ISSN: 0975-833X

Available online at http://www.journalcra.com

International Journal of Current Research
Vol. 5, Issue, 02, pp. 199-205, February, 2013

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CURRENT RESEARCH

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Male migrant hotel workers' marital status and Female Sex workers Contact Linkage:A Micro Level study in Tamil Nadu

***Sujith P. Dr. S. Ramachandran and Dr. A. K. Ravishankar**

Department of Population Studies Annamalai University Tamil Nadu

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Received 10th November, 2012
Received in revised form
24th December, 2012
Accepted 15th January, 2013
Published online 14th February, 2013

Key words:
Female Sex Worker,
Marital Status,
Migrant workers,
Migration.

ABSTRACT

Background: Migration is found to be an important transmission mode of HIV infection mainly through unsafe sex with Female Sex Workers. Many workers have chances and choices to get FSWs. If sex behaviour is unsafe with FSWs, there will be more likely for HIV risk. Keeping the above in view, an attempt is made to find the relationship between the marital status and Female sex workers contact of male workers in hotels of Chennai and Madurai Districts of Tamil Nadu.
Methods: The data base of this study is ICSSR-funded research project on Sexual behaviour and HIV risk among hotel male migrant worker in Tamil Nadu: An assessment. The sample respondents (581) with their marital status have been chosen for this study purpose.
Results: The respondents who have ever had sex with Female Sex Workers in last one year prior to this study constitute about 21.3 percent, among them 48.4 percent are married 51.6 are single respondents. Single respondents have more multiple FSW partners than married. Condom used is very less among married respondents than single while the sexual encounter with FSWs.
Conclusion: In conclusion, the pattern of migration influences premarital/extramarital sexual behaviour of the migrant labourers and enhances HIV risk chances through unsafe sex in an absence of condom use. In addition to a focus on high risk group, it could also be extended to improve the knowledge and enhance access to services to the general population and rural population. This will put the programme on the right track.

INTRODUCTION

Migration is one of the social factors responsible for the spread of human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infection and other sexually transmitted infections (STIs); (Entz *et al*, 2000, Lurie *et al*, 2003, UNAIDS 2001) . Studies in Africa and Asia have demonstrated a link between migration and multi-partnered sexual networking (Vanlandingham *et al* 1998); (Brockerhoff and Biddlecom AF 1999; Wolffers I 2002). Men, irrespective of their marital status, (Migrants who are staying away from home) have more chance to get HIV transmission through sexual contact with the women (sex partners) having HIV. This situation facilitates transmitting HIV infection from husband to wife and others while they return to their native places (Pison G, *et al*, 1993). India is a country with 2nd largest human population in the world. The epidemic HIV and AIDS affect every segments of population of India, from children to adults, businessmen to homeless people, female sex workers to housewives, and gay men to heterosexuals. There is no single 'group' affected by HIV. However, HIV prevalence among certain groups (sex workers, injecting drug users, truck drivers, migrant workers, men who have sex with men) remains high and is currently around 6 to 8 times that of the general population, (UNGASS, 2008). Being mobile in and of itself is not a risk factor for HIV infection. It is the situations encountered and the behaviours possibly engaged in during mobility or migration that increase vulnerability and risk regarding HIV/AIDS. (UNAIDS, 2001)

In many cases, migration does not change an individual's sexual behaviour, but leads them to take their established sexual behaviour to areas where there is a higher prevalence of HIV. Therefore not all migrants are at equal risk of HIV (NACO, 2007), but migration is one of the HIV transmission promotion factors in general. Hotel workers are usually migrants and the most vulnerable to HIV risk through multiple sex partners' contact. These hotel workers are staying away from their native places and returning their homes after a quit long time interval. A large number of people move around India for work; it is estimated that 258 million adults in India are migrants; majority are men migrating for employment. It is said that migrants and other mobile individuals are considered as the bridge populations for HIV transmission from urban to rural areas and between high-risk and low-risk groups (Saggurti, *et al*, 2008). Like other migrant workers hotel male migrant workers are also as bridge population for HIV transmission from urban to rural areas and between high-risk (FSWs) and low-risk groups (general population). Long working hours, isolation from their family, movement between areas, facilities available in the place of destination and friendship, independency in earning money may increase the chance for having multi partners' sexual contact, which in turn may increase the risk of HIV transmission. A long distance and Duration away from their native places, existing of many stimulants and opportunities available at the work places mostly in urban and metropolitan areas contribute to various kinds of sexual behaviour among the migrants workers and there by HIV risk through multiple sex partners.

