	87.7	89.2	71.9	62.8	67.7	56.1	47.6
15.	Orissa	70.2	54.2	65.5	61.8	61.9	83.3	34.4	32
16.	Other North Eastern States	74.8	54.8	73.3	70.3	80.5	72.4	55.6	31.6
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	71.6	43.8	74.9	43.4	51.3	46.3	39.6	18
18.	Rajasthan	77.0	80.7	58.1	73.2	81.1	36.6	41.5	22.5
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	68.7	83.5	86.6	93.3	80.6	71.2	49.3	60.6
20.	Uttar Pradesh	64.2	62.5	52.7	75.1	52.3	64	24.1	28.6
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	77.3	64.3	67.2	51.1	88.6	71.1	54.8	32.3
22.	Jharkhand	75.9		77.1		72.3		45.5	
23.	Chhattisgarh	80.2		79.1		69.6		49.8	
24.	Sikkim	73.9		87.8		70.4		47.5	
25.	Uttarakhand	61.6		55.9		52.9		25.6	
All India		77.3	63.4	70.3	65.8	71.9	58.1	45.6	29.0
CI		72.7 – 81.9		65.3 – 75.3		66.9 – 76.9		40.0 – 51.2	
Brothel Based		78.2	63.9	71.5	66	75.1	63.4	31.2	29.8
Non-brothel Based		77.0	63.0	69.8	65.7	70.5	54.5	68.8	28.5

Base: All respondents

Overall, 70 percent of FSWs (66% in BSS 2001) were aware that mosquito bites do not transmit HIV. Higher proportion (81 to 89%) of FSWs in Kerala, Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, Delhi, Manipur, Tamil Nadu and Sikkim were aware of this aspect. The awareness level was lowest in Jammu & Kashmir (33%) followed by Assam (52%), Uttar Pradesh (53%) and Haryana (55%).

The awareness that a healthy looking person could be suffering from HIV has increased from 58 percent in BSS 2001 to 72 percent in BSS 2006. The awareness level was high (80 to 91%) in Goa, Karnataka, Other North Eastern States, Tamil Nadu, Rajasthan, Maharashtra, Assam and Kerala. The awareness level of the same was low in Madhya Pradesh (48%), Punjab (51%), Uttar Pradesh (52%) and Gujarat (56%).

The proportion of respondents correctly identifying all three issues has significantly increased from 29 percent in BSS 2001 to 46 percent in BSS 2006. Against 31 percent of the brothel based FSWs, 69 percent of the Non Brothel based FSWs covered in BSS 2006 had no such misconception. This proportion was highest in Kerala (65%) followed by Karnataka (64%) and Delhi (60%) and it was lowest in Jammu & Kashmir (11%), Uttar Pradesh (24%) and Uttarakhand (26%).

4.3.4 Comprehensive Correct Knowledge about HIV Transmission and Prevention

Based on the information collected on awareness of different prevention methods, and misconceptions regarding HIV/AIDS, a composite indicator that indicates comprehensive correct knowledge about HIV transmission and Prevention is constructed as 'Percentage of Female Sex Workers who could correctly identify the two major ways of preventing the sexual transmission

Table 4.11: Proportion of respondents with comprehensive correct knowledge about HIV transmission and prevention

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl.No.	State/Group of States	BSS 2006	BSS 2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	30.8	25.8
2.	Assam	39.3	30.7
3.	Bihar	24.6	19.8
4.	Delhi	42.1	18.6
5.	Goa	53.0	33.3
6.	Gujarat	28.6	17.0
7.	Haryana	20.0	10.0
8.	Himachal Pradesh	33.8	5.5
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	7.7	12.3
10.	Karnataka	53.0	13.1
11.	Kerala	47.2	30.4
12.	Madhya Pradesh	25.1	9.4
13.	Maharashtra	44.4	30.9
14.	Manipur	53.9	34.1
15.	Orissa	15.9	23.9
16.	Other NE States	45.6	26.5
17.	Punjab	33.0	15.0
18.	Rajasthan	37.8	13.3
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	45.2	43.5
20.	Uttar Pradesh	13.5	19.8
21.	West Bengal	36.1	27.7
22.	Jharkhand	21.6	
23.	Chhattisgarh	18.4	
24.	Sikkim	28.3	
25.	Uttarakhand	20.0	
All India		37.9	22.2

Base: All respondents

of HIV (Consistent condom use and having one faithful uninfected sex partner), reject the two most common local misconceptions about HIV transmission (transmission of HIV/AIDS through mosquito bites and sharing of meals with HIV/AIDS patients), and who know that a healthy-looking person can transmit HIV. The composite indicator constructed on the basis of above information is presented for both BSS 2001 and BSS 2006 in Table 4.11.

The proportion of respondents with comprehensive correct knowledge about HIV transmission and prevention has increased significantly from 22 percent in BSS 2001 to 38 percent in BSS 2006. Over half of the respondents in Manipur, Karnataka and Goa have such awareness. The corresponding percentage varied between 8 to 20 percent in the states of Jammu & Kashmir, Uttar Pradesh, Orissa, Chhattisgarh, Haryana and Uttarakhand.

4.4 Awareness of STDs, Self-reported STD Prevalence and Treatment Seeking Behaviour

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

4.4.1 Ever Heard of STDs

Overall, 89 percent of FSWs in BSS 2006 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. This proportion was lower at 83 percent in BSS 2001. The proportion of respondents aware of any STD was lowest in Other North Eastern States (54%), followed by Sikkim (61%), Jharkhand (77%) and Jammu & Kashmir (80%). There is no significant difference between brothel and non-brothel-based FSWs in this regard (Table 4.12).

4.4.2 Awareness of STD Symptoms

The respondents who were aware of STDs were asked whether they were aware of any symptom of STDs among women and men separately. Table 4.12 reveals that the proportion of the FSWs describing 'swellings in groin area' or 'warts' as symptoms of STDs among women has declined from 83 percent in BSS 2001 to 77 percent in BSS 2006. This percentage was lowest in Sikkim (26%) followed by Gujarat (49%) and Jammu & Kashmir (56%). Over 90 percent of the FSWs in the states of Maharashtra, Jharkhand and Delhi were having the knowledge that 'swellings in groin area' or 'warts' are the symptoms of STDs among women.

The awareness level among the FSWs about the symptoms of STDs in males has also declined from BSS 2001. Overall, about 63 percent of the FSWs in BSS 2006 against 68 percent in BSS 2001 were aware of any one symptom of STDs among men. The corresponding proportion was low in Sikkim (10%), Himachal Pradesh (26%) and Jammu and Kashmir (30%). However, the awareness level of STD symptoms in men was relatively better in Karnataka, Kerala, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra, Delhi and West Bengal as more than 70 percent of the respondents in these states reported the same. Brothel based FSWs have greater awareness of STD symptoms in women and men than non-brothel based FSWs. (Table 4.12)

4.4.3 Self-reported STD Prevalence

All the FSWs covered in BSS 2001 and BSS 2006 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 4.12: Percentage respondents who had ever heard of STD and were aware of common STD symptoms among men and women

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	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	
		2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	83.6	86.0	72.8	86.0	77.2	75.6
2.	Assam	93.7	88.1	69.6	88.1	49.8	68.9
3.	Bihar	89.7	81.6	79.5	81.6	65.2	69.4
4.	Delhi	97.4	93.3	91.0	93.3	78.9	81.8
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	91.4	63.3	76.7	63.3	62.9	46.3
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	85.1	96.2	48.9	96.2	42.1	80.6
7.	Haryana	96.7	90.7	82.4	90.7	69.7	57.0
8.	Himachal Pradesh	92.3	97.8	73.7	97.8	25.5	94.1
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	79.8	57.9	55.8	57.9	30.4	50.9
10.	Karnataka	83.0	48.3	74.6	48.3	72.8	34.1
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	90.7	94.8	86.1	94.8	76.6	86.3
12.	Madhya Pradesh	98.1	63.4	82.1	63.4	69.5	48.2
13.	Maharashtra	89.8	93.3	90.1	93.3	77.6	59.9
14.	Manipur	98.1	73.0	84.1	73.0	68.2	58.4
15.	Orissa	93.3	86.8	67.1	86.8	44.8	65.4
16.	Other North Eastern States	54.4	64.3	70.7	64.3	52.4	32.4
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	99.6	85.4	77.2	85.4	66.5	71.5
18.	Rajasthan	95.9	87.5	76.4	87.5	64.5	75.6
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	87.8	99.3	83.5	99.3	76.8	87.7
20.	Uttar Pradesh	92.7	72.9	73.6	72.9	58.7	68.9
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	93.3	100.0	86.7	100.0	81.2	95.4
22.	Jharkhand	76.9		90.3		59.2	
23.	Chhattisgarh	85.8		78.2		62.9	
24.	Sikkim	60.8		26.0		9.6	
25.	Uttarakhand	96.7		72.0		42.9	
All India		88.9	82.8	77.2	82.8	63.1	67.6
CI		85.4 – 92.4		72.6 – 81.8		57.8 – 68.4	
Brothel Based		90.8	81.9	81.8	69.3	72.8	67.0
Non-brothel Based		88.1	83.5	75.2	71.5	58.9	68.0

Base: All respondents

The analysis of responses presented in Table 4.13 indicates that half of the FSWs had suffered from any one symptom of STD during last 12 months prior to the survey. The corresponding percentage was relatively lower at 46 percent in BSS 2001. A higher proportion of non-brothel based FSWs (53%) suffered from one or the other symptom of STDs as compared with brothel based FSWs (44%). Across states, the prevalence of STDs among the FSWs was high in the states of Uttarakhand (80%), Orissa (67%), Karnataka (66%) and Haryana (66%). It was significantly lower in the states of West Bengal (20%), Bihar (21%) and Sikkim (23%).

Table 4.13 further shows that the overall proportion of FSWs who suffered from more than one of the symptoms of STDs has gone up from 31 percent in BSS 2001 to 38 percent in BSS 2006. Here also a higher proportion of non-brothel based FSWs (40%) suffered from more than one symptom of STD as compared with brothel based FSWs (34%). More than half of the FSWs in Uttarakhand, Haryana, Karnataka, Goa, Manipur, Orissa and Maharashtra compared to less than 15 percent in Bihar, Tamil Nadu, West Bengal and Sikkim suffered from more than one of the symptoms of STDs during last 12 months.

Overall, the proportion of respondents reporting all five symptoms was at four percent (1% in BSS 2001). Comparatively high proportions were recorded in Manipur (25%), Orissa (7%), Rajasthan (7%), Maharashtra (7%) and Andhra Pradesh (6%).

Table 4.13: Percentage of respondents who reported to have suffered from STD symptoms in the last 12 months


(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Suffered from any one symptom		Suffered from more than one symptom		Suffered from all five symptoms	
		2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	59.6	63.1	47.3	45.5	6.3	1.1
2.	Assam	35.9	59.3	27.8	39.6	3.0	1.9
3.	Bihar	20.9	15.3	13.9	9.7	1.5	1.1
4.	Delhi	57.5	58.7	46.9	44.6	1.5	0.0
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	60.8	15.9	53.7	7.4	5.2	0.7
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	57.9	59.7	47.5	46.5	0.4	1.0
7.	Haryana	66.3	68.5	55.6	41.5	1.5	1.1
8.	Himachal Pradesh	57.7	61.6	42.3	36.9	2.6	0.0
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	46.0	45.6	23.5	39.5	0.0	9.6
10.	Karnataka	66.3	60.7	54.4	46.8	4.8	0.0
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	39.0	44.4	26.0	34.4	1.1	2.6
12.	Madhya Pradesh	56.9	22.1	39.3	13.8	0.7	0.4
13.	Maharashtra	62.1	30.1	50.3	17.1	6.7	0.4
14.	Manipur	61.3	59.2	53.5	49.8	25.3	0.7
15.	Orissa	67.0	57.0	53.3	40.4	7.0	6.3
16.	Other North Eastern States	44.1	26.1	28.9	17.3	3.0	3.3
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	57.1	63.7	43.2	41.6	0.0	0.0
18.	Rajasthan	40.4	59.8	31.5	38.4	6.7	1.1
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	30.4	53.9	13.7	30.1	0.7	0.0
20.	Uttar Pradesh	46.0	9.2	32.8	2.9	0.0	0.0
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	20.4	31.2	7.6	17.0	0.4	1.4
22.	Jharkhand	41.8		28.0		3.0	
23.	Chhattisgarh	57.3		49.1		3.0	
24.	Sikkim	22.5		4.2		0.0	
25.	Uttarakhand	79.6		62.6		5.6	
All India		50.4	45.8	37.9	31.2	3.7	1.3
CI		44.9 – 55.9		32.6 – 43.2		1.6 – 5.8	
Brothel Based		44.0	29.8	33.9	19.0	3.1	1.3
Non-brothel Based		53.1	56.3	39.5	39.1	4.0	1.4

Base: All respondents

Prevalence of Sexually Transmitted Diseases

Figure 4.6: Percentage of FSWs who reported to have suffered from any one STD symptom in the last 12 months



4.4.4 STD Treatment Seeking Behaviour

All the FSWs who reportedly suffered from one or more symptoms of STDs during last 12 months were asked a question that read as “What did you do the last time you had any of these problems?” The responses to the above question have been analysed to ascertain the proportion of FSWs who did not seek any prescribed treatment, took informal health treatment and those who sought treatment from formal health care facilities.

Table 4.14 provides information on those FSWs who suffered from any STD symptom in last 12 months and sought informal health treatment or did not take any prescribed treatment during last episode of STD symptoms. Overall, the proportion of FSWs who did not undergo any treatment has declined significantly from 14 percent in BSS 2001 to eight percent in BSS 2006. The states, which figured prominently in not seeking treatment, were Jammu & Kashmir (18%), Other North Eastern States (18%), Chhattisgarh (17%) and Madhya Pradesh (16%). Greater proportion of non-brothel based FSWs (9%) did not take any treatment than brothel-based FSWs (6%).

Around 15 percent of the FSWs in both the surveys had sought home based treatment. Home based treatment was more prevalent among the FSWs in Punjab (64%), Rajasthan (36%), Delhi (29%), Chhattisgarh (28%) and Himachal Pradesh (27%).

About four percent tried to avoid seeking treatment and borrowed prescriptions from friends or relatives based on self-diagnosis of symptoms and medicated themselves accordingly. Another six percent took medicines already available with them. About 14 percent of the FSWs bought medicines from a chemist shop. This proportion in BSS 2001 was 19 percent. A higher proportion of non-brothel based FSWs (15%) bought medicines from a chemist shop as compared with brothel based FSWs (12%). The proportion of FSWs purchasing medicines from a chemist shop was higher in Punjab (32%), Bihar (32%), Rajasthan (26%) and Tamil Nadu (26%).

Table 4.15 indicates that the proportion of the FSWs visiting a government hospital/clinic for treatment of STDs has increased from 28 percent in BSS 2001 to 32 percent in BSS 2006. Overall, 31 percent (35% in BSS 2001) of the FSWs went to a private hospital/clinic for the treatment of the problem. Treatment from NGO peer educator/clinic was sought by 21 percent (compared

Table 4.14: Percentage distribution of respondents who sought STD treatment - Took no treatment or went to informal health facility during last STD episode

(All figure are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	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	0.9	5.3	0.9	1.9	7.8
2.	Assam	2.1	11.3	2.1	4.1	17.5
3.	Bihar	14.0	3.5	1.8	3.5	31.6
4.	Delhi	0.6	28.7	1.9	17.2	17.8
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	4.3	11.0	4.3	16.6	20.9
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	14.9	12.4	28.6	7.5	3.7
7.	Haryana	4.5	5.0	0.6	5.6	21.8
8.	Himachal Pradesh	5.1	26.8	10.2	8.3	16.6
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	18.4	20.8	3.2	4.8	13.6
10.	Karnataka	2.8	3.4	0.6	0.0	2.2
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	15.2	5.7	1.9	1.9	5.7
12.	Madhya Pradesh	16.4	23.7	7.2	3.3	15.8
13.	Maharashtra	4.2	3.3	0.3	2.4	13.7
14.	Manipur	5.5	7.9	1.8	4.8	3.0
15.	Orissa	14.4	18.8	0.6	0.6	11.6
16.	Other North Eastern States	17.6	19.3	14.3	14.3	19.3
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	4.5	63.5	11.5	19.9	32.1
18.	Rajasthan	2.8	35.8	14.7	4.6	25.7
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	1.2	0.0	0.0	1.2	25.6
20.	Uttar Pradesh	8.7	5.6	1.6	2.4	8.7
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	7.3	7.3	0.9	0.0	7.3
22.	Jharkhand	14.3	15.2	2.7	8.0	13.4
23.	Chhattisgarh	17.0	27.5	0.0	7.2	3.9
24.	Sikkim	0.0	7.4	0.0	0.0	3.7
25.	Uttarakhand	11.6	15.3	1.9	0.9	19.5
All India (2006)		7.9	15.1	4.4	5.6	13.9
CI		4.9 – 10.9	11.2 – 19.0	2.1 – 6.7	3.1 – 8.1	10.0 – 17.7
All India (2001)		13.5	13.8	4.5	5.2	18.9
Brothel Based (2006)		5.8	14.2	2.0	5.2	12.1
Non-brothel Based (2006)		8.7	15.4	5.2	5.8	14.5


Base: Those who reported to have suffered from any symptom of STDs in last 12 months
Multiple responses possible

to 12% in BSS 2001) of the FSWs. A few of the FSWs (3%) reportedly sought treatment from the traditional healers.

