

1 **Transactional sex among young people in Switzerland: a cross-sectional study**

2

3 Joan-Carles Surís, MD, MPH, PhD

4 Sophie Stadelmann, MA

5 Diane Auderset, MA

6 Yara Barrense-Dias, PhD

7 **Affiliation:** Research Group on Adolescent Health, Department of Epidemiology and Health Services,
8 Center for Primary Care and Public Health (Unisanté), University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland

9 **Running title:** Transactional sex among youths in Switzerland

10 **Corresponding author:** Prof. Joan-Carles Surís

11 GRSA/DESS/Unisanté

12 Route de la Corniche 10

13 1010 Lausanne, Switzerland

14 Telephone: +4121 3147375

15 Fax: +4121 3417373

16 Email: joan-carles.suris@unisanté.ch

17

18 **Abstract**

19 **Background.** The aim of this research was to determine the prevalence and characteristics of youths
20 having ever exchanged sex and to assess if there were differences depending on whether they had
21 done it once or several times. We also investigated what they exchanged sex for and their
22 relationship with the last person they did it with.

23 **Methods.** Cross-sectional national survey carried out in Switzerland in 2017 among young adults. The
24 5,175 participants (51% males, mean age 26,3 years) who answered the question *Have you ever*
25 *received something or obtained an advantage in exchange for a sexual act?* were divided into three
26 groups: Never (96.8%), Once (1.5%) and Several (1.7%).

27 **Results.** In the multivariate analysis, compared to the *Never* group, those in the *Once* group were
28 significantly more likely to be males, to have a poor mental health, to be non-exclusively
29 heterosexual and to have had 10+ lifetime sexual partners.

30 Those in the *Several* group reported the same characteristics, but were also more likely to be
31 younger at first sexual contact, to have their parents not living together, to report a lower
32 socioeconomic status and a history of sexual abuse, and to have ever sent sexual images/videos of
33 themselves. They were also less satisfied with their financial situation.

34 **Conclusions.** Results indicate that transactional sex is a reality for some youths in Switzerland and
35 health professionals dealing with them should include this question in their sexual anamnesis. From a
36 public health perspective, sexual education and prevention campaigns should include this
37 phenomenon.

38 **Keywords.** Youth; Transactional sex; Sexual behavior; Switzerland

39

40 Introduction

41 Transactional sex is defined as exchanging sex for money, goods or an advantage(1). Transactional
42 sex differs from prostitution in the sense that it is not a regular behavior and it is not limited to
43 exchanging sex for money (2, 3). Research on transactional sex among young people is relatively
44 scarce in Western countries (4) and often related to trading sex specifically for money(5, 6), drugs(7)
45 or both(8-10). It is also often limited to specific populations such as university students (11), youths
46 in foster care(6), homeless youths (12) or youths seeking testing for sexually transmitted infections
47 (STI) (13).

48 Prevalence rates for transactional sex range from 0.4% among 8th grade students (mean age 13.6
49 years) in Hong-Kong (14), to 16.3% among vulnerable youths in the US (10). A survey among
50 university students in Germany found a 7% rate (15). Divergences in the terminology used in
51 research can explain part of these differences. For example, some authors employ very broad
52 questions such as *Have you ever sold sexual services?*(2) or limited to financial exchange such as *Have*
53 *you ever had sex with someone who paid you to do so?*(16), while others use much more explicit ones
54 such as *Have you ever received something (money, drugs, alcohol, gifts or other) in exchange for*
55 *sexual contact (touching, oral sex, intercourse, or another activity of a sexual nature)?*(17).

56 Differences in prevalence rates also depend on the age range or the type of population studied.
57 Moreover, some studies inquire about lifetime(2, 3, 8, 14, 16, 17) while others refer to the last 6(18)
58 or 12 months (5, 19). Yet, studies rarely address the relationship these youths have with the person
59 they exchanged sex with or what they received in exchange (other than money or drugs).

60 Youth engaging in transactional sex are especially vulnerable because they are more exposed to
61 health risks such as STIs(4, 8, 11), physical or sexual abuse(4, 20), substance abuse(4, 8), or
62 psychological problems (4, 11, 20). However, primary care physicians rarely ask their patients about
63 it and the prevalence in Switzerland is unknown.

64 The aim of this research was to determine the characteristics of youths who had ever exchanged sex
65 for money, goods or an advantage and to assess if there were differences depending on whether

66 they had done it only once or more than once. We were especially interested in comparing sex
67 exchangers based on frequency because we hypothesize that those having done it only once may
68 reflect a moment of distress while those doing it repeatedly may reflect more vulnerability and less
69 access to basic needs. In addition, we also investigated what they exchanged sex for and their
70 relationship with the last person they exchanged sex with.

