A STUDY OF WOMEN ENGAGED IN ECONOMICALLY MOTIVATED SEXUAL RELATIONSHIPS IN NIGERIA
Women and Transactional Sex in Nigeria: a study of women engaged in economically motivated sexual relationships in Nigeria
Transactional sex (TS) is a terminology used to describe the exchange of sexual services for something (benefits). It is used to indicate sexual transactions that do not necessarily occur between a professional sex worker and a client (Steinfatt 2006). A common understanding among those who have studied transactional sex is that it is associated with factors such as poverty, the influence of Western consumerism, imbalances in economic power between men and women, and the breakdown of traditional African marriage customs involving bride-wealth (Swidler et al 2007). Transactional sex has been linked by several studies to the socio-economic disadvantage of women, thus providing a dynamic for partner change, and making more affluent, higher risk men more desirable. It also creates additional barriers to condom use.

This study, the first of its kind in Nigeria, explores transactional sex among women in the larger Nigerian population seeking to identify risk factors for women engaging in transactional sex. It determines the rate of occurrence of transactional sex among select populations of women in Nigeria, as well as their motivations for engaging in transactional sex. It also assesses STI and HIV knowledge among women who engage in transactional sex, and condom use among these groups. Additionally, the influence of alcohol and drug use among women who engage in transactional sex is explored.
It is envisaged that findings from this study will inform the planning and delivery of reproductive and sexual health interventions that go beyond focus on ‘risk’ populations, and meet the needs of women in the general population in Nigeria.
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Transactional sex (TS) is a terminology used to describe the exchange of sexual services for something (benefits). Studies in transactional sex have identified it as a likely important factor in sexual relationships and health in certain cultures, and a major driver of the AIDS pandemic (Swidler et al 2007; Wamoyi et al 2010). This study, the first of its kind in Nigeria, seeks to explore transactional sex among women in the larger Nigerian population, and identify risk factors for women engaging in transactional sex.

The broad objective of the research is to estimate the occurrence of transactional sex among women, identify demographic and social variables, as well as work dynamics associated with reporting transactional sex. Respondents in this study were women of reproductive age (aged 15 – 49 years), from the eight USAID - PEPFAR focus states in Nigeria: Akwa Ibom, Benue, Cross River, Kaduna, Lagos, Nasarawa, Rivers, and FCT.

Findings from this study indicate that in Nigeria, students in tertiary institutions have the highest rate of involvement in transactional sex, followed by youth corp members and uniformed service personnel. Women who engage in transactional sex in Nigeria are also mostly aged 25 years and above, have never been married and have attained higher levels of education. While students in tertiary institutions had the highest proportions who were involved in transactional sex, this group had the highest proportion of women
who know their HIV status, had tested for HIV within the last 12 months, or knew where to get tested for HIV. They also reportedly used condoms most frequently while exchanging sex for gifts or favours.

The main motivation for transactional sex was to pay for housing, utilities, school related expenses and allowances. Furthermore, the influence of alcohol was not a main facilitator for risky transactional sex. However, drug use was a facilitator for risky transactional sex, as a large proportion of women who reported using psychoactive drugs also reported not using a condom the last time they exchanged sex for gifts or favours.

These findings highlight the need for targeted HIV prevention programming including in-school interventions, work place interventions, and skills on condom negotiation within the context of intimidation and coercion. There is also a need to explore the motivations for transactional sex in rural areas of Nigeria, to identify specific needs of women in these locations.
## Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FCT</td>
<td>Federal Capital Territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>Human Immunodeficiency Virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB</td>
<td>Institutional Review Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARHS</td>
<td>National HIV&amp;AIDS and Reproductive Health Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHREC</td>
<td>National Health Research Ethics Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYSC</td>
<td>National Youth Service Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STI</td>
<td>Sexually Transmitted Infection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Transactional Sex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.1: Introduction

Transactional sex (TS) is a terminology used to describe the exchange of sexual services for something (benefits). The term is mostly used to indicate sexual transactions that do not necessarily occur between a professional sex worker and a client (Steinfatt 2006). In some studies, the term transactional sex and sex work are used interchangeably. This is because of the fine line between both terms and the lack of a more specific definition of transactional sex (Ditmore 2006; Moore, Biddlecom & Zulu 2007).

However, researchers argue that transactional sex differs from sex work despite their similarities. A major difference is that the exchange of gifts for sex includes a broader set of (usually non-marital) obligations that do not necessarily involve a predetermined payment or gift; rather there is a definite motivation to benefit materially (in form of rent money, grades, school tuition, luxury goods, basic needs, and etc.) from the sexual exchange (Hunter 2002; Moore, Biddlecom & Zulu 2007; Stoebenau et al 2013).

Transactional sex is a common practice among unmarried females and underlies most non-marital relationships. A study carried out among Ugandan university students found that about 25% of students engage in transactional sex (Choudhry et al 2014). In Nigeria, younger age groups and the unmarried are mostly implicated in transactional sex (Moore, Biddlecom & Zulu 2007; NARHS 2012; Wamoyi et al 2010).
A common understanding in the study of transactional sex is that it is associated with factors such as poverty, the influence of Western consumerism, imbalances in economic power between men and women, and the breakdown of traditional African marriage customs involving bride-wealth (Swidler et al 2007). As described in the words of Swidler (2007), transactional sex is “akin to prostitution and is a degraded form of sexual expression forced on vulnerable women by economic desperation” (Swidler et al 2007, p. 1).

Women engage in transactional sex from between the ages of 15 and above except in countries like Ghana and Tanzania where transactional sex starts as early as the age of 12 (Chatterji et al 2005). People who engage in transactional sex usually tag themselves as boyfriend/girlfriend or sugar daddy/sugar babies but this does not necessarily mean that sex is given out of affection (Hoefinger 2010).

1.2: Context

Studies in transactional sex have identified it as a likely important factor in sexual relationships and health in certain cultures. It has also been claimed by some to be a major driver of the AIDS pandemic (Swidler et al 2007; Wamoyi et al 2010). It may put young men and women in sub-Saharan Africa at increased risk of contracting STIs including HIV&AIDS; and especially put young women at higher risk of pregnancy and child bearing (Chatterji et al 2005). Transactional sex has been linked by several studies to the socio-economic disadvantage of women, thus providing a dynamic
for partner change, and making more affluent, higher risk men further desirable. It also creates additional barriers to condom use (Dunke et al 2004; Luke & Kurz 2002; Moore, Biddlecom & Zulu 2007; Wamoyi et al 2010; Stoeberau et al 2013; Sherman et al 2014).

