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Appendix 1: Overview of reviewed literature on transactional sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Research pop.</th>
<th>Urban/rural</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Conclusion about factors underlying/related to transactional (or risky) sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ackermann &amp; De Klerk</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>Transactional sex result of female poverty and male control of sexuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankomah</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Premarital youth</td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>FGDs (6), in-depth interviews (78)</td>
<td>Relationships about material gain; economic need + societal norms obstruct women to negotiate safe sex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benessch</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Villagers,</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>Interviews, FGDs</td>
<td>Matrilineal women’s once strong social position severely undermined throughout history, leading them now to depend heavily on exploitative sexual relationships with men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryceson &amp; Fonseca</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Peasants</td>
<td>(semi) rural</td>
<td>Key informant interviews, FGDs, survey 141 rural households</td>
<td>Destitution increasingly pushing women to transactional sex e.g. as form of ganyu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buseh et al.</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>General population,</td>
<td>rural mission</td>
<td>FGDs (3)</td>
<td>Women may have extra-marital partners for economic security and lack power to negotiate terms of sex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell et al.</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>General population</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>Focus on lineage procreation encourages sex without limits. Economic exchange in sexual relationships is common and considered normal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Female commercial sex workers</td>
<td>Mining community</td>
<td>In-depth interviews 21 CSWs</td>
<td>Most women unwillingly pushed into sex work by destitution and lack of other livelihood options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatterji et al.</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>12 countries sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>Existing national survey statistics</td>
<td>In most countries TS highest among 15-19 girls, unmarried, non-Muslim women + young, unmarried &amp; Muslim men. No consistent correlation with socio-economic status, location, or in-school status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluver et al.</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>AIDS-orphans</td>
<td>Peri-urban settlements</td>
<td>Longitudinal follow up of 723 adolescents</td>
<td>Familial AIDS, food insecurity, and exposure to abuse raised prevalence of transactional sex amongst girls from 1% to 57%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>Young women</td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>Ethnographic approach</td>
<td>Money is means to achieve respected social adulthood, support expected from male sexual partners à women’s use of sexuality to amass resources is socially respected and valued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>General population</td>
<td>small town</td>
<td>Ethnographic approach</td>
<td>Despite locally prevalent discourse on contemporary women as running after money, women only divorce after severe hardship. Husbands expected to provide even if wife has money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodoo</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Urban poor</td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>Existing national statistics, FGDs</td>
<td>Risky sex is economic survival strategy, particularly among urban, poor women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunkle et al.</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>Structured questionnaires</td>
<td>Sex with non-primary partner motivated by material gain = 20%: associated with higher HIV infection, gender-based violence, substance use, socio-economic disadvantage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunkle et al.</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Young men aged 15-26</td>
<td>rural</td>
<td>Interviews 1288 men</td>
<td>Strong link between transactional sex and gender-based violence. Men get resources through sexual partnerships too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert &amp; Walker</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>National statistics</td>
<td>Strong association of HIV infection with low income, high unemployment, and poor education; women worst off.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gysels et al.</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Sex workers</td>
<td>trading centre</td>
<td>Life histories (34), participant observation, sexual diaries</td>
<td>Disadvantaged backgrounds played role in move into commercial sex. Better economic situation = better negotiating position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallman</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Youth aged 14-24</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>Household survey</td>
<td>Economic disadvantage associated with risky sex (including transactional sex), particularly for (young) women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haram</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Unmarried youth incl single mothers</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>Long-term fieldwork, life histories</td>
<td>Gifting pivotal aspect of all relationships and particularly sexual. Young women barter sex for economic benefit. Aware of HIV risk, but for many it is economically and socially too costly to abandon relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hargreaves et al.</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Age group 14-35</td>
<td>rural</td>
<td>Cohort survey 1967 respondents</td>
<td>Only low education for women related to increased HIV incidence (household wealth, marital status, and mobility unrelated).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins et al.</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Young women</td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>Peer in-depth interviews</td>
<td>By extracting financial and material resources from older men through power of their sexuality, young women construct a positive identity and esteem linked to perceptions of modernity and consumption and their ability to access consumer goods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helle-Valle</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>General population</td>