71 **Material and methods**

72 Data were drawn from the 2017 survey on the sexual health and behavior of young people (21). This
73 representative national sample (in terms of age, gender, language and canton of residence) was
74 provided by the Swiss Federal Office of Statistics based on young people aged 24 to 26 years on
75 September 30th 2016 in Switzerland. This age range was selected in order to ensure that the majority
76 of the participants would be sexually active and, at the same time, sufficiently young to be able to
77 recall accurately the beginning of their sexual life. An invitation letter including the website link to
78 complete the online questionnaire and a random personal code to access it was sent to all potential
79 participants by postal mail. The final sample included 7,142 participants (response rate 15.1%, mean
80 age 26.3 years when completing the survey in 2017). The protocol was approved by the Ethics
81 committee in research of the canton of Vaud. A detailed description of the survey methodology can
82 be found elsewhere(21).

83 Out of the 7,142 participants, 5,175 (51% males) answered the question *Have you ever received*
84 *something (money, drugs, alcohol, gift, clothes, etc.) or obtained an advantage (being accepted in a*
85 *group, having a good reputation, etc.) in exchange for a sexual act (caresses, oral sex, fellatio,*
86 *cunnilingus, intercourse with or without vaginal and / or anal penetration or other activity of a sexual*
87 *nature) with a person?*, with 5 possible answers (*Never, Once, 2-3 times, 4-10 times, more than 10*
88 *times*) further divided into three groups: Never (N=5,007; 96.8%), Once (N=80; 1.5%) and Several
89 (N=88; 1.7%).

90 The three groups were compared on variables described in the literature(2, 3, 5, 8, 10, 11, 14, 16) as
91 linked to sex exchange, such as sociodemographics (age, gender [Male / Female], migrant status

92 [Swiss-born/Other], family structure [Parents being together/Not being together], perceived family
93 socioeconomic status (SES) at age 15 compared to other families in Switzerland [Average or better/
94 Below average], education level [Tertiary / Lower] and satisfaction with their current financial
95 situation [on a scale from 1, Not satisfied, to 10, Very satisfied]). Groups were also compared on
96 substance use (lifetime drunkenness episodes and cannabis use, both dichotomized as 10 times or
97 more/less than 10 times) and mental health [Good/ Poor; using the mental health inventory (MHI-5),
98 a brief questionnaire with 5 items referring to the last 4 weeks(22)].

99 Sexual behavior data included age at first sexual contact (defined as any sexual act), having ever
100 performed oral, vaginal or anal sex, lifetime number of sexual partners [10 or more/less than 10],
101 ever being diagnosed with an STI, condom use at first and last intercourse, sexual orientation, and
102 experience of sexting. Sexual orientation being a multidimensional and complex entity, we used
103 three variables to define it as recommended by other authors(23, 24): self-identification, sexual
104 attraction and sexual behavior. Self-identification was assessed through the question *How would you*
105 *describe yourself?* with the following possibilities: heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual, I don't know/I
106 am not sure and other. Attraction was measured with the question *What best describes how you*
107 *feel?* with five possibilities ranging from attracted only to people of the same sex as me to attracted
108 only to people of the opposite sex. Sexual behavior was based on the sex of the partners with whom
109 they performed sexual acts (sexual contact, oral, vaginal or anal sex). By combining these three
110 dimensions we created a variable distinguishing those being exclusively heterosexual (all aspects
111 were reported as heterosexual) from those identified as non-exclusively heterosexual (at least one
112 variable categorized as non-heterosexual). Additionally, as a recent paper(25) described transactional
113 sexting as sending a self-made sexually explicit image or video in exchange for something else, we
114 decided to include a variable on sexting. In our study, sexting was defined as having ever sent a
115 sexual-related picture / video of themselves to someone (via email, cellphone, etc.).

116 Finally, we conducted further investigations among those having ever exchanged sex by gender and
117 by frequency [Once vs. Several]. We compared what they had received in exchange and their

118 relationship with their last exchange partner. We also asked them if, in receiving the goods, they felt
119 obligated to have sex with them.