Recent research has demonstrated the association between transactional sex, increased rate of HIV/STI risk and having more high-risk sexual partners (Dunkle et al 2010; Wamoyi et al 2010; Sherman et al 2014). In a 2011 youth study in Liberia, transactional sex was said to have emerged during the conflict and post-conflict periods as a source of economic resource. Some of the youth acknowledged that while their first sexual encounter was non-transactional, sexual encounters became transactional when they realised the potential for financial gains (Jennings 2010).

In northern Tanzania, transactional sex is seen mostly in non-marital relationships and was not, per se, perceived as immoral. It was observed that macro-level factors shaping transactional sex (kinship, economic and normative) overwhelmingly favored men more than women. However, at the micro-level, there were different dimensions of power, stemming from individual attributes and immediate circumstances, some of which benefited women (Chatterji 2007).

Risky transactional sex, without the use of condoms, exists on a continuum based on the economic status of women. Among women in poverty, it serves as an economic survival strategy and
forms a power imbalance based on money and violence (Dunkle et al 2007), positioning women at a disadvantage in sexual negotiations (Manganja, Maman & Groves 2007). Transactional sex can also provide opportunity for social mobility and economic independence among women who are less poor (Swidler & Watkins 2007). In turn, some scholars associate transactional sex with the use of female erotic power and new inter-generational strategies. They argue that these are part of a broader moral economy where the money young women earn from transactional sex is redistributed to kin and peers (Groes-Green 2013; Groes-Green 2014; Cole 2010).

It has been deduced across Nigeria, and sub-Saharan Africa, that women engage in transactional sex because of similar reasons including:

(a) Acute economic pressure; lack of housing and food insecurity combined with desire for fashion and material items.

(b) Purchase of necessities for the household

(c) Gaining capital for small businesses

(d) To cover education-related expenses

(e) Gaining of connections in social networks

(f) Academic achievements/upgrading of grades

(g) Outings to expensive hotels

(Manganja, Maman & Groves 2007; Edward, Halpern & Wechsberg 2006).
In contrast, countries like Tanzania, Ghana and South Africa have shown other factors for transactional sex including:
(a) Threat of shortened life span due to the visible presence of HIV&AIDS illness and death of close ones (Mouta Baba-Djara 2013)
(b) Women agencies posing transactional sex as an assertion of power and culture where the sexuality of a woman is highly valued and improves status and support from men (Alana Brennan & Jennifer Beard, 2013)
(c) Farm labor (Starvous 2004; Longfield & Glick 2004).
(d) Exchange of sex for drugs among women who use crack cocaine (Edwards, Halpern & Wechsberg 2006).

1.3: Rationale for the study
Transactional sex is considered one of the major factors in the spread of HIV&AIDS and STIs, unwanted pregnancies among young women as well as engagement in sexual activities under the influence of alcohol and drugs. As shown by the 2012 NARHS survey, about 66% of all transactional sex cases occur in the rural areas (NARHS 2012). However, research on transactional sex in sub-Saharan Africa has mainly focused on urban areas and on commercial sex work (Wamoyi et al 2010; Gould & Fick 2008; Varga 1997). This study seeks to explore transactional sex among women in the larger Nigerian population. It seeks to identify risk factors for women engaging in transactional sex, and outline a continuum of women who engage in transactional sex in Nigeria. It is envisaged that findings from this study will inform the planning and delivery of reproductive and sexual health interventions that go beyond focus
on ‘risk’ populations, and meet the needs of women in the general population in Nigeria.

1.4: Objectives of the study
The broad objective of the research is to estimate the occurrence of transactional sex among women, and identify demographic and social variables, as well as work dynamics associated with reporting transactional sex.

1.4.1: Specific objectives
1. To determine the rate of occurrence of transactional sex among women aged 15-49
2. To assess HIV knowledge, alcohol and drug use among women who engage in transactional sex
3. To assess condom knowledge and use of condoms among women who engage in transactional sex
4. To generate motivators of transactional sex among women aged 15-49
2.1: Introduction
This section gives information on the methodology of the study, and the sampling design. It focuses on the selection of respondents, the questionnaire and its administration, ethical considerations and limitations of the study. Operational terms used in the study are also defined and explained.

2.2: Selection of respondents
Female respondents were selected from structured organisations in Nigeria including Uniformed Service, the National Youth Service Corps (NYSC), tertiary institutions, the civil service, as well as in entertainment, hospitality, financial institutions and market women. These groups were selected based on previous research in which these populations were identified as being involved in transactional sex. In addition, as this is a novel research in Nigeria, working with structured groups in Nigeria allowed for easier access to the study respondents. Respondents in this study were women of reproductive age (aged 15 – 49 years), from the eight USAID - PEPFAR focus states in Nigeria: Akwa Ibom, Benue, Cross River, Kaduna, Lagos, Nasarawa, Rivers, and FCT.

2.3: Administration of questionnaire
An individual semi-structured questionnaire was self-administered by each respondent. Sampling was carried out using a convenience approach, with respondents accessed at sporting or social centres.
The questionnaires and all study procedures were piloted prior to implementation of the study. Questionnaire administration was preceded by briefings from field researchers on the purpose of the study, as well as on issues of confidentiality and consent. To ensure confidentiality, personal data such as names were not collected. Each questionnaire was appropriately labeled by location and institution to aid data entry and analysis. The study captured information on the following broad themes:

- Background characteristics of respondents
- STIs assessment
- Sexual history
- Condom use
- Alcohol and drug use

Appendix 3 shows the questionnaire used in this study.

**2.4: Ethical consideration & consent**

After a briefing on the purpose of the study, consent was sought from respondents and consent forms were signed, with the assurance of confidentiality. In addition, permission to conduct this research was sought and the National Health Research Ethics Committee (NHREC) of the Federal Ministry of Health, Nigeria granted IRB approval. See copy of IRB approval in Appendix 2.

**2.5: Limitations of the study**

1. This study was carried out during a period of political transition and electioneering. This negatively affected the number of respondents who were willing to participate, especially from the civil service and
NYSC. They were concerned about how it would affect their work status.

