



# HHS Public Access

Author manuscript

*Arch Sex Behav.* Author manuscript; available in PMC 2024 October 01.

Published in final edited form as:

*Arch Sex Behav.* 2024 October ; 53(9): 3639–3653. doi:10.1007/s10508-024-02957-8.

## “It’s Almost Like Playing ‘The Price is Right’”: Factors Considered by Online Male Sex Workers When Setting the Price for Their Services

Karolynn Siegel<sup>1</sup>, María Cabán<sup>1</sup>, Courtney J. Brown-Bradley<sup>1</sup>, Eric W. Schrimshaw<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Sociomedical Sciences, Columbia University Mailman School of Public Health, New York, NY 10032, USA

<sup>2</sup>Department of Population Health Sciences, College of Medicine, University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL, USA

### Abstract

Some men who have sex with men (MSM) engage in the exchange of sexual services for money, drugs, shelter or something else of value. There has been limited research examining the factors that influence how male sex workers (MSWs) determine their fees for their services. To learn more about this, qualitative interview data were analyzed from 180 MSM from 8 US cities who had recently engaged in exchange sex with clients they had primarily met through dating/hookup websites and apps. The primary factor that affected participants’ fees was the type of services provided, with a higher price generally charged for anal sex than for oral sex, mutual masturbation or massage. Condomless anal sex, in particular, commanded a higher fee. Additionally, participants required more money for special kinks or fetishes or any services that they considered to be risky, demanding or physically or emotionally uncomfortable. Other factors that affected how much participants charged for a given encounter included the duration of the meeting, the level of client appeal, the perceived wealth of the client, and the participant’s current financial situation. Participants varied in their approaches to fee setting, in terms of both their degree of flexibility when negotiating a price and whether they preferred to suggest a fee or have the client first state an amount they were willing to pay. Information about MSWs’ approaches to fee setting provides greater understanding of their lived experiences and the risks they may accept for higher fees.

### Keywords

Male sex worker; Men who have sex with men; Fee for service; Sex work

<sup>✉</sup>Karolynn Siegel, ks420@cumc.columbia.edu.

**Author Contributions** KS and EWS contributed to the study conception and design. Data analysis was carried out by KS and CBB. The first draft of the manuscript was written by KS, MC, and CBB and all authors commented on previous versions of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

**Conflict of interest** The authors declare they have no financial interests. Eric W. Schrimshaw is on the Editorial Board of Archives of Sexual Behavior and receives no compensation as an Editorial Board Member.

**Consent to Participate** Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

**Research Involving Human Participants** This study was performed in line with the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki. Approval was granted by the Institutional Review Board at Columbia University Irving Medical Center (Protocol AAAR5835).

## Introduction

A portion of men who have sex with men (MSM) have provided sexual services in exchange for money, drugs, shelter or something else of value. Estimates have varied considerably across studies, presumably due to eligibility criteria and when and where the data were collected, ranging from a low of 7% to a high of 29% (Armstrong et al., 2021; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2019; Meunier et al., 2021; Nerlander et al., 2017). The most common motivation for becoming involved in sex work is for income (Bar-Johnson & Weiss, 2015; Henriksen et al., 2020; Mimiaga et al., 2009; Minichiello et al., 2002; Smith et al., 2013; Uy et al., 2004). Although some MSM rely solely on sex work to support themselves, others use it to supplement their employment salary, while still others—often youth who have run away or left home due to family conflict or rejection—use it to buy food and other things to meet their most basic needs. In recent years, particularly with the rise of dating and hookup websites and apps, there has been a growing number of MSM who engage in what Morris (2021) has called “incidental sex work”—i.e., informal, casual or opportunistic sex work (Morris, 2021).

It has been observed that the Internet and mobile technologies have transformed male sex work in fundamental ways that make it safer, more convenient and less stigmatized (Argento et al., 2018; Bimbi, 2007; Cunningham & Kendall, 2011; Jones, 2015; McLean, 2015; Minichiello et al., 2002, 2013; Scott et al., 2005). For example, Argento (2018) conducted interviews MSWs in Vancouver, Canada, who described the changes in their work as they transitioned from street to online solicitation. Participants reported that they found that the ability to screen clients and negotiate terms of an encounter prior to meeting has reduced the risks of violence, stigma and police harassment (Argento et al., 2018).

The rise of the use of dating and hookup websites and apps has facilitated entry into sex work (Cunningham & Kendall, 2011; MacPhail et al., 2015; McLean, 2015; Siegel et al., 2023b) and made it easy for sex workers to secure clients independently with no intermediary, allowing them to set their own fees and keep all the money they earn. Many independent sex workers who meet clients online can earn a good living while evading tax payments and see sex work as offering good money (Siegel et al., 2023a). Sex work can be a particularly attractive and flexible source of income for those who are young, less educated or discriminated against due to factors such as their migrant status and may find that society only offers them low paying employment opportunities (e.g., fast-food worker) (Cameron et al., 1999).

Sex work, however, also carries recognized health and social risks. By far, the most noted and studied has been the risk to men’s sexual health, particularly the risk of HIV and STI acquisition. However, the strong focus there has been on these risks may overshadow concerns more salient to sex workers in their day-to-day lives, such as the threat of or experiences of violence and harm (Mimiaga et al., 2021; Raine, 2021). Furthermore, as an illegal activity, there is also the possibility of arrest (Sanders, 2016). For those engaged in survival sex, who are often adolescents and young adults, avoiding exploitation and physical harm as well as meeting basic daily needs are pressing concerns (Dank et al., 2015). Finally,

those engaged in sex work are often centered on concealment to manage the risk to one's reputation and stigmatization if others were to learn of one's involvement in such activity (Siegel et al., 2022).

Little is currently known about the extent to which male sex workers take these various risks into account in setting their fees or what other factors they might also consider. However, this is an important question given that income is the main motivating factor for entering and remaining in sex work. Over the past two decades, a good deal of research has been done on the factors associated with workers asking for or receiving higher or lower fees, but most of this work was carried out in other countries and exclusively focused on female sex workers (FSWs) (Adriaenssens & Hendrickx, 2012; Arunachalam & Shah, 2012; Egger & Lindenblatt, 2015; Gertler et al., 2005; Quaipe et al., 2019; Rao et al., 2003; Shah, 2013). In most instances, this research addressed whether there was a financial premium or bonus received by FSWs who provided condomless sex when requested by clients to compensate themselves for the risks they are assuming of acquiring HIV/STIs. This phenomenon of receiving higher fees or a bonus when providing condomless sex to offset the risks involved for sex workers has been referred to as a "compensating differential" and the evidence across studies of FSWs for its existence is quite consistent with some qualifications, but few exceptions (Adriaenssens & Hendrickx, 2012; Arunachalam & Shah, 2012; Egger & Lindenblatt, 2015; Gertler et al., 2005; Quaipe et al., 2019; Rao et al., 2003; Shah, 2013). Other researchers have found that FSWs' level of attractiveness can influence the fees they are able to obtain. Those who are perceived by clients to be more physically attractive or of a desirable weight can command a higher fee and often a greater compensating differential for condomless sex than those who are unattractive or overweight (Arunachalam & Shah, 2012; Chang & Weng, 2012; Gertler et al., 2005; Griffith et al., 2016; Islam & Smyth, 2012). Of course, physical attractiveness and desirable weight are socially constructed notions and can vary across societies or even among subgroups within a given society. For women in particular, how these characteristics are defined are clearly strongly influenced by heteronormative values.