<td>rural</td>
<td>Ethnographic research</td>
<td>Material support generates agency, women can remain independent through informal sexual relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Young women</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>Ethnographic research</td>
<td>Rural setting à limited livelihood options à sex for subsistence needs; urban setting à less destitution à sex for socially motivated consumption desires, women more agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaufman &amp; Stavrou</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>14-22, 3 races (African, Indian, White)</td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>FGDs (10)</td>
<td>Gifting among like-age adolescents is common &amp; important in shaping sexual relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keene</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Uganda, Botswana</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>Educational, socio-economic, and cultural disadvantages increase HIV risk in general, but particularly for women, who are pushed to rely on transactional sex with one or several men to gain access to needed resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leclerc-Madlala</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>peri-urban</td>
<td>Ethnographic approach</td>
<td>Pre-existing sexual cultures &amp; gender inequality with new influences (migration, increasing poverty, family disintegration, new ways for acquiring &amp; demonstrating wealth) stimulate transactional sex and prove fertile ground for HIV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leclerc-Madlala</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>Ethnographic approach</td>
<td>Transactional sex perceived as normal, leading to multiple liaisons, exploited for new ‘needs’ = commodities of modernity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>Adolescents</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>Cross generational sex common; girls exert agency over who to date and how long, but less control over sexual practices. Gifts and violence limit girls’ negotiating power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machel</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>School girls aged 14-20 of middle and working class</td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>Interviews + survey 182 girls</td>
<td>Girls with lower socio-economic status more vulnerable than higher SES: more accepting gender power differences, less assertive, more economically dependent on partner weakening bargaining power safe sex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacPherson et al.</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Fishing community</td>
<td>rural</td>
<td>Participant observation, FGDs, semi-structured interviews</td>
<td>Transactional sex common, women particularly vulnerable in negotiation because of existing gendered power structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maganja et al.</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Youth 16-24</td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>Interviews (60), 14 FGDs (14)</td>
<td>Transactional sex in both casual &amp; committed relationships; much distrust; sex-gift exchange expected otherwise extra partners/breakup/rape; women exert agency but still at disadvantage negotiating safe sex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masvawure</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>University students</td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>Participant observation, in-depth interviews</td>
<td>Transactional sex for social status, to feel and be perceived of as modern &amp; successful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Country/Region</td>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Findings/Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meekers &amp; Calves</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Youth aged 17-25</td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>FGDs</td>
<td>Economic need leads many young women to use premarital sexual relations (incl multiple partners) for economic support, despite HIV risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merten &amp; Haller</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Fishermen, fish traders</td>
<td>rural</td>
<td>Participant observation, FGDs, interviews</td>
<td>Fish-for-sex exchanges not based on tradition, but on the economic opportunities provided in conditions of poverty and changing livelihoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill &amp; Anarfi</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>HIV positive women</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>In-depth Interviews HIV+ women (31)</td>
<td>Poverty, through limited education and vocational skills, led women to take on boyfriends to support them as survival strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller et al.</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>HIV positive people</td>
<td>rural clinic</td>
<td>In-depth interviews HIV+ women (41)</td>
<td>Food security increases female vulnerability by pushing them into transactional sex and violent relationships, and limiting their control over condom use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills &amp; Ssewakiryanga</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>University youth</td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>Single sex + mixed FGDs</td>
<td>Fragile masculinities depend (a.o.) on providing for girlfriend while avoiding to be stripped of all income; both genders secretive about wealth. Ideology of romantic love less central to people’s aspirations than centrality of money as symbol through which relationships are practised and understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore et al.</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Burkina Faso, Ghana, Malawi, Uganda</td>
<td>Youth aged 12-19</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>Nationally representative household surveys, FGDs, in-depth interviews</td>
<td>Transactional sex very common, unrelated to household economic status, orphan hood, education level, age difference, or condom use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munthali et al.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Adolescents aged 12-19</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>Nationally representative household survey</td>
<td>4 out of 5 girls received something (96% money) in exchange for sex in past year, indicating that this is a common feature of routine dating &amp; courting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nnko et al.</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Out-of-school adolescents</td>