2. Respondents who consented to participate in this study were mostly students in tertiary institutions, and uniformed service personnel. Thus, findings are mostly skewed towards these groups due to their larger populations in this study.

3. Some sub-populations of women were minimally covered in this study because of time, resources, and access to these women. Thus, these groups make up a lower proportion of respondents in this study.

2.6: Operational definition of terms

- **Uniformed service personnel**: These are women who work in professions such as the Military, Police, Fire Service, Immigration, Navy, and other uniformed services.
- **Tertiary institutions**: These are women who have completed secondary education and are currently enrolled in a tertiary institution in Nigeria.
- **NYSC**: These are women who have completed tertiary education and are currently serving as youth corp members under the Nigeria National Youth Service Corps.
- **Civil Service**: This consists of female employees in Nigeria Government agencies other than the Military. For the purpose of this study, this also excludes uniformed service personnel usually classified under the Nigeria civil service.
- **Others**: This consists of women from the entertainment and hospitality industries, market women, women from financial
institutions, and women from other associations or institutions not specified, who participated in this study.

- **Sugar daddy:** This is a rich older man who gives gifts and money to a much younger woman, usually in return for sex (Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary 2015).

- **Aristo:** A Nigerian slang for an elderly man who uses the lure of a good time to seduce young girls (usually young college girls). The slang is derived from a play on the word - aristocrat (Urban Dictionary 2015).
3.1: Demographics & background findings
Data was collected from a total of 8,584 female respondents aged 15 – 49 years in eight Nigerian states: Akwa Ibom, Benue, Cross River, Kaduna, Lagos, Nasarawa, Rivers, and the FCT.

3.1.1: Age and Occupation
60.4 % of the respondents were 25 years and above, 34% between 20 – 24 years, and 5.6% 15 – 19 years. Respondents were mostly students in tertiary institutions (66.4 %). Those associated with entertainment, hospitality, financial institutions, market women, or others not specified made up 24.1% of all respondents, while uniformed service personnel, youth corp members and civil service made up 23.9%, 2.6% and 2.6%, respectively, of respondents.

3.1.2: Educational attainment
More than half (59%) of the respondents had completed at least secondary school, mostly constituting of students in tertiary institutions (79.4%), and uniformed service personnel (19.9%). 40.1% of respondents had completed tertiary education, most of whom were associated with entertainment, hospitality, financial institutions, market women, or others not specified (59.9%). In addition, 47.6% of uniformed service personnel, 80.5% of
respondents from the civil service and 100% of youth corp members had completed tertiary education.

3.1.3: Marital status
More than half (63.7%) of the respondents had never been married, mostly those in tertiary institutions (55.1%) and those associated with entertainment, hospitality, financial institutions, market women, or others not specified (27.4%). Less than a third of all respondents were married (27.6%), 5.4% were cohabiting, and 3.4% were either divorced/separated, or widowed.
Table 1: Showing the demographic characteristics of study respondents by institutions/associations, Nigeria, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic characteristics</th>
<th>Uniformed Service Personnel</th>
<th>Tertiary Institutions Civil Service</th>
<th>NYSC</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akwa Ibom</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benue</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross River</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasarawa</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCT</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>4024</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>2065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 25</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25+</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>4024</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>2065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qur’anic education only</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Education</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary education</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>4024</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Demographic characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Uniformed Service Personnel</th>
<th>Tertiary Institutions</th>
<th>Civil Service</th>
<th>NYSC</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>2365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabiting</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>3016</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1496</td>
<td>5469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formerly married (Divorced/Separated)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>4024</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>2065</td>
<td>8584</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Uniformed Service Personnel</th>
<th>Tertiary Institutions</th>
<th>Civil Service</th>
<th>NYSC</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>2365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabiting</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>3016</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1496</td>
<td>5469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formerly married (Divorced/Separated)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>4024</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>2065</td>
<td>8584</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.1.4: Sources of Income

55.7% of respondents reported that they have a primary source of income, either through formal employment (31.2%) or self employment (68.8%). Uniformed service personnel were the largest population who reported having a primary source of income (37.1%), followed by respondents associated with entertainment, hospitality, financial institutions, market women, or others not specified (26.2%). In addition, of all respondents who were reported to have a primary source of income, 29.7% were students in tertiary institutions.

Respondents with secondary (49.4%) and tertiary education (49.0%) mostly reported that they have a primary source of income.
Respondents with only primary education made up only 0.1% of those with a primary source of income while respondents with vocational education (0.4%), no education (0.2%) and Qur’anic education (0.04%) were the least groups to have a primary source of income. 52.3% who were reported to have a primary source of income had never been married, while 37.4% were currently married.

42.6 % of the respondents reported that they did not have a primary source of income. Of this number, 68.6 % were students in tertiary institutions, while 21.7% were associated with entertainment, hospitality, financial institutions, market women, or others not specified. Respondents who had completed secondary education (70.1%) and tertiary education (29.4%) mostly reported that they do not have a primary source of income. This consisted primarily of respondents in tertiary institutions (66.4%), youth corp members (21.8%) and uniformed service personnel (5.0%). Respondents without primary sources of income had mostly never been married (76.1%) or were currently married (16.7%).

Respondents without a primary source of income reported that they receive financial support mostly from their parents (32.5%), spouses (28.6%), partner(s) (19.0%), and from other unspecified sources (19.9%). Students in tertiary institutions who responded as not having a primary source of income received financial support from their parents/guardians (39.8%), spouses (24.0%), partner(s) (19.5%), or from other unspecified sources (16.7%). Youth corps
members also reported that they receiving financial support from their parents/guardians (33.0%) and from other unspecified sources (26.4%).

Figure 1: Showing the sources of income of study respondents by institutions/associations, Nigeria, 2015.

About a third (33.6%) of all respondents reported that they have a supplementary source of income. Students in tertiary education (40.8%), youth corp members (26.1%) and uniformed service personnel (25.9%) mostly reported that they have a supplementary
source of income. In addition, respondents who had never been married (56.6%), followed by respondents currently married (31.9%) were mostly reported to have a supplementary source of income.