Therefore this study is intent to address this issue based n the data collected from the migrant Hotel workers in Tamil Nadu. The prime objectives of this paper are to examine the relationship between migrant workers' marital status and their sexual behaviour particularly with female sex workers and to investigate the linkage between migration and HIV risk among the hotel workers in Tamilnadu.

Corresponding author: sujith1181@gmail.com

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The data collected for the study on "Migration is a factor responsible for unsafe sex and HIV risk: A study on young male migrant hotel workers in Tamilnadu" funded by ICSSR in 2009 were used for this study. The sample size fixed for the ICSSR-funded study was 639 respondents who were chosen using systematic random sampling method. The two important big cities: Chennai and Madurai were chosen for selection of sample population. The detail about the list of the hotels in the respective cities, hotel workers and their age particular, migration and marital status were prepared. From a sample frame consisting of migrant hotel workers made separately for Chennai and Madurai, 639 respondents were selected. From these sample respondents, 581 respondents comprising of both married and unmarried were chosen for the study purpose. A detailed survey schedule as a tool of data collection was administered to collect data from the respondents on various dimensions relating to socio-economic and demographic characteristics, sexual behaviour, HIV knowledge and its risk taking behaviour. Then data were processed and analysed, using SPSS Package. Some statistical techniques like proportionate methods and chi square test were applied to measure the significance of association between marital status and sexuality and HIV risk relation.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

SED Profile of the hotel male migrant workers

This section focuses on an analysis of socio-economic and demographic characteristics of the male migrant workers in Chennai and Madurai. This analysis may be useful to assess their role on sexual behaviour and their risk taking chance.

Table 1. Place of birth /Origin of Respondents

Place of Birth /Origin	No of respondents	Percent
Tamilnadu	554	95.4
Other states	27	4.6
Total	581	100.0

Table 1 shows that 95.4% of the respondents were inter district migrants in Tamilnadu and the remaining migrants were across the Tamil Nadu State.

It is evident from Table 1 that while majorities (53.8%) of the married migrant workers are in the age group 25-34 years and majority (58.8%) of unmarried migrant workers are in the 15-24 age group. Majority from each of the marital status categories are from rural areas, 55 percent of married and 56 percent of unmarried belong to Hindus. About half of married and two fifth of unmarried respondents are in the MBC category.34.9 percent of married 45.5 percent of unmarried respondents have secondary school level education and the remaining proportions in the respective marital status categories are distributed in other education level categories. While 36.1 percent of married workers work as cook, and 37.9 percent of unmarried respondents are cleaners and water boys. But the proportion working as assistants is comparatively high in unmarried category as against the high proportion of married employed in administrative work.

Interestingly, about 56 percent each from married and unmarried categories fall in the monthly income between Rs. 3001-6000. The average monthly income is Rs 5689.1/- for married and Rs 4446.9/- unmarried respondents indicating that married migrants earn comparatively more. Majority each from married and unmarried categories are found to be two-time migrants, but one time migrants and three-time migrants constitute high proportions in unmarried and married categories respectively. The average duration since they left their native places is 7.9 years for married respondents and 4.4 years for unmarried respondents. The average duration of work at current place is 4.03 years for married and 2.6 years for unmarried respondents. The proportion working all the 7 days in a week is comparatively high in unmarried category. Similarly the average time of work is comparatively high for unmarried respondents who are also largely working on shift work system. Majority of married and the high proportion of unmarried respondents are likely to visit their native places at least five times a year. Irrespective of marital status majority are exposed to mass media and have more exposure to porn materials.