120 Statistical analysis

121 We used Stata 14 (StataCorp. 2015. *Stata Statistical Software: Release 14*. College Station, TX:
122 StataCorp LP) for all calculations. We first run bivariate analyses comparing the three groups (Never,
123 Once, Several). We used chi-square tests for categorical variables and ANOVA for continuous ones.
124 Subsequently, in addition to age at the time of the survey and gender, we entered all significant
125 ($p < .05$) variables in a backward stepwise multinomial logistic regression using *Never* as the reference
126 category. Using a backward selection, non-significant variables were thus consecutively eliminated
127 until no more variables could be excluded from the model. Results are given as relative risk ratios
128 (RRR) with 95% confidence intervals.

129 For the comparisons among those having ever exchanged sex, groups were compared by gender and
130 by frequency category (Once vs. Several) using a bivariate approach with chi-square tests.

131 To correct a slight over-representation of females from the French-speaking part of Switzerland,
132 analyses were weighted by gender and canton of residence.

133 **Results**

134 Overall, 3.2% of our sample had ever exchanged sex, with 1.7% of them having done it more than
135 once.

136 At the bivariate level, we found no differences between the three groups on age, gender, ever having
137 had vaginal or oral sex, and condom use at first or last intercourse. Age at first sexual experience and
138 satisfaction with own financial situation decreased significantly with increasing sexual exchange
139 frequency. With the exception of being Swiss-born that presented an inverted-U shape, the
140 prevalence of all the other categorical variables increased along the frequency of sexual exchange
141 (Table 1).

142 At the multivariate level, compared to the *Never* group, those in the *Once* group were significantly
143 more likely to be males (RRR: 1.74), to have a poor mental health (RRR: 2.09), to be non-exclusively
144 heterosexual (RRR: 2.56) and to have had ten or more sexual partners in their lifetime (RRR: 4.07).
145 Compared to the *Never* group, those in the *Several* group were significantly more likely to be males
146 (RRR: 2.48), to have their parents not living together (RRR: 1.74), to report a below average SES (RRR:
147 1.49) and a poor mental health (RRR: 2.76). They were less likely to be satisfied with their financial
148 situation (RRR: 0.88), younger at first sexual contact (RRR: 0.88), and more likely to be non-
149 exclusively heterosexual (RRR: 1.91), to report a history of sexual abuse (RRR: 3.86), to have had ten
150 or more sexual partners in their lifetime (RRR: 7.17), and to have ever sent sexual images/videos of
151 themselves (RRR: 2.37) (Table 2).

152 Overall, money (48.8%), to have a good reputation (39.7%), and a gift (36.8%) were, by far, the most
153 reported goods accepted in exchange for sex. Both by gender and by frequency category, these three
154 items remained among the most frequently cited, although drugs was the second most reported
155 among females (22.1%). Nonetheless, only to receive alcohol or clothes in exchange for sex showed
156 statistically significant differences when compared by frequency, with those in the *Several* group
157 reporting more often such exchanges (Table 3).

158 In around half of the cases, both by gender and by frequency category, the last person they had
159 exchanged sex with was an acquaintance who was older than they were. Significantly more females
160 (19.2%) than males (7.4%) had felt obligated to exchange sex, and those having done it only once
161 showed a marginal significance ($p=0.051$) to have felt obligated compared to those having done it
162 more often (7.6% vs. 17.4%; Table 4).

163 **Discussion**

164 Overall, 3.2% of our sample had ever exchanged sexual acts for money, goods or an advantage. This
165 prevalence is similar to the one reported by Edwards et al. (8) (3.5%) in the United States (US) in a
166 much younger sample (mean age 16 years) and higher than the ones in samples of US university
167 students (2.1%) (11) or adolescents (2%) (16) or among Swedish adolescents (~1.5%) (2, 3). However,

168 a study among high-school students in Quebec found a prevalence rate of 4% (17) and one using the
169 US National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health reached almost 5% (9). Although the prevalence
170 rate in our sample is higher than the one found in a STI clinic (2.5%) (13), it is much lower than the
171 one found in a vulnerable sample of US adolescents and young adults, where it reached 16.3% (10).
172 As mentioned, the wording of the question, together with the age range and type of sample could
173 explain some of the observed differences.

174 Our results indicate that those having ever exchanged sex were almost equally distributed between
175 having done it once (48%) and several times (52%), similar to other studies (2). The percentage of
176 those having done it several times in our study is lower than what has been found among US
177 university students (67%) (11) or among high-school students in Sweden (84%) (3).

