

Is Poverty or Wealth Driving HIV Transmission?

Stuart Gillespie, Suneetha Kadiyala and Robert Greener^a

While early studies tended to find positive correlations between economic resources, education and HIV infection, as the epidemic has progressed, it has increasingly been assumed that this relationship is changing. But what is really known about the degree, type and dynamics of the influence of socioeconomic factors on rates of HIV transmission in different settings and at various stages of the AIDS epidemic? This brief highlights the key findings of a review of studies that sought to address this question.¹

In most countries, relatively rich and better educated men and women have higher rates of partner change because they have greater personal autonomy and spatial mobility. Although the richer and better educated are likely to have better access to reproductive health care, condom use is generally low in Africa and other parts of the developing world. Pre-existing sexual behaviour patterns therefore make the richer and the better educated more vulnerable to HIV infection, especially in the early stages of the epidemic, when information about the virus and how to protect oneself is usually low. At a later stage, however, it has been argued that individuals with higher socioeconomic status tend to adopt safer sexual practices, once the effects of AIDS-related morbidity and mortality become more apparent, adding greater credibility to HIV prevention messages.

Another currently postulated dynamic is that poverty (possibly itself fuelled by AIDS) is increasingly placing individuals from poor households at greater risk of exposure to HIV via the economically-driven adoption of risky behaviours. Poverty and food insecurity are thought to increase sexual risk taking, particularly among women who may engage in transactional sex to procure food for themselves and their children. Women's economic dependence on their partners may also make it difficult for them to insist on safer sex (e.g. condom use). In addition, poor people are more likely to be food insecure and malnourished. Malnutrition is known to weaken the immune system, which in turn may lead to greater risk of HIV transmission in any unprotected sexual encounter. This strand of literature on HIV transmission in Africa stresses the reversal in the distribution of the epidemic across population subgroups as the epidemic advances within countries—with those of lower socioeconomic status experiencing a higher subsequent rate of HIV transmission.

What Does the Evidence Show?

At the macro level there is a weak positive relationship between national wealth and HIV prevalence across countries in sub-Saharan Africa, where higher prevalence is seen in the wealthier countries of southern Africa. Strong urban-rural economic linkages, good transport links and high professional mobility may translate into both higher incomes and higher HIV incidence. National poverty rates on the other do not show a strong association with HIV prevalence, but income inequality does. Countries with greater inequality have higher HIV prevalence, especially in sub-Saharan Africa but also to a lesser extent in Asia and Latin America.

Micro level evidence that poverty is a major driver of the epidemic is rather mixed. Several studies that adopt ethnographic methodologies suggest that material poverty increases the risks of contracting HIV mainly through the channel of high risk behaviour adoption.

One recent cross-sectional study using DHS data from eight countries however finds HIV prevalence to be generally lower among the poorest individuals in these countries. This is partly accounted for by an association of wealth with other underlying factors. Wealthier individuals tend to live in urban areas where HIV is more prevalent, they tend to be more mobile, more likely to have multiple partners, more likely to engage in sex with non-regular partners, and they live longer—all factors which may present greater lifetime HIV risks. But, on the other hand, they tend to be better educated, with better knowledge of HIV prevention methods, and are more likely to use condoms—factors which reduce their risk relative to poorer individuals. Controlling for these associations however does not reverse the conclusion—there is no apparent association between low wealth status and HIV.

Such cross-sectional studies however suffer from important limitations: i) they are unable to distinguish between the effect of economic status on HIV infection and the effect of HIV infection on economic status, and ii) they are unable to control for the fact that individuals from richer households may survive longer with HIV, and thus are more likely to be present in the population to be tested, thereby increasing HIV prevalence rates.

These limitations can be overcome by using prospective cohorts to track HIV incidence. Three recent studies in this way show different results—a study in Zimbabwe finds

^a **Stuart Gillespie** and **Suneetha Kadiyala**, International Food Policy Research Institute/RENEWAL; **Robert Greener**, UNAIDS.

¹ Gillespie, S.R., Kadiyala, S and Greener, R. (2007) Is Poverty or Wealth Driving HIV Transmission. AIDS Vol. 21, Suppl. 7, S5-16.

relative wealth to be associated with lower incidence, while one South African study finds incidence to be highest in the middle-wealth group, and another finds no association at all between HIV incidence and wealth.