A higher proportion of brothel based FSWs (33%) went to NGO peer educator/clinic as compared with non-brothel based FSWs (17%). The proportion seeking treatment from private hospital/ clinic was also higher among brothel based FSWs (35%) than non-brothel based FSWs (29%). However, similar proportion of the non-brothel (32%) and brothel based FSWs (30%) went to government hospitals.

Treatment Seeking Behaviour for STDs

Figure 4.7: Percentage of FSWs who did not seek any treatment during the last episode of STD



Base: Those who reported to have suffered from any symptom of STD in last 12 months

Table 4.15: Percentage distribution of respondents who sought STD treatment - Went to health practitioner during the last episode

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	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	1.9	65.7	16.2	12.8
2.	Assam	7.2	2.1	18.6	57.7
3.	Bihar	0.0	21.1	50.9	8.8
4.	Delhi	0.0	43.3	47.1	21.0
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	13.5	17.2	26.4	24.5
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	14.9	0.6	17.4	30.4
7.	Haryana	0.0	10.1	47.5	25.1
8.	Himachal Pradesh	0.0	6.4	27.4	52.2
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	2.4	0.8	22.4	28.8
10.	Karnataka	0.6	74.9	6.7	33.5
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	9.5	21.0	19.0	41.0
12.	Madhya Pradesh	0.0	0.0	39.5	25.7
13.	Maharashtra	1.2	24.7	37.5	36.3
14.	Manipur	1.8	69.1	11.5	26.1
15.	Orissa	6.1	2.8	16.6	47.5
16.	Other North Eastern States	1.7	0.8	14.3	33.6
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	3.8	0.0	50.0	26.9
18.	Rajasthan	0.0	9.2	62.4	18.3
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	0.0	3.7	57.3	30.5
20.	Uttar Pradesh	1.6	0.0	69.8	41.3
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	0.0	45.5	16.4	18.2
22.	Jharkhand	3.6	8.9	24.1	34.8

(Contd.)

(Contd.)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	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
23.	Chhattisgarh	2.6	6.5	23.5	53.6
24.	Sikkim	0.0	0.0	25.9	63.0
25.	Uttarakhand	3.3	1.9	47.4	35.3
All India (2006)		3.1	21.3	30.8	31.9
CI		1.2 – 5.0	16.8 – 25.8	25.7 – 35.9	26.8 – 37.0
All India (2001)		5.0	11.7	35.1	27.8
Brothel Based (2006)		1.3	33.0	35.1	30.3
Non-brothel Based (2006)		3.7	17.2	29.4	32.4

Base: Those who reported to have suffered from any symptom of STDs in last 12 months
Multiple responses possible

State-wise analysis shows that a significant proportion of FSWs went to government hospital for the treatment of STDs in Sikkim (63%), Assam (58%), Chhattisgarh (54%) and Himachal Pradesh (52%). Higher proportion of the FSWs in Uttar Pradesh (70%), Rajasthan (62%), Tamil Nadu (57%), Bihar (51%) and Punjab (50%) visited private doctors more often during their last episode of STD symptoms. About 75 percent of the FSWs in Karnataka visited NGO clinic followed by Manipur (69%) and Andhra Pradesh (66%). Dependence on traditional healers/quacks for treatment of STDs was mostly reported in Gujarat (15%), Goa (14%) and Kerala (10%).

4.4.5 Time taken to Visit a Health Practitioner and Type of Medicine taken during Last Episode of STD

Table 4.16 provides information on time taken to visit a health practitioner during the last episode of STD symptoms and type of medicine taken for treatment of STD symptoms. Against 43 percent of FSWs in BSS 2001, 46 percent in BSS 2006 visited health practitioner within one week of onset of the STD symptoms during the last episode. Nearly two-fifths of them in BSS 2001 as well as BSS 2006 had reportedly visited the health practitioner in less than a month but more than a week after experiencing the problem last time. The proportion of the FSWs who waited for more than a month before seeking treatment has declined to 12 percent from BSS 2001 estimate of 17 percent.

The proportion of brothel based FSWs (55%) who visited health practitioner within one week or less was significantly higher than that of the non-brothel based FSWs (43%). The corresponding proportions for those who visited the health practitioner in less than a month but more than a week were 33 percent for the brothel based FSWs and 40 percent for the non-brothel based FSWs. The non-brothel based FSWs (13%) are more likely to delay their visit to health practitioner for a month or more than their brothel based counter parts (9%).

Across states the proportion of FSWs visiting a health practitioner within a week was high in Uttar Pradesh (77%), Kerala (64%), Jammu & Kashmir (64%) and Bihar (61%). The proportion of FSWs who went to a health practitioner after one month of the onset of the STD symptoms was highest in Orissa (39%) followed by Manipur (22%) and Punjab (20%).

Table 4.16 further reveals that most of the FSWs across all the states covered under the study had taken allopathic medicines when they suffered last time from any STD. At national level, 11 percent and nine percent of the FSWs had taken Ayurvedic/Herbal and homeopathic medicines respectively during last episode.

Table 4.16: Percentage distribution of respondents by time taken to visit a health practitioner and type of medicine taken during last episode of STD

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	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	53.3	37.2	9.1	82.6	13.2	2.2
2.	Assam	23.2	55.8	15.8	85.3	13.7	9.5
3.	Bihar	61.2	20.4	16.3	98.0	0.0	2.0
4.	Delhi	50.0	37.8	3.8	98.7	10.9	12.2
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	34.0	42.3	10.3	59.0	24.4	16.0
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	41.6	35.0	7.3	48.2	19.0	21.2
7.	Haryana	48.0	33.3	14.0	89.5	5.8	3.5
8.	Himachal Pradesh	47.0	37.6	13.4	93.3	4.0	7.4
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	63.7	34.3	2.0	87.3	2.9	21.6
10.	Karnataka	41.4	45.4	13.2	85.6	0.0	5.7
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	64.0	27.0	6.7	86.5	4.5	7.9
12.	Madhya Pradesh	52.8	23.6	8.7	85.0	3.9	25.2
13.	Maharashtra	55.6	35.1	5.9	81.1	23.9	16.1
14.	Manipur	51.3	25.6	22.4	93.6	6.4	7.7
15.	Orissa	14.2	44.5	38.7	80.6	1.3	20.6
16.	Other North Eastern States	35.7	43.9	16.3	79.6	29.6	7.1
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	25.5	55.0	19.5	94.0	4.0	12.1
18.	Rajasthan	52.8	29.2	16.0	94.3	0.0	2.8
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	32.1	49.4	8.6	86.4	2.5	0.0
20.	Uttar Pradesh	76.5	19.1	3.5	98.3	2.6	1.7
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	58.8	36.3	4.9	97.1	1.0	2.0
22.	Jharkhand	55.2	38.5	6.3	82.3	5.2	11.5
23.	Chhattisgarh	41.7	41.7	13.4	95.3	0.8	35.4
24.	Sikkim	22.2	70.4	7.4	96.3	0.0	3.7
25.	Uttarakhand	40.0	44.2	15.3	95.8	2.1	13.7
All India (2006)		46.3	37.9	12.1	85.8	8.8	11.3
CI		40.8 – 51.8	32.6 – 43.2	8.5 – 15.7	82.0 – 89.6	5.7 – 11.9	7.8 – 14.8
All India (2001)		42.5	36.4	16.9	78.9	3.3	12.4
Brothel Based (2006)		54.6	33.0	8.7	89.9	11.1	10.6
Non-brothel Based (2006)		43.3	39.6	13.3	84.4	8.0	11.5

Base: Those who reported to have suffered from any or all symptoms of STD in last 12 months

Note: Due to other responses in the question, total percentage does not add up to 100.

4.4.6 STD Treatment Service Preferred to be Utilised for Future Episodes of STD

When respondents were asked to cite a source that they would prefer for STD treatment for any likely episodes in the future, 38 percent (37% in BSS 2001) of the FSWs clearly stated that they would prefer government hospital. The proportion of FSWs preferring private hospital/clinic has declined from 46 percent in BSS 2001 to 31 percent in BSS 2006. There has been a sharp increase (2001 - 9%, 2006 - 18%) in the proportion of the FSWs preferring NGO peer educator/NGO clinic for treatment of STDs.

Higher proportion of the brothel based FSWs preferred private practitioners/clinics and NGO peer educators/clinic whereas government hospital was preferred by higher proportion of the non-brothel based FSWs. (Table 4.17)


Table 4.17: Percentage distribution of respondents by preferred treatment source to be utilised for future episodes of STD

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	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	
		2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	16.2	68.8	11.9	23.3	54.5	1.8	7.1	1.8	1.7	0.0
2.	Assam	27.8	8.1	49.3	69.6	1.5	2.2	5.9	11.5	0.0	5.9
3.	Bihar	54.4	78.8	14.7	14.9	27.9	0.0	0.4	2.8	1.1	0.3
4.	Delhi	39.6	80.7	18.7	15.6	32.2	2.2	5.9	0.4	2.2	0.0
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	27.2	67.8	26.5	23.3	15.3	4.8	4.5	0.0	1.1	3.7
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	18.5	48.6	28.6	31.6	0.7	16.0	1.1	0.7	1.4	1.7
7.	Haryana	51.9	56.3	44.1	31.5	2.6	0.0	0.7	3.3	0.0	2.6
8.	Himachal Pradesh	19.1	53.1	76.1	39.5	1.1	0.0	0.4	1.1	2.6	1.1
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	23.9	25.4	68.4	55.3	0.7	0.0	1.8	1.8	1.5	5.3
10.	Karnataka	5.9	33.0	17.4	48.7	72.6	3.0	0.7	3.4	1.1	1.5
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	7.4	24.4	19.3	49.6	19.3	22.2	0.7	0.7	0.4	0.7
12.	Madhya Pradesh	49.4	52.9	41.9	45.3	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.4	4.9	1.4
13.	Maharashtra	44.2	68.0	33.8	23.8	13.7	7.4	6.1	0.0	0.7	0.4
14.	Manipur	6.3	15.7	49.1	28.8	40.9	24.3	1.9	9.7	0.4	6.7
15.	Orissa	13.7	17.6	71.5	68.8	0.4	2.9	1.9	4.4	6.7	3.3
16.	Other North Eastern States	23.3	32.7	49.6	54.0	12.2	5.1	5.6	2.6	1.9	1.8
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	53.1	50.6	37.7	45.3	0.4	0.0	1.8	0.7	3.3	0.7
18.	Rajasthan	55.6	29.2	30.7	57.2	1.9	2.6	0.7	0.7	1.1	3.7
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	43.0	55.4	45.2	35.7	5.6	1.9	4.1	1.1	1.1	1.5
20.	Uttar Pradesh	62.8	66.3	35.0	27.5	0.4	0.0	0.7	0.7	0.4	3.3
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	17.6	13.1	22.0	7.1	55.9	79.8	1.9	0.0	0.6	0.0
22.	Jharkhand	39.6		40.7		1.9		7.1		7.5	
23.	Chhattisgarh	22.5		65.9		3.7		1.1		3.7	
24.	Sikkim	35.0		57.5		1.7		0.0		0.8	
25.	Uttarakhand	35.9		57.4		1.5		1.9		1.1	
All India		31.1	45.7	38.2	37.3	17.9	8.8	3.0	2.3	1.8	2.1
CI		26.0 – 36.2		32.8 – 43.6		13.7 – 22.1		1.1 – 4.9		0.3 – 3.3	
Brothel Based		35.1	55.6	27.2	28.1	28.2	12.4	2.7	1.1	1.3	1.5
Non-brothel Based		29.4	39.3	42.8	43.2	13.5	6.4	3.1	3.1	2.0	2.4

Base: All respondents

Note: Due to other responses in the question, total percentage does not add up to 100.



State-wise comparison shows that majority of the FSWs (50% to 63%) in Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Bihar, Punjab and Haryana preferred private hospital/clinic whereas majority of the FSWs (57-76%) in Himachal Pradesh, Orissa, Jammu & Kashmir, Chhattisgarh, Sikkim and Uttarakhand preferred to visit the government hospital. The FSWs preferring NGO peer educator/clinic were mostly from the states of Karnataka (73%), West Bengal (56%), Andhra Pradesh (55%) and Manipur (41%).

4.5 Sexual Behaviour and Condom Usage

This section presents information about age at first sex and the age at which the FSWs first started sex work. Also presented are the degree of high-risk behaviour 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 captured only 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 last seven 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. Data on condom negotiation is also presented.

4.5.1 Age at First Sex

All the FSWs were asked to mention the age at which they had sex (penetrative) for the first time. As shown in Table 4.18, one-fourth of FSWs covered in BSS 2006 reported that the age at first sex was less than 15 years.

Nearly half of the FSWs had first sex between the ages of 16 and 18 years. The age at first sex reported by the FSWs in BSS 2006 and BSS 2001 was more or less similar. The median age at first sex was 17 years in both the surveys. About 37 percent of brothel based FSWs against 19 percent of the non-brothel based FSWs had first sex before attaining the age of 15 years. However, higher proportion of the non-brothel based FSWs (27%) than the brothel based FSWs (14%) were between 19-21 years at the time of first sex.

Across states, higher proportion (41-57%) of the FSWs in the states of Uttar Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh and West Bengal had first sex before reaching the age of 15 years. The proportion of the FSWs who had first sex after the age of 19 years was highest in Jharkhand (62%) followed by Assam (58%), Manipur (58%) and Goa (55%). The median age at first sex varied between 16-19 years across the states.