178 Four markers remained statistically significant, independently of the frequency of sex exchange: male
179 gender, non-exclusively heterosexual orientation, poor mental health and higher number of lifetime
180 sexual partners. Several studies have reported that sexual exchange was significantly more frequent
181 among males (2, 3, 8, 9, 13, 16) and two hypotheses have been postulated to explain this
182 phenomenon. On the one side, Kaestle (16) suggests that males and females respond differently,
183 hence inducing a self-disclosure bias. The author states that males could be even proud to sell sex as
184 it may represent that they are desirable and, thus, more likely to report it. The second hypothesis
185 refers to not being exclusively heterosexual. Svedin & Priebe (3) postulate that the male
186 preponderance reflected that most buyers were men and transactions were of homosexual nature.

187 In a similar line, Kaestle (16) indicates that as very few women report buying sex, most of the men
188 selling sex do it to other men. Our results do not allow proving the self-disclosure hypothesis, but the
189 fact that those exchanging sex are significantly more likely to be non-exclusively heterosexual can
190 explain, at least in part, the male preponderance in our study. Actually, the literature on
191 transactional sex among non-exclusively heterosexual people shows higher prevalence rates.

192 Mgbako et al. (26) found that, among men having sex with men (MSM), 24% of those aged 18-24
193 years practiced transactional sex. Berg et al. (1), in their study in different European countries, found

194 that 12% of MSM had engaged in transactional sex in the previous year. In their review of women
195 having sex with women, Tat et al. (27) reported rates ranging between 8% and 19%. Blum et al. (11)
196 described a higher proportion of bisexual attraction and bisexual intercourse among youths having
197 exchanged sex. Similarly, several studies (3, 8, 10) also concluded that those exchanging sex were
198 more likely to be non-heterosexual.

199 In line with our results, a Swedish study reported poorer mental health among those having
200 exchanged sex (3). More specifically, several authors described that they were more likely to be
201 depressed (8, 16), while Blum et al. (11) found that youths having exchanged sex were more likely to
202 suffer from post-traumatic stress syndrome, anxiety or low self-esteem. Pedersen & Hegna (5) only
203 found this association among boys. Nevertheless, based on our cross-sectional results, we cannot
204 ascertain whether poor mental health is the cause or the consequence of transactional sex.

205 Youths having exchanged sex more than once were more likely to live in a non-intact family, as
206 described by other authors (2, 3, 5, 8). It is worth noting that, contrary to Swedish studies (2, 3), we
207 found that their economic situation (both familial and personal) was significantly worse than the one
208 reported by those never having exchanged sex. In this line, Stoner et al. (18) also found a relationship
209 between economic deprivation and transactional sex among women, while a qualitative study among
210 young people in South Africa(28) reported that poverty was an important driver to transactional sex.
211 This finding might imply that transactional sex, at least in some cases, could be a way to meet basic
212 needs, which would explain why it is exchanged mostly for money.

213 In agreement with our results, other authors(3, 5, 11) also found that those having ever exchanged
214 sex were younger at their sexual debut. Moreover, as in our results, other researchers (3, 5, 11, 13)
215 have depicted greater number of sexual partners among sex exchangers.

216 Our results confirm previous studies (3, 9, 13, 16, 17) indicating that a history of sexual abuse is
217 associated with sex exchange. However, in our study, it only remained significant among those
218 having exchanged more than once in the multivariate analysis. Our results also show that females
219 and those having done it only once were more likely to have felt obligated to exchange sex for goods.

220 Lavoie et al. (17) declared that in 30% of the cases the young person felt coerced to have sex, a much
221 higher overall rate than in our study (12.2%). A qualitative study among homeless youth trading sex
222 (12) also reported that for some of these youths the decision to trade sex was not always voluntary.
223 This finding could also be explained because, when helped in some way (be it shelter, drugs or
224 money), sex was the only thing they could offer in exchange. This would imply that they would not
225 feel necessarily forced to have sex but rather that they felt somehow obliged to do it as a way of
226 gratitude. This hypothesis would explain why being obligated was more frequent among one-timers.
227 The gender difference could be due to cultural norms (sexual compliance) where girls may feel
228 obliged to offer sex when they receive something.

229 We found that youths in the *Several* group were more likely to have ever sent sexy pictures or videos
230 of themselves than their controls. This result is in line with Van Ouytsel et al. (25) who performed an
231 exploratory study on transactional sexting. Frenlund et al. (2) found that youths exchanging sex
232 were using the Internet as a contact source. It could be that the higher level of sexting might be a
233 way to find partners for transactional sex, and that sending pictures/videos would be a way to
234 present oneself to the potential buyer. It could also indicate that sexting is a new way to exchange
235 sex for goods. These hypotheses would explain why the result is only significant among those in the
236 *Several* group. However, further studies are needed to prove this hypothesis.