Respondents who had completed secondary (53.2%) and tertiary (45.5%) education were mostly reported to have a supplementary source of income, while those with no education (0.1%) and qur’anic education only (0.03%) were the smallest proportions who had a supplementary source of income. In addition, supplementary income mostly was sourced from businesses (54.2%), part time work (16.8 %), from their partner (s) (13.5%) or spouses (8.2 %), and from other work not specified (7.4%). Respondents who had businesses as their source of supplementary income were mostly uniformed service personnel (38.8%), students in tertiary institutions (28.5%), or youth corp members (24.1%). Students in tertiary institutions mainly sourced supplementary income from part time work (43.7%) or partner (s) (39.2%).

Of all respondents who reported that they have a supplementary source of income, 36.6 % also had a primary source of income. Respondents who had both primary and supplementary sources of income were mainly students in tertiary education (33.1%), uniformed service personnel (32.1%), or youth corp members (26.5%). In addition, 4.2% and 4.1% respectively of respondents who reported that they have both primary and supplementary sources of income consisted of respondents associated with
entertainment, hospitality, financial institutions, market women, or others not specified, and respondents in the civil service.

3.2: STI Assessment & HIV
3.2.1: STI Assessment
To assess for STIs, respondents were asked if they had experienced symptoms of STIs in the last 6 months. Symptoms assessed included lower abdominal pain, genital pain on urination, anal discharge or itching, rashes or sores around the anus or genitalia, and abnormal vaginal discharge. Lower abdominal pain, at almost half of all responses (47.5%), was the most common symptom, while abnormal vaginal discharge (21.4% of all responses) was the second most common symptom.

Akwa Ibom state recorded the highest number of respondents who experience any of these symptoms within the last 6 months. Students in tertiary institutions also recorded a high number of respondents who experienced any of the symptoms in the last 6 months (51.4% of all responses). In addition, more often than not, respondents who had attained tertiary (72.2%) and secondary (26.1%) education, as well as those who were never married (65.4%) had experienced any symptoms in the last 6 months.
Respondents were asked if their partners had experienced any symptoms in the last 6 months. Painful urination, at a response rate of 28.6%, was the most common symptom reportedly experienced by respondents’ sexual partners. Students in tertiary institutions mostly knew whether their sexual partner(s) had experienced any symptoms in the last 6 months (52.3%). Respondents who had attained tertiary education (73.6%) and respondents who had never been married (59.8%) also mostly knew whether their sexual partner(s) had experienced any symptoms in the last 6 months.
3.2.2: HIV status

76.9% of respondents reported that they know their HIV status, with students in tertiary institutions (43.0%), youth corp members (26.0%) and uniformed service personnel (25.4%) being the largest groups to know their HIV status. Respondents who had attained tertiary (75.8%) and secondary (22.5%) education were also aware of their status, as well as those who were never married (61.7%) or married (30.1%). In addition, more than half (58.6%) of the respondents who had a primary source of income knew their HIV status.

Figure 2: Showing respondents who know their HIV status by institutions/associations, Nigeria, 2015.

54.2% of respondents reported that they tested for HIV within the last 12 months. Again, students in tertiary institutions (43.7%),
youth corp members (25.9%) and uniformed service personnel (24.8%) mostly had been tested for HIV within the last 12 months. Respondents who had attained tertiary (76.1%) and secondary (22.2%) education had mostly been tested for HIV within the last 12 months, as well as those who were never married (61.1%) or married (31.4%). 61.4% of the respondents who had a primary source of income had been tested for HIV within the last 12 months.

Figure 3: Showing respondents who tested for HIV within the last 12 months by institutions/associations, Nigeria, 2015.

Of the 23.1% of respondents who had not tested for HIV, students in tertiary institutions mostly knew where to get tested (49.4%). A high number of people who had attained tertiary education (69.4%), as well as those never married (63.8%) also knew where to
get tested. In addition, slightly over half of the respondents (52.4%) who knew where to get tested had a primary source of income.

**3.3: Sexual history**

Overall, 29.8% of all respondents were reported to have ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours. Of this group, almost half (48%) were students in tertiary institutions. In addition, 27.4% and 23% of respondents who reportedly had ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours were youth corp members or uniformed service personnel respectively. Members of the civil service and other institutions/associations had the least proportions of people who have ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours.

**Figure 4: Showing respondents who have ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours by institutions/associations, Nigeria, 2015.**

![Respondents who have ever exchanged sex for gifts/favours](image)
Across the states, students in tertiary institutions consistently remained the largest group to have ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours, with students from Cross River and Akwa Ibom states making up 22.1% and 18.3% respectively, of all students who reported having ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours. In Akwa Ibom State, students in tertiary institutions made up 36% of respondents who had ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours; closely followed by uniformed service personnel (30%) and youth corp members (29.6%). In Cross River State, while students in tertiary institutions mostly reported ever exchanging sex for gifts or favours (53.1%), more youth corp members reported ever exchanging sex for gifts or favours (30.1%) than uniformed service personnel (16.2%).

Figure 5: Showing respondents who have ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours by states and institutions/associations, Nigeria, 2015.
3.3.1: Educational attainment and age

Of all respondents who reported that they had ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours, 58.9% had completed secondary education, while 39.7% of respondents had completed tertiary education. Respondents with no education (0.4%) or Qur’anic education only (0.2%) were the least proportions to have ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours. In addition, mostly respondents aged 25 years and above were reported to have exchanged sex for gifts or favours (66.1%), followed by respondents aged between 20 – 24 years (30.9%), and those aged 15 – 19 years (3.0%).

Figure 6: Showing educational attainment of respondents who have ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours, Nigeria, 2015.
3.3.2: Marital status

66.4% of respondents who reported that they have ever having exchanged sex for gifts or favours had never been married. Furthermore, 18.9% of respondents who were reported to have ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours were currently married, while 9.3% were cohabiting. Women who were separated/divorced (3.8%) or widowed (1.6%) were the least reported to have ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours.

Figure 7: Showing marital status of respondents who have ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours, Nigeria, 2015.
3.3.3: Sources of income
Over half of the women who had ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours had a primary source of income (56.7%). These were mostly uniformed service personnel (33.6%), youth corp members (31.6%) or students in tertiary institutions (31.1%). Of the respondents who were reported to have exchanged sex for gifts or favours, 42.4% had a supplementary source of income. They were also mostly students in tertiary institutions (42.8%), youth corps members (29.6%) or uniformed service personnel (24.2%).