Additional factors that have been reported to affect FSWs' fees include the location of the meeting (with higher prices for out-calls than in-calls) (DeAngelo et al., 2019) and the duration of the meeting (Moffatt & Peters, 2004). Client characteristics have also been found to be considered by FSWs in setting their fees. For example, Gertler et al. (2005) found FSWs in Mexico gathered information about a potential client through their communications and by the client's appearance to estimate how much he might be willing to pay and arrive at an asking price (Gertler et al., 2005). To date, there has been much less investigation of the factors that influence the fees of male sex workers (MSWs) and if they consider any of the different risks associated with sex work in setting them. Logan (2016) noted:

The most important feature of online male sex work in the United States is the lack of organizational structure, in that male sex workers do not work under pimps or in exclusive contracts with agencies as do the majority of female sex workers...As such, male sex workers are independent owner-operators who compete against one another and whose fees are not shared with others.

(Logan, 2016, p. 258)

Using data from approximately 2000 men gathered from a large website for male escort advertising in the USA, Logan and Shah (2013) found that those who posted a face picture (as opposed to other kinds of photos) enjoyed a price premium. They attributed this to the fact that doing so “signals” to potential clients a sex worker’s commitment to truthfulness, discretion and the client’s safety, since it would be very hard for the escort to create a new identity if he was later found to be deceptive and his picture was shared on client forums established to informally police sex work (Logan & Shah, 2013). Using the same source, Logan (2017a) established that male escorts experienced a price penalty or enjoyed a reward based on certain physical characteristics. They suffered a small penalty for thinness, but a sizeable one for being overweight. Men with a muscular build realized a price premium. Additionally, men who were “tops” (penetrative partner) received a price premium and “bottoms” a penalty. He attributed this last finding to “gay men placing a sizable premium of traditional masculine (dominant) behaviors at the expense of others” (Logan, 2017a, pp. 115–116). Finally, there was a price penalty for age, with lower fees received by for older escorts.

Studies that have analyzed male escorts’/sex workers’ online advertising or negotiations have reported that they often included what types of services could be provided (Argento et al., 2018; Blackwell & Dziegielewski, 2013; Jackson & Judge, 2021; Kille et al., 2017; Lee-Gonyea et al., 2009; MacPhail et al., 2015; Pruitt, 2005) and associated pricing information, generally in the form of hourly rates (Blackwell & Dziegielewski, 2013; Kille et al., 2017; Lee-Gonyea et al., 2009; MacPhail et al., 2015). Two studies have found that sex workers charged more for out-calls than in-calls. In a Canadian study, researchers analyzed 75 Internet-based sex workers’ advertisements (45 women, 24 men and 6 transgender) in which workers listed hourly rates (Kille et al., 2017). MSWs charged significantly higher fees when travel to the client was involved; this excluded related expenses like hotel, transportation costs and meals which were specified separately from the hourly rate. In another study that examined 163 profiles on a popular website of MSWs from Florida, while the focus was not on fees for services, the investigators did find that these varied depending upon where the encounter would occur (Blackwell & Dziegielewski, 2013). For meetings at the worker’s location, only 22.7% of MSWs charged more than \$200, while nearly half (47.8%) charged more than \$200 for meetings at the client’s location.

While MSWs have reported in a number of studies that clients often will try to induce them to have condomless sex by offering more money for that service (Bimbi & Parsons, 2005; Mimiaga et al., 2009; Reisner et al., 2008), most of the work on a compensating differential for condomless sex has looked at FSWs, with a few notable exceptions. One was a study of MSWs in Ecuador (Shah, 2013). The data indicated that there was a premium for condomless sex and that it was greater where the local STI (other than HIV) rates were higher, suggesting a compensating differential that grew with the risk of STI acquisition. Logan (2017b), however, using data from over 6,000 reviews written by clients of MSWs, found that sex workers who advertised safer sex earned more (on average) than those who did not. He contended there was a segment of the client market, perhaps those who are more risk-averse, that want condomed sex and will pay more for it, especially if it is challenging to find it in the non-commercial sex market (Logan, 2017b).

In another study, researchers reported on data gathered through interviews with MSWs and male clients in Mombasa, Kenya (Valente et al., 2020). A majority of sex workers said they charged wealthy clients more and many added extra fees for massages, oral sex and certain sexual positions. A few MSWs also reported charging clients they were attracted to less money, suggesting they considered their anticipated pleasure in having sex with a particular client in setting their prices. Several men considered their own appearance and charged more if they had spent money on enhancing their appearance (e.g., nice clothing and makeup).

It is reasonable to assume most sex workers desire to maximize fees for their services, since they are assuming certain risks—e.g., of violence, STIs, etc.—that are in some cases proportional to the number of clients they see; so, higher fees may allow them to see fewer clients to meet their financial needs. Income is also their main motivation reported for engaging in sex work (Bar-Johnson & Weiss, 2015; Henriksen et al., 2020; Mimiaga et al., 2009; Minichiello et al., 2002; Smith et al., 2013; Uy et al., 2004). At the same time, however, it seems clear that they must offer competitive pricing to ensure their fees do not become a barrier to obtaining clients. Yet, currently very little is known about what male sex workers consider in determining the fees they ask of clients as there is a paucity of studies that actually examine that decision making process. To show that sex workers' fees or earnings are statistically associated with certain behaviors or worker characteristics is not the same as saying workers consider these factors when setting fees. In the present report, interview data gathered from MSWs who primarily met clients in dating/hookup apps and websites was analyzed to investigate how they determined their services fees. For the purposes of this paper, Minichiello et al.'s (2015) definition of male sex workers was adopted and reads as follows:

The expression “male sex worker” is used in this paper to refer to sex workers whose sex as determined by biological markers was deemed male at the time of birth. This nuance deliberately excludes transgender sex workers in recognition of the different issues faced by that population. Most of the research cited in this article adopted this same definition of MSW...