237 Our research shows that sex was mainly exchanged for money in both genders and in both frequency
238 categories. This finding is in line with other studies (2, 3). Nonetheless, Blum et al. (11) found that
239 half of the students in their sample had exchanged sex for drugs, which we found mainly among
240 females. Also in agreement with our results, Svedin & Priebe (3) found that survival sex (in exchange
241 for food or shelter) was rare. However, it is interesting to note that over one fourth of males
242 exchanged sex for a good reputation. This finding could be linked to what has been mentioned
243 before regarding boys being proud to be desirable and, hence, to acquire a better reputation.
244 Moreover, the literature indicates that to feel appreciated (29) or feeling excluded or being different
245 (30) were also motives for sex exchange.

246 Both by gender and by frequency, in around half of the cases the person the youths exchanged sex
247 with was an acquaintance, which seems to confirm that it differs from prostitution. In their survey,
248 Lavoie et al. (17) reported that, in their sample, in 61% of the cases the other person was a friend,
249 while in 27% it was an acquaintance. The fact that in their study only in 22% of the cases the other
250 person was an adult (over 19 years) could explain this difference. The vast majority of females in our
251 study were more likely to exchange with an older partner while one male in five exchanged with
252 someone younger, which could reflect social norms. This result coincides with those from Fredlund et
253 al. (2) who also found that most persons they had exchanged sex with were older.

254 Overall, youths having exchanged sex were quite different depending on whether they had done it
255 only once or more often. Those in the *Once* group seem to have lived this situation rather like some
256 kind of accident, something that happened once but was not repeated and that could be assumed to
257 have little consequences. To some point, it could be interpreted as a solution in a (unique) moment
258 of distress. Nevertheless, it cannot be excluded that those in the *Once* group have not had yet the
259 opportunity to repeat the experience, although at the age of the participants (26 years) it is most
260 likely to be infrequent.

261 However, those having exchanged sex several times were more likely to report markers of
262 vulnerability such as living in a non-intact family, lower socioeconomic situation, poorer mental
263 health, and a history of sexual abuse. Stoner et al. (18), in their study among women exchanging sex,
264 reported that they were more vulnerable in terms of race, education, income or history of abuse.

265 Other researchers (8) also found that these youths were more likely to be on drugs or to have run
266 away from home, both indicators of vulnerability. The same has been described among poor
267 communities in the United States (10) or among high-school substance users in Canada (7). As
268 mentioned above, to what degree sex exchange among young people in Switzerland is a way to meet
269 basic needs, especially since money is the main exchanged good, remains to be studied.

270 The strengths of this study are that it is based on a nationally representative sample with a larger
271 group of youths exchanging sex (n=168) than most previous studies (2, 3, 5, 11, 17) and that it details

272 how and with whom the last encounter happened. However, some limitations need to be
273 mentioned. First, our response rate (15.1%) was low, although it was in the range of what has been
274 reported for this type of studies (31, 32). Second, our data did not allow determining at what age
275 they had started exchanging sex, and this is an important point as, if underage, it could be considered
276 a form of sexual exploitation (7). Third, for those having exchanged sex more than once, we do not
277 know if it is a practice they are still currently doing. Fourth, although our sample was nationally
278 representative, it is possible that those most vulnerable have not participated, hence our prevalence
279 rate might be underestimated. Moreover, it may also be that some youths, when exchanging sex for
280 help for an exam, for example, may not consider it as exchange, increasing the underestimation.
281 Finally, a social desirability bias cannot be excluded.

282 In spite of these limitations, our results indicate that, although rare, transactional sex is a reality for
283 some young people in Switzerland. From a clinical point of view, health professionals dealing with
284 young people should include this question in the sexual anamnesis of their patients. From a public
285 health perspective, sexual education and prevention campaigns should include this phenomenon,
286 especially when directed to underage youths. Moreover, the approach should not be limited to
287 economic transactions but also to the other types of exchange.

288

289 **Conflict of interest**

290 The authors declare no conflict of interest

291 **Funding**

292 The survey on sexual health and behaviors of young people living in Switzerland was financed by the
293 Swiss National Science Foundation (grant #162538).