Figure 8: Showing sources of income of respondents who have ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours by institutions/associations, Nigeria, 2015.
3.3.4: HIV status

75.4% of respondents who had ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours know their HIV status. Of this group of respondents, 44.6%, 29.4% and 23.3% respectively were students of tertiary institutions, youth corp members, or uniformed service personnel. Respondents who had ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours, and who had attained tertiary (74.2%) and secondary (24.7%) education mostly knew their HIV status. In addition, respondents who had ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours, and who were never married (66.3%), or married (19.3%) mostly knew their HIV status.

50.2% of respondents who had ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours had tested for HIV in the last 12 months. Those who had tested for HIV in the last 12 months were mostly students of tertiary institutions (46.0%), youth corp members (30.1%), or uniformed service personnel (21.5%). Many of them had never married (65.5%) and had attained tertiary education (72.9%).
41.2% of women who reportedly had ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours did not know their HIV status, but knew a place where they could get a HIV test done. They were also mainly students of tertiary institutions (49.7%), youth corp members (24.5%), or uniformed service personnel (23.5%). In addition, respondents had
mostly attained tertiary education (69.7%) and had never been married (68.7%).

28.4% of all respondents did not know their HIV status, or where to get tested for HIV. Students in tertiary institutions made up 57.7% of this group. Of the respondents who reported ever exchanging sex for gifts or favours, 13.5% did not know their HIV status, nor where to get tested. These were mostly students in tertiary institutions (59.3%), youth corp members (21.5%) and uniformed service personnel (15.1%).

Of all respondents who were reported to have ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours, about a third (33.7%) had made the last recent exchange within the last three months. Of these, 58.5% were students in tertiary institutions, 25.0% were youth corp members, and 13.6% were uniformed service personnel. Respondents who had never been married had the highest numbers recorded for those who exchanged sex for gifts or favours in the last three months (37.0%). More married respondents had exchanged sex for favours over the past 12 months (45.9%) or six months (25.3%) of the study. However, 17.5% of married respondents who had ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours reported doing so within the last three months.
3.3.5: Reason for exchange of sex

Respondents mostly exchanged sex in order to pay for things they could not afford such as school fees, allowances, etc. (29.2% of all responses). Payment for housing/accommodation was the most common reason for exchanging sex for gifts or favours, with students in tertiary institutions mostly giving this response (39.9%). This was followed by youth corp members (36.0%) and uniformed service personnel (21.8%).
Students in tertiary institutions (39.9%) and uniformed service personnel (33.8%) also reported that they exchanged sex in order to support their families. Students in tertiary institutions mostly reported that they exchanged sex for grades/marks, with almost a quarter of students (24.0%) who had ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours reporting the exchange of sex for grades/marks.

Over half of the respondents who exchanged sex for job security were uniformed service personnel (55.9%). In addition, youth corp members (21.6%) and students in tertiary education (19.6%) also reported that they exchanged sex for job security. Only 2.5% of all respondents exchanged sex as a result of coercion or intimidation. However, almost half who reported this were students in tertiary institutions (47.0%). Youth corp members (25.8%) and uniformed service personnel (24.2%) also reported that they were coerced or intimidated into exchanging sex.
Table 2: Showing the reasons for women’s exchange of sex for gifts or favours by institutions/associations, Nigeria, 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Uniform</th>
<th>Tertiary inst.</th>
<th>Civil</th>
<th>NYSC</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay for things</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase grades/marks</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay for housing, etc.</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support family</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security/promotion</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion/intimidation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2654</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students in tertiary institutions made up 51.6% of all respondents who were reported to exchange sex for gifts or favours to boost their social status. In addition, youth corp members (27.0%) and uniformed service personnel (19.5%) also reported sex for gifts or favours to boost their social status. Respondents associated with entertainment, hospitality, financial institutions, market women, or others not specified, mostly had other reasons for exchanging sex for gifts or favours, making up 55.7% of such responses. Students in tertiary institutions (23.0%), as well as uniformed service personnel (18.0%) also reported other reasons for exchanging sex for gifts or favours.
Respondents who were married mostly exchanged sex to pay for things they could not afford such as school fees, allowances, etc. (22.6%) or to support their families (21.7%). Respondents who were cohabiting and those who had never been married also exchanged sex to pay for things they could not afford such as school fees, allowances, etc. (27.0% and 32.8% respectively) or to pay for housing, utilities and other bills (20.7% and 21.3% respectively). Respondents who were formerly married (separated or divorced) or widowed mainly exchanged sex to support their families (26.9% and 31.7% respectively), and pay for housing, utilities and other bills (19.4% and 25% respectively). In addition, respondents who had attained secondary (26.8%) or tertiary (72.1%) education mostly exchanged sex to pay for things they could not afford such as school fees and allowances. 29.1% of those who had attained tertiary education exchanged sex to pay for housing, utilities and other bills.

7 respondents representing in 0.08% of all respondents in the study, reported that they have never exchanged sex for gifts or favours, giving reasons why they exchanged sex. This proportion of women could possibly have ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours, but are in denial of this. On the other hand, these women may not have ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours, but may have the tendency to do so in future.
3.3.6: Number and Type of Sexual Partners

On the average, respondents reported that they had two sex partners within the last 12 months. 20.0% of respondents also reported that they had more than one sex partner at the same time in the last 12 months. Of these, respondents were mostly students in tertiary institutions (47.5%), youth corp members (28.3%), and uniformed service personnel (20.5%). They were also mostly never married (70.3%), and had attained tertiary education (75.7%). Furthermore, 55.6% of respondents who had more than one sex partner at the same time in the last 12 months had a primary source of income. 51.6% of respondents had two sex partners, 24.9% had three sex partners, while 17.4% had four to five sex partners at the same time in the last 12 months.

Respondents were asked what type of sexual partner or partners they have, with the option of multiple responses. 26.8% reported spouses, 49.0% had main boyfriends, 13.8% had casual sex partners, while 11.5% had sugar daddies/aristos. Respondents who had attained secondary and tertiary education were most likely to report that they have spouses (13.8% and 44.9%), main boyfriends (18.7% and 93.2%), casual sex partners (7.0% and 23.6%) and sugar daddies/aristos (5.2% and 21.0%).