(Minichiello et al., 2015, p. 2)

## Method

### Participants

The data for this report come from a cross-sectional study of 180 MSM who had engaged in exchange sex with male clients primarily met through dating/hookup websites and apps not intended for sex work. Eligibility requirements for study participation were as follows: (1) were assigned male sex at birth and current identification as men, genderqueer or non-binary; (2) were at the time of enrollment 18–45 years old; (3) self-report never having tested positive for HIV; (4) self-identify as Black/African-American, White/Caucasian or Hispanic/Latino of any race; (5) report fluency in English; (6) currently reside in the areas of Atlanta, GA, Baltimore, MD, Boston, MA, Chicago, IL, Detroit, MI, New York City, NY, Philadelphia, PA, or Washington, D.C.; (7) report having received money, drugs, shelter or other goods in exchange for any kind of sex with at least two different male partners in the prior three months; (8) report anal sex with at least one of their exchange partners from the

previous three months; and (9) report having met at least one of their exchange partners from the prior three months on a dating/hookup website or app.

Regarding the justification of the above eligibility criteria, female and transgender individuals were excluded because they use different venues for finding clients and have different risk considerations. The lower age limit for study participation was set at 18 because the hookup apps/websites where MSM meet exchange partners require users to be age 18 or older. The upper age limit was set at 45 because preliminary survey data we collected before the study suggested that recent exchange sex was not prevalent above that age. Participants had to self-report never having tested HIV-positive as our focus was on differences between HIV-negative workers who did and did not use consistent protection (condom use or PrEP use) with their clients. Eligible participants had to identify as Black non-Hispanic, White non-Hispanic or Hispanic/Latino (of any race) because these three racial/ethnic groups account for the large majority of HIV-positive and at-risk MSM in the USA. Asian/Pacific Islanders were excluded because they comprise a small percentage of residents of the metropolitan areas where we recruited from, which would have made it extremely difficult—as supported by our preliminary survey data—to enroll adequate numbers of them to allow for meaningful subgroup comparisons. Participants had to report being sufficiently fluent in English to complete the data collection. As the majority of Latinos and nearly all non-Hispanic individuals ages 18–45 report they speak English well or very well, this criterion did not restrict our ability to obtain a diverse sample or disqualify too many otherwise eligible MSM. Residency in the metropolitan areas of New York, NY, Philadelphia, PA, Baltimore, MD, Washington, D.C., Atlanta, GA, Boston, MA, Chicago, IL, or Detroit, MI, was required as cities in the study in order to enhance generalizability of the sample and prevent the 180 interviewees from being sparsely distributed across the country. A relatively high proportion of National HIV Behavioral Surveillance (NHBS) participants from all these cities reported engagement in sex work in the past year (Nerlander et al., 2017). These cities also had some of the highest prevalence of HIV among MSM tested in the NHBS in 2014, e.g., Baltimore (30%), Philadelphia (27%), Washington, DC (20%), and NYC (16%) (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2016). We required participants to have had at least two clients in the past three months to ensure that the participants were engaging in exchange sex with some regularity and to ensure that they were doing so not just with one steady exchange partner. Additionally, participants must have had anal sex with at least one client in the past three months because MSM who engage in only oral sex are at low risk of HIV acquisition. Finally, we required participants to have met at least one of their clients in the past three months on a dating or hookup website or app because we were interested in examining how these venues might be a pathway into sex work. In the interviews, we wanted participants to provide rich descriptions of their experiences; therefore, we focused on the past 3 months to limit the period of recall that would be required of them.

## Measures and Procedure

Recruitment and data collection took place between October 2018 and April 2020. Advertisements about a sexual health study were placed on dating/hookup websites/apps (e.g., Grindr, Scruff, Jack'd) and social networking websites (e.g., Facebook, Twitter,

Instagram) that were popular among MSM. While not explicitly stating that the focus of the research was on sex work, symbols and pictures on the advertisements suggested the research topic. The advertisements also stated eligible participants would receive a \$100 electronic gift card for completing the study. By clicking on the advertisements, potential participants were redirected to a 3–5-min screening survey, with questions about demographics and recent sexual behaviors including exchange sex, in order to determine study eligibility.

At the first stage of online recruitment, the study's focus on exchange sex was not explicitly stated in order to prevent men from potentially misrepresenting their participation in this activity to gain entrance into the study. Some social media sites would also not allow such an ad. Men, who based on answers to the screener were determined to be eligible, were asked to provide contact information so a team member could reach out to tell him more about the study. When called, the prospective participant was told that the focus of the study was on MSM who engaged in exchange sex. Specifically, the consent form stated, "The purpose of this study is to better understand exchange sex among men who have sex with men." Further, in the consent form they were informed that "We are specifically interested in exchange encounters, which involve the exchange of money, drugs, services, housing, or goods for sexual activity. We want to learn about how such encounters are discussed and how the decision to engage in different exchange sexual behaviors is made."

Those who wished to participate in the study were consented and went on to complete a 20–30-min questionnaire administered by a study team member to confirm study eligibility and gather additional background information. Next, participants were sent a link, to complete a 20–30-min online self-administered questionnaire, focused on recent sexual behaviors along with standardized questions regarding mental health and substance use, history of adverse events (i.e., violence, arrest, being forced to leave home as a child), specific sexual behaviors with their partners from the past three months and a few standardized measures. Finally, participants completed a phone-based in-depth, semi-structured qualitative interview with a study team member. These interviews, which lasted an average of 88 min, focused on the participants' experiences with exchange sex.

## Data Analysis

Interviews were transcribed verbatim. The research team developed a topical coding scheme which focused on the primary areas of interest outlined in the study aims. The transcripts were then coded in ATLAS.ti. Data for this report come from extracted portions of the interview data assigned the topical code "negotiation of exchange sex," which was defined as "what the participants wanted to discuss with the prospective client prior to an in-person meeting." First, a diverse subsample of study participants, representing different ages, race/ethnicities and length of time involved in sex work was selected. Next, two of the authors worked independently to review their extracted data to identify the factors associated with how participants set their fees. They then met to compare their lists of factors and develop a single list that removed any redundancy. Codes were then developed for each factor. The two authors independently applied these codes to a different subset of interviews and met to resolve any disagreements in their assignment of codes. This step was repeated once more.

At this point, having reached a high level of agreement, these codes were applied to all the extracted “negotiation” data from the full set of interviews. While the subcodes were applied anytime fees were discussed in the interview, most of the material extracted resulted from replies to questions such as, “Tell me about how you determine what/how much you’re going to get”; “Do you have ongoing rates or are they flexible/negotiable?”; “What are you typically looking to make for different things?”; “Are there reasons why you would want more than your usual rate?”; and “Are there reasons why you would settle for less than your usual rate?.”