294

295 **References**

- 296 1. Berg RC, Schmidt AJ, Weatherburn P, The Emis N. Transactional Sex: Supply and Demand
297 Among European Men Who have Sex with Men (MSM) in the Context of Local Laws. *Int J Sex Health*.
298 2015;27(3):286-302.
- 299 2. Fredlund C, Svensson F, Svedin CG, Priebe G, Wadsby M. Adolescents' lifetime experience of
300 selling sex: development over five years. *Journal of child sexual abuse*. 2013;22(3):312-25.
- 301 3. Svedin CG, Priebe G. Selling sex in a population-based study of high school seniors in sweden:
302 demographic and psychosocial correlates. *Arch Sex Behav*. 2007;36(1):21-32.
- 303 4. Krisch M, Averdijk M, Valdebenito S, Eisner M. Sex Trade Among Youth: A Global Review of
304 the Prevalence, Contexts and Correlates of Transactional Sex Among the General Population of
305 Youth. *Adolesc Res Rev*. 2019;4(2):115-34.
- 306 5. Pedersen W, Hegna K. Children and adolescents who sell sex: a community study. *Soc Sci*
307 *Med*. 2003;56(1):135-47.
- 308 6. Ahrens KR, Katon W, McCarty C, Richardson LP, Courtney ME. Association between childhood
309 sexual abuse and transactional sex in youth aging out of foster care. *Child Abuse Negl*. 2012;36(1):75-
310 80.
- 311 7. Homma Y, Nicholson D, Saewyc EM. A profile of high school students in rural Canada who
312 exchange sex for substances. *Can J Hum Sex*. 2012;21(1):29-40.
- 313 8. Edwards JM, Iritani BJ, Hallfors DD. Prevalence and correlates of exchanging sex for drugs or
314 money among adolescents in the United States. *Sex Transm Infect*. 2006;82(5):354-8.
- 315 9. Ulloa E, Salazar M, Monjaras L. Prevalence and Correlates of Sex Exchange Among a
316 Nationally Representative Sample of Adolescents and Young Adults. *J Child Sex Abus*. 2016;25(5):524-
317 37.
- 318 10. Boyer CB, Greenberg L, Chutuape K, Walker B, Monte D, Kirk J, et al. Exchange of Sex for
319 Drugs or Money in Adolescents and Young Adults: An Examination of Sociodemographic Factors, HIV-
320 Related Risk, and Community Context. *J Community Health*. 2017;42(1):90-100.

- 321 11. Blum AW, Lust K, Christenson G, Odlaug BL, Redden SA, Grant JE. Transactional sexual activity
322 among university students: Prevalence and clinical correlates. *Int J Sex Health*. 2018;30(3):271-80.
- 323 12. Tyler KA, Johnson KA. Trading sex: voluntary or coerced? The experiences of homeless youth.
324 *J Sex Res*. 2006;43(3):208-16.
- 325 13. Gerassi LB, Jonson-Reid M, Plax K, Kaushik G. Trading Sex for Money or Compensation:
326 Prevalence and Associated Characteristics from a Sexually Transmitted Infection (STI) Clinic Sample. *J*
327 *Aggress Maltreat Trauma*. 2016;25(9):909-20.
- 328 14. Lee TY, Shek DT. Compensated dating in Hong Kong: prevalence, psychosocial correlates, and
329 relationships with other risky behaviors. *J Pediatr Adolesc Gynecol*. 2013;26(3 Suppl):S42-8.
- 330 15. Betzler F, Kohler S, Schlemm L. Sex work among students of higher education: a survey-
331 based, cross-sectional study. *Arch Sex Behav*. 2015;44(3):525-8.
- 332 16. Kaestle CE. Selling and buying sex: a longitudinal study of risk and protective factors in
333 adolescence. *Prev Sci*. 2012;13(3):314-22.
- 334 17. Lavoie F, Thibodeau C, Gagne MH, Hebert M. Buying and selling sex in Quebec adolescents: a
335 study of risk and protective factors. *Arch Sex Behav*. 2010;39(5):1147-60.
- 336 18. Stoner MCD, Haley DF, Golin CE, Adimora AA, Pettifor A. The Relationship Between Economic
337 Deprivation, Housing Instability and Transactional Sex Among Women in North Carolina (HPTN 064).
338 *AIDS Behav*. 2019;23(11):2946-55.
- 339 19. Magni S, Christofides N, Johnson S, Weiner R. Alcohol Use and Transactional Sex among
340 Women in South Africa: Results from a Nationally Representative Survey. *PLoS One*.
341 2015;10(12):e0145326.
- 342 20. Svensson F, Fredlund C, Svedin CG, Priebe G, Wadsby M. Adolescents selling sex: Exposure to
343 abuse, mental health, self-harm behaviour and the need for help and support-a study of a Swedish
344 national sample. *Nord J Psychiat*. 2013;67(2):81-8.