Respondents who had never been married had the largest number of all types of sexual partners except spouses (main boyfriends: 64.6%; casual sex partners: 15.6%; and sugar daddies/aristos: 13.0%). Of all married respondents, 17.3% were reported to have
another type of sexual partner in addition to their spouses. 8.8% reported that they had main boyfriends, 4.8% had casual sex partners, while 3.6% had a sugar daddy/aristo. Respondents who were cohabiting were reported to have main boyfriends (72.9%), casual sex partners (27.1%) and sugar daddies/aristos (26.6%). Formerly married (separated/divorced) and widowed respondents were also reported to have main boyfriends (46.1% and 38.2%), casual sex partners (37.6% and 23.6%), and sugar daddies/aristos (29.8% and 19.1%).

32.0% of respondents reported that within their institutions or associations, sex is exchanged for gifts or favours. Of these, 50.1%, 23.7% and 21.2% were students in tertiary institutions, youth corp members, and uniformed service personnel respectively. Respondents also reported that they knew, on average, a minimum of 13 women and a maximum of 28 women, in their institutions/associations who exchange sex for gifts or favours.
3.4: Condom use
Respondents were asked if they had used a condom the last time they exchanged sex for gifts or favours. 70.8% of respondents who reported that they had ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours also reported that condoms were used at the last exchange. Those who used condoms were mostly students in tertiary institutions (43.4%) and youth corp members (30.5%). They were also mostly never married (68.7%) and had attained tertiary (73.1%) or secondary (25.7%) education.
Respondents who did not use a condom the last time they exchanged sex for gifts or favours mostly cited trust for their partners as the reason why condoms were not used (34.0%). Other reasons mostly cited were refusal by partners (23.8%), pleasure (20.3%), and that condoms were not available (18.2%). Only 1.0% of respondents stated that condoms were not affordable. Trust and partner refusal were reasons mostly cited by respondents who had attained tertiary education (35.9% and 22.9% respectively). The
same reasons were also given for not using a condom by respondents who had never been married (29.8% and 24.5% respectively). Furthermore, 49.2% of married respondents who did not use a condom the last time they exchanged sex for gifts or favours mentioned trust as the reason for not using a condom.

Figure 13: Showing reasons for not using a condom at the last exchange of sex by respondents who had ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours by institutions/associations, Nigeria, 2015.
Almost a quarter (22.8%) of those who had ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours reported that they have had more than one sexual partner at the same time in the last 12 months, in addition to not using a condom the last time they exchanged sex for gifts or favours. These respondents were mostly students in tertiary institutions (51.1%), youth corp members (23.7%) and uniformed service personnel (22.1%). They were also mostly never married (68.6%) and had attained tertiary education (73.8%). In addition, 7.0% of respondents who did not use a condom the last time they exchanged sex for gifts or favours and had more than one sex partner at the same time in the last 12 months, did not know their HIV status.

3.5: Alcohol & Drugs use
3.5.1: Alcohol use
A total of 4,329 respondents were surveyed, 50.4% of all respondents reported that they drink alcohol. Of this number, 69.6% reported occasional alcohol consumption (e.g. at social gatherings). This mostly consisted of students in tertiary institutions (42.9%), uniformed service personnel (26.0%) and youth corp members (25.8%). Students in tertiary institutions, uniformed service personnel, and youth corp members also responded to daily consumption of alcohol (46.7%, 27.7% and 23.2%), as well as weekly (44.4%, 26.8% and 25.0%).
Respondents who drank alcohol daily or weekly were mostly never married (59.6% and 59.2%), and had completed tertiary education (67.2% and 68.0%). In addition, 61.2% of respondents who reported that they consume alcohol had a primary source of income. 14.8% of respondents who drank alcohol reported not using a condom the last time they exchanged sex for gifts or favours. Furthermore, 10.0% of respondents who drank alcohol also reported that they had more than one sexual partner in the last 12 months, and did not use condoms at their last exchange of sex for gifts or favours.
3.3.2: Psychoactive Drug Use

Only 586, or 6.9% of all respondents were reported to have taken psychoactive drugs. Those who did were mostly students in tertiary institutions (47.3%), uniformed service personnel (23.4%) and youth corp members (25.8%). They had also mostly attained tertiary (71.0%) education, and had never been married (62.1%). In addition, of the respondents who reported taking psychoactive drugs, over half (56.0%) had a primary source of income.

Figure 15: Showing respondents who reported using psychoactive drugs by institution/association

Over half (58.3%) of the respondents who reported that they use psychoactive drugs, do so occasionally, while about 21% of respondents who take psychoactive drugs do so daily or weekly. Mostly students in tertiary institutions (56.1%) and uniformed
service personnel (22.4%) use psychoactive drugs daily. In addition, of all who reported weekly use of psychoactive drugs, 28.7% consisted of youth corp members.

Marijuana, at 43.6%, was the most reported substance used. In addition, cocaine (16.2%) and heroin (13.0%) were also the highest reported drugs used by respondents. Other drugs used include crack (8.8%), Pentazocine (6.6%), Amphetamine (6.4%), Fortwin (5.4%), and others such as Tramadol, Benylin (with Codeine), Shisha, and painkillers.

63.1% of respondents who were reported to use psychoactive drugs also reported that they had ever exchanged sex for gifts of favours. Of this group, it was reported that 32.2% did not use a condom at their last exchange of sex. In addition, 50.6% students in tertiary institutions who used psychoactive substances reported not using condoms at their last exchange of sex for gifts or favours.
This chapter discusses the findings from the data, compared with findings from literature and other studies on transactional sex. It also highlights the implication of these findings for the planning and implementation of sexual and reproductive health programmes in Nigeria.

4.1: Rate of occurrence of transactional sex among women aged 15-49

From the results, almost a third of respondents reported that they had ever exchanged sex for favours or gifts (29.8%). In line with other studies (Choudhry et al 2014; Moore, Biddlecom & Zulu 2007; Wamoyi et al 2010; NARHS 2013), students in tertiary institutions were mostly involved in transactional sex (48.0%). However, youth corp members and uniformed service personnel together made up half of the women also involved in transactional sex. This raises the need for in-school HIV programmes and work place HIV programmes, with a focus on behaviour change communication messaging for these populations.