<td>rural</td>
<td>Social mapping 2 communities, narrative research workshops (10), in-depth interviews (81)</td>
<td>Exchange of money and gifts for sex was reported by both female and male adolescents, but perception and interpretation differed: Males perceived that females engage in sex largely for material gain while females saw it as display of partner’s love or commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nnko &amp; Pool</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>School youth</td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>Role plays</td>
<td>For boys sexual desire is important motivating factor, for girls an ambiguous mixture of attraction &amp; financial gain. Girls often quite competent in negotiating financially rewarding sexual deals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Age/Group</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Findings/Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyanzi et al.</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>School youth</td>
<td>rural</td>
<td>Role plays, FGDs, interviews (30) + survey (80)</td>
<td>Girls feel humiliated if not receiving anything for sex, receipt of money/gifts conveys social status among peer group. Boys think only HIV+ girls would give free sex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oyefara</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Female commercial sex workers</td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>Survey (320), in-depth interviews (10)</td>
<td>35% joined sex industry out of poverty and lacking other means of finding food; poverty &amp; food insecurity lowered condom use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poulin</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Premarital youth aged 15-24</td>
<td>rural</td>
<td>Field observations, in-depth interviews (54), survey data</td>
<td>Transfers are as much an expression of love/commitment as meeting material needs (women) or get sex (men); part and parcel of normal relationship; size of transfer unrelated to condom use, rather love/commitment/seriousness; girls have power over relationships beyond negotiating safe sex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson &amp; Yeh</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Formal &amp; informal female commercial sex workers</td>
<td>semi-urban</td>
<td>Self-report diaries (192)</td>
<td>When household member (mostly child) falls ill, CSW (of whom many did not self-identify as such), particularly the poorer ones, intensified risky sexual contacts (anal or unprotected intercourse).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shefer et al.</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>University students</td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>Narrative analysis</td>
<td>Unequal power dynamics between urban-rural and local-foreigner divides, and across wealth, age and status exacerbate unsafe and coercive sexual practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silberschmidt &amp; Rasch</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Girls aged 15-19 who aborted</td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews (51)</td>
<td>Girls not only victims but also willing preys and active social agents engaging in high-risk sexual behaviour for material gain. Vast majority involved with business men twice their age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoebenu et al.</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>South Africa, Lesotho, Madagascar</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>FGDs, interviews, survey</td>
<td>Transactional sex linked to consumerism, women not passive victims (use sexuality to extract resources) but agency within limits --&gt; men continue to determine the terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swidler &amp; Watkins</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>General population</td>
<td>rural</td>
<td>Conversation diaries of 22 local observers</td>
<td>Patron-client ties and moral obligation to support the needy underlie transactional sex, rather than simply male lust and female poverty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tawfik &amp; Watkins</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>General population</td>
<td>rural</td>
<td>Conversation diaries of 22 local observers</td>
<td>In policy circles women from rural Malawi said to engage in extra-marital sex because they need money for survival, but women themselves say they are not only motivated by money for survival but also for attractive consumer goods, by passion, and by revenge for a husband’s infidelity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Sample Description</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van den Borne</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Informal sex workers, urban</td>
<td>Semi-structured in-depth conversations, FGDs, observations</td>
<td>Women materially motivated, but hope for lasting relationship. Sex-money transactions under cover of normal male-female reciprocity, to distance both sex worker and client from tabooed prostitution, and increase chances of supportive relationship to become lasting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Eerdewijk</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Premarital youth, urban</td>
<td>Participant observation, interviews, FGDs</td>
<td>Money &amp; gifts understood as expression of boyfriends’ love and care; occurs in all sexual relationships - despite discourse on incompatibility of love and material interest.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wamoyi et al.</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Premarital youth, rural</td>
<td>Participant observation, interviews, FGDs, survey</td>
<td>At micro-level girls quite powerful, actively using sexuality as resource. Sex-gift exchange basis of most relationships, entered for material gain: basics, luxuries, peer pressure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiser et al.</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Botswana, Swaziland</td>
<td>Adults aged 18-49, both</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey 2000 adults</td>
<td>Food insufficiency associated with inconsistent condom use, sex exchange, intergenerational sex, lack of control in sexual relationships - among women, not men.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wojcicki</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Women aged 20-45 who frequent bars to exchange sex for money, semi-urban</td>
<td>participant observation, 50 interviews</td>
<td>Women economically motivated, for basic needs or luxuries, but not self-identifying nor seen as commercial sex worker. When exchange/bargain is not made explicit, and women’s financial need emphasized, then less stigma involved than CSW.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>