4.5.2 Age when Started Sex Work

Nearly half of the FSWs contacted in BSS 2001 as well as in BSS 2006 had reportedly started sex work between 16 and 21 years of age. Only eight percent (10% in BSS 2001) of the FSWs started sex work when they were aged 15 years or less. The median age at starting sex work was 20 years in both the surveys. (Table 4.19)

The proportion of brothel based FSWs (15%) who first started sex work below 15 years of age was higher as compared with non-brothel based FSWs (4%). Similar proportions were recorded for the age group of 16-18 years (35% and 20% respectively). However, higher proportion of non-

Table 4.18: Percentage distribution of respondents by age at first sex

(All figures except median age are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Age at the time of first sex (in years)					Median age (in years)	
		<15	16-18	19-21	22-25	25+	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	40.5	48.1	11.0	0.4	0.0	16	17
2.	Assam	4.4	37.4	36.7	20.0	1.5	19	17
3.	Bihar	48.2	41.5	9.6	0.7	0.0	16	17
4.	Delhi	20.1	53.1	22.3	3.7	0.7	17	17
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	11.6	33.2	48.1	7.1	0.0	19	17
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	8.7	57.2	29.0	4.0	0.0	18	18
7.	Haryana	32.2	51.9	14.8	1.1	0.0	16	16
8.	Himachal Pradesh	12.1	57.0	24.6	6.3	0.0	18	18
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	8.1	54.4	27.2	8.8	1.5	18	18
10.	Karnataka	27.0	41.1	26.3	4.4	1.1	18	17
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	20.8	37.5	29.4	9.7	2.6	18	18
12.	Madhya Pradesh	41.2	51.7	6.7	0.4	0.0	16	17
13.	Maharashtra	21.6	54.9	19.4	2.8	0.6	17	17
14.	Manipur	12.3	30.1	32.0	22.3	3.3	19	19
15.	Orissa	32.6	50.0	14.8	2.2	0.4	16	16
16.	Other North Eastern States	20.0	39.6	30.7	9.3	0.4	18	18
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	7.3	56.0	27.1	9.2	0.4	18	18
18.	Rajasthan	26.7	52.6	19.6	1.1	0.0	17	16
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	7.4	46.7	39.3	6.3	0.0	18	19
20.	Uttar Pradesh	56.6	38.3	4.4	0.7	0.0	15	18
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	40.9	32.8	19.4	5.9	0.9	16	16
22.	Jharkhand	4.1	34.3	41.8	16.8	3.0	19	
23.	Chhattisgarh	33.3	50.6	12.0	2.2	0.0	16	
24.	Sikkim	6.7	49.2	38.3	5.0	0.8	18	
25.	Uttarakhand	14.1	54.4	22.2	7.8	1.5	17	
All India (2006)		24.0	46.0	23.1	6.0	0.7	17	
CI		19.3–28.7	40.5–51.5	18.5–27.7	3.4–8.6	4.2–9.8	13 – 21	
All India (2001)		27.4	44.7	21.7	5.6	0.6	17	
Brothel Based		36.6	46.3	14.2	2.4	0.2	16	17
Non-brothel Based		18.7	45.9	26.9	7.5	0.9	18	18

Base: All respondents

Table 4.19: Percentage distribution of respondents by age when started sex work


(All figures except median age are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Age at which first started sex work (in years)					Median age (in years)	
		< 15	16-18	19-21	22-25	>25		
		2006	2006	2006	2006	2006	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	11.2	27.8	36.2	19.2	5.6	19	20
2.	Assam	0.7	17.8	30.7	36.3	14.4	22	21
3.	Bihar	32.7	37.1	22.1	7.0	1.1	17	17
4.	Delhi	9.2	28.2	38.1	21.2	3.3	19	20
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	2.6	9.7	24.3	42.9	19.0	24	20
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	0.4	6.9	29.3	43.5	19.6	23	24
7.	Haryana	10.4	25.2	27.4	21.9	15.2	20	22
8.	Himachal Pradesh	2.6	22.4	28.7	29.0	17.3	21	22
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	1.5	16.2	17.6	42.3	22.4	23	21
10.	Karnataka	15.2	24.4	36.3	18.1	5.9	20	21
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	1.9	8.6	24.9	24.2	40.1	24	25
12.	Madhya Pradesh	6.4	21.7	31.8	30.0	10.1	20	17
13.	Maharashtra	6.5	39.9	32.3	15.9	3.9	19	20
14.	Manipur	3.3	16.7	23.8	29.7	26.4	22	21
15.	Orissa	5.6	25.9	28.1	29.6	10.7	20	17
16.	Other North Eastern States	2.2	10.0	39.6	34.4	13.7	21	21
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	1.1	31.1	26.4	29.7	11.4	20	21
18.	Rajasthan	17.8	44.4	29.3	7.4	1.1	18	18
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	0.0	1.1	7.0	36.7	54.8	26	25
20.	Uttar Pradesh	33.9	45.6	16.4	2.9	1.1	17	20
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	6.9	18.1	23.1	26.3	25.6	22	20
22.	Jharkhand	0.0	20.5	30.2	34.3	14.9	21	
23.	Chhattisgarh	7.1	33.3	30.7	22.8	3.4	19	
24.	Sikkim	0.8	32.5	27.5	30.8	8.3	20	
25.	Uttarakhand	3.7	27.4	21.9	19.6	27.4	21	
All India (2006)		7.6	24.1	27.7	25.5	14.8	20	
CI		4.7–10.5	19.4–28.8	22.8–32.6	20.7–30.3	10.9–18.7	16 – 24	
All India (2001)		9.8	23.8	26.4	24.7	15.3	20	
Brothel Based		15.3	34.6	28.7	15.9	5.0	18	19
Non-brothel Based		4.3	19.7	27.3	29.5	19.0	21	22

Base: All respondents

brothel based FSWs first started work between 22-25 years as compared with brothel based FSWs (30% and 16%). The proportion starting sex work after the age of 25 years was also higher for non-brothel based FSWs (19%) than the brothel based FSWs (5%).

The median age at starting sex work was as high as 26 years in Tamil Nadu and as lowest as 17 years in Bihar and Uttar Pradesh.



4.5.3 Number of Paying Clients/Non-paying Regular Partners/Non-paying Non-regular Partners in Last Seven Days

As shown in Table 4.20, on an average the FSWs covered in BSS 2006 had 10 paying clients (11 in BSS 2001) in last seven days prior to survey. The mean number of paying clients in the last seven days among brothel based FSWs was 12 compared with nine among non-brothel based FSWs. The mean number of clients in the last seven days was higher in Madhya Pradesh (17), Delhi (14), Assam (14) and Maharashtra (13).

Table 4.20: Percentage distribution of respondents by number of paying clients and non-paying partners in the last seven days

(All figures except means are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	No. of paying clients					No. of non-paying regular partner			No. of non-paying non-regular partner			
		< 7	8-14	15-21	>22	Mean	1	> 2	Mean	1	2-4	>5	Mean
1.	Andhra Pradesh	30.4	42.0	20.1	7.5	11.5	61.4	12.5	1.0	11.8	8.6	0.7	0.4
2.	Assam	15.9	38.1	37.4	8.5	14.0	40.0	11.5	0.6	26.7	52.2	6.3	1.9
3.	Bihar	59.2	27.6	8.8	4.4	7.7	39.7	7.7	0.6	2.2	2.2	0.0	0.1
4.	Delhi	14.3	45.4	24.9	15.0	14.3	11.7	2.6	0.2	24.2	23.1	4.0	1.0
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	41.8	47.0	9.3	1.9	9.0	62.3	7.8	0.8	16.4	4.9	0.0	0.3
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	22.1	46.0	25.4	3.6	11.6	58.0	18.1	1.2	17.8	6.9	4.7	0.3
7.	Haryana	48.9	17.8	0.4	0.4	5.6	73.0	2.2	0.8	13.0	12.2	12.2	0.5
8.	Himachal Pradesh	84.9	15.1	0.0	0.0	4.7	65.1	1.8	0.7	12.9	6.6	0.0	0.3
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	99.6	0.4	0.0	0.0	2.8	75.7	0.0	0.8	18.0	2.9	0.0	0.2
10.	Karnataka	61.9	33.3	3.7	1.1	6.3	40.7	0.7	0.4	19.3	8.5	1.9	0.5
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	75.1	21.6	3.3	0.0	5.5	37.2	6.3	0.6	11.9	6.7	0.7	0.3
12.	Madhya Pradesh	12.7	24.0	35.6	27.7	17.4	58.1	0.4	0.6	18.0	7.1	0.0	0.3
13.	Maharashtra	22.9	35.9	23.8	9.6	13.2	40.7	34.8	1.2	27.5	27.2	11.5	1.1
14.	Manipur	29.7	44.2	20.4	4.1	10.7	31.2	0.0	0.3	24.5	8.9	0.4	0.5
15.	Orissa	58.9	26.3	5.2	9.6	8.7	51.9	0.0	0.5	7.0	4.8	1.1	0.2

(Contd.)

(Contd.)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	No. of paying clients					No. of non-paying regular partner			No. of non-paying non-regular partner			
		< 7	8-14	15-21	>22	Mean	1	> 2	Mean	1	2-4	>5	Mean
16.	Other North Eastern States	45.9	39.6	7.8	2.2	8.5	18.9	5.6	0.3	14.4	22.2	4.1	0.8
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	75.8	23.4	0.4	0.0	5.8	73.6	12.8	1.0	25.3	10.6	0.0	0.5
18.	Rajasthan	55.9	30.7	12.2	1.1	7.9	44.1	5.2	0.5	13.7	3.0	0.0	0.2
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	26.7	60.7	11.5	1.1	9.9	47.4	1.1	0.6	23.7	11.5	0.7	0.5
20.	Uttar Pradesh	48.2	21.2	24.8	5.1	9.5	45.3	1.5	0.5	6.2	1.8	0.0	0.1
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	38.7	30.2	20.9	10.2	11.5	53.7	0.7	0.6	1.9	0.9	0.2	0.1
22.	Jharkhand	22.8	52.6	19.4	5.2	11.2	49.3	10.1	0.7	23.5	9.7	0.0	0.4
23.	Chhattisgarh	30.0	43.1	19.5	7.5	11.8	59.6	5.6	0.7	10.1	4.5	0.0	0.2
24.	Sikkim	82.5	15.8	1.7	0.0	4.9	35.0	1.7	0.4	15.8	2.5	0.0	0.2
25.	Uttarakhand	58.1	37.0	4.8	0.0	6.8	47.8	0.0	0.5	19.6	13.0	0.0	0.5
All India (2006)		44.1	33.4	14.8	5.6	9.7	49.5	7.2	0.7	16.0	11.7	2.2	0.5
CI		38.6–49.6	28.2–38.6	10.9–18.7	3.1–8.1	6.4–13.0	44.0–55.0	4.4–10.0	0.0–1.6	12.0–20.0	7.5–14.3	0.6–3.8	0.0–1.3
All India (2001)		38.9	34.6	17.2	8.1	11.0	40.5	3.0	1.1	10.2	5.9	0.5	1.7
Brothel Based		36.2	31.7	20.5	9.6	11.5	52.6	10.3	0.7	12.1	10.1	3.6	0.5
Non-brothel Based		47.4	34.1	12.4	3.9	8.9	49.5	5.9	0.7	17.6	11.2	1.7	0.5

Base: All respondents

About 44 percent of the FSWs in BSS 2006 compared to 39 percent in BSS 2001 had less than seven paying clients in last seven days prior to survey. A higher proportion of non-brothel based FSWs (47%) had less than seven clients compared with brothel based FSWs (36%). However, a higher proportion of brothel based FSWs (30%) had over 15 paying clients compared with non-brothel based FSWs (16%). State figures indicate that almost all the FSWs in Jammu & Kashmir and 75 to 85 percent of the FSWs in Kerala, Punjab, Sikkim and Himachal Pradesh had less than seven paying clients in last seven days. The proportion of FSWs having more than 22 paying clients in last seven days was highest in Madhya Pradesh (28%) followed by Delhi (15%), West Bengal, Orissa and Maharashtra (10%).

Overall, 43 percent of FSWs did not have any non-paying regular partners in last seven days prior to the survey. A higher proportion of non-brothel based FSWs (45%) did not have any non-paying partner in the last seven days as compared with brothel based FSWs (37%). Nearly half of the brothel as well as the non-brothel based FSWs had one non-paying regular partner in the same reference period. Overall, the mean number of non-paying regular partners was one in last seven days prior to the survey. State-wise analysis reveals that more than two-thirds of the FSWs in Sikkim, Manipur, Other North Eastern States and Delhi did not have any non-paying regular partners in last seven days. This percentage was lower (less than 25%) in the states of Punjab, Haryana, Maharashtra, Jammu & Kashmir and Gujarat.

Overall, 70 percent of FSWs covered in BSS 2006 against 83 percent in BSS 2001 did not have non-paying non-regulars partners in last seven days prior to the survey. A higher proportion of brothel based FSWs (74%) did not have any non-paying non-regular partner in the last seven days as compared with non-brothel based FSWs (69%). Around one-tenth of the brothel as well as non-brothel based FSWs had between two and four non-paying non-regular partner in the last seven days. State-wise analysis in Table 4.20 reveals that more than two-thirds of FSWs in all the states, except Assam, Maharashtra, Delhi and Other North Eastern States did not have non-

paying non-regular partner. Overall, 12 percent of the FSWs reported that they had two to four non-paying non-regular partners during last week. The percentage of such FSWs was higher in the states of Assam, Maharashtra, Delhi and Other North Eastern States. (Table 4.20)

4.5.4 Number of Paying Clients on Last Working Day

Table 4.21 reveals that about half of the FSWs in both the surveys (2006 - 49%, 2001 - 54%) had two to three clients on the last working day. The proportion of FSWs having one paying client was 34 percent in BSS 2006 and 27 percent in BSS 2001. Nearly 17 percent of FSWs in BSS 2006 (18% in BSS 2001) had four or more clients on last working day. A higher proportion of non-brothel based FSWs (37%) had one paying client on the last working day as compared with brothel based FSWs (26%) but a higher proportion of brothel based FSWs (29%) had four or more paying clients on the

Table 4.21: Percentage distribution of respondents by number of paying clients on the last working day

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	No. of paying clients on the last working day						
		0	1	2-3	4-5	6-7	8+	Mean
1.	Andhra Pradesh	0.2	17.8	54.4	17.3	4.9	5.4	3.2
2.	Assam	0.0	10.0	64.8	22.2	2.2	0.7	2.8
3.	Bihar	0.0	39.7	47.1	9.2	3.3	0.7	2.3
4.	Delhi	0.0	6.2	43.2	32.2	13.2	5.1	4.6
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	0.0	26.1	55.2	14.2	2.6	1.9	2.6
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	0.7	17.4	72.5	6.9	1.1	1.4	3.4
7.	Haryana	0.0	51.9	23.0	0.4	0.0	24.8	19.9
8.	Himachal Pradesh	0.0	67.8	31.9	0.4	0.0	0.0	1.4
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	11.8	71.0	17.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
10.	Karnataka	0.0	29.2	61.8	5.2	1.1	2.6	3.1
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	0.0	52.8	42.0	4.5	0.7	0.0	1.7
12.	Madhya Pradesh	0.0	19.5	56.6	20.2	2.6	1.1	2.8
13.	Maharashtra	0.2	17.7	52.3	15.9	8.3	5.5	3.5
14.	Manipur	0.0	26.4	56.5	16.0	0.7	0.4	2.4
15.	Orissa	0.0	50.6	38.3	7.1	3.3	0.7	2.0
16.	Other North Eastern States	0.0	34.9	55.0	9.3	0.4	0.4	2.2
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	0.0	54.9	44.7	0.0	0.0	0.4	1.6
18.	Rajasthan	0.4	42.6	48.1	7.0	0.7	1.1	2.0
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	0.4	12.2	70.0	15.2	1.5	0.7	3.1
20.	Uttar Pradesh	0.0	35.8	44.9	17.9	0.7	0.7	2.3
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	0.2	34.0	48.2	11.6	3.4	2.6	2.5
22.	Jharkhand	5.6	21.3	55.4	16.9	0.4	0.4	2.3
23.	Chhattisgarh	0.0	36.7	45.3	13.5	3.4	1.1	2.3
24.	Sikkim	0.0	65.8	32.5	1.7	0.0	0.0	1.4
25.	Uttarakhand	0.0	45.2	50.0	4.8	0.0	0.0	1.8
All India (2006)		0.7	33.6	49.1	11.4	2.6	2.6	3.1
CI		0.0 – 1.6	28.4 – 38.8	43.6 – 54.6	7.9 – 14.9	0.8 – 4.4	0.8 – 4.4	1.2 – 5.0
All India (2001)		0.8	27.3	53.8	13.7	2.6	1.7	2.6
Brothel Based (2006)		0.1	25.8	45.4	19.1	6.0	3.5	3.1
Non-brothel Based (2006)		1.0	36.8	50.6	8.2	1.2	2.2	3.2

Base: All respondents

last working day as compared with non-brothel based FSWs (12%). Mean number of paying clients was 3.1 and 2.6 in BSS 2006 and BSS 2001 respectively.

State figures in Table 4.21 indicate that nearly two-thirds of FSWs in Gujarat, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka and Assam reported having two to three clients on last working day prior to the survey. More than half of the FSWs in Jammu & Kashmir, Orissa, Himachal Pradesh, Sikkim, Punjab, Kerala and Haryana had one client on last working day.

Mean number of paying clients on last working day was as high as 4.6 clients in Delhi followed by 3.5 clients in Maharashtra, 3.4 clients in Gujarat, 3.2 clients in Andhra Pradesh and 3.1 clients in Karnataka and Tamil Nadu. The lowest mean number of clients on last working day was reported from Jammu & Kashmir (1.1 clients) followed by Himachal Pradesh and Sikkim (1.4 clients), Punjab (1.6), Kerala (1.7) and Uttarakhand (1.8 clients).