Respondents with higher educational attainment (secondary: 58.9% and tertiary: 39.7%) mostly reported that they were involved in transactional sex. This is contrary to other studies, such as Dunkle et al (2010), where transactional sex is linked to lower levels of education. However, this could be as a result of the large population
of students in tertiary institutions who consented to participate in this study. In addition, women aged 25 and above were found to be mostly involved in transactional sex (66.1%), contrary to previous findings in which adolescents were mostly implicated in transactional sex (Luke 2005; Chatterji et al 2005; NARHS 2012). Again, respondents who had primary or supplementary sources of income were mostly involved in transactional sex, unlike in the Swindler et al, 2007 study where transactional sex occurred mostly among people without a source of income.

Women who had never been married were mostly involved in transactional sex (66.4%), with more reports of transactional sex within the last three months (37.0%). However, almost a fifth (18.9%) of women who were married reported that they had ever engaged in transactional sex. Additionally, 17.5% of married women had engaged in transactional sex within the last three months, while 17.3% were reported to have another sexual partner apart from their spouses. This could put their spouses at the risk of contracting HIV or STIs, especially as almost half of the married respondents who did not use condoms at their last exchange of sex for gifts or favours cited trust as the reason for not using condoms. This highlights the need for HIV programming among the wider population, in a bid to reduce the multiple and concurrent sexual partnerships and reduce the risk of HIV transmission among spouses.
4.2: HIV knowledge, alcohol and drug use among women who engage in transactional sex

About three quarters (75.4%) of respondents who engage in transactional sex reported that they know their HIV status, with 50.2% of the women tested in the last 12 months. 41.2% of those who had not been tested also knew where to get tested for HIV. While respondents were not asked how HIV could be contracted or prevented, a large proportion of women knowing their HIV status, and where to get tested implies some knowledge of HIV. However, this knowledge did not seem to prevent them from engaging in transactional sex, multiple partnerships, or unprotected sexual intercourse. This implies a gap in knowledge and practices regarding HIV and its prevention among women in Nigeria.

Consumption of alcohol, or the influence of alcohol did not seem to be a major facilitator for women engaging in risky transactional sex. Most of the respondents who were reported to exchange sex for gifts and favours without the use of a condom in the last three months, either do not drink alcohol (26.8%), or only did so occasionally (35.5%). Alcohol use was also not a facilitator for multiple sexual partnerships as less than a quarter of women who consumed alcohol daily (22.0%) reported that they had more than one sexual partner in the last 12 months and had not used a condom at the last exchange of sex for gifts or favours.

However, 63.1% of women who use psychoactive drugs reported that they had ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours, with 32.2%
reporting that a condom was not used at the last exchange. Of these, about half were students in tertiary institutions. The link between alcohol and drug use, and HIV transmission therefore cannot be ignored. Sexual and reproductive health programming needs to continue to take this into consideration, especially among students in tertiary institutions and uniformed service personnel.

Women’s knowledge of symptoms of STIs, and especially the symptoms of their sexual partners was skewed towards students in tertiary institutions. This implies less power imbalances between this population and their sexual partners, and could possibly be contributory to the greater use of condoms by women in this population. Women surveyed in this population were most likely to report condom use at their last exchange of sex for gifts or favours (43.4%). There is need however to continue to provide messages on correct and consistent condom use for all populations, especially uniformed service personnel and youth corp members.

4.3: Condom knowledge and use of condoms among women who engage in transactional sex
Most respondents (70.8%) and especially students in tertiary institutions (43.4%) reported that they used a condom at the last exchange of sex for gifts or favours. Women with higher levels of educational attainment also mostly used condoms at their last exchange of sex for gifts or favours, as well as women who had primary and supplementary sources of income. Of the 22.8% of respondents who had more than one sexual partner, and did not
use a condom at their last exchange of sex for gifts or favours, about half (51.1%) were students in tertiary institutions. This highlights the continuous/increased need for programming on condom use and negotiation among students in tertiary institutions, amongst other populations, as this population could be contributing to the spread of HIV and STIs among the wider population.

The main reasons specified by women who did not use condoms at their last exchange of sex for gifts or favours included trust for their sexual partners (34.0%) and partners’ refusal (23.8%). This highlights the need for increased/continuous messaging on HIV testing and mutual faithfulness of sex partners. Messaging on condom negotiation could also be delivered; keeping in mind factors that contribute to women’s inability to negotiate, such as economic imbalances, intimidation and coercion.

4.4: Motivators of transactional sex among women aged 15-49
Key among the motivations for exchanging sex for gifts or favours was the need for women to pay for things they cannot afford such as school fees, allowances, etc., and to pay for housing, utilities and other bills. Respondents who reported that they had ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours, and even those who had done so within the last three months had a primary or supplementary source of income. This implies that contrary to findings from other studies, abject poverty is not the major motivation for transactional
sex in Nigeria, especially in urban areas where this study was conducted.

In addition, this study reiterates the ‘sex for grades’ syndrome in Nigerian tertiary institutions, with over half of the students in tertiary institutions reporting that sex is exchanged for favours and gifts in their institutions. 70.7% of women who exchanged sex for grades were students in tertiary institutions. This implies the need to include academic and non-academic staff as the targets for sexual and reproductive health programming, using relevant and appropriate messaging.

Coercion and intimidation of women to exchange sex for gifts or favours, while found among a small number of respondents, was prevalent among about a quarter each of students in tertiary institutions and uniformed service personnel. In addition, uniformed service personnel, at 55.9% of all responses reported that they exchanged sex for job security. This raises concerns about power imbalances in these institutions, and how this could be fueling the spread of HIV and STIs. A woman’s ability to negotiate for condom use is greatly diminished in instances of coercion or intimidation for sex.
5.1: Recommendations

Key recommendations as a result of the findings of this study include:

- The need to explore/improve on in-school interventions, while extending this to youth corp members. Work place interventions for uniformed service personnel, and the civil service should be established to reduce the need for exchange of sex for job security among these groups.

- In school interventions should focus on students, in addition to academic and non-academic staff to reduce intimidation or coercion of women to exchange sex for grades. Additionally, in-school interventions beyond seeking to reduce multiple and concurrent sexual partnerships, should help to achieve a policy environment where women have redress for being intimidated or coerced into exchanging sex for grades in tertiary institutions.