Respondent's marital status and sexual behavior (Female Sex Workers Contact)

This section examines the linkage between the respondents' marital status and their sexual behaviour particularly with Female Sex Workers (FSW). Though performance of marriage is one the means to satisfy their sexual needs, it is not necessary that the married men

Table 2. Socio- economic and demographic characteristics of the respondents

SED Characteristics		Married		Single		Total	
		Nos.	%	Nos.	%	Nos.	%
Age	15-24	8	3.4	201	58.6	209	36.0
	25-34	128	53.8	135	39.4	263	45.3
	35-44	76	31.9	3	0.9	79	13.6
	45+	26	10.9	4	1.2	30	5.2
	Average age	34.6years		23.7 years		28.2 years	
Place of birth	Town	45	18.9	90	26.2	135	23.2
	Village	193	81.1	253	73.8	446	76.8
Religion	Hindu	131	55.0	192	56.0	323	55.6
	Muslim	32	13.4	57	16.6	89	15.3
	Christian	75	31.5	94	27.4	169	29.1
Caste	SC/ST	48	20.2	114	33.2	162	27.9
	MBC	120	50.4	138	40.2	258	44.4
	BC	68	28.6	81	23.6	149	25.6
	FC	2	0.8	10	2.9	12	2.1
Education	Primary complete	76	31.9	89	25.9	165	28.4
	Secondary completed	83	34.9	156	45.5	239	41.1
	Higher secondary	49	20.6	63	18.4	112	19.3
	Diplomat	24	10.1	26	7.6	50	8.6
	No schooling	6	2.5	9	2.6	15	2.6
Category of work	Admin	56	23.5	44	12.8	100	17.2
	Cook	86	36.1	61	17.8	147	25.3
	Assistant	59	24.8	108	31.5	167	28.7
	Cleaner/ water boy	37	15.5	130	37.9	167	28.7
Salary	≤3000	15	6.3	96	28.0	111	19.1
	3001-6000	134	56.3	195	56.9	329	56.6
	6001-9000	81	34.0	45	13.1	126	21.7
	≥9001	8	3.4	7	2.0	15	2.6
	Average income	Rs 5689.08		Rs 4446.9		Rs 4955.8	

Movements	First time	43	18.1	108	31.5	151	26.0
	Second time	141	59.2	189	55.1	330	56.8
	Third time	54	22.7	46	13.4	100	17.2
Duration left from native place	<2	26	10.9	84	24.5	110	18.9
(in years)	2-4	37	15.5	111	32.4	148	25.5
	4-6	56	23.5	95	27.7	151	26.0
	6-8	31	13.0	21	6.1	52	9.0
	8-10	88	37.0	32	9.3	120	20.7
	Average years	7.9 years		4.4 years		5.8 years	
Duration of work at current place	<2	108	45.4	214	62.4	322	55.4
(in years)	2-4	73	30.7	72	21.0	145	25.0
	4-6	29	12.2	40	11.7	69	11.9
	6-8	10	4.2	7	2.0	17	2.9
	8+	18	7.6	10	2.9	28	4.8
	Average years	4.03 years		2.6 years		3.1 years	
Hours of work in a day	≤8	34	14.3	23	6.7	57	9.8
	9-10	106	44.5	168	49.0	274	47.2
	11-12	88	37.0	138	40.2	226	38.9
	≥13	10	4.2	14	4.1	24	4.1
	Average hrs work in day	10.6 hrs		10.9 hrs		10.7 hrs	
No of Days work in week	<=6 days	188	79.0	231	67.3	419	72.1
	7days	50	21.0	112	32.7	162	27.9
Duty timing	Day time	62	26.1	63	18.4	125	21.5
	Night time	7	2.9	8	2.3	15	2.6
	Day and night time	112	47.1	193	56.3	305	52.5
	Shift system	52	21.8	71	20.7	123	21.2
	No fixed timing	5	2.1	8	2.3	13	2.2
Frequency of home visit	Not visited	6	2.5	25	7.3	31	5.3
	1-4 times / year	29	12.2	58	16.9	87	15.0
	Up to five times / year	131	55.0	165	48.1	296	50.9
	More than five times / year	16	6.7	23	6.7	39	6.7
	No specific schedule	56	23.5	72	21.0	128	22.0
Exposure to media	Not exposure	12	5.0	8	2.3	20	3.4
	Exposure	226	95.0	335	97.7	561	96.6
Exposure to porn materials	Not exposure	61	25.6	73	21.3	134	23.1
	Exposure	177	74.4	270	78.7	447	76.9
Total		238	100.0	343	100.0	581	100.0

keep themselves away from sexual activities with other than wife. Migration facilitates this type of sexual behaviour particularly sex with FSW. Table 2 shows the detail about migrant workers sexual contact with female sex workers at current place of stay in a specified time period.