## Results

A diverse sample of 180 men were enrolled in the study and completed in-depth interviews. Their characteristics are included in Table 1. Participants described a variety of factors that they took into account when setting fees to charge for services. Many of them were tailored to the particular client and to distinct behaviors. The specific considerations MSWs used when setting prices are described below, followed by the different approaches (e.g., level of flexibility) MSWs reported in setting fees with clients.

### Factors Considered in Determining the Fee

**Services to be Provided**—The factor participants most frequently cited as having an influence on their fee setting was what sexual services they would provide to their exchange partners. Many men felt that they needed to receive greater compensation to engage in sexual activities they preferred not to take part in because they felt those activities were degrading, risky or physically and/or emotionally uncomfortable. In general, participants expected more money for anal sex, particularly if it would be condomless, than for oral sex, mutual masturbation or sexual massages. For instance, a 23-year-old Latino participant from Philadelphia reported that his rates varied by sex act, with a premium charged for condomless anal sex (CAS).

Right now, I do 85 for a blow job. I do 100 for a blow job, making out, and physical touching. For sex all the way with condom is 280 dollars. Sex all the way without condom is 400 dollars. Then I put that if there’s anything else that you want me to do, I’ll just charge by the hour.

A 20-year-old Latino participant from Chicago who said he generally preferred not to have anal sex with exchange partners, reported different prices for oral sex, anal sex with a condom and CAS.

I think in my head I have a couple of prices. For oral sex if you want me to give or even receive I’m going to charge around 50. And then also depending on how you look. If I don’t like you as much, if you’re not as attractive as me, I might put that up a little bit more. With anal sex I’ll usually just do a flat rate of 150 and if you want unprotected, I’ll probably skew it up a little bit more, up to 175 or 200.

Some participants also asked for different fees based on their comfort engaging in various activities clients may request. A 26-year-old Black participant from Philadelphia, for example, did not wish to be the receptive partner for any type of sex, although he would



reluctantly perform oral sex if the client wore a condom. However, due to his psychological discomfort with giving oral sex he charged more for that activity than for receiving oral sex.

I would want more if I'm going to perform oral sex. That's something that I generally do not like to do. Just because someone's doing it for me, I don't know, that just feels a little bit less shameful, I guess? I don't know. That, if someone wants to pay me \$15 to give me a blowjob, sure, why not? If they want to pay me \$400, great, but if they want to pay me \$15 for me to give them, no, I'm not doing that. ... I think it's the idea of giving someone else pleasure for actual, the idea of getting on my knees for someone for money, I guess it's a cliché but it feels humiliating.

For a 25-year-old White participant from NYC, positions that he felt took more effort on his part required a higher fee.

You know I don't really go out with a set number in mind. I definitely won't get out of bed for anything below 50. But I mean it just depends on what they're looking—I always end up negotiating something. Generally, I try, if it's going to be anything labor intensive, at least a hundred... Where I'm doing the work—If I have to suck the dick or get fucked or something.

Similarly, a 22-year-old Black participant from Detroit preferred not to bottom with exchange partners and would ask for more money for bottoming (i.e., being the receptive partner during anal sex). He felt greater compensation was necessary to offset the preparation time, psychological discomfort and loss of power or control he felt with that position.

I will much rather top. If I have to bottom, I'm probably going to ask for a lot more money. ... It takes time to prepare to bottom and it hurts. You have to worry about bleeding and stuff like that. It's a lot to go through. ... If they want to pay me and they want to penetrate me, I just get a bad feeling about that. That's why I say that I need more money. I don't know, it's just something that I just don't feel right about. ... I feel like that would just give them so much power over me. They're already paying me to do something which is giving them power over me. To let them do that to me would be too much.

Participants who were willing to cater to kinks or participate in fetish play also tended to charge more for those activities than more “vanilla” (i.e., common or more normative sex acts such as oral sex, anal sex and mutual masturbation). A 27-year-old White participant from Philadelphia, for example, had a minimum rate he told prospective clients he expected to receive for his services, but would try to raise it for any kinks or fetishes that they were interested in exploring.

So, I'll usually tell them I'm looking for at least 200 to 250. Then if they're okay with that, I'll ask them, “Is there anything special you want to do? Any fetishes or kinks, or anything that you really, really, really want to do that you can't get anywhere like home or anything like that?” And if they say yeah, I'll ask them what it is. Then depending on what it is, I'll raise the price a little bit more, maybe by like 40 bucks, just to see what I can get out of them. Or I'll ask them, “Well, how

much are you willing to pay for somebody to let you tie them up and gag them, and call you daddy while you're fucking them?" I let them tell me how much they're willing to pay, and if I like the price, I'll agree. If I don't, I try to raise it up a little bit more.

A 23-year-old Latino participant from NYC reported that he asked for more money for "things out of my comfort zone," such as fisting, but that he was willing to try for the right price.

There was a time where a guy wanted me to try fisting, and I am not, that scares me to death. So, I was like, I'll try. Maybe I told him like that's another like one thousand dollars that you would have to give me, because I am not into that and never done that before in my life. I don't know what it's like. I'm scared of it but I'm willing to see how it is. Even though it didn't really work out as planned, you know, he still paid it and I was okay with it.

When asked whether there were circumstances when he would ask for more than his typical rate of \$120/hour, a 40-year-old Latino participant from Philadelphia replied,

Oh God, yes. Absolutely. It is not my regular, but there are guys who want fetishes met. And if it's a fetish that doesn't involve a sex act I don't want to do, or if it's a relatively harmless or even what I would call a non-sexual fetish, I will definitely ask for more money, but I will oblige the fetish.

**Duration of Meeting**—Another factor that many participants used to determine the value of a given exchange encounter was the length of time they would spend with an exchange partner. Some participants presented clients with clearly delineated rates for different time increments. A 30-year-old White participant from NYC, for example, described his expectations for compensation as follows:

So, it depends on time for the most part. If it's in an afternoon or an evening, so like four to six hours, I'll usually ask for like 600. If it's just like a lunch hour, like a 90-minute sort of thing, it'll be 200, and if it's an overnight, like nine to 12 hours, which is very rare, it'd be like closer to a thousand. ... It's kind of presented. I have it in like a picture where it's kind of a menu and it has those three options.

Another participant, a 24-year-old Latino man from Chicago, outlined how the length of time a client desired influenced his rates.

When I first started I was doing \$200 [per hour]. And then when I was talking to other escorts they were doing like \$250 or \$300; so then that's sort of my range usually. And so sort of in the first message people will just say like, "What's your rate?" And then I'll say, and then I'll just tell them, "\$250 for an hour. Or I can cut you a deal if you're going to do multiple hours, and just do \$100 any additional hours after the first one." Or things like that.