4.5.5 Condom Use during Last Sex with Paying Clients and Non-paying Partners

Each FSW covered in BSS 2001 as well as BSS 2006 was asked to mention whether a condom was used last time she had sex with the paying clients and non-paying partners. As Table 4.22 shows the proportion of FSWs reporting use of condom last time when they had sex with the paying clients has gone up from 76 percent in BSS 2001 to 88 percent in BSS 2006. Against 94 percent of the brothel based FSWs, 85 percent of the non-brothel based FSWs reported condom usage in the last occasion when they had sex with a paying client. Compared to other states, condom use during last sex among FSWs was low in Sikkim (59%), Uttarakhand (68%), Orissa (71%), Madhya Pradesh (72%), Jammu & Kashmir (72%) and Himachal Pradesh (79%).

Table 4.22 further indicates that about 54 percent of FSWs in BSS 2006 against 39 percent in BSS 2001 used condom last time when they had sex with non-paying partners. Here also higher proportion of the brothel based FSWs (61%) than the non-brothel based FSWs (51%) reported last time condom use with non-paying partner. A significant proportion of FSWs in Delhi (94%), Assam (86%), Maharashtra (78%), Manipur (73%), and Gujarat (70%) reported condom use with non-paying partners. Lowest proportion of the FSWs in Orissa (18%) followed by Punjab, Jammu & Kashmir, West Bengal, Himachal Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh (31 to 40%) had used condom last time when they had sex with non-paying partners.

4.5.6 Consistent Condom Use with Paying Clients and Non-paying Partners

Overall, nearly three-fourths of the FSWs in BSS 2006 compared to half of those in BSS 2001 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 (85%) as compared with non-brothel based FSWs (69%). More than 90 percent of FSWs in Delhi, Maharashtra and Goa reported use of condom consistently with all the paying clients in last 30 days (Table 4.22). The corresponding percentage was much lower in Sikkim (11%), Uttarakhand (32%) and Jammu & Kashmir (49%). The consistency of condom usage is a higher priority indicator as compared to the use of condom at last sexual intercourse, and it shows over one-fourth of the FSWs' population had unprotected sex in the last month.

Only 37 percent of the FSWs (21% in BSS 2001) reported consistent use of condom with non-paying partner during the last 30 days. The proportion of FSWs reporting use of condom every time with all the non-paying partners during the last 30 days preceding the survey was highest in Delhi (86%) followed by Assam (71%), Maharashtra (61%) and Jharkhand (51%). It was less than 15 percent in Sikkim, Jammu & Kashmir, Orissa, Himachal Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh. This proportion is higher among brothel based FSWs (50%) than non-brothel based FSWs (32%).



Table 4.22: Percentage of respondents who reported condom usage during last sex and consistent condom use in last 30 days with paying client and non-paying partners

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	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*	
		2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	93.6	78.9	45.5	58.2	69.5	53.1	33.8	29.1
2.	Assam	98.1	75.2	85.9	48.5	84.8	26.9	71.0	12.6
3.	Bihar	91.9	65.3	59.7	20.0	87.5	23.9	44.4	5.3
4.	Delhi	99.3	72.5	93.8	66.7	91.6	63.6	85.6	45.8
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	96.3	77.0	56.6	44.2	92.5	69.3	39.6	32.6
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	88.8	77.1	69.8	34.5	80.4	58.1	46.6	26.8
7.	Haryana	84.1	69.6	54.8	16.6	74.0	27.6	39.5	7.3
8.	Himachal Pradesh	78.9	87.8	37.3	35.7	56.7	41.0	11.8	16.3
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	72.1	80.7	31.5	26.3	48.8	50.9	11.1	6.3
10.	Karnataka	92.5	73.4	51.6	58.6	87.3	55.7	44.2	33.7
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	92.6	87.8	46.6	48.0	88.8	73.7	33.1	38.2
12.	Madhya Pradesh	71.5	70.9	41.1	49.2	60.7	65.0	12.1	28.5
13.	Maharashtra	98.3	87.7	78.4	39.3	91.9	72.5	61.4	7.1
14.	Manipur	95.2	71.8	73.2	67.9	80.3	53.3	49.3	44.9
15.	Orissa	71.0	73.0	18.1	53.6	58.7	65.2	11.5	38.5
16.	Other North Eastern States	80.7	64.1	52.5	40.2	61.0	23.7	29.5	20.5
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	84.6	79.0	30.7	25.4	78.0	45.8	21.0	9.7
18.	Rajasthan	96.3	67.8	44.7	25.6	85.2	33.8	30.3	13.3
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	90.7	83.3	55.0	25.0	58.1	54.1	16.8	9.2
20.	Uttar Pradesh	81.8	68.9	40.0	41.5	72.6	61.9	27.9	13.8
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	91.8	86.5	37.0	22.6	77.6	39.0	30.6	9.5
22.	Jharkhand	87.6		60.1		80.8		50.8	
23.	Chhattisgarh	86.5		60.5		69.7		36.8	
24.	Sikkim	59.2		50.8		11.0		9.5	
25.	Uttarakhand	67.8		53.2		31.7		26.8	
All India		87.5	76.0	53.7	38.8	73.4	50.3	36.7	20.5
CI		83.9 – 91.1		48.2 – 59.2		68.5 – 78.3		31.4 – 42.0	
Brothel Based		94.2	75.2	61.3	39.0	84.6	57.2	50.1	21.3
Non-brothel Based		84.7	76.5	51.0	38.7	68.7	45.8	31.8	20.2

Base: All respondents

*Base: Those respondents who reported any non-paying partner in the last 7 days




4.5.7 Person Suggesting Condom Use at Last Sex with Paying Client/Non-paying Partner

Overall, 64 percent (62% in BSS 2001) of the FSWs, who had used condom at last sexual intercourse with a paying client, reported that they themselves suggested the use of condom. About 21 percent of the FSWs in BSS 2006 compared to 27 percent in BSS 2001 reported that client had suggested to use condom. It was a joint decision in case of about 15 percent and 11 percent of the FSWs in BSS 2006 and BSS 2001 respectively. Among brothel based FSWs a higher proportion reported that the decision was her own (78%) as compared with non-brothel based FSWs (57%). A higher proportion of non-brothel based FSWs (27%) reported that the decision to use a condom was the client's than brothel based FSWs (9%). Among the FSWs who had used condom last time, relatively higher proportion in Jammu and Kashmir (71%), Uttarakhand (57%) and Sikkim (51%) reported that it was client who suggested condom use. (Table 4.23)

Table 4.23 further indicates that half of the FSWs in BSS 2006 (43% in BSS 2001), who had used condom at last sexual intercourse with a non-paying partners, reported that she herself suggested the partner to use condom last time. About 14 percent of the FSWs reported that the suggestion to use a condom last time had been their partner's and about 34 percent of the

Condom Usage

Figure 4.12: Percentage of FSWs who reported condom usage during last sex with paying clients: Interstate Comparison, 2006



Base: All respondents

respondents reported that it was a joint decision. The corresponding proportion in BSS 2001 was 43 percent and 31 percent respectively. 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 (63%) as compared with non-brothel based FSWs (45%). However, a higher proportion of non-brothel based FSWs (17%) reported that the decision to use a condom was the client's than brothel based FSWs (7%).

Over 70 percent of the FSWs in Delhi, Kerala and Andhra Pradesh reported that she herself suggested using a condom to her non-paying partner at last sexual intercourse. Higher percentage of FSWs in Uttarakhand (37%), Jammu & Kashmir (26%), Assam (26%) and Rajasthan (23%) reported that their non-paying partner had suggested using a condom. These percentages should be interpreted with caution as the number of non-paying partners in FSWs across all the states is low and therefore the base used for calculating percentages is small (Table 4.23).

Table 4.23: Percentage distribution of respondents by person who suggested condom use at last sex with paying client/non-paying partners

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Paying client			Non-paying partners		
		Self	Client	Joint decision	Self	Partner	Joint decision
1.	Andhra Pradesh	89.8	4.6	5.6	79.3	9.2	4.3
2.	Assam	36.2	29.8	34.0	40.2	25.6	34.2
3.	Bihar	76.4	4.4	19.2	53.8	5.0	41.3
4.	Delhi	74.2	3.7	22.1	71.3	6.0	22.7
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	69.4	25.6	5.0	34.7	18.2	47.1
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	62.0	22.9	15.1	45.2	6.5	48.4
7.	Haryana	58.1	30.0	11.9	49.6	12.8	37.6
8.	Himachal Pradesh	36.2	29.6	34.3	21.5	12.7	65.8
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	15.8	70.9	13.3	20.3	25.7	54.1
10.	Karnataka	71.4	6.9	21.4	52.4	9.5	34.5
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	83.9	4.8	11.2	75.4	7.2	17.4
12.	Madhya Pradesh	39.3	43.5	17.3	34.6	15.4	50.0
13.	Maharashtra	68.4	19.0	12.6	59.6	16.9	23.2
14.	Manipur	65.6	13.3	21.1	45.2	14.4	40.4
15.	Orissa	61.8	24.1	14.1	46.7	6.7	46.7
16.	Other North Eastern States	39.6	38.2	22.1	24.7	19.2	53.4
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	58.9	21.2	19.9	50.6	1.3	48.1
18.	Rajasthan	68.5	19.6	11.9	47.8	23.2	29.0
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	69.4	17.6	13.1	57.9	15.9	10.3
20.	Uttar Pradesh	71.9	17.0	11.2	26.8	7.1	66.1
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	84.1	10.8	5.1	60.0	2.7	37.3
22.	Jharkhand	56.4	20.9	22.6	53.1	12.4	34.5
23.	Chhattisgarh	71.4	17.3	11.3	61.6	13.4	25.0
24.	Sikkim	39.4	50.7	9.9	34.4	12.5	50.0
25.	Uttarakhand	30.1	57.4	12.6	31.7	36.6	30.7
All India (2006)		63.9	20.9	15.1	50.4	14.1	34.1
CI		58.6 – 69.2	16.4 – 25.4	11.2 – 19.0	44.9 – 55.9	10.3 – 17.9	28.9 – 39.3
All India (2001)		62.0	27.0	10.8	43.3	25.0	31.4
Brothel Based (2006)		78.3	8.8	12.9	63.2	7.2	28.4
Non-brothel Based (2006)		57.2	26.6	16.2	44.9	17.2	36.5

Base: Respondents who used condom at last sex

4.5.8 Type of Condom Brands Used at Last Sex with Paying Client/Non-paying Partners

All the FSWs who reported use of condom at last sexual intercourse were asked to mention the type of condom brands used at last sex with paying client/non-paying partners. Among the FSWs who had used condom at last sex with paying clients, 43 percent reported the use of Nirodh brand. Deluxe Nirodh and Kamasutra were reported by 23 percent and eight percent of FSWs respectively. A higher proportion of non-brothel based FSWs (10%) used Kamasutra as compared with brothel based FSWs (4%) but a higher proportion of brothel based FSWs (32%)

Table 4.24: Percentage distribution of respondents by type of condom brands used at last sex with paying client/non-paying partners

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Paying client			Non-paying partners		
		Nirodh	Delux Nirodh	Kamasutra	Nirodh	Delux Nirodh	Kamasutra
1.	Andhra Pradesh	73.3	23.8	2.0	73.4	22.3	3.8
2.	Assam	47.9	11.3	20.4	51.6	10.0	22.8
3.	Bihar	61.6	8.0	2.0	50.0	11.3	2.5
4.	Delhi	23.2	56.8	5.5	25.3	52.0	4.7
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	54.3	15.9	14.3	42.1	24.8	16.5
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	41.2	12.2	13.9	43.2	14.2	17.4
7.	Haryana	30.8	21.6	2.2	41.4	16.5	1.5
8.	Himachal Pradesh	24.9	12.7	12.7	35.4	10.1	7.6
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	4.6	20.4	8.2	13.5	17.6	9.5
10.	Karnataka	81.0	6.0	8.9	77.4	8.3	8.3
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	28.1	42.6	14.5	20.3	39.1	24.6
12.	Madhya Pradesh	25.7	12.6	5.8	23.1	10.3	6.4
13.	Maharashtra	41.2	17.3	14.1	35.6	20.1	16.7
14.	Manipur	53.9	21.1	5.9	56.7	20.2	5.8
15.	Orissa	30.9	21.5	4.7	16.7	43.3	3.3
16.	Other North Eastern States	33.2	12.9	21.2	38.4	16.4	17.8
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	41.1	11.3	13.0	57.0	6.3	12.7
18.	Rajasthan	54.2	21.5	3.1	55.1	14.5	2.9
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	43.7	8.2	14.3	31.8	10.3	11.2
20.	Uttar Pradesh	25.4	55.4	0.9	37.5	42.9	0.0
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	24.8	52.3	4.3	24.5	50.9	5.5
22.	Jharkhand	61.1	9.8	7.7	72.6	6.2	2.7
23.	Chhattisgarh	78.4	3.9	3.9	78.6	7.1	4.5
24.	Sikkim	22.5	14.1	2.8	28.1	21.9	0.0
25.	Uttarakhand	25.1	37.7	2.2	34.7	37.6	5.9
All India (2006)		43.2	22.6	8.4	44.5	20.6	10.1
CI		37.7 – 48.7	18.0 – 27.2	5.3 – 11.5	39.0 – 50.0	16.1 – 25.1	6.8 – 13.4
All India (2001)		39.2	26.7	11.5	39.0	21.9	12.9
Brothel Based (2006)		47.6	32.3	4.2	49.6	28.7	5.2
Non-brothel Based (2006)		41.1	18.1	10.4	42.3	17.1	12.2

Base: Respondents who used condom at last sex

Note: Due to other responses in the question, total percentage does not add up to 100.

used Delux Nirodh as compared with brothel based FSWs (18%). Majority of the FSWs, who had used condom last time, in Karnataka (81%), Chhattisgarh (78%), Andhra Pradesh (73%) Bihar (62%) and Jharkhand (61%) reported use of Nirodh brand with paying client at last sexual intercourse. A large proportion of respondents, who had used condom last time, in Delhi (57%), Uttar Pradesh (55%), West Bengal (52%) and Kerala (43%) had used Delux Nirodh brand at that time. About one-fifth of FSWs in Assam and Other North Eastern States reported the use of Kamasutra brand last time when they had sexual intercourse with paying client.

More than two-fifths of the FSWs, who had used condom at last sexual intercourse with non-paying partner, reported use of Nirodh brand at that time. Delux Nirodh was another common brand (21%) followed by Kamasutra (10%). Like among paying clients, a higher proportion of non-brothel based FSWs (12%) used Kamasutra as compared with brothel based FSWs (5%) with their non-paying partners but a higher proportion of brothel based FSWs (29%) used Delux Nirodh as compared with brothel based FSWs (17%). Majority of the FSWs (73% to 79%), who had used condom last time, in Chhattisgarh, Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh and Jharkhand reported using Nirodh. A large proportion (43%-52%) of FSWs in Delhi, West Bengal, Orissa and Uttar Pradesh used Delux Nirodh with non-paying partners.

4.5.9 Source of Condom Used at Last Sex with Paying Client/Non-paying Partner

Overall, 31 percent of the FSWs who had used condom last time with paying clients reportedly obtained condom from their client itself and another 30 percent obtained it from NGOs or their peer educators. Procurement of condoms from chemist shop/pharmacy was mentioned by 18 percent of the FSWs who used condom last time with paying clients. Nearly 37 percent of non-brothel based FSWs obtained condoms from the person they had sex with and 22 percent each obtained it from a chemist shop/pharmacy or NGO peer educator. A considerably higher proportion of brothel based FSWs (46%) obtained condom from NGO clinic/peer educator as compared with non-brothel based FSWs (22%). A large proportion of FSWs, who had used condom last time with paying client, reportedly obtained the condom from the client in Jammu & Kashmir (83%), Madhya Pradesh (82%), Himachal Pradesh (78%) and Uttarakhand (74%). The proportion of FSWs who had obtained it from NGOs/Peer educator was high in Andhra Pradesh (74%), Bihar (64%), Karnataka (61%) and Manipur (50%). As high as 41 percent of the FSWs in Manipur followed by 38 percent in Haryana and 32 percent in Sikkim procured condoms from the chemist shop/pharmacy. (Table 4.25)

Among the FSWs who had used condom last time with non-paying partner, one-fourth each reportedly obtained condom from their partners and chemist shop/pharmacy. One-fifth had obtained it from NGOs/Peer educator. A considerably higher proportion of non-brothel based FSWs (28%) obtained condom from person they had sex with as compared with non-brothel based FSWs (16%). Over a fourth of the non-brothel based FSWs (28%) bought condom from chemist shop/pharmacy as compared with 12 percent brothel based FSWs. However, a higher proportion of brothel based FSWs (31%) obtained condom from NGO clinic/peer educator as compared with non-brothel based FSWs (16%). The NGOs/Peer educators were instrumental in providing and promoting condom use in Karnataka (63%), West Bengal (58%), Bihar (55%), Manipur (53%), and Delhi (44%). Purchase of condoms from chemist shop/pharmacy was more common in the states of Sikkim (53%), Haryana (45%), Jammu & Kashmir (42%) and Maharashtra (34%).