- Messages and programmes on condom use among uniformed service personnel and students should include skills in negotiation and managing coercion and intimidation for sex.

- Further study to explore transactional sex and its motivations in rural areas in Nigeria is necessary, to provide evidence for programmes in such locations.
5.2: Conclusion

This study focused on different groups of women in Nigeria, and the rate of transactional sex among these groups. It also identified HIV knowledge and condom use among these women, drug and alcohol use, as well as the motivators for transactional sex in Nigeria.

Findings from this study indicate that in Nigeria, students in tertiary institutions have the highest rate of involvement in transactional sex, followed by youth corp members and uniformed service personnel. Women who engage in transactional sex in Nigeria are mostly aged 25 years and above, have never been married and have attained higher levels of education. While students in tertiary institutions had the highest proportions who were involved in transactional sex, this group had the highest proportion of women who knew their HIV status, had tested for HIV within the last 12 months, or knew where to get tested for HIV. Findings also show that this group used condoms most frequently while exchanging sex for gifts or favours.

The main motivation for transactional sex was to pay for housing, utilities, school related expenses and allowances. Furthermore, the influence of alcohol was not a main facilitator for risky transactional sex. However, drug use was a facilitator for risky transactional sex, as a large proportion of women who reported using psychoactive
drugs also reported not using a condom the last time they exchanged sex for gifts or favours.

These findings highlight the need for targeted HIV prevention programming including in-school interventions, work place interventions, and skills on condom negotiation within the context of intimidation and coercion. There is also a need to explore the motivations for transactional sex in rural areas of Nigeria, to identify specific needs of women in these locations.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form No:</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>LGA</th>
<th>Town</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Background Characteristics</strong></th>
<th>Uniformed Service personnel</th>
<th>Tertiary Institutions</th>
<th>Civil service</th>
<th>Entertainment</th>
<th>Market women</th>
<th>Hospitality</th>
<th>Financial Institutions</th>
<th>Others (specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1. Which of these institutions/association do you belong?</td>
<td>Uniformed Service personnel</td>
<td>Tertiary Institutions</td>
<td>Civil service</td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>Market women</td>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>Financial Institutions</td>
<td>Others (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2. What is your Educational attainment?</th>
<th>No education</th>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>Qur’anic only</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Tertiary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3. How old are you?</th>
<th>______</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4. What is your marital status?</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Cohabit</th>
<th>Never married</th>
<th>Formerly married (Divorced/Separated)</th>
<th>Widow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q5. Do you have a primary source of income?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q6. If Yes, what is your primary source of income?</th>
<th>Self-employed</th>
<th>Employed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q7. If No, what is your primary source of income?</th>
<th>Spouse</th>
<th>Partner(s)</th>
<th>Parent/Guardian</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Q8** Do you do any other thing to supplement your primary source of income?  
- Yes........................................1  
- No........................................2  

**Q9** If yes, what is this source of income?  
- Part—time work.........................1  
- Business..................................2  
- Spouse....................................3  
- Partner (s)...............................4  
- Others....................................5  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>STIs Assessment</strong></th>
<th><strong>Yes</strong></th>
<th><strong>No</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q10 Have you had any of the following symptoms in the last 6 months?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower abdominal pain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genital Pain on urination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anal discharge/ itching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rash/sores around the anus/genitalia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abnormal Vaginal discharge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Q11 Have your partner (s) had any of the following symptoms in the last 6 months? | **Yes** | **No** |  
| Scrotal swelling |  
| Genital Pain on urination |  
| Anal discharge/ itching |  
| Rash/sores around the penis/anus |  
| Swelling of the groin |  

**HIV**

| Q12 Do you know your HIV status? | Yes........................................1  
| No........................................2  

| Q13 If Yes, have you done an HIV test in the last 12 months? | Yes........................................1  
| No........................................2  

| Q14 If No, do you know a place where you can go to have an HIV test? | Yes........................................1  
| No........................................2  

**SEXUAL HISTORY**

| Q15 Have you ever exchanged sex for gifts or favours? | Yes........................................1  
| No........................................2  

| Q16 If yes, did it happen in the last _____? | 3 months (__________); 6 months (__________); 12 months (__________); Over 12 months (__________)  

| Q17 What was your reason(s) for exchanging sex for gifts or favours? | 1. Pay for things I could not afford e.g. School fees, Allowances  
| 2. To increase grades or marks  
| 3. Pay for housing, utilities and other bills  
| 4. Support my family financially  
| 5. Job security |
| Q21  | How many sexual partners have you had in the last 12 months? | 6. Coercion/intimidation  
7. Maintain social status  
8. Others (specify) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>__ __ __ __</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Q22  | In the last 12 months, have you had more than one sexual partner at the same time? | Yes/No |

| Q23  | If yes, how many | ____________ |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q24</th>
<th>What type of sexual partner(s) do you have? (Please tick as applicable)</th>
<th>Spouse</th>
<th>Yes No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boyfriend (main)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Casual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>daddy/Aristo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Q25  | Within your institutions/association, is sex exchanged for gifts or favours? | Yes……………………………………1  
No…………………………………2 |

| Q26  | If yes how many women do you know who exchange sex for gifts or favours? | • Minimum……………………  
• Maximum……………………  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONDOM USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Q27  | The last time you exchanged sex for gifts/favours was a condom used? | Yes…………………..  
No………………….. |

| Q28  | If no, why was a condom not used? | Not available………………1  
Not affordable………………2  
Partner refusal………………3  
Trust…………………..4  
Pleasure…………………..5  
Others (specify)……………6 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALCOHOL AND DRUGS USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Q29  | How often do you drink alcohol? | Never…………………..1  
Daily…………………..2  
Once a week………………3  
Occasionally (at events) 4 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q30</th>
<th>Do you take psychoactive drugs (Inhale or inject drugs that make a person feel high)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes........................................ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No........................................... 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q31</th>
<th>How often do you take or inject psychoactive drugs?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never ........................................ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily ........................................... 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Once a week ...................................... 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occasionally (at events) ........................ 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q32</th>
<th>What type of drugs do you inject or take? (Multiple options possible)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heroin ........................................ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cocaine ................................. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crack .................................... 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amphetamine .............................. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fortwin ................................ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marijuana ............................... 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others .................................. 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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