While some participants didn't necessarily have strict predetermined rates, they still felt they should be compensated more for longer encounters. When a 27-year-old White participant from Baltimore was asked how much he typically charged, for example, he responded,

Usually, they're fine with \$100 for an encounter, and the encounters usually last an hour or so...If someone suggested something that was gonna be a much bigger time commitment, or something that I don't know how comfortable I'd be doing, then I would ask for more. Like if someone's like, "Will you spend the day with me?" and I'm like, "Well, not for a hundred bucks, but if you give me ... " and just think of a rate that makes sense to me...one time, a guy wanted me to fuck him, and he was like, "I've got fifty bucks," and I was in and out in five minutes. I mean, easy \$50...but if someone's like, "Can we do \$20 an hour?" I'm like, "No." I mean, I make more than that at my real job.

A few participants added that the client was also expected to cover other additional expenses, for instance, all travel costs whether that be a car service to a local out-call or more substantial travel expenses for out-of-town encounters.

**Client Appeal**—Many participants said that the physical appearance of a prospective client and how appealing he was as a sexual partner influenced what activities they would engage in with him and how much he would be asked to pay. A 35-year-old Black participant from D.C., for example, reported he sometimes tried raising the price for less attractive exchange partners because their physicality made the encounters more challenging for him.

And then if I find that the guy is really maybe not particularly attractive to me, I will sometimes, with the full understanding that it might not happen because he's not going to be open to it, sometimes I'll push up the price to see. And I do it partly because a lot of times I don't want to have the encounter, but if the price is right it's a consideration. That's the dark me inside of things. But part of it is in these encounters, it's like being a bit of an actor and I'll find that I don't want to discriminate against anyone. But I do find that my performance varies. I'm not a machine so if I don't feel any physical attraction or count on anything to be particularly attractive to, it makes my job a little bit more difficult.

Similarly, a 25-year-old White participant noted that exchange encounters with unattractive clients were more difficult, and therefore, he expected to be paid more for those meetings.

If I'm being honest with myself, I would expect more money from a less attractive person. Just because I would have to put myself through more. Oh, my God! I'm so shallow!

For a 27-year-old White participant from Philadelphia, his level of desire to have sex with the potential client determined the rate he charged. He delineated his fees as follows:

Okay, if I'm looking at this holistic and if there's any number of factors that influence whether or not I want to have sex with this person, and money is just one factor and how much money is something that influences the strength of that factor. There's some people who I will enthusiastically have sex with for \$0. There's some people who I would enthusiastically have sex with for \$150 and would kind of suffer through sex with for free, and there's some people who at 50 bucks, I'll be enthusiastic to have sex with them and at 200 bucks, fantastic. Let's do it. And

there's some people who, "Sweetie, you could pay my rent for three months and I wouldn't touch it."

A 21-year-old Black participant from Chicago explained his typical fees and how they varied by the attractiveness of the client.

I spit the number that I think that they will usually be cool with, which just ranges from between \$75 and \$100.... If a guy's a little bit less attractive but not ugly, then I would ask him for maybe \$100. Rather than if it's a cute guy that I would be willing to have sex with him for free, then I would ask if they're willing to do \$75.

For a 19-year-old Latino participant from Detroit, what he found to be an acceptable fee depended in part upon how much money he had at the time, but increased if he found the potential client unattractive. When asked what amount he found good enough, he replied,

Well, it really depends on how much money I have. If I really need some money, I'll take \$40, but if it's someone that's really not attractive to me, I need probably about \$100 or something.

Age was sometimes mentioned in conjunction with or as a component of a client's appeal, with higher fees asked for older, less attractive clients and a willingness to accept lower fees than usual for young, attractive clients. For instance, a 31-year-old White participant from Boston described how he determined how much he expected to receive for an exchange encounter.

Usually by how old and gross the person is that I don't want to meet. Like if it's someone who's really old, really gross, [who] I'm not interested in, I'd ask a little bit more than normal as if it was someone around my age, decent looking. Then how much they really expect to get done, too. A lot of older would just pay to give me head and I don't even have to do anything back. But there are people who do expect it back. [And then I would expect more], absolutely.

A 21-year-old White participant from Boston who had only had two exchange partners said he would require more money from unattractive or older clients than he did from more attractive younger ones. He reported that among the information he wanted to discuss with a client prior to the meeting was what he would want to happen at their meeting and how much he would be paid.

Before meeting, I like to discuss, first of all, what we're going to be doing and how much I'm going to receive for it. That's always super important, because if we're going to be doing something more than what me and [name of a client] have done, for example, I'd expect the same amount of money, or even more. Also, depending on how attractive I find them, like if they are less attractive, or even older, I'd expect a lot more money than I would if like with [name of a client]. Because [name of a client] is 28 and a little bit more attractive than most.

Similarly, a 37-year-old Black participant from NYC described how he adjusted his rate according to age and attractiveness. When asked why he would ask for more than his typical rate he replied,

Age, maybe. ... Depends on the person's age. Like if they're older, I typically will charge them a little more. I know it sounds weird, but older people just—it's more work.

When asked whether there were any reasons he would settle for less, he responded,

Yes, absolutely. Mostly younger. The younger, more attractive types that I'm sexually attracted to.

**Perceived Wealth of the Client**—Another factor that influenced some participants' fees was how wealthy they perceived a prospective client to be, typically asking higher fees of those who appeared to have greater resources and occasionally lowering rates for those they believed had limited funds. For example, a 45-year-old Black participant from Atlanta said the assumed wealth of a prospective client was key to setting a price. When asked to describe how he typically determined how much he would tell a client he expected to receive in exchange for sex, he responded,

Strictly based on the client. If I know they're crypto guys, it's always 500 to 750. Always. I typically stay in that range, because that's not a lot for the guys that are in crypto. If they are entrepreneurs, whether they're in their startup phase or their company is in the Atlanta Business Chronicle, it's always in that 500 to 750. Now guys that are IT or anything else, 400 is the lowest that I'll charge.

When a 35-year-old Black participant from NYC was asked how he typically determined price with his clients, he said,

Like I want sex with someone for \$300, but you can kind of tell if you can push that number... I guess it would be I look for, like if it's going to be at a hotel, what hotel are we staying at? If I'm invited to their house, what does their house look like? You can kind of get a sense if someone has money. Then if that's the case, I'd be like, well \$300 to do this, but for fucking, it's going to be \$500.

A 25-year-old White participant from NYC also said he usually asked for more money from clients he perceived to probably be able to manage a higher fee.

Especially if they seem wealthier based on their picture or where they say they're living or anything like that. A white guy in Chelsea I'll definitely ask for more.

Several participants, including a 32-year-old Black one from Atlanta, also mentioned being willing to take less from a client who might be short of money, particularly if it was a former client and on previous times, they had paid the participant's usual fees.