Education is another correlate of socioeconomic status and here a relatively clear picture emerges. Most studies suggest that education is increasingly associated, on balance, with less risky behaviours.

Pathways, Interactions and Mediating Factors

Links between socioeconomic conditions, such as wealth and education, and HIV risk and vulnerability are clearly complex—perhaps too complex for a single explanation. A major analytical challenge is to define the causal pathways operating from distal socioeconomic factors to proximal individual behaviours and ultimately physiological factors. Different socioeconomic factors may affect health at different times in the life course, operating at different levels (e.g., individual, household and neighbourhood) and through different causal pathways. The review highlights three key mediating factors: gender inequalities, mobility and the socioecology of HIV.

The issue of gender is front and central to any discussion of HIV and poverty. Women's dependence on men's economic support throughout much of the developing world means that women's personal resources, including their sexuality, has economic potential. Economic asymmetries within a couple are reinforced by various contextual factors, such as family and peer pressures, social and economic institutions and pervasive and deeply entrenched gender-based inequalities. Gender economic inequality between young women and adult men has been found to be a driver of HIV transmission, as has food insufficiency which may not directly correlate with household income. A specific focus on protecting and promoting access to food may thus decrease exposure to HIV, especially among women.

There is convincing empirical evidence of the link between human mobility and HIV spread. In sub-Saharan Africa, the risk of HIV infection has been found to be higher near roads, and amongst people who either have personal migration experience or have sexual partners who are migrants.

There are some important neglected issues—the influence of social cohesion and community-level structural factors, for example, are under-researched and little understood. Likewise, the literature is somewhat biased towards explaining the relationship between socioeconomic conditions and HIV through high risk behaviour adoption pathways, with less attention being paid to the ways in which pre-existing health and nutritional status may have compromised immune status of individuals.

Conclusions

AIDS cannot thus be termed a “disease of poverty.” Although it is true that poor individuals and households are likely to be hit harder by the downstream impacts of AIDS, their chances of being exposed to HIV in the first place are not necessarily greater than wealthier individuals or households. Relative wealth appears to have a mixed influence on HIV risk depending on context and an array of mediating factors. Gender inequality appears to be particularly important. Education in general appears to be protective with regard to HIV risk, and the interaction effects between education and wealth could be very positive—when people have resources, and the ability to use those resources, they can act on safeguarding their sexual health. Sustained efforts to improve education levels as well as targeted and tailored messages on HIV prevention efforts can yield positive results.

Overall, what is clear is that approaches to HIV prevention *need to cut across all socioeconomic strata of society* and they need to be tailored to the specific drivers of transmission within different groups—with particular attention to the vulnerabilities faced by youth and women, and to the dynamic and contextual nature of the relationship between socioeconomic status and HIV.



INTERNATIONAL FOOD POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE • 2033 K Street NW • Washington, DC 20006-1002 USA
T 1-202-862-5638 • Skype ID: ifprihomeoffice • F 1-202-467-4439 • E s.drimie@cgiar.org • www.ifpri.org/renewal

About RENEWAL

Facilitated by the International Food Policy Research Institute, RENEWAL is a regional “network-of-networks” in Sub-Saharan Africa. Currently active in five “hub” countries (Malawi, Uganda, Zambia, South Africa, and Kenya), RENEWAL comprises national networks of food and nutrition-relevant organizations (public, private, and nongovernmental) together with partners in AIDS and public health research. RENEWAL aims to enhance understanding of the worsening interactions between HIV, food security, and nutrition, and facilitate a comprehensive response to these interactions. RENEWAL is grateful for support, at present, from Irish Aid, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), the International Development Research Centre (IDRC, Canada), and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

Note: This brief is based on a RENEWAL working paper containing preliminary material and research results. These papers have not been subject to formal external reviews managed by IFPRI's Publications Review Committee, but have been reviewed by at least one internal or external researcher. They are circulated in order to stimulate discussion and critical comment.

Copyright © 2008 International Food Policy Research Institute. All rights reserved. Sections of this material may be reproduced for personal and not-for-profit use without the express written permission of but with acknowledgment to IFPRI. To obtain permission to reprint, contact the Communications Division at ifpri-copyright@cgiar.org.