4.5.10 Reasons for Not Using Condom at Last Sex with Paying Client/Non-paying Partner

Overall 12 percent of the FSWs had not used condom during the last sex with paying client and 46 percent had not used it during the last sex with non-paying partner. The reason for non-use of condoms was ascertained from all the FSWs who had not used condom during the last sex with paying client/non-paying partner. As table 4.26 shows, at the national level, the FSWs reporting 'partner objection' as the main reason for not using condom at last sex with paying client has declined from 68 percent in BSS 2001 to 45 percent in BSS 2006. Significant decline is also noticed with respect to the proportion of FSWs reporting "non-availability of condoms" and "did not think it was necessary" as the reason for not using condom at last sex with the paying client. (Table 4.26)

Among brothel based FSWs, 21 percent reported non-availability as a reason for not using condom as compared with 11 percent of non-brothel based FSWs. Seven percent of non-

Table 4.25: Percentage distribution of respondents by source of condom used at last sex with paying client/non-paying partners

(All figure are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Paying client			Non-paying partners		
		Person had sex with	NGOs/Peer educator	Purchased at chemist shop/ pharmacy	Person had sex with	NGOs/Peer educator	Purchased at chemist shop/ pharmacy
1.	Andhra Pradesh	6.6	73.9	8.8	6.5	2.2	11.4
2.	Assam	32.5	0.8	24.5	26.9	0.5	24.2
3.	Bihar	18.0	64.4	8.4	13.8	55.0	13.8
4.	Delhi	15.5	43.5	15.5	20.7	44.0	14.7
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	21.7	38.8	16.3	22.3	31.4	23.1
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	18.0	17.6	25.7	11.0	15.5	29.7
7.	Haryana	35.7	9.7	38.3	17.3	14.3	45.1
8.	Himachal Pradesh	78.4	1.4	15.5	44.3	3.8	30.4
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	82.7	0.5	16.8	52.7	0.0	41.9
10.	Karnataka	12.1	60.5	10.5	7.1	63.1	11.9
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	12.4	43.0	19.7	10.1	33.3	30.4
12.	Madhya Pradesh	82.2	0.0	6.8	73.1	0.0	14.1
13.	Maharashtra	19.0	22.4	29.3	14.4	20.1	33.6
14.	Manipur	5.1	50.4	41.0	9.6	52.9	27.9
15.	Orissa	29.8	17.8	15.2	13.3	10.0	30.0
16.	Other North Eastern States	45.2	18.4	17.5	38.4	17.8	16.4
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	50.2	5.2	16.9	24.1	7.6	27.8
18.	Rajasthan	25.8	47.7	11.9	37.7	37.7	8.7
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	19.6	30.6	22.0	18.7	9.3	22.4
20.	Uttar Pradesh	46.4	4.0	21.4	53.6	1.8	14.3
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	14.5	49.7	15.1	21.8	58.2	10.0
22.	Jharkhand	58.1	12.0	10.3	48.7	13.3	8.0
23.	Chhattisgarh	28.1	12.1	9.5	18.8	13.4	15.2
24.	Sikkim	53.5	4.2	32.4	34.4	3.1	53.1
25.	Uttarakhand	74.3	2.7	9.3	54.5	5.9	14.9
All India (2006)		30.6	29.7	18.2	24.5	20.3	23.0
CI		25.5 – 35.7	24.7 - 34.7	13.9 – 22.5	19.8 – 29.2	15.9 – 24.7	18.4 – 27.6
All India (2006)		31.8	21.3	19.5	33.4	22.1	16.1
Brothel Based (2006)		16.7	45.5	10.8	16.0	30.8	11.9
Non-brothel Based (2006)		37.1	22.4	21.6	28.2	15.7	27.8

Base: Respondents who used condom at last sex

Note: Due to other responses in the question, total percentage does not add up to 100.

Table 4.26: Percentage distribution of respondents by reasons for not using condom at last sex with paying client/non-paying partners

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Paying client			Non-paying partners		
		Partner objected	Not available	Didn't think it was necessary	Partner objected	Not available	Didn't think it was necessary
1.	Andhra Pradesh	31.3	9.4	6.3	10.1	21.1	4.6
2.	Assam	40.0	20.0	0.0	5.6	30.6	8.3
3.	Bihar	19.0	14.3	61.9	3.8	45.3	39.6
4.	Delhi	100.0	0.0	0.0	30.0	20.0	10.0
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	10.0	0.0	10.0	17.6	28.6	26.4
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	26.7	33.3	10.0	3.0	18.2	24.2
7.	Haryana	14.3	9.5	28.6	41.9	20.0	8.6
8.	Himachal Pradesh	50.9	16.4	7.3	26.5	13.6	15.9
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	50.0	10.9	4.7	18.4	13.2	17.8
10.	Karnataka	36.8	0.0	15.8	5.6	33.3	9.7
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	52.4	9.5	9.5	15.2	69.6	10.1
12.	Madhya Pradesh	22.4	14.5	14.5	8.9	34.8	18.8
13.	Maharashtra	44.4	11.1	0.0	11.7	23.4	21.3
14.	Manipur	53.8	7.7	0.0	15.8	21.1	13.2
15.	Orissa	52.5	4.9	4.9	22.2	27.0	18.3
16.	Other North Eastern States	40.4	19.2	3.8	24.2	18.2	18.2
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	42.9	9.5	0.0	27.0	33.1	20.2
18.	Rajasthan	30.0	50.0	0.0	25.3	34.9	14.5
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	40.0	0.0	4.0	13.1	42.9	0.0
20.	Uttar Pradesh	42.0	14.0	0.0	19.0	25.0	23.8
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	79.5	4.5	0.0	46.5	18.2	4.8
22.	Jharkhand	46.9	6.3	6.3	21.6	17.6	21.6
23.	Chhattisgarh	30.6	41.7	5.6	15.1	27.4	13.7
24.	Sikkim	61.7	6.4	0.0	32.3	3.2	9.7
25.	Uttarakhand	75.3	8.2	1.2	32.6	28.1	7.9
All India (2006)		45.1	12.5	7.4	21.0	26.2	14.6
CI		39.6 – 50.6	8.9 – 16.1	4.5 – 10.3	16.5 – 25.5	21.4 – 31.0	10.7 – 18.5
All India (2001)		68.2	27.5	20.3	52.2	51.7	32.8
Brothel Based (2006)		36.3	21.0	11.3	19.8	25.7	15.6
Non-brothel Based (2006)		46.5	11.1	6.7	21.3	26.4	14.3

Base: Respondents who had not used condom during last sex.

Note: Due to other responses in the question, total percentage does not add up to 100.

brothel based FSWs reported “didn’t think necessary” as a reason for not using condom as compared with 11 percent brothel based FSWs. However, among brothel based FSWs, 36 percent reported partner objection as a reason for not using condom as compared with 47 percent non-brothel based FSWs. The state-wise figures presented in Table 4.26 should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size.

Table 4.26 further indicates that among the FSWs who had not used condom at last sex with non-paying partner, the main reason for not using condom was “not available” (26%) followed by “partner objection” (21%) and “decreases pleasure” (15%) . Since BSS 2001, there has been a significant decline in the proportion of the FSWs (who had not used condom at last sex with non-paying partner) citing above three reasons.

4.5.11 Condom Negotiation with Paying Clients

Overall, 87 percent of FSWs in BSS 2006 against 81 percent in BSS 2001 reported that they usually insisted their clients to use a condom. This proportion was highest in Goa (99%) followed by Manipur (98%), Tamil Nadu (97%), Karnataka (96%) and lowest in Madhya Pradesh (60%) followed by Uttarakhand (65%). The brothel based FSWs (92%) are more likely to insist their clients to use a condom than the non-brothel based FSWs (85%). Over 80 percent of the FSWs in all the states except Madhya Pradesh, Uttarakhand, Haryana, Jammu & Kashmir, Orissa and Sikkim reported that they usually insisted their clients to use a condom. (Table 4.27)

More than half of the FSWs (56%) reported client’s refusal in last three months for using condom. This proportion was highest in West Bengal and Sikkim (86%) followed by Kerala (79%), Chhattisgarh (73%) and Tamil Nadu. The proportion of the FSWs reporting client refusal was lower (less than 40%) in Haryana, Goa, Delhi and Himachal Pradesh. A significant difference was observed in proportion of brothel (60%) and non-brothel (54%) based FSWs who reported client refusal for using condom.

The FSWs who reported client’s refusal for using condom were further asked what action they took the last time their client refused to use a condom. The commonly mentioned responses to the above query included “refused to have sex” (37%), “charged extra amount” (20%), and “persuaded successfully” (22%). A significantly higher proportion of FSWs in Bihar (76%) followed by Rajasthan (60%) and Maharashtra (58%) “refused to have sex” when the client refused to use condom. The corresponding percentage was much higher among the brothel (55%) based FSWs than the non-brothel based FSWs (29%). Highest proportion of respondents in Himachal Pradesh (38%), Manipur (36%), Tamil Nadu (44%) and Jharkhand (39%) reported that they charged extra amount last time when the client refused to use a condom. The proportion of respondents who sold sex and did not do anything was highest in Haryana (39%), Jammu & Kashmir (38%), Madhya Pradesh (42%), Other North East States (34%) and Sikkim (38%).

4.6 Other Salient Observations

4.6.1 Perception regarding Risk of Contracting HIV/AIDS

All the FSWs covered in BSS 2001 and BSS 2006 were asked to measure their perception of getting HIV/AIDS infection against a four-point scale varying from “very high” to “no chance”. A significant increase from BSS 2001 can be seen in the proportion of FSWs who reported high risk of contracting HIV/AIDS (2001-17%, 2006-30%). (Table 4.28)

This proportion was highest in Maharashtra (51%), followed by Himachal Pradesh (49%), Delhi (44%), Uttarakhand (43%) and low in Sikkim (3%), Haryana and Gujarat (6%). A significant difference in this proportion was also observed among brothel based FSWs (38%) and non-brothel FSWs (26%).

Table 4.27: Percentage distribution of respondents who reported condom negotiation with paying clients

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Usually insist on client using condom		Reporting client refusal in last 3 months	Action taken on client refusal *				
		2006	2001		Refused sex	Charged extra	Persuaded successfully	Failed to persuade	Sold sex
1.	Andhra Pradesh	90.2	71.1	62.1	43.3	14.3	30.5	7.6	4.3
2.	Assam	90.4	75.4	48.1	45.4	21.5	10.8	0.0	22.3
3.	Bihar	93.3	87.5	58.2	76.3	3.8	12.2	5.1	2.6
4.	Delhi	95.2	97.0	37.7	44.7	23.3	23.3	3.9	4.9
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	99.3	99.3	34.7	46.2	29.0	17.2	4.3	3.2
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	93.4	89.5	52.9	40.7	26.2	10.3	4.1	18.6
7.	Haryana	69.8	66.3	33.6	22.2	8.9	14.4	12.2	38.9
8.	Himachal Pradesh	79.2	67.2	39.8	18.7	38.3	9.3	8.4	25.2
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	70.9	51.3	49.2	8.7	23.6	8.7	21.3	37.8
10.	Karnataka	96.3	69.2	56.5	46.1	5.9	40.8	2.0	4.6
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	91.8	87.0	78.8	40.1	16.0	37.7	4.2	1.9
12.	Madhya Pradesh	59.8	78.3	60.2	15.6	18.8	19.4	4.4	41.9
13.	Maharashtra	90.5	98.9	44.0	57.8	12.2	22.4	5.9	1.7
14.	Manipur	97.8	77.7	44.0	31.4	36.4	22.0	0.8	9.3
15.	Orissa	72.9	81.4	59.5	42.2	16.3	4.8	16.3	20.4
16.	Other North Eastern States	85.5	61.3	42.8	16.5	17.4	14.8	13.0	33.9
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	92.3	62.2	64.2	36.8	14.9	19.5	13.8	14.9
18.	Rajasthan	91.8	68.0	50.0	60.4	14.9	9.0	3.0	12.7
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	96.7	89.6	69.3	19.8	44.4	23.0	11.8	1.1
20.	Uttar Pradesh	81.7	92.7	57.1	43.6	24.4	19.2	5.1	7.7
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	96.1	99.6	85.7	43.5	15.8	33.1	5.6	1.9
22.	Jharkhand	80.8		45.0	23.1	38.5	19.7	9.4	6.8
23.	Chhattisgarh	85.8		73.0	34.9	11.8	36.4	6.2	9.2
24.	Sikkim	76.1		85.5	14.0	34.0	6.0	8.0	38.0
25.	Uttarakhand	65.3		60.1	7.5	21.7	18.6	26.1	26.1
All India (2006)		86.7		56.0	37.2	19.8	21.9	7.9	12.8
CI		83.0–90.4		50.5–61.5	31.9–42.5	15.4–24.2	17.3–26.5	4.9–10.9	9.1–16.5
All India (2001)		80.5		68.5	37.6	17.9	15.4	11.9	17.0
Brothel Based		91.6		59.8	54.5	11.1	26.0	4.5	3.8
Non-brothel Based		84.6		54.4	29.1	23.9	20.0	9.5	17.0

Base: All respondents

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

Table 4.28: Percentage distribution of respondents by perception regarding risk of contracting HIV/AIDS

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Very high		Moderate		Low		No chance	
		2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	39.9	10.0	37.9	29.4	14.2	45.5	8.0	14.7
2.	Assam	34.4	33.7	17.8	21.5	17.8	34.4	19.6	5.2
3.	Bihar	15.4	16.7	16.5	20.5	23.5	31.6	42.3	19.4
4.	Delhi	43.6	10.4	28.2	32.7	15.0	33.1	12.8	14.1
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	23.1	8.1	27.2	23.3	38.4	38.1	10.1	28.1
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	5.8	9.4	21.7	20.1	43.5	38.5	16.7	18.1
7.	Haryana	5.6	5.9	19.3	28.5	28.9	29.6	44.8	10.0
8.	Himachal Pradesh	48.5	0.4	29.4	6.6	9.2	36.2	2.2	41.3
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	38.2	10.5	35.7	8.8	13.6	28.9	7.4	29.8
10.	Karnataka	33.3	28.1	44.8	24.7	18.5	29.2	1.9	12.4
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	31.6	13.0	33.8	33.7	26.0	39.3	8.2	12.2
12.	Madhya Pradesh	20.2	42.4	21.7	13.0	22.8	21.0	28.5	13.0
13.	Maharashtra	50.6	26.0	22.7	25.7	16.5	26.8	8.7	19.0
14.	Manipur	40.9	23.2	18.6	39.7	33.8	32.2	6.3	4.1
15.	Orissa	18.5	26.5	31.9	15.4	29.6	23.9	17.8	21.3
16.	Other North Eastern States	16.3	16.9	27.0	36.0	26.3	22.1	22.6	13.6
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	18.7	4.9	56.4	25.1	12.5	33.7	8.8	19.9
18.	Rajasthan	24.4	4.4	26.7	34.7	26.3	21.8	19.6	18.5
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	19.6	19.7	55.9	49.4	24.1	23.8	0.4	7.1
20.	Uttar Pradesh	34.7	28.2	23.4	11.4	25.2	25.6	10.9	30.4
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	37.6	11.7	28.5	42.2	19.3	27.0	10.9	18.4
22.	Jharkhand	13.8		28.0		30.6		23.1	
23.	Chhattisgarh	26.2		22.1		24.7		22.8	
24.	Sikkim	2.5		10.0		57.5		25.8	
25.	Uttarakhand	42.6		31.5		11.5		5.2	
All India		29.6	16.8	29.2	26.3	22.9	30.7	14.5	17.3
CI		24.6 – 34.6		24.2 – 34.2		18.3 – 27.5		10.6 – 18.4	
Brothel Based		38.4	21.2	23.6	23.1	19.1	28.4	16.7	20.5
Non-brothel Based		25.9	14.0	31.5	28.4	24.4	32.1	13.6	15.3

Base: All Respondents

The proportion of FSWs who reported moderate chances of getting HIV/AIDS was less than one-fifth in the states of Haryana and Manipur (19%), Assam (18%), Bihar (17%) and Sikkim (10%). A significant proportion of FSWs in Punjab and Tamil Nadu (56%) and Karnataka (45%) felt they had a moderate chance of contracting HIV/AIDS.