I mean, if they bring it up then I'll say, "Hey, this is how much I charge. This is how much that this can happen for." I don't do a whole lot of negotiations. So, if you're saying like 20 bucks, then it's not going down. If you start a little higher, I can do that. Obviously, there is points in time, where people have experienced this before, may not have that much at that point. Then okay, at some point, I can negotiate with you maybe down to \$80 if I've seen you a few times and you've paid me \$100. And I had a good experience with you and I don't mind. It's a good experience and I get that some people don't just have money flowing out of their

pockets all the time, so I get that. So, if you're brand new, then you're probably going to be paying \$100, \$150. If you are someone I've been with a few times, then I don't mind if they tell me they can't. They don't have that much money at that point in time.

**Current Financial Need**—While many participants had a standard rate that they typically charged, some lowered that fee in times of personal financial need and were firmer in their pricing when they could afford to lose a potential client who couldn't pay their standard rate. A 21-year-old White participant from Chicago was willing to accept lower rates when he was in financial need but would wait for an exchange partner who would pay his desired rate if he didn't need the money immediately. He explained,

Well, okay, so I just moved, so I'm trying to figure out what is reasonable and expectable in this local area. Where I used to live, I was able to do \$400 an hour pretty easily. ... It also depends on where I was, so if I am in a pretty tight financial situation, I'll be much more flexible on my prices and rates. But if it's just kind of like, "You know, I would like money right now, but I'm not super needing for it," I'll have a number and I'll just try to find that number.

A 19-year-old Black participant from NYC based his decisions on whether or not he would accept the amount an exchange partner was offering on how much he needed the money at the time.

Well, it's usually up to the guy how much they're willing to spend. I've gotten as little as \$40 to perform oral sex on a guy and I've gotten sometimes, \$200 just for giving a guy a massage. So, it just varies. ... I usually just leave it up to them. If I'm really desperate for the money, then I just to take it. But now, if it doesn't seem reasonable, I just won't do it.

For a 36-year-old Black participant from NYC, a pressing need for money in some instances made him willing to accept a lower fee for an exchange encounter. When asked whether there were reasons why he would potentially settle for less money than usual, he responded:

Yeah, I may be under some strain for a bill or something, or I may have something very important that have to get as much money as possible as fast as I can, but there have been situations where I would, yes.

Alternatively, several participants occasionally proposed higher fees than usual when their current financial obligations necessitated asking for a fee high enough to meet those obligations. When a 27-year-old White participant from Philadelphia asked how much he generally expected to charge clients, he said he based his rates on what he needed at the time help to close the gap between his paycheck and his current bills.

So, usually ... I usually start at 200, is usually the first thing that I say, just because it's a little bit more than ... it's more than 100, but it's doable for some people, for most people. But then I also put into consideration if I have any bills that need to be paid soon. I look at my bank account and I see how much money I have. So, I just try to figure that little bit out 'cause I pay ... 'cause I'm paying student loans, credit card, cable and internet, and then groceries and stuff like that. So, I add all of that

up. I try to figure out how much money I'm going to get on my actual paycheck, and then I'll base the pricing off of there.

Similarly, a 43-year-old Black participant from NYC based his rate for a given exchange encounter on his current expenses. When asked whether there are any reasons why he would ask a client for more money than he charged, he replied.

Yeah, I need to pay rent, and the rent for that week is \$175. After that, you need to be able to eat, you need to be able to get on a train, you need to be able to do laundry, you need to do a whole lot of stuff. Your rate will be like, you know what, you're starting at \$175 in your head, and then after you say, "You know what? I need \$50 more, and then \$25 dollars more, so that's \$225." So you're gonna do \$250.

### Fee-Setting Approaches

Participants varied in their approaches when negotiating payment with potential clients and reported differences in their level of flexibility and the degree to which different factors played a role in determining price. A 29-year-old White participant from Baltimore described the finesse required to negotiate an acceptable fee for services.

I feel like I definitely employ market segmentation to the max. I try to extract as much money as I can without being too needy, but there's obviously a negotiating table that both people come to, and it is like a dance because you can easily piss someone off, you know, if you are asking too much.

Some participants always set the fee with clients upfront and were firm on their pricing. For instance, a 35-year-old White man from Chicago explained why he became set on charging a non-negotiable standard hourly rate that was the same for everyone. He stated that he had found that negotiating generally led to less desirable clients, rather than more respectful ones who also tended to want to see him on a regular basis.

I have a set, pretty much, rate. If they don't want to do it then they just... I don't see 'em. I'm pretty... my foot down on that because I've learned that, I mean they will try to kind of take not advantage of you, but try to talk you down in price and just can't do it because if you let them do it once, then they're going to expect it all the time. It's just better to stay firm with your pricing. I'm pretty set on that. ... Yeah, I think in the beginning, the first few months of being here I was a little more flexible but then I started to realize they weren't necessarily... the people who were trying to talk you down too much in price were people that you didn't necessarily want to be around. Because the guys that do it on a regular, they're professional about it almost. So, the ones that like, "We'll pay your price and not talk you down," stuff like that, are the ones who are going to probably become regulars because, it's like professional's the wrong word, but they're very experienced at being a client. So, they just understand and kind of respect what you do because some people don't respect. If they don't respect you, they're going to want to pay you less and they don't think you're worth that money. So, I think that's what it is, is more of a respect thing for me to stay firm on those prices.

A 28-year-old Latino participant from D.C. also provided his rates to potential clients and tried to avoid negotiation.

No, I try not to negotiate. I try to let them know, well, I let them know what the price is and if there's any problem with that, we talk about it. Pretty much if it's not what I want then it's not going to happen. ... I ask for cash. I ask for between 200, 250 and that's just a session. It doesn't necessarily, I would give them maybe two hours of my time for that. Anything above that, it has to be discussed. Like overnight, I really try not to because I don't want to stay at someone's house overnight. Just pretty much the flat rate and, yeah, that's all we discuss. Anything overnight usually I'm not doing so it's not something that I try to talk about.

Others preferred to have the prospective client first propose an amount he wanted to spend and then set realistic expectations about services that could buy; this was done in an effort to try to avoid haggling. For example, a 31-year-old White participant from NYC typically asked potential clients what they were willing to pay and then told them what they could receive for that amount.

Some people will say, "This is what I have," and then it's like, "What can you give for this amount?" so that's usually what it is. That's usually kind of how I start it. I'm like, "Well, what are you willing to pay?" It's like this amount, and then I'm like, "Okay, then you can get this, this, and this." If it's the other way around where they're kind of like, "Well, I want this, this, and this," and then I set a price, and then it kind of becomes this awful haggling thing. Yeah, usually it's like they'll say, "This is what I'm willing to do." You have some people that are like, they want to do so little, and they'll give you so much, or you'll have some people that want to do so much and give you nothing. Yeah, I usually let them set the number, and then go from there.