Table 3. Distribution of the respondent's marital status and Ever Had Sex (last one year) with Female Sex Workers

Sex with Female Sex Workers (last one year)	Current Marital Status				Total	
	Single		Married			
	Nos.	%	Nos.	%	Nos.	%
Yes	64	18.7	60	25.2	124	21.3
No	279	81.3	178	74.8	457	78.7
Total	343	100.0	238	100.0	581	100.0

It is evident from Table that 18.7 percent of unmarried (single) and 25.2 percent (one fourth) of married respondents had sexual contact with female sex workers in the last one year since until the survey date. Interestingly, the female sex workers' contact is comparatively high among married migrants' workers.

among married respondents, the number of FSWs contacted by the clients is comparatively high in unmarried category. Table 5 shows cross classification of data on sexual experience with FSWs by the number of migratory moves made by the respondents. The main purpose of this analysis is to find the linkage between the number of migratory moves and female sex workers' contact. Irrespective of the number of moves, majority in each of the specified time categories had sexual contact with FSWs. While analysing the respondent's behaviour in the category of "last 3 months", interestingly majority of those with one move had sexual contact with FSWs as compared to those with two moves and three or more than three moves. This association is found to be statistically significant.

Table 6 shows data on an experience of female sex workers' contact by the respondents in different specified time periods cross classified with the number of visits made by the respondents to their native places per year. Table shows significance of association between the two while analysing the sexual behaviour in the last 3 months, but in other time period categories, majority irrespective of the number of

Table 4. Distribution of the respondent's marital status and no of Female Sex Workers had sex in last one year

No of FSW's visited (last one year)	Current Marital Status				Total	
	Single		Married			
	No of Respondents	%	No of Respondents	%	No of Respondents	%
1	12	18.8	22	36.7	34	27.4
2	18	28.1	9	15.0	27	21.8
3	7	10.9	7	11.6	14	11.3
4 or more	27	42.2	22	36.7	49	39.5
Total	64	100.0	60	100.0	124	100.0
Average Number of FSWs visited	2.8		2.5		2.6	

Table 4 shows that 81.2 percent of unmarried and 73.3 percent of married respondents had sexual contact with more than one FSW in the past one year. The average number of FSWs visited by unmarried respondents is 2.8 as against 2.5 FSWs for married respondents. Though the proportion with FSW contact is comparatively high

visits to their native places had sexual contact with FSWs indicating no such significant association between the number of visits to their native places and the respondents' sexual behaviour with female sex workers.

Table 5. Respondent's movement and sexual experience with FSWs

Sexual Experience with FSW		No of movement			Total	χ^2 value
		1	2	3or more		
Sex at current place	Yes	15(78.9)	57(71.2)	18(72.0)	90(72.6)	NS (0.462)
	No	4(21.1)	23(28.8)	7(28.0)	34(27.4)	0.79
Sex at last 6 months	Yes	18(94.7)	61(76.2)	20(80.0)	99(79.8)	NS(3.26)
	No	1(5.3)	19(23.8)	5(20.0)	25(20.2)	0.19
Sex at last 3months	Yes	13(68.4)	19(23.8)	12(48.0)	44(35.5)	(P≤ 0.000)
	No	6(31.6)	61(76.2)	13(52.0)	80(64.5)	15.53
Total		19(100.0)	80(100.0)	25(100.0)	124(100)	

Table 6. No of visists to homes at native places and respondents sexual experience with FSWs