“No chance” was perceived by a fairly high proportion of respondents in Haryana (45%) and Bihar (42%) and was less than 10 percent in Punjab, Maharashtra, Kerala, Andhra Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir, Manipur, Uttarakhand, Himachal Pradesh and Karnataka. Overall, 15 percent of FSWs (17% in 2001) perceive that there is no chance of contracting HIV/AIDS.

4.6.2 HIV Testing

More than three-fourths (77%) of the respondents reported that it was possible to get a confidential test done to find out if they were HIV infected. This proportion ranged from 92 percent in Goa, Manipur and Maharashtra to 35 percent in Jammu & Kashmir. Relatively higher proportion of the brothel based FSWs (82%) than the non-brothel based FSWs (74%) perceived the possibility of confidential HIV testing in their area. (Table 4.29)

Overall, nearly two-fifths (38%) of the FSWs reported that they had ever undergone any HIV test. The corresponding percentage was less (28%) in BSS 2001. Significantly higher proportion of the brothel based FSWs (55%) than the non-brothel based FSWs (30%) had ever undergone HIV


Table 4.29: Percentage of respondents reporting possibility of confidential HIV testing, ever had HIV test and found out result

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Possibility of confidential HIV testing		Ever had HIV test		HIV test undertaken voluntarily/required*				Ever found out result of test*	
		2006	2001	2006	2001	Voluntary		Required		2006	2001
						2006	2001	2006	2001		
1.	Andhra Pradesh	81.0	64.5	78.2	23.3	71.0	61.5	28.8	38.5	89.0	100.0
2.	Assam	80.7	70.7	27.8	7.4	46.7	65.0	49.3	35.0	64.0	60.0
3.	Bihar	74.6	50.7	48.5	8.3	82.6	75.0	9.8	25.0	97.7	58.3
4.	Delhi	81.0	83.3	55.3	37.2	78.1	63.0	20.5	37.0	96.0	96.0
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	92.2	86.3	55.6	82.6	77.2	85.2	21.5	14.8	89.9	90.1
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	85.5	70.1	21.0	26.7	84.5	68.8	15.5	31.2	93.1	81.8
7.	Haryana	90.7	48.9	23.3	1.9	69.8	40.0	30.2	40.0	84.1	60.0
8.	Himachal Pradesh	68.8	63.8	10.3	3.3	64.3	77.8	32.1	22.2	92.9	77.8
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	35.3	57.9	6.3	1.8	94.1	100.0	5.9	0.0	94.1	100.0
10.	Karnataka	90.0	69.3	77.4	24.0	84.2	62.5	15.8	37.5	95.7	93.8
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	84.0	59.6	71.0	34.8	81.7	59.6	15.2	40.4	96.3	94.7
12.	Madhya Pradesh	50.2	64.5	4.1	43.8	63.6	81.8	36.4	17.4	72.7	96.7
13.	Maharashtra	91.5	78.8	73.6	58.4	89.4	92.4	10.3	7.6	93.0	97.5
14.	Manipur	92.2	64.8	48.3	36.0	40.0	87.5	60.0	12.5	96.9	86.5
15.	Orissa	67.8	89.3	17.8	47.8	20.8	62.3	79.2	37.7	83.3	73.1
16.	Other North Eastern States	58.1	41.5	20.4	13.6	54.5	89.2	45.5	8.1	76.4	91.9
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	84.6	63.7	8.1	4.9	54.5	92.3	45.5	7.7	95.5	92.3
18.	Rajasthan	80.7	59.8	33.3	15.1	85.6	56.1	13.3	39.0	92.2	87.8
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	75.2	82.9	42.2	55.8	68.4	79.3	31.6	20.7	96.5	98.0
20.	Uttar Pradesh	86.1	60.1	31.8	48.7	79.3	85.7	19.5	14.3	75.9	91.7
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	70.9	23.0	47.0	0.7	78.0	100.0	22.0	0.0	96.5	100.0
22.	Jharkhand	57.8		6.0		75.0		25.0		68.8	
23.	Chhattisgarh	83.5		16.5		81.8		15.9		84.1	
24.	Sikkim	49.2		8.3		80.0		10.0		10.0	
25.	Uttarakhand	74.1		6.7		38.9		61.1		83.3	
All India		76.6	64.5	37.6	28.0	74.8	76.5	24.2	23.2	91.0	90.4
CI		71.9 – 81.3		32.2 – 42.9		70.0 – 79.6		19.5 – 28.9		87.8 – 94.2	
Brothel Based		82.1	66.6	55.2	40.5	77.4	80.0	21.0	19.9	91.1	89.9
Non-brothel Based		74.3	63.1	30.2	19.9	72.7	71.9	26.6	27.5	90.9	91.1

Base: All respondents

*Base: Those respondents who have had a HIV test



tests. The proportion of the FSWs having undergone HIV test was much higher (71% to 78%) in the states of Kerala, Maharashtra, Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh. However, less than 10 percent of the FSWs in Sikkim, Punjab, Uttarakhand, Jammu & Kashmir, Jharkhand and Madhya Pradesh had ever undergone HIV test. (Table 4.29)

All the FSWs who had ever undergone HIV tests were further asked to mention whether they have undergone the test voluntarily or it was required for them. As the table 4.29 shows, among the FSWs who had ever undergone HIV tests, over three-fourths had gone for the test voluntarily. The proportion of respondents who had undergone HIV test voluntarily was reported highest in Jammu & Kashmir (94%), followed by Maharashtra (89%), Rajasthan (86%), Gujarat (85%) and lowest in Orissa (21%), Uttarakhand (39%) and Manipur (40%).

A significantly high proportion (91%) of FSWs who had undergone test, reported to have got the result of their test. A very low proportion was recorded in Sikkim (10%) while in rest of the states except Assam (64%), more than two-thirds of the respondents reported that they found out the result of the HIV test. (Table 4.29)

4.6.3 Exposure to STI/HIV/AIDS Programme Interventions in Last One Year

All the respondents were asked whether anyone approached them for educating on STI/HIV/AIDS or they attended any STI/HIV/AIDS intervention programme in last one year. The responses are presented in Table 4.30.

Overall, 56 percent of the FSWs reported that someone had approached them in the last 12 months for educating on STI/HIV/AIDS. This proportion was significantly higher for the brothel based FSWs (70%) than the non-brothel based FSWs (50%).


Across states, more than three-fourths of FSWs in Kerala and Manipur (89%), Goa (82%) and Delhi (76%) reported that someone had approached them for educating on STI/HIV/AIDS. This proportion was significantly lower in Jammu & Kashmir (6%), Madhya Pradesh (9%) and Punjab (16%).

Nearly one-third of the FSWs (against one-fourth in BSS 2001) reported attendance/participation in some campaign/meeting on STI/HIV/AIDS in the last 12 months. The

corresponding percentage was 45 percent and 30 percent for the brothel and non-brothel based FSWs respectively. A significantly higher proportion of FSWs in Manipur (73%), Kerala (62%), Maharashtra (56%) and Goa (52%) had attended/participated in any campaign or meeting in last 12 months. This proportion was lowest in Madhya Pradesh (2%) followed by Jammu & Kashmir (4%), Punjab (4%) and Sikkim (9%).

Attitude towards HIV Testing

Figure 4.14: Percentage of FSWs who have ever had HIV test: State-wise, 2006




Base: All respondents

Table 4.30: Percentage of respondents who reported exposure to STI/HIV/AIDS programme interventions in the last one year

(All figures are in percentage)

Sl. No.	State/Group of States	Received education on STI/HIV/AIDS		Attend/Participate in campaign/meeting on STI/HIV/AIDS	
		2006	2001	2006	2001
1.	Andhra Pradesh	85.1	44.1	64.9	8.2
2.	Assam	29.6	52.2	13.7	12.6
3.	Bihar	72.8	11.5	31.3	4.2
4.	Delhi	75.8	82.5	23.4	29.7
5.	Goa + Daman & Diu	82.1	80.4	51.9	45.6
6.	Gujarat + Dadra & Nagar Haveli	64.1	60.4	27.5	28.8
7.	Haryana	25.2	8.1	14.4	2.6
8.	Himachal Pradesh	25.4	14.8	13.6	8.1
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	6.3	9.6	3.7	2.6
10.	Karnataka	88.5	27.0	81.1	11.2
11.	Kerala + Lakshadweep	88.5	63.3	61.7	60.0
12.	Madhya Pradesh	9.0	60.9	1.5	26.8
13.	Maharashtra	69.9	70.3	56.4	36.1
14.	Manipur	88.5	64.0	72.5	41.6
15.	Orissa	43.0	55.5	18.1	33.1
16.	Other North Eastern States	42.2	20.2	33.7	9.6
17.	Punjab + Chandigarh	15.8	10.9	4.0	4.5
18.	Rajasthan	72.6	33.6	28.1	18.1
19.	Tamil Nadu + Puducherry	60.4	57.6	39.6	52.4
20.	Uttar Pradesh	49.3	43.2	28.5	15.8
21.	West Bengal + Andaman & Nicobar Islands	72.8	92.9	43.5	50.7
22.	Jharkhand	43.3		10.4	
23.	Chhattisgarh	39.7		22.1	
24.	Sikkim	52.5		9.2	
25.	Uttarakhand	39.6		22.2	
All India		56.1	46.9	34.1	24.5
CI		50.6 – 61.6		28.9 – 39.3	
Brothel Based		69.9	61.8	44.6	30.1
Non-brothel Based		50.3	37.2	29.7	20.8

Base: All respondents





National BSS 2006: Questionnaire for Clients of Female Sex Workers

Operational Definition of the Respondent

Men who have bought sex in the last one month

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, incomplete interview or non-availability of respondents the identification page must be filled up.

001	SCHEDULE NUMBER	
002	STATE	
003	TYPE OF SETTLEMENT 1. Urban 2. Rural	
004	CITY/TOWN/VILLAGE	
005	SITE	
006	RESULT CODE Completed 1; Partially Completed 2; Refused 3; Respondents not available for interview 4	
007	INTERVIEWER'S NAME	
008	DATE OF INTERVIEW (DD/MM/YY)	/ /
009	INTERVIEW SETTING One to one interview-1; Interview in presence of others-2	
010	PLACE OF INTERVIEW	
011	TIME OF INTERVIEW (Railway time)	
012	RESULT CODE Completed1 Partially completed2 Refused3 Incapacitated4 Others (Specify)7	

To Be Filled By Supervisor

013	SUPERVISOR NAME	
014	SPOT CHECKED 1. Yes 2. No	☐

Introduction: “My name is..... I’m working for a social research organisation. 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 behaviour 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 last 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 kind of behaviours. We would greatly appreciate your help in responding to this survey. The survey will take about 30 minutes. Would you be willing to participate?

Given Consent: **Yes - 1** —————→ **Continue**
 No - 2 —————→ **End**

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

Section 1: Background Characteristics

Q. No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories	Skip to
Q101	How old are you?	Age in completed years Others (Specify) _____ 77	
Q102	What has been your highest level of educational attainment?	Illiterate..... 01 Literate but no formal education... 02 1 – 5th 03 6 – 8th 04 9 – 10th 05 11 – 12th 06 12 + 07 Others (Specify) _____ 77	

Q. No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories		Skip to
Q103	What is your main occupation?	Unemployed/not working/retired..... 01 Student..... 02 Non-agricultural/casual labourer..... 03 Domestic servant..... 04 Agricultural labour..... 05 Skilled/semi-skilled labourer in manufacturing/ processing industry..... 06 Cultivator..... 07 Petty business/small shop owner..... 08 Small artisan in HH and cottage industry..... 09 Truck drivers/cleaners..... 10 Local transport workers (auto/taxi drivers, hand cart pullers, rickshaw pullers)..... 11 Self employed professional service (pvt./ govt.)..... 12 Large business/medium to large shop owner..... 13 Others (Specify)..... 77		
Q104	Do you live in this city/town?	Yes..... 1 No..... 2 Others (Specify)..... 7		
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)..... 77		
Q106	With whom do you stay?	Alone..... 1 With spouse/Live in partner..... 2 With parents..... 3 With other relatives..... 4 With employer..... 5 With co-worker/students..... 6 Others (Specify)..... 7		
Q107	Where do you stay?	Residence..... 1 Hostel/Mess..... 2 Labour Camp..... 3 Footpath/Railway Stn/Bus terminus/Other public places..... 4 Others (Specify)..... 7		
Q108	In last 12 months, how often have you been away from home? (DON'T INCLUDE THOSE WORKING AWAY FROM HOME BUT RETURNING HOME EVERY EVENING)	Weekly..... 01 Fortnightly..... 02 Monthly..... 03 Once in 3 months..... 04 Once in 6 months..... 05 Once in a year..... 06 Not been away from home..... 07 Others (Specify)..... 77		

Q. No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories	Skip to
Q109	Have you ever had any drinks containing alcohol?	Yes..... 1 No..... 2 Others (Specify)_____ 7 (If “Cannot remember” or “No response” is mentioned in Others, skip to Q112)	→Q112
Q110	During the last 4 weeks how often have you had drinks containing alcohol? Would you say ... (READ RESPONSES AND CIRCLE ONE)	Every day..... 1 At least once a week..... 2 Less than once a week..... 3 Did not drink in the last 4 weeks... 4 Others (Specify)_____ 7	
Q111	How frequently do you take alcoholic drinks before having sex with your commercial sex partners?	Always..... 1 Sometimes..... 2 Rarely..... 3 Never..... 4 Others (Specify)_____ 7	
Q112	Some people have tried different types of intoxicating drugs. Have you tried any?	Yes..... 1 No..... 2 Others (Specify)_____ 7 (If “Cannot remember” or “No response” is mentioned in Others, skip to Q201)	→Q201
Q113	Which drugs have you tried? (DON'T READ OUT THE LIST MULTIPLE RESPONSES POSSIBLE)	Charas..... 1 Ganja..... 2 Bhang..... 3 Afim..... 4 Brown-sugar..... 5 Heroin..... 6 Others (Specify)_____ 7	
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? (DRUGS INJECTED FOR MEDICAL PURPOSES OR TREATMENT OF AN ILLNESS DO NOT COUNT)	Yes..... 1 No..... 2 Others (Specify)_____ 7	

Section 2: Knowledge, Opinion and Attitude towards STI/HIV/AIDS

Q. No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories	Skip to
Q201	Have you heard of problems like genital discharge or genital ulcer/genital sore or burning sensation while passing urine which people get through sexual intercourse? (IT'S A PROMPTED QUESTION. PLEASE MAKE SURE THAT THE RESPONDENT UNDERSTANDS THE SYMPTOMS WE ARE TALKING ABOUT. USE LOCAL /POPULAR TERMINOLOGIES, IF ANY)	Yes..... 1 No..... 2 Others (Specify)_____ 7 (If “Cannot remember” or “No response” is mentioned in Others, skip to Q204)	→Q204