Similarly, a 38-year-old Black participant from D.C. who had a flexible approach to negotiating fees also preferred that the prospective client initially propose an amount he wanted to pay for the encounter and then negotiate with him if what he proposed was unacceptable. He described his approach for determining an acceptable amount for proposed activities.

Well, I try to make things as friendly as possible. So generally, I try to get right into it to not waste time. I ask them how they're doing. I let them kind of generally start off the conversation, 'cause they'll be like, "So I saw your ad and I'm hitting you up to see what's up," and all that. Then we get into it and I'm like, "Well, what are you looking for?" Then we'll get into it and I'll say, "Well, this is what I can do." And then they'll be like, "Well, how much is it?" I'll be like, "What are you willing to pay?" 'Cause I just don't set a certain amount out there. I let them negotiate, and then if it's something that I'm willing to go with, I'll be like, "Okay." But if it's something that I'm not willing to accept, I honestly let them know. I'll be like, "That's not something that I can do that for." And then they'll offer more. Or they'll just turn it down, either or.



Some participants emphasized that fee setting was not always a straightforward calculation simply based upon an hourly rate or by sex act. For example, a 23-year-old White participant from D.C. stated he used to give clients specific rates according to a “if we do X then it’ll cost this amount” approach. He eventually determined that he needed a different method for negotiating the price of an exchange encounter, using “something more of a heuristic ... [to arrive] at what seems like an appropriate price and maybe there’s a negotiation.” He said there were a lot of “complicating factors” including which sex acts would occur, the level of preparation required of him, how far he would have to travel if it was an out-call, how attractive the potential client was, how awkward or nervous the potential client seemed which made servicing him harder, how wealthy he appeared to be, the proposed length of the encounter, whether the potential client was interested in being a regular or only in having a onetime meeting. Considering these factors in combination helped him to arrive at a proposed amount for a given encounter with a potential exchange partner. He related:

You have to figure out what’s an acceptable amount for different guys because even if it’s not direct negotiation, I sort of have to play a bit of a guessing game. It’s almost the Price is Right, guessing a number that’s acceptable without going over.

## Discussion

The rise of the Internet and mobile apps has created the opportunity for MSWs to operate completely independently, keep all they earn, and have an efficient and effective way to meet clients. This in turn has enabled them to set their own fees and to vary them as they choose across clients. As cited above, Logan (2016) noted that FSWs more often work through an intermediary (e.g., a madam, pimp, brothel, agency) than MSWs and consequently do not enjoy as much control over the terms of their work (Logan, 2016). This report adds to the understanding of fee-setting considerations of MSWs living in several large US cities who primarily meet clients through dating and hookup websites or apps and work independently. Very little qualitative research has previously investigated the factors that influence what is charged for a given exchange encounter.

As with other service-oriented jobs, participants determined their fees largely based on the particular services the client was requesting and the associated risks or demands involved. Specifically, they considered things like what services the client was requesting; the amount of preparation and effort that would be required for them to satisfy the client’s needs; how much risk to their health these activities posed; and how much physical or psychological discomfort they were likely to experience if they provided the services requested. In many occupations, it is recognized that workers can reasonably expect a premium for doing risky, dirty or otherwise disagreeable tasks. Participants seemed to abide by this notion and typically asked for more money for engaging in acts that put them at risk for HIV or STIs, or that made them emotionally or physically uncomfortable. For example, receptive anal sex raised multiple considerations; it posed a higher risk for acquiring HIV, necessitated preparation time before the encounter, made some participants feel vulnerable or not in a position of control and could be physically uncomfortable or damaging to the rectal area. These considerations often led participants to charge more for this activity.

A premium price was also applied when “kinks” or “fetishes” that went beyond basic masturbation, oral sex or anal intercourse were involved. When participants were asked to engage in activities that pushed them beyond their comfort zone, but that they felt were nevertheless acceptable and safe, they also typically asked for more than their standard or minimum fee. For the “right price,” most were willing to step outside their comfort zone and give the client what he wanted, although some were adamant about not engaging in condomless anal sex irrespective of the amount the client might offer. Men who pay for sex with men may come to the commercial sex market because they find it difficult in the non-commercial sex market to have the kind of sexual experiences they desire (Harriman et al., 2007; Sanders et al., 2020). However, even within the commercial market some men might have trouble finding a sex worker willing to fulfill unconventional or what some might consider degrading sexual desires. In such cases, sex workers would have greater leverage in the negotiation process to demand higher fees.

The planned duration of the meeting with the client was another factor that men considered in setting their fees. Presumably this was because they recognized that a longer meeting was physically and, in some cases, psychologically more taxing, but also that “time is money”; that is, more time spent with one client might mean foregoing the income of servicing another one. So, all the time spent with the client had to be compensated and thus was an important determinant in setting fees. Some simply charged a fixed amount for a given block of time, such as each hour, while others charged a certain amount for say the first hour, but would reduce the price for each additional hour, presumably to make it more financially feasible and attractive to clients to extend the session.

Unlike what has been reported in some research on sex workers (DeAngelo et al., 2019), these participants did not report setting a higher fee for out-calls than for in-calls to offset the time spent traveling to the client. While location was discussed ahead of time for logistical purposes and to allow the participant to evaluate its likely safety (Siegel et al., 2023a), travel time was not reported as a consideration in setting fees. Some actually reported a reluctance or inability to host clients, so preferred out-calls. However, a few did mention that they negotiated, separate from their rates, client coverage of the costs of a car service to out-calls, particularly those not nearby, or coverage of travel costs for longer-distance excursions. Possibly travel time didn’t enter into their fee-setting considerations prominently because the participants mostly were from urban settings and so didn’t typically have to travel far to meet a client.

Prior research with FSWs has found some evidence that attractive workers received higher fees (Gertler et al., 2005; Griffith et al., 2016). Interestingly, participants did not discuss factoring in what they believed was their own attractiveness or desirability (possibly related to their youthfulness) into setting their fees. However, it has been noted that men who possess more erotic capital do have more power with regard to setting the terms of their sexual interactions with others (Logan, 2017b). In the case of MSWs, this would presumably include setting fees. So, it is somewhat surprising participants did not explicitly mention their own physical attractiveness or youthfulness, which would presumably appeal to many clients, as a consideration in setting their fees. Perhaps they assumed that the large majority of men who enter sex work possess a certain level of attractiveness that is “above average”

and therefore being attractive is not such a differentiating characteristic. Still given that as Logan (2017b), observed, “Gay men have well-known and well-researched tendencies to value youth and physical appearance in sexual partners” (Logan, 2017b, p. 181), it is somewhat surprising that participants did not cite their own desirability based on age or physical characteristics as a common consideration in setting their prices.