Sexual Experience with FSW		No of Visit home place					Total	χ^2 value
		Not visited	1-4 times /yr	up to 5 times/yr	more than 5times/yr	no specific schedule		
Sex at current place	Yes	0(0.0)	11(73.3)	51(68.0)	8(100.0)	20(83.3)	90(72.6)	p≤ 0.05(.033)
	No	2(100.0)	4(26.7)	24(32.0)	0(0.0)	4(16.7)	34(27.4)	10.5
Sex in last 6 months	Yes	2(100.0)	9(60.0)	60(80.0)	8(100.0)	20(83.3)	99(79.8)	NS(.173)
	No	0(0.0)	6(40.0)	15(20.0)	0(0.0)	4(16.7)	25(20.2)	6.37
Sex in last 3months	Yes	0(0.0)	7(46.7)	22(29.3)	4(50.0)	11(45.8)	44(35.5)	NS(.285)
	No	2(100.0)	8(53.3)	53(70.7)	4(50.0)	13(54.2)	80(64.5)	5.018
Total		2(100.0)	15(100.0)	75(100.0)	8(100.0)	24(100.0)	124(100.0)	

Here an attempt is made to examine the chances of having sexual contact with female sex workers with varying duration of stay away from home. Migration facilitates staying away from home favouring the chance of having sex with FSWs. Data on these two aspects are cross-classified in table. The sexual behaviour of respondents with FSWs in the past one year is analysed. Table shows no a very strong association between the duration of stay away from home and sexual contact with FSWs. Majority in each of the duration categories reported to have sex with FSWs while analysing their sexual behaviour in various reference periods till survey date. Only in the duration category of "Sex in the last 3 months", the proportion having sexual contact with FSWs increases with the duration of stay away from home. This association is found to be statistically significant.

Detail about FSWs' contact

This section deals with the details of female sex workers and their sexual behaviour with migrant workers categorized into unmarried and married group. This detail is analysed on the basis of the information about those who had sexual contact with FSWs in the last one year till the survey date. Table shows that irrespective of marital status majority of respondents had sexual contact with FSWs mainly in bars/night clubs and isolated places. Brothel house, Home and hotel are also some of the places for their meeting. It is known that FSWs are not involved in brothel business in brothel homes runby Brothel Keepers. The migrants personally tried to contact FSWs for having sex. Table shows that majority of the FSWs are in the age group 25-29 years. The average ages of FSWs with whom married and unmarried migrants had sex are 27.2 years and 27 years respectively. Therefore, the FSWs are not adults and young. Majority and a high proportion of female sex workers who had sex with unmarried and married migrant workers or respondents respectively are married. About 10 percent of them are divorced, widowed or separated. Therefore, unmarried migrant workers are largely associated with married FSWs. Sex with multiple sex partners or unsafe sex is a host factor for HIV transmission. The sex with FSWs using condom is considered safe sex preventing HIV transmission. Therefore, the practice of Condom use among the migrant workers during sex with FSWs is analysed to understand their HIV risk behaviour. Interestingly, the unmarried respondents with condom use during sex with FSWs constitute 69.4 percent as against 38.3 percent in married category. It means that unmarried respondents had safe sex with FSWs as compared to married respondents. In other words, married migrant workers faced high HIV risk when compared with unmarried respondents. Analysis shows that about 95 percent of respondents paid for their sex with FSWs. An attempt is made to analyse whether the respondents are found to be drunken during sex with FSWs. The cases with consumption of liquor constitute about 50 percent in unmarried category as against 33.3 percent in married category. Therefore, unmarried migrants are much more habituated to alcohol consumption during sex with FSWs.

Linkage Between back ground conditions of respondents and use of condom during sex with FSWs.