- 345 21. Barrense-Dias Y, Akre C, Berchtold A, Leeners B, Morselli D, Suris JC. Sexual health and
346 behavior of young people in Switzerland. Lausanne: Institut universitaire de médecine sociale et
347 préventive (IUMSP); 2018.
- 348 22. Berwick DM, Murphy JM, Goldman PA, Ware JE, Jr., Barsky AJ, Weinstein MC. Performance of
349 a five-item mental health screening test. *Med Care*. 1991;29(2):169-76.
- 350 23. Coker TR, Austin SB, Schuster MA. The health and health care of lesbian, gay, and bisexual
351 adolescents. *Annual review of public health*. 2010;31:457-77.
- 352 24. Priebe G, Svedin CG. Operationalization of three dimensions of sexual orientation in a
353 national survey of late adolescents. *J Sex Res*. 2013;50(8):727-38.
- 354 25. Van Ouytsel J, Walrave M, Ponnet K. An Exploratory Study of Transactional Sexting Among
355 High School Students. *J Adolesc Health*. 2020;66(4):510-3.
- 356 26. Mgbako O, Park SH, Callander D, Brinker DA, Kuhner C, Carrico AW, et al. Transactional sex,
357 condomless anal sex, and HIV risk among men who have sex with men. *Int J STD AIDS*.
358 2019;30(8):795-801.
- 359 27. Tat SA, Marrazzo JM, Graham SM. Women Who Have Sex with Women Living in Low- and
360 Middle-Income Countries: A Systematic Review of Sexual Health and Risk Behaviors. *LGBT Health*.
361 2015;2(2):91-104.
- 362 28. van der Heijden I, Swartz S. 'Something for something': the importance of talking about
363 transactional sex with youth in South Africa using a resilience-based approach. *Afr J AIDS Res*.
364 2014;13(1):53-63.
- 365 29. Fredlund C, Dahlstrom O, Svedin CG, Wadsby M, Jonsson LS, Priebe G. Adolescents' motives
366 for selling sex in a welfare state - A Swedish national study. *Child Abuse Negl*. 2018;81:286-95.
- 367 30. Jonsson LS, Svedin CG, Hyden M. Young women selling sex online - narratives on regulating
368 feelings. *Adolesc Health Med Ther*. 2015;6:17-27.
- 369 31. Doring N, Mohseni MR. Are Online Sexual Activities and Sexting Good for Adults' Sexual Well-
370 Being? Results From a National Online Survey. *Int J Sex Health*. 2018;30(3):250-63.

371 32. Jorgensen MJ, Maindal HT, Christensen KS, Olesen F, Andersen B. Sexual behaviour among
372 young Danes aged 15-29 years: a cross-sectional study of core indicators. *Sex Transm Infect.*
373 2015;91(3):171-7.
374

375 Table 1. Bivariate analysis of the characteristics of the sample and comparison between the three
 376 studied groups.

	Total (N=5175)	Never (N=5007)	Once (N=80)	Several (N=88)	P- value
Gender (Male)	51.0%	50.8%	58.1%	59.8%	NS
Age (mean ± SD)	26.35±.01	26.34±.01	26.30±.10	26.31±.09	NS
Swiss-born (no)	11.4%	11.2%	20.6%	14.7%	<.05
Parental situation (not together)	33.8%	33.2%	48.2%	52.7%	<.001
SES (below average)	15.5%	15.0%	29.9%	34.5%	<.001
Education (below tertiary)	49.6%	49.1%	59.6%	66.8%	<.01
Own financial situation satisfaction (mean ± SD)	6.37±.04	6.40±.04	5.56±.29	5.25±.29	<.001
Mental health (poor)	15.4%	14.9%	27.9%	35.4%	<.01
Lifetime alcohol misuse (≥10 episodes)	52.9%	52.5%	62.3%	67.4%	<.01
Lifetime cannabis use (≥10 times)	27.4%	26.7%	38.9%	58.0%	<.001
Sexual orientation (non-heterosexual)	16.8%	15.6%	47.7%	50.9%	<.001
Age at first sexual experience (mean ± SD)	16.67±.05	16.74±.05	15.67±.31	14.98±.24	<.001
Ever had oral sex (yes)	96.3%	96.3%	96.8%	98.8%	NS
Ever had vaginal sex (yes)	88.1%	88.1%	87.6%	86.9%	NS
Ever had anal sex (yes)	52.7%	51.8%	72.0%	84.9%	<.001
Ever had a STI (yes)	18.6%	18.2%	24.0%	35.4%	<.001
Ever been sexually abused (yes)	9.2%	8.6%	19.6%	33.6%	<.001
Number of sexual partners/life (≥10)	22.3%	20.6%	63.7%	81.4%	<.001
Ever sent sexual images/videos	50.4%	49.1%	70.4%	82.9%	<.001
Ever surfed porn sites	79.5%	79.0%	91.9%	95.0%	<.001
Condom use at first intercourse	84.8%	84.9%	81.0%	82.8%	NS
Condom use at last intercourse	54.7%	54.6%	53.6%	58.2%	NS