Q. No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories	Skip to			
Q202	Can you describe any other (beside the three symptoms mentioned in the earlier question) symptoms of STI in WOMEN...? Any others? (PLEASE READ OUT ALL THE OPTIONS AND CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE CODE)	Lower abdominal pain Swellings in groin area Pain during sexual intercourse Itching/reddening Warts Skin rashes Others (Specify)_____	Y 1 1 1 1 1 1	N 2 2 2 2 2 2	DK 8 8 8 8 8 8	NR 9 9 9 9 9 9
Q203	Can you describe any other (beside the three symptoms mentioned in the earlier question) symptoms of STI in MEN...? Any others? (PLEASE READ OUT ALL THE OPTIONS AND CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE CODE)	Swellings in groin area Itching/reddening Warts Skin rashes Can't retract foreskin Others (Specify)_____	Y 1 1 1 1 1	N 2 2 2 2 2	DK 8 8 8 8 8	NR 9 9 9 9 9
Q204A	Have you ever heard of HIV?	Yes..... No..... No response	1 2 9			
Q204B	Have you ever heard of AIDS?	Yes..... No..... No response	1 2 9			
SKIP TO Q213 IF CODED 2 OR 9 in Q204A AND Q204B						
Q205	Can a person get HIV/AIDS from mosquito bites?	Yes..... No..... Others (Specify)_____	1 2 7			
Q206	Can people protect themselves from HIV/AIDS by having one uninfected faithful sex partner?	Yes..... No..... Others (Specify)_____	1 2 7			
Q207	Can people protect themselves from HIV/AIDS by abstaining from sexual intercourse?	Yes..... No..... Others (Specify)_____	1 2 7			
Q208	Can a person get HIV/AIDS by sharing a meal with someone who is infected?	Yes..... No..... Others (Specify)_____	1 2 7			
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 7			
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 7			
Q211	Can a pregnant woman infected with HIV or AIDS transmit the virus to her unborn child?	Yes..... No..... Others (Specify)_____	1 2 7			
Q212A	Can a woman with HIV or AIDS transmit virus to her newborn child through breast feeding?	Yes..... No..... Others (Specify)_____	1 2 7			

Q. No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories	Skip to
Q212B	Have you ever heard of ICTC? (Integrated Counselling and Testing Centre – where one can get information on HIV/AIDS and get tested for HIV/AIDS)	Yes..... 1 No..... Don't 2 know..... 8 No response..... 9	
Q212C	Have you ever heard about PPTCT? (Prevention of Parent to Child Transmission of HIV/AIDS)?	Yes..... 1 No..... Don't 2 know..... 8 No response..... 9	
Q213	Have you ever heard about ART Centres? (Anti Retroviral Therapy – Medicine for HIV/AIDS)	Yes..... 1 No..... Don't 2 know..... 8 No response..... 9	
Q214	Have you had an ulcer/sore in your genital area during the last 12 months?	Yes..... 1 No..... 2 Others (Specify)..... 7	
Q215	Have you had burning pain during urination in the last 12 months?	Yes..... 1 No..... 2 Others (Specify)..... 7	

FILTER: CHECK Q214 to Q215 Reported any symptom of STI ☐ →	Not reported any symptom of STI	☐ →	→Q219
--	--	----------------------------	--------------

Q216	What did you do the last time you had any of these problems? (READ OUT ALL THE CODING OPTIONS) (MULTIPLE RESPONSES POSSIBLE)	Took home based remedy..... 01 Borrowed prescription from friend/relative..... 02 Took medicine I had at home..... 03 Purchased medicine from a chemist shop..... 04 Went to a traditional healer/quack..... 05 Went to NGO Peer Educator/NGO Clinic..... 06 Went to a private hospital/clinic..... 07 Went to a govt. hospital/clinic..... 08 No treatment..... 09 Others (Specify)..... 77	→Q219
Q217	What type of medicine did you take last time? (MULTIPLE RESPONSES POSSIBLE)	Allopathic..... 1 Homeopathic..... 2 Ayurvedic/Herbal..... 3 Others (Specify)..... 7	

Q. No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories	Skip to
Q218	How much time did you take to visit a health practitioner last time after you experienced a STI symptom?	1 week or less..... 1 Less than 1 month but more than 1 week..... 2 One month or more..... 3 Others (Specify)..... 7	
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) (READ OUT ALL THE CODING OPTIONS AND CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE)	Took home based remedy..... 01 Borrowed prescription from friend/relative..... 02 Took medicine I had at home..... 03 Purchased medicine from a chemist shop..... 04 Went to a traditional healer/quack.... 05 Went to NGO Peer educator/NGO Clinic..... 06 Went to a private hospital/clinic..... 07 Went to a govt. hospital/clinic..... 08 No treatment..... 09 Others (Specify)..... 77	

Section 3: Marriage and Live-in Partnerships

Q. No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories	Skip to
Q301	Have you ever been married?	Yes..... 1 No..... 2 Others (Specify)..... 7 (If “No response” is mentioned in Others, skip to Q303)	→Q303
Q302	How old were you when you got married for the first time?	Age in completed years Others (Specify)..... 77	
Q303	Are you currently married or living with a sexual partner?	Currently married, living with spouse... 1 Currently married, having or living with other sexual partner..... 2 Currently married, not living with spouse or having any other sexual partner..... 3 Not currently married, living with/having sexual partner..... 4 Not currently married, not living with/having sexual partner..... 5 Others (Specify)..... 7	

Section 4: Sexual History - Number and Type of Partners

Q No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories	Skip to																		
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) _____ 77																			
Q402	Who was your first sexual partner?	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>A female (unpaid).....</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>A female (paid).....</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>A male (unpaid).....</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>A male (paid).....</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Others (Specify)_____</td> <td>7</td> </tr> </table>	A female (unpaid).....	1	A female (paid).....	2	A male (unpaid).....	3	A male (paid).....	4	Others (Specify)_____	7									
A female (unpaid).....	1																				
A female (paid).....	2																				
A male (unpaid).....	3																				
A male (paid).....	4																				
Others (Specify)_____	7																				
Q403	What was the age of your first sexual partner?	Age in completed years Others (Specify)_____ 77	→ Q408																		
Q404	Did you ever have sex (manual/oral/anal) with any male partner/hijra? [PROBE FOR EACH TYPE OF SEX]	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>Yes.....</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No.....</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Others (Specify)_____</td> <td>7</td> </tr> </table> (If “Cannot remember” or “No response” is mentioned in Others, skip to Q408)		Yes.....	1	No.....	2	Others (Specify)_____	7												
Yes.....	1																				
No.....	2																				
Others (Specify)_____	7																				
Q405	Did you have anal sex with any male partner/hijra in last 12 months?	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>Yes.....</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No.....</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Others (Specify)_____</td> <td>7</td> </tr> </table> (If “Cannot remember” or “No response” is mentioned in Others, skip to Q408)	Yes.....	1	No.....	2	Others (Specify)_____	7	→ Q408												
Yes.....	1																				
No.....	2																				
Others (Specify)_____	7																				
Q406	Did you use condom last time you had anal sex with any male partner/ hijra?	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>Yes.....</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No.....</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Others (Specify)_____</td> <td>7</td> </tr> </table>	Yes.....	1	No.....	2	Others (Specify)_____	7													
Yes.....	1																				
No.....	2																				
Others (Specify)_____	7																				
Q407	How frequently did you use condom with all your male partners/hijras in last 12 months?	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>Every time.....</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sometimes.....</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Never.....</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Others (Specify)_____</td> <td>7</td> </tr> </table>	Every time.....	1	Sometimes.....	2	Never.....	3	Others (Specify)_____	7											
Every time.....	1																				
Sometimes.....	2																				
Never.....	3																				
Others (Specify)_____	7																				
Q408	Think about the female sexual partners you’ve had in the last 3 months . How many were: - Partners with whom you had sex in exchange for money (“COMMERCIAL” PARTNERS) - Your spouse(s) or live-in sexual partners (“REGULAR” PARTNERS) - Sexual partners that you are not married to and have never lived with and did not pay (“NON-REGULAR PARTNERS”) – DO NOT INCLUDE CURRENT SPOUSE(S) OR LIVE-IN SEXUAL PARTNERS)	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>COMMERCIAL</td> <td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cannot remember.....</td> <td>88</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No response.....</td> <td>99</td> </tr> <tr> <td>REGULAR</td> <td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cannot remember.....</td> <td>88</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No response.....</td> <td>99</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NON-REGULAR</td> <td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cannot remember.....</td> <td>88</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No response.....</td> <td>99</td> </tr> </table>	COMMERCIAL		Cannot remember.....	88	No response.....	99	REGULAR		Cannot remember.....	88	No response.....	99	NON-REGULAR		Cannot remember.....	88	No response.....	99	
COMMERCIAL																					
Cannot remember.....	88																				
No response.....	99																				
REGULAR																					
Cannot remember.....	88																				
No response.....	99																				
NON-REGULAR																					
Cannot remember.....	88																				
No response.....	99																				

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
Q501	FILTER: CHECK Q 408 HAD SEX WITH COMMERCIAL FEMALE PARTNER DURING LAST 3 MONTHS.... [1] ↓	DID NOT HAVE SEX WITH COMMERCIAL FEMALE PARTNER DURING LAST 3 MONTHS	[2]	→Q601
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) _____ 77		
Q503	The last time you had sex with a commercial partner, did you use a condom?	Yes..... 1 No..... 2 Not aware of condom..... 8 Others (Specify) _____ 7 (If “Cannot remember” or “No response” is mentioned in Others, skip to Q507)		→Q507 →Q510
Q504	Who suggested condom use that time?	Myself..... 1 My partner..... 2 Joint decision..... 3 Others (Specify) _____ 7		
Q505	Which brand of condom did you use last time? [SHOW PACKAGE COVERS OF POPULAR BRANDS]	Nirodh..... 1 Kamasutra..... 2 Delux..... 3 Masti..... 4 Kohinoor..... 5 Others (Specify) _____ 7		
Q506	From where did you get this condom? AFTER ASKING THIS QUESTION GO TO Q508	Person had sex with..... 1 Health worker/ clinic..... 2 Friend..... 3 Purchased at chemist shop..... 4 Purchased at pan shop..... 5 Purchased at other type of outlet (grocery)..... 6 Others (Specify) _____ 7		
Q507	Why didn't you use a condom that time? (IF “NOT AWARE OF CONDOM” MENTIONED IN OTHERS, SKIP TO Q601)	Too expensive..... 01 Client objected..... 02 Don't like them..... 03 Used other contraceptive..... 04 Didn't think it was necessary..... 05 Decreases pleasure..... 06 Didn't think of it..... 07 Place was inappropriate..... 08 Not available..... 09 Others (Specify) _____ 77		
Q508	Do you generally use condom with your commercial partners?	Yes..... 1 No..... 2 Others (Specify) _____ 7		
Q509	In general, with what frequency did you use a condom with your commercial partner during the last 3 months?	Every time..... 1 Sometimes..... 2 Never..... 3 Others (Specify) _____ 7		→Q601 →Q601

Q No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories		Skip to
Q510	Have you ever heard or seen a condom? (SHOW PICTURE OR SAMPLE OF ONE)	Yes..... No..... No response.....	1 2 9	

Section 6: Sexual History - Regular Partners

Q No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories		Skip to
Q601	FILTER: CHECK Q 408 HAD SEX WITH REGULAR FEMALE PARTNER DURING LAST 3 MONTHS. [1] ↓	DID NOT HAVE SEX WITH REGULAR FEMALE PARTNER DURING LAST 3 MONTHS [2]→		→Q701
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) _____ 77		
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 “Cannot remember” or “No response” is mentioned in Others, skip to Q607)	1 2 8 7	→Q607 →Q701
Q604	Who suggested using a condom that time?	Myself..... My partner..... Joint decision..... Others (Specify) _____	1 2 3 7	
Q605	Which brand of condom did you use last time? (SHOW PACKAGE COVERS OF POPULAR BRANDS)	Nirodh..... Kamasutra..... Delux..... Masti..... Kohinoor..... Others (Specify) _____	1 2 3 4 5 7	
Q606	From where did you get this condom? (AFTER ASKING THIS QUESTION GO TO Q608)	Partner had sex with..... Health worker/ clinic..... Friend..... Purchased at chemist shop..... Purchased at pan shop..... Purchase at other type of outlet (grocery)..... Others (Specify) _____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
Q607	Why didn't you use a condom that time? (IF “NOT AWARE OF CONDOM” MENTIONED IN OTHERS, SKIPTO Q701)	Too expensive..... Client objected..... Don't like them..... Used other contraceptive..... Didn't think it was necessary..... Decreases pleasure..... Didn't think of it..... Place was inappropriate..... Not available..... Others (Specify) _____	01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 77	

Q. No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories	Skip to
Q608	Do you generally use condom with your regular partners?	Yes..... 1 No..... 2 Others (Specify)..... 7	
Q609	In general, with what frequency did you use a condom with your regular partner during the last 3 months?	Every time 1 Sometimes 2 Never 3 Others (Specify)..... 7	→Q701 →Q701
Q610	Have you ever heard or seen a condom? (SHOW PICTURE OR SAMPLE OF ONE)	Yes..... 1 No..... 2 No response..... 9	

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
Q701	FILTER: CHECK Q 408 HAD SEX WITH NON-REGULAR NON PAYING FEMALE PARTNER DURING LAST 3 MONTHS... [1] ↓	DID NOT HAVE SEX WITH NON-REGULAR NON-PAYING FEMALE PARTNER DURING LAST 3 MONTHS [2]→	→Q801
Q702	At what age did you first have sexual intercourse with any non-regular (non-paying) female partner?	Age in completed years Others (Specify)..... 77	
Q703	Who was your first non-regular (non-paying) female sex partner?	Girlfriend..... 1 Relative..... 2 Neighbour..... 3 Domestic maid..... 4 Any other person (Specify)..... 7	
Q704	The last time you had sex with a non-regular (non-paying) female partner did you use a condom?	Yes..... 1 No..... 2 Not aware of condom..... 8 Others (Specify)..... 7 (If "Cannot remember" or "No response" is mentioned in Others, skip to Q708)	→Q708 →Q801
Q705	Who suggested condom use that time?	Myself..... 1 My partner..... 2 Joint decision..... 3 Others (specify)..... 7	
Q706	Which brand of condom did you use last time? [SHOW PACKAGE COVERS OF POPULAR BRANDS]	Nirodh..... 1 Kamasutra..... 2 Delux..... 3 Masti..... 4 Kohinoor..... 5 Others (Specify)..... 7	
Q707	From where did you get this condom? (AFTER ASKING THIS QUESTION GO TO Q709)	Person had sex with..... 1 Health worker/clinic..... 2 Friend..... 3 Purchased at chemist shop..... 4 Purchased at pan shop..... 5 Purchased at other type of outlet (grocery)..... 6 Others (Specify)..... 7	

Q No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories		Skip to
Q708	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 Q801)	Too expensive..... Client objected..... Don't like them..... Used other contraceptive..... Didn't think it was necessary..... Decreases pleasure..... Didn't think of it..... Place was inappropriate..... Not available..... Others (Specify)_____	01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 77	
Q709	Do you generally use condom with non-regular partners?	Yes..... No..... Others (Specify)_____	1 2 7	
Q710	In general, with what frequency did you use a condom during the last 3 months?	Every time..... Sometimes..... Never..... Others (Specify)_____	1 2 3 7	→Q801 →Q801
Q711	Have you ever heard or seen a condom? (SHOW PICTURE OR SAMPLE OF ONE)	Yes..... No..... No response.....	1 2 9	

Section 8: Risk Perception and Exposure to Intervention

Q. No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories		Skip to
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 8 7	
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 7	
Q803	Is it possible for someone like you to get a confidential test done 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 7	
Q804	I do not want to know the result, but have you ever had an HIV test?	Yes..... No..... Others (Specify)_____	1 2 7	→Q807
		(If "Cannot remember" or "No response" is mentioned in Others, skip to Q807)		
Q805	Did you voluntarily undergo the HIV test, or were you required to have the test?	Voluntary..... Required..... Others (Specify)_____	1 2 7	
Q806	Please do not tell me the result, but did you find out the result of your test?	Yes..... No..... Others (Specify)_____	1 2 7	

Q. No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories		Skip to
Q807	Did anyone in the last one year approach you to educate you on the spread of STI/HIV/AIDS?	Yes.....	1	
		No.....	2	
		Others (Specify)_____	7	
Q808	Did you attend/participate in any campaign/meeting on STI/HIV/AIDS in the last one year?	Yes.....	1	
		No.....	2	
		Others (Specify)_____	7	
Q809	If we ask you to recall only one message about HIV/ AIDS, which one would you easily remember? (RECORD THE ANSWER IN VERBATIM)	Message: _____ _____ _____ _____		



National BSS 2006: Questionnaire for Female Sex Workers (FSWs)

Operational Definition of the Respondent

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

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, incomplete interview or non-availability of respondents the identification page must be filled.