It is not possible to completely eradicate sex habit with female sex workers. Under such circumstance, practice of safe sex by using condom during sex with FSWs will be a better measure to protect the clients from HIV infection. There are factors influencing the use of condom during sex with FSWs. Here an attempt is made to find the influence of back ground conditions of the respondents on the use of condom by migrant workers during sex with FSWs in the last one year prior to the survey. Out of 124 respondents, 50.8% were not using condom while they had sex with FSWs in last one year. In other words, about half of the respondents or migrant workers took HIV transmission risk because of unsafe sex with FSWs. Majority of

Table 7. Duration of stay away from home and sexual experience with FSWs

Sexual Experience with FSW		Duration left from home place(in years)						Total	χ^2
		Not Visited so far	≤ 3year	4-6	7-9	10-12	13+		
Sex at current place	Yes	0(0.0)	41(82.0)	35(63.6)	7(100.0)	5(71.4)	2(66.7)	90(72.6)	p≤ 0.05
	No	2(100.0)	9(18.0)	20(36.4)	0(0.0)	2(28.6)	1(33.3)	34(27.4)	(0.29)12.43
Sex in last 6 months	Yes	2(100.0)	37(74.0)	46(83.6)	6(85.7)	5(71.4)	3(100.0)	99(79.8)	NS(.658)
	No	0(0.0)	13(26.0)	9(16.4)	1(14.3)	2(28.6)	0(0.0)	25(20.2)	3.27
Sex in last 3months	Yes	0(0.0)	13(26.0)	19(34.5)	6(85.7)	5(71.4)	1(33.3)	44(35.5)	p≤ 0.01
	No	2(100.0)	37(74.0)	36(65.5)	1(14.3)	2(28.6)	2(66.7)	80(64.5)	(0.11)14.75
Total		2(100.0)	50(100.0)	55(100.0)	7(100.0)	7(100.0)	3(100.0)	124(100.0)	

Table 8. Distribution of the respondent's marital status and the particulars of the Female Sex Workers ever contacted respondents in last one year prior to the study

Particulars of the Female Sex Workers		Current Marital Status				Total	
		Single		Married			
		Nos.	%	Nos.	%	Nos.	%
Location of sexual encounter with FSWs	Brothel	8	12.5	8	13.3	16	12.9
	Hotel / lodge	8	12.5	3	5.0	11	8.9
	Bar/night club	19	29.7	21	35.0	40	32.3
	Home	11	17.2	6	10.0	27	13.7
	Other isolated places	18	28.1	22	36.7	40	32.3
Age of FSWs	15-19	0	0.0	2	3.3	2	1.6
Average age of the FSW's	20-24	12	18.8	10	16.7	22	17.7
	25-29	32	50.0	24	40.0	56	45.2
	30-34	16	25.0	22	36.7	38	30.6
	35+	4	6.2	2	3.3	6	4.8
	Mean age	27 years		27.2 years		27.09 years	
Marital status of sex workers – last one year sex	Married	28	43.8	33	55.0	61	49.2
	Unmarried	19	29.7	15	25.0	34	27.4
	Widowed/Divorced/Separated	9	14.1	6	10.0	15	12.1
	Don't Know	8	12.5	6	10.0	14	11.3
Use condom sex with FSW– last one year sex	Yes	38	59.4	23	38.3	61	49.2
	No	26	40.6	37	61.7	63	50.8
Paid for sex worker – last one year	Yes	61	95.3	55	91.7	116	93.5
	No	3	4.7	5	8.3	8	6.5
Consumption of Alcohol prior to sex with FSW's	Yes	32	50.0	20	33.3	52	41.9
	No	32	50.0	40	66.7	72	58.1
Total		64	100.0	60	100.0	124	100.0

Table 9. Distribution of respondents condom use while sex with FSWs in last one year with their selected Background Characteristics