377 NS: Non significant

378

379 Table 2. Backward stepwise multinomial logistic regression comparing each group reporting
 380 exchanging sex to the Never group (reference category).

	Once (N=80)	P	Several (N=88)	P
Gender (Male)	1.74 [1.04:2.92]	<.05	2.48 [1.30:4.71]	<.01
Parental situation (not together)	1.35 [0.79:2.30]	NS	1.74 [1.02:2.96]	<.05
SES (below average)	1.33 [0.97:1.83]	NS	1.49 [1.12:1.97]	<.01
Satisfaction with own financial situation	0.95 [0.86:1.05]	NS	0.88 [0.79:0.97]	<.05
Mental health (poor)	2.09 [1.17:3.73]	<.05	2.76 [1.57:4.87]	<.01
Sexual orientation (non-heterosexual)	2.56 [1.45:4.53]	<.01	1.91 [1.08:3.37]	<.05
Age at first sexual experience	0.92 [0.84:1.02]	NS	0.88 [0.80:0.96]	<.01
Ever been sexually abused (yes)	1.56 [0.81:3.04]	NS	3.86 [1.99:7.50]	<.001
Lifetime number of sexual partners (≥ 10)	4.07 [2.19:7.56]	<.001	7.17 [3.65:14.11]	<.001
Ever sent sexual images/videos	0.99 [0.52:1.88]	NS	2.37 [1.03:5.46]	<.05

381 NS: Non significant

382

383 Table 3. Descriptive results of the goods obtained in exchange for sex by gender and by frequency
 384 category.

	Total	By gender			By frequency category		
		Males (N=99)	Females (N=69)	P-value	Once (N=80)	Several (N=88)	P-value
Money	48.8%	54.4%	40.8%	NS	44.9%	52.4%	NS
To have a good reputation	39.7%	27.1%	18.6%	NS	22.0%	25.1%	NS
Gift	36.8%	22.9%	20.5%	NS	15.7%	27.5%	NS
Drugs	16.7%	13.0%	22.1%	NS	10.8%	22.0%	NS
Alcohol	20.4%	11.9%	12.5%	NS	4.7%	18.8%	.01
To be accepted in a group	13.6%	5.9%	11.2%	NS	6.5%	9.5%	NS
Clothes	11.5%	6.4%	7.6%	NS	0.9%	12.2%	.01
Other*	10.4%	4.5%	8.6%	NS	8.2%	4.4%	NS

385 NS: Non significant

386 *Included: friendship (N=1); help for test (N=2); to be left alone (N=1); shelter (N=3); I am not sure
 387 (N=1)

388

389

390 Table 4. Context of the last sex exchange for youths reporting exchanging sex, by gender and
 391 frequency category.

	Total (N=168)	By gender			By frequency category		
		Males (N=99)	Females (N=69)	P-value	Once (N=80)	Several (N=88)	P-value
The person was:				NS			NS
A friend	19.4%	17.7%	21.8%		24.1%	15.1%	
An acquaintance	49.7%	48.6%	51.4%		48.4%	51.0%	
A stranger	29.7%	31.7%	26.8%		27.5%	31.7%	
Other	1.2%	2.0%	0%		0%	2.2%	
Compared to you, the person was:				<.05			NS
Younger	13.5%	20.6%	3.2%		17.2%	10.2%	
About the same age	19.2%	19.0%	19.5%		19.8%	18.6%	
Older	65.2%	58.3%	75.1%		60.4%	69.5%	
I don't know	2.1%	2.1%	2.2%		2.6%	1.7%	
Did you feel obligated to do it (yes)	12.2%	7.4%	19.2%	<.05	17.4%	7.6%	.051

392 NS: Non significant

393

394