001	SCHEDULE NUMBER	
002	TYPE OF FSWs BROTHEL BASED FSWs 1 (Women selling sex within brothels) NON-BROTHEL BASED FSWs 2 (Women selling sex at defined sex access points outside of brothels)	
003	STATE _____	
004	TYPE OF SETTLEMENT 1. Urban 2. Rural	
005	CITY/TOWN/VILLAGE _____	
006	SITE	
007	INTERVIEWER'S NAME _____	
008	DATE OF INTERVIEW (DD/MM/YY)	/ /
009	TIME OF INTERVIEW (Railway time)	
010	RESULT CODE Completed1 Partially completed2 Refused3 Incapacitated4 Others (Specify)7	
011	PLACE OF INTERVIEW _____	
012	INTERVIEW SETTING One to one Interview 1; Interview in presence of others 2	

To Be Filled By Supervisor

013	SUPERVISOR NAME	
014	Accompanied 1. Yes 2. No	☐

Introduction: “My name is..... I’m working for a social research organisation. 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 behaviour 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 last few weeks for this study? **IF THE RESPONDENT HAS BEEN INTERVIEWED DURING BSS 2006, 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?

Yes - 1 —————> Continue

No - 2 —————> End

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

Section 1: Background Characteristics

Q No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories	Skip to
Q101	How old are you?	Age in completed years	
Q102	What has been your highest level of educational attainment?	Illiterate..... 01 Literate but no formal education... 02 1 – 5th 03 6 – 8th 04 9 – 10th 05 11 – 12th 06 12 +..... 07 Others (Specify)_____ 77	

Q No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories		Skip to
Q103	Do you live in this city /town ?	Yes..... No..... Others (Specify)_____	1 2 7	
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)_____ 77		
Q105	Were you engaged in this profession at any place before coming here?	Yes..... No..... Others (Specify)_____	1 2 7	
Q106	Do you also travel to other places for sex work?	Yes..... No..... Others (Specify)_____	1 2 7	
Q107	Have you ever had drinks containing alcohol?	Yes..... No..... Others (Specify)_____	1 2 7	→Q110
		(If “Cannot remember” or “No response” is mentioned in Others, Skip to Q110)		
Q108	During the last 4 weeks how often have you had drinks containing alcohol? Would you say... (READ RESPONSES AND CIRCLE ONE)	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 7	
Q109	How frequently do you take alcoholic drinks before having sex with your clients /partners? (READ RESPONSES AND CIRCLE ONE)	Always..... Sometimes..... Rarely..... Never..... Others (Specify)_____	1 2 3 4 7	
Q110	Some people take a range of different types of intoxicating drugs. Have you ever tried any? (Cigarette, Gutka, Tobacco not to be included as intoxicating drugs)	Yes..... No..... Others (Specify)_____	1 2 7	→Q201
		(If “Cannot remember” or “No response” is mentioned in Others, Skip to Q201)		
Q111	Which ones have you tried? (DON'T READ OUT THE LIST. MULTIPLE RESPONSES POSSIBLE)	Charas..... Ganja..... Bhang..... Afim..... Brown-sugar..... Heroin..... Others (Specify)_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
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? (Drugs injected for medical purposes or treatment of an illness do not count)	Yes..... No..... Others (Specify)_____	1 2 7	

Section 2: Knowledge, Opinion and Attitude towards STI/HIV/AIDS

Q No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories	Skip to
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? (IT'S A PROMPTED QUESTION. PLEASE MAKE SURE THAT THE RESPONDENT UNDERSTANDS THE SYMPTOMS WE ARE TALKING ABOUT. USE LOCAL/POPULAR TERMINOLOGIES, IF ANY)	Yes..... 1 No..... 2 Others (Specify)_____ 7 (If "Cannot remember" or "No response" is mentioned in Others, Skip to Q204)	→Q204A
Q202	Can you describe any other (beside the symptoms mentioned in the earlier question) symptoms of STI in WOMEN...? Any others? (PLEASE READ OUT ALL THE OPTIONS AND CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE CODE)	Swellings in groin area Itching/reddening Warts Skin rashes Others (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
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 MEN...? Any others? (PLEASE READ OUT ALL THE OPTIONS AND CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE CODE)	Swellings in groin area Itching/reddening Warts Skin rashes Can't retract foreskin Others (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
Q204A	Have you ever heard of HIV?	Yes..... 1 No..... 2 No response..... 9	
Q204B	Have you ever heard of AIDS?	Yes..... 1 No..... 2 No response..... 9	
SKIP TO Q213 IF CODED 2 OR 9 in Q204A AND Q204B			
Q205	Can a person get HIV/AIDS from mosquito bites?	Yes..... 1 No..... 2 Others (Specify)_____ 7	
Q206	Can people protect themselves from HIV/AIDS by having one uninfected faithful sex partner?	Yes..... 1 No..... 2 Others (Specify)_____ 7	
Q207	Can people protect themselves from HIV/AIDS by abstaining from sexual intercourse?	Yes..... 1 No..... 2 Others (Specify)_____ 7	
Q208	Can a person get HIV/AIDS by sharing a meal with someone who is infected?	Yes..... 1 No..... 2 Others (Specify)_____ 7	
Q209	Can a person get HIV/AIDS by getting injections with a needle that was already used by someone else who was infected?	Yes..... 1 No..... 2 Others (Specify)_____ 7	
Q210	Do you think that a healthy-looking person can be infected with HIV, the virus that causes AIDS?	Yes..... 1 No..... 2 Others (Specify)_____ 7	

Q No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories	Skip to
Q211	Can a pregnant woman infected with HIV or AIDS transmit the virus to her unborn child?	Yes..... No..... Others (Specify).....	1 2 7
Q212A	Can a woman with HIV or AIDS transmit virus to her newborn child through breast feeding?	Yes..... No..... Others (Specify).....	1 2 7
Q212B	Have you ever heard of ICTC? (Integrated Counselling and Testing Centre – where one can get information on HIV/AIDS and get tested for HIV/AIDS)	Yes..... No..... Don't know..... No response.....	1 2 8 9
Q212C	Have you ever heard about PPTCT (Prevention of Parent to Child Transmission of HIV/AIDS)?	Yes..... No..... Don't know..... No response.....	1 2 8 9
Q212D	Have you ever heard about ART Centres? (Anti Retroviral Therapy – Medicine for HIV/AIDS)	Yes..... No..... Don't know..... No response.....	1 2 8 9
Q213	Have you had a thick yellowish/greenish discharge with a foul smell from your vagina in the last 12 months?	Yes..... No..... Others (Specify).....	1 2 7
Q214	Have you had an ulcer/sore in your genital area during the last 12 months?	Yes..... No..... Others (Specify).....	1 2 7
Q215	Have you had pain during intercourse in the last 12 months?	Yes..... No..... Others (Specify).....	1 2 7
Q216	Have you had lower abdominal pain during the last 12 months?	Yes..... No..... Others (Specify).....	1 2 7
Q217	Have you had burning pain during urination in the last 12 months?	Yes..... No..... Others (Specify).....	1 2 7

FILTER: CHECK Q213 to Q217 Reported any symptom of STI -1 ☐ →	Not reported any symptom of STI	☐ 2 →	→Q221
--	--	------------------------------	--------------

Q218	What did you do the last time you had any of these problems? (READ OUT ALL THE CODING OPTIONS) (MULTIPLE RESPONSES POSSIBLE)	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.. Went to NGO Peer Educator/NGO Clinic..... Went to a private hospital/clinic... Went to a govt. hospital/clinic.... No treatment..... Others (Specify).....	01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 77	→Q221
------	--	---	--	--------------

Q219	What type of medicine did you take last time? (MULTIPLE RESPONSES POSSIBLE)	Allopathic..... Homeopathic..... Ayurvedic/Herbal..... Others (Specify) _____	1 2 3 7	
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 7	
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) (READ OUT ALL THE CODING OPTIONS AND CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE)	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.. Went to NGO Peer Educator/NGO Clinic..... Went to a private hospital/clinic... Went to a govt. hospital/clinic.... No treatment..... Others (Specify) _____	01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 77	

Section 3: Marriage, Family, Income

Q.No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories	Skip to
Q301	Have you ever been married?	Yes..... No..... Others (Specify) _____ (If “No response” is mentioned in Others, Skip to Q303)	1 2 7 →Q303
Q302	How old were you when you got married for the first time?	Age in completed years Others (Specify) _____	77
Q303	Who is your sexual partner with whom you are currently living?	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..... Others (Specify) _____	1 2 3 4 5 7
Q304	Do you have any other source of income? (ASK THIS QUESTION TO ONLY NON-BROTHEL BASED FEMALE SEX WORKERS)	Yes..... No..... Others (Specify) _____ (If “No response” is mentioned in Others, Skip to Q401)	1 2 7 →Q401

Q.No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories	Skip to
Q305	What is/are your additional sources of income? (MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE)	Work as maid servant..... 1 Work as bar girl..... 2 Work in a beauty/massage parlour.. 3 Work in an office..... 4 Have a petty business..... 5 Work as a factory worker..... 6 Others (Specify) _____ 7	

Section 4: Number and Type of Partners

Q. No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories	Skip to
Q401	How old were you when you had your first sex (penetrative)?	In completed years Others (Specify) _____ 77	
Q402	How old were you when you first sold sex in cash or kind (penetrative)?	In completed years Others (Specify) _____ 77	
Q403	Among all of your partners in the last seven days (one week), how many were: a) PAYING CLIENTS: Partners with whom you had sex in exchange of money b) NON-PAYING REGULAR PARTNERS: Regular partners who did not pay any money to have sex with you (INCLUDE SPOUSE, LIVE-IN SEXUAL PARTNERS) c) NON-PAYING NON-REGULAR PARTNERS: Non-regular partners who did not pay any money to have sex with you (INCLUDE POLICE, BROKERS AND OTHERS)	Paying Clients Cannot remember..... 88 No response 99 Non-paying regular partner (Include spouse and live-in partners) Cannot remember..... 88 No response 99 Non-paying non-regular partners (Include pimp, broker, police) Cannot remember... 88 No response 99	
Q404	In total, with how many different sexual partners have you had sex during the last seven days (one week)? INCLUDE SPOUSE(S), LIVE-IN SEXUAL PARTNER(S) NOTE: CHECK TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTNERS IN Q 403 TO MAKE SURE THE NUMBERS MATCH.	Number in last 7 days Cannot remember..... 88 No response 99	

Section 5: Sexual History - Paying Clients

Now I would ask questions pertaining to clients who pay you for sex

Q.No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories		Skip to
Q501	On the last day you worked, how many clients did you have?	Number of clients Others (Specify) _____ 77		
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 "Cannot remember" or "No response" is mentioned in Others, Skip to Q506)	1 2 8 7	→Q506 →Q509
Q503	Who suggested using a condom that time?	Myself..... Client..... Joint decision..... Others (Specify) _____	1 2 3 7	
Q504	Which brand of condom did your client use last time? [SHOW PACKAGE COVERS OF POPULAR BRANDS] [IF NOT USED CONDOM THEN GO TO Q506]	Nirodh..... Kamasutra..... Delux..... Masti..... Kohinoor..... Others (Specify) _____	1 2 3 4 5 7	
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)..... NGO Peer educator/Anganwadi worker/ VHW..... Others (Specify) _____	01 02 03 04 05 06 07 77	} →507
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)	Too expensive..... Client objected..... Don't like them..... Used other contraceptive..... Didn't think it was necessary..... Decreases pleasure..... Didn't think of it..... Place was inappropriate..... Not available..... Others (Specify) _____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 77	
Q507	Do you generally use condom with your paying clients?	Yes..... No..... Others (Specify) _____	1 2 7	
Q508	In general, with what frequency did your clients use condoms over the last 30 days?	EveryTime..... Sometimes..... Never..... Others (Specify) _____	1 2 3 7	→601A →601A
Q509	Have you ever heard or seen a condom? (SHOW PICTURE OR SAMPLE OF ONE)	Yes..... No..... Others (Specify) _____	1 2 7	

Section 6: Sexual History - Non-paying Partners

Now I would be asking questions pertaining to non-paying sexual partners

Q. No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories	Skip to
Q601A	FILTER: CHECK Q403 HAS NON-PAYING PARTNER [_1_] HAS NO NON-PAYING PARTNER..[_2_] ☐ ↓ ☐ →		→Q701
Q601B	Who was the last non-paying partner?	Non-paying regular..... 1 Non-paying non-regular..... 2	
Q602	The last time you had sex with this non-paying partner, did your partner use a condom?	Yes..... 1 No..... 2 Not aware of condom..... 8 Others (specify)_____ 7 (If "Cannot remember" or "No response" is mentioned in Others, Skip to Q606)	→Q606 →Q701
Q603	Who suggested using a condom that time?	Myself..... 1 My partner..... 2 Joint decision..... 3 Others (Specify)_____ 7	
Q604	Which brand of condom did your partner use last time? [SHOW PACKAGE COVERS OF POPULAR BRANDS]	Nirodh..... 1 Kamasutra..... 2 Delux..... 3 Masti..... 4 Kohinoor..... 5 Others (specify)_____ 7	
Q605	From where did you get this condom?	Person had sex with..... 01 Govt. health worker/clinic..... 02 Friend..... 03 Purchased at chemist shop/ pharmacy..... 04 Pan shop..... 05 Purchase at other type of outlet (i.e. grocery)..... 06 NGO Peer educator/Anganwadi worker/ VHW..... 07 Others (Specify)_____ 77 (If "Cannot remember" or "No response" is mentioned in Others, Skip to Q607)	→Q607
Q606	Why didn't your partner use a condom that time? (READ AND CIRCLE ALL ANSWERS MENTIONED) (If "NOT AWARE OF CONDOM" MENTIONED IN OTHERS, SKIPTO Q701)	Too expensive..... 1 Client objected..... 2 Don't like them..... 3 Used other contraceptive..... 4 Didn't think it was necessary..... 5 Decreases pleasure..... 6 Didn't think of it..... 7 Place was inappropriate..... 8 Not available..... 9 Others (Specify) _____ 77	
Q607	Do you generally use condom with your non-paying partners?	Yes..... 1 No..... 2 Others (Specify)_____ 7	

Q. No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories	Skip to
Q608	In general, with what frequency did your non-paying partner(s) use a condom over the last 3 months?	Every Time..... 1 Sometimes..... 2 Never..... 3 Others (Specify) _____ 7	

Section 7: Risk Perception and Exposure to Intervention

Q. No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories		Skip to
Q701	Can people protect themselves from HIV by using a condom correctly every time they have sex?	Yes..... 1 No..... 2 Not aware of condom..... 8 Others (Specify) _____ 7		→Q705
Q702	Do you usually insist your clients to use condom?	Yes..... 1 No..... 2 Others (Specify) _____ 7		
Q703	Has any of your clients refused to use condom in the last 3 months?	Yes..... 1 No..... 2 Others (Specify) _____ 7		→Q705
Q704	What did you do when your client refused to use a condom last time?	Refused to have sex..... 1 Charged extra amount..... 2 Persuaded successfully..... 3 Failed to persuade..... 4 Did not do anything..... 5 Others (Specify) _____ 7		
Q705	In your opinion, what are the chances for you all for contracting HIV/AIDS infection? (READ OUT ALL THE OPTIONS AND CIRCLE ONE)	Very high..... 1 Moderate..... 2 Low..... 3 No chance..... 4 Others (Specify) _____ 7		
Q706	Is it possible for you all to get a confidential test done 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..... 1 No..... 2 Others (Specify) _____ 7		
Q707	I do not want to know the result, but have you ever had an HIV test?	Yes..... 1 No..... 2 Others (Specify) _____ 7 (If "Cannot remember" or "No response" is mentioned in Others, Skip to Q710)		→Q710
Q708	Did you voluntarily undergo the HIV test, or were you required to have the test?	Voluntary..... 1 Required..... 2 Others (Specify) _____ 7		
Q709	Please do not tell me the result, but did you find out the result of your test?	Yes..... 1 No..... 2 Others (Specify) _____ 7		

Q. No.	Questions and Filters	Coding Categories		Skip to
Q710	Did anyone in the last one year approach you to educate you on spread of STI/HIV/AIDS?	Yes..... No..... Others (Specify)_____	1 2 7	
Q711	Did you attend/participate in any campaign/meeting on STI/HIV/AIDS in the last one year?	Yes..... No..... Others (Specify)_____	1 2 7	
Q712	If we ask you to recall only one message about HIV/AIDS, which one would you easily remember? (RECORD THE ANSWER IN VERBATIM)	Message:_____ _____ _____		