Background variables		Condom use while sex with FSWs				Total	
		Use	%	Non Use	%		
Age	15-24	20	62.5	12	37.5	32	25.8
	25-34	28	48.3	30	51.7	58	46.8
	35-44	8	30.8	18	69.2	26	21.0
	45+	5	62.5	3	37.5	8	6.5
Place of birth	Town	6	27.3	16	72.7	22	17.7
	Village	55	53.9	47	40.1	102	82.3
Religion	Hindu	35	50.0	35	50.0	70	56.5
	Muslim	9	52.9	8	47.1	17	13.7
	Christian	17	45.9	20	54.1	37	29.8
Caste recoded	SC/ST	22	57.9	16	42.1	38	30.6
	MBC	25	44.6	31	55.4	56	45.2
	BC	14	46.7	16	53.3	30	24.2
Marital status	Single	38	59.4	26	40.6	64	51.6
	Married	23	38.3	37	61.7	60	48.4
Education	Primary completed	12	48.0	13	52.0	25	20.2
	Secondary completed	27	56.3	21	43.7	48	38.7
	Higher secondary	14	35.9	25	64.1	39	31.5
	Diplomat	8	66.7	4	33.3	12	9.7
Category of Work	Admin	16	59.3	11	40.7	27	21.8
	Cook	19	54.3	16	45.7	35	28.2
	Assistant	16	43.2	21	56.8	37	29.8
	Cleaner/Water boy	10	40.0	15	60.0	25	20.2
Times of Movement	Single place	15	78.9	4	21.1	19	15.3
	More than single place	46	43.8	59	56.2	105	84.7
Heard about HIV	Yes	56	51.4	53	48.6	109	87.9
	No	5	33.3	10	66.7	15	12.1
Heard about AIDS	Yes	52	46.8	59	53.2	111	89.5
	No	9	69.2	4	30.8	13	10.5
Aware of STI symptoms	Yes	54	49.1	56	50.9	110	88.7
	No	7	50.0	7	50.0	14	11.3
Exposure to media	Yes	60	49.6	61	50.4	121	97.5
	No	1	33.3	2	66.7	3	2.5
Exposure to porn materials	Yes	58	52.3	53	47.7	111	89.5
	No	3	23.1	10	76.9	13	10.5
Age of FSWs	15-19	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	1.6
	20-24	10	45.5	12	54.5	22	17.7
	25-29	31	55.4	25	44.6	56	45.2
	30-34	15	39.5	23	60.5	38	30.6
	35+	3	50.0	3	50.0	6	4.8
Total		61	49.2	63	50.8	124	100.0

Table 10. Binary logistic regression analysis of respondents habit of condom use while sex with FSWs

Selected back ground variables		B	Sig.	Exp(B)
Age	15-24®		.276	
	25-34	-.985	.118	.373
	35+	-.715	.339	.489
Place of Birth	Town®		.000	
	Village	1.041	.093	2.833
Religion	Hindus®		.000	
	Non Hindus	-.023	.962	.977
Caste	SC/ST®		.511	
	MBC	-.498	.367	.608
	BC	-.689	.265	.502
Education	Primary completed		.386	
	Secondary completed	.259	.668	1.296
	Higher secondary or above	-.431	.476	.650
Marital Status	Married®		.000	
	Single	.876	.120	2.401
Category of Work	Admin		.143	
	Cook	-.503	.403	.605
	Assistant	-.833	.164	.435
	Cleaner/Water boy	-1.830	.022	.160
Exposure to media	Not exposure®		.000	
	Exposure	-.889	.603	.411
Exposure to pornographic materials	Not exposure ®		.000	
	Exposure	1.539	.113	4.659
Times of Movement	Single ®		.000	
	More than single	-1.415	.043	.243
Constant		1.220	.537	3.389
-2 Log likelihood		140.997		
Cox & Snell R Square		.220		
Nagelkerke R Square		.294		

the respondents in the age group 35-44 were not using condom during sex with FSWs as compared to the users in other age groups. Interestingly, the use of condom by the respondents born in the urban areas is comparatively less. Among different religious groups the proportion of Christians without use of condom is comparatively less. Similarly, the practice of condom is comparatively less in MBC and BC categories. In married category, the respondents without use of condom constitute 62 percent, very high as compared to such proportion in unmarried category. It means that married migrant hotel workers emerge as high risk group. The proportion of users is comparatively high in the better education attainment category (Diplomat and collegiate levels). This analysis shows certain linkages between the use of condom during sex with FSWs and their background conditions. It seems that those who have better socio-economic characteristics are more prone to use condom during sex with FSWs. The proportion of non-users who have not heard of HIV infection is comparatively high. The proportions of condom users who knew safe sex and knowledge about condom use as a AIDS prevention mechanism are comparatively high indicating a close link between the knowledge about HIV/AIDS and use of condom during sex with FSWs. Similarly the proportions of users who are more exposed to mass media and to pornographic materials are comparatively high. Respondents category of work reveals that the proportion of low category workers (cleaner and water boys) are comparatively high among the non users of condom while they sex with FSWs and unprotected sexual encounter with FSWs is high among the respondents moved more than one place.

Logistic Regression Analysis

Here an attempt is made to apply logistic regression technique to measure the effect of background conditions (predictors) of the respondents on the use of condom (response variable) during sex with FSWs in the last one year. The dependent variable (condom use) is dichotomous in nature. This variable is classified into Use of condom and non use of condom which are assigned the values 1 and 0 respectively. The results of logistic regression are presented in table. The primary purpose of using this technique is to calculate odd ratio explaining the likelihood to use of condom in each of the variable categories as compared to reference category of the same variable. Respondents belonging to rural area have 2.8 times more chance to use condom while they had sex with FSWs in last one year. Respondents category of work reveals that cleaner/water boys had 0.16 times less chance to use condom when they had sex with FSWs in last one year, and the respondents those who moved more than single place had 0.24 times less chance to use condom during sexual encounter with FSWs in last one year.

Conclusion

There is not much difference between married and unmarried with regard to sexual behaviour with Female Sex Workers (FSW) as both groups considerably have the habit of sexual contact with FSWs. Of course, migration facilitates them stay away from home creating an ambiance to establish sexual contact with FSWs. Though the practice of unsafe sex is found in both marital status categories, married respondents are comparatively more on unsafe side in the sense that they are not using condoms during sex with FSWs who are the most vulnerable to transmitting HIV infection and other Sexually Transmitted Diseases (STDs) like RTI. It is therefore concluded that both married and unmarried migrant workers face high HIV risk through unsafe sex particularly with FSWs. This kind of sexual behaviour is not only affecting the migrants and also their wives and children and other sex partners if any. The better policy suggestion would be how to make these migrant workers adopt safe sex particularly with FSWs by creating awareness to accept using condoms during sex with FSWs. This needs to sensitize an effective integrated programmes to create awareness of safe sex and the means to achieve it and effective implementation strategies to remove the deadlock on the way to achiving the objectives or bottle neck of achieving the objectives of the programmes.

REFERENCES

1. Entz AT, Ruffolo VP, Chinveschakitvanich V, Soskolne V and van Griensven GJP (2000) HIV-1 prevalence, HIV-1 subtypes

and risk factors among fishermen in the gulf of Thailand and the Andaman sea. AIDS 14, 1027–1034.
2. Lurie MN, Williams BG, Zuma K *et al.* (2003) The impact of migration on HIV-1 transmission in South Africa: a study of migrant and nonmigrant men and their partners. Sexually Transmitted Diseases 30, 149–156.
3. UNAIDS (2001) Population Mobility and AIDS: UNAIDS Technical update. UNAIDS, Geneva.
4. Vanlandingham M, Knodel J, Saengtienchai C and Pramualratana A (1998) In the company of friends: peer influence on Thai male extramarital sex. Social Science and Medicine 47, 1993–2011.
5. Brockerhoff M and Biddlecom AF (1999) Migration, sexual behaviour and the risk of HIV infection in Kenya. International Migration Review 33, 833–856.
6. Wolffers I, Fernandez I, Verghis S and Vink M (2002) Sexual behaviour and vulnerability of migrant workers for HIV infection. Culture, Health and Sexuality 4, 459–473.
7. Pison G, Guenno BL, Lagarde E, Enel C and Seck C (1993) Seasonal migration: a risk factor for HIV infection in Rural Senegal. Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes 6, 196–200.
8. UNGASS (2008) 'India - Country progress report')
9. UNAIDS (2001) 'Population Mobility and AIDS', Technical Update, February, p.5)
10. NACO (2007, October) 'Targeted interventions under NACP III: Operational guidelines'. Vol II: Migrants and truckers}
11 Saggurti N, Verma RK, Jain A, RamaRao S, Kumar KA, Subbiah A, *et al*. HIV risk behaviours among contracted and non-contracted male migrant workers in India: potential role of labour contractors and contractual systems in HIV prevention. AIDS 2008, 22 Suppl 5:S127-136.

****