Men in this study did, however, often consider a potential client’s attractiveness in setting their fees. Some participants apparently felt it was less work to service appealing partners, and it might even be pleasurable, and therefore were willing to accept a lower fee from them. The authors previously reported that some study participants felt a psychological reward when an attractive man was willing to pay them for sex as it seemed to validate their own attractiveness or desirability (Siegel et al., 2023b). Perhaps this was enough in some instances to allow them to be willing to accept a lower fee from an attractive client. Indeed, some participants acknowledged they would have been willing to have sex with some of their attractive clients even without being paid. Participants often reported proposing higher rates to potential clients that they found unattractive. This was done either in hope that the clients would simply seek out another less expensive sex worker, or if the client accepted their fee, they would at least be compensated for a more challenging situation in which to perform sexually. It was often older clients who they found physically unappealing, and they felt required more effort to service.

Gertler et al (2005) found that FSWs relied upon clues derived from a male client’s appearance, communication skills and perceived economic status to decide on a rate that they believed the client was likely to be able and willing to pay (Gertler et al., 2005). Some participants also used clues about a potential client they obtained through their pre-meeting video chats, or from researching the person online, or from what they knew about the client’s neighborhood or hotel, to help them assess how high a fee the client could likely afford and find acceptable. They commonly increased their requested fees if they perceived a client to be wealthy and easily able to pay a higher price for exchange sex.

Participants also considered their own financial needs at the time when setting fees for a client. Some participants were more flexible about their fees and were willing to accept lower fees when they had an immediate need for more money and alternative sources of income were not readily available or inadequate. In some cases, they would try to make up for the lost income by seeing more clients. Alternatively, some tried to increase the amount they asked for their services when their financial needs were greater or more urgent.

On the other hand, some participants, when financially secure with other sources of income available to meet immediate needs, were much less willing to be flexible or accept less than their usual fees. These men could afford to wait for a client who was willing and able to pay what they wanted to make. Further, since many participants did not rely solely on sex work for their income but rather used the money they earned from sex work for discretionary spending or to supplement income from another job, they were able to hold reasonably firm on their pricing.

Participants also described varied negotiating styles or tactics in setting fees. While some men set fees that they firmly adhered to, others were more flexible although most tried not to accept below a certain amount for different activities when negotiating a fee. This base rate was usually per hour and/or by sex act. Some participants asked potential clients how much they wanted to spend and then told them what they could receive for that amount of money. For those who asked clients what they were willing to pay, they often did so to either avoid haggling over the cost for a specific service should the client's proposed fee be acceptable, or because they chose to start negotiating from the client's initial offer if it was deemed too low, rather than state a fee that might be unacceptably high. However, some also recognized a potential client might offer more than what the participant would ask him to pay, so they let the client first suggest a fee to avoid underpricing their services.

### Limitations

Several study limitations should be noted. One is that participants were recruited from eight US urban centers, the transferability of the findings to MSWs in other cities, small towns, suburban or rural areas is restricted. Furthermore, the way in which fees are set among MSWs, who like our participants primarily use dating/hookup websites and apps to find clients, may differ from MSWs who rely solely or primarily on other venues to obtain clients. This study did not examine the health outcomes of different price setting arrangements reported by participants as it was not designed to do so. However, it would be valuable to investigate this important issue in subsequent studies of sex workers. It must also be acknowledged that some clients of MSW may read this article and use the information it contains about the strategies MSW use to obtain higher fees to resist those strategies and potentially compromising the income of some workers. They might also share the information with other clients (e.g., through online forums) who would also use it to negotiate lower fees. Finally, women also engage in online sex work and future research should examine differences between them and male sex workers fee-setting practices and how they may relate to sexual risk taking with clients.

### Funding

This work was supported by the National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities under Grant R01MD011587, "Exchange Sex and HIV Risk Among MSM Online" (PIs: Siegel/Schrimshaw).

### Availability of Data and Materials

All reasonable requests will be considered.

### References

- Adriaenssens S, & Hendrickx J (2012). Sex, price and preferences: Accounting for unsafe sexual practices in prostitution markets: Accounting for unsafe sexual practices in prostitution. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 34(5), 665–680. 10.1111/j.1467-9566.2011.01400.x [PubMed: 22103861]
- Argento E, Taylor M, Jollimore J, Taylor C, Jennex J, Krusi A, & Shannon K (2018). The loss of Boystown and transition to online sex work: Strategies and barriers to increase safety among men sex workers and clients of men. *American Journal of Men's Health*, 12(6), 1994–2005. 10.1177/1557988316655785

- Armstrong HL, Sang JM, Skala A, Wang L, Zhu J, Lachowsky NJ, Card KG, Benoit C, Olarewaju G, Hogg RS, Moore DM, & Roth EA (2021). Factors associated with transactional sex among a cohort of gay, bisexual, and other men who have sex with men in Vancouver, Canada. *Sexual Health*, 18(6), 487–497. 10.1071/SH21128
- Arunachalam R, & Shah M (2012). The prostitute's allure: The return to beauty in commercial sex work. *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*, 12(1). 10.1515/1935-1682.3203
- Bar-Johnson MD, & Weiss P (2015). A comparison of male sex workers in Prague: Internet escorts versus men who work in specialized bars and clubs. *Journal of Sex Research*, 52(3), 338–346. 10.1080/00224499.2013.848256 [PubMed: 24423089]
- Bimbi DS (2007). Male prostitution: Pathology, paradigms and progress in research. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 53(1–2), 7–35. 10.1300/J082v53n01\_02 [PubMed: 18019068]
- Bimbi DS, & Parsons JT (2005). Barebacking among internet based male sex workers. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Psychotherapy*, 9(3–4), 85–105. 10.1300/J236v09n03\_06
- Blackwell CW, & Dziegielewski SF (2013). Risk for a price: Sexual activity solicitations in online male sex worker profiles. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 39(2), 159–170. 10.1080/01488376.2012.744617
- Cameron S, Collins A, & Thew N (1999). Prostitution services: An exploratory empirical analysis. *Applied Economics*, 31(12), 1523–1529. 10.1080/000368499323049
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC]. (2016). HIV infection risk, prevention, and testing behaviors among men who have sex with men—National HIV Behavioral Surveillance, 20 U.S. Cities, 2014 (15; HIV Surveillance Special Report). <http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/pdf/library/reports/surveillance/cdc-hiv-hssr-nhbs-msm-2014.pdf>
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC]. (2019). HIV infection risk, prevention, and testing behaviors among men who have sex with men—National HIV Behavioral Surveillance, 23 U.S. Cities, 2017 (22; HIV Surveillance Special Report). <https://npin.cdc.gov/publication/hiv-infection-risk-prevention-and-testing-behaviors-among-men-who-have-sex-men-national>
- Chang H-H, & Weng Y (2012). What is more important for prostitute price? Physical appearance or risky sex behavior? *Economics Letters*, 117(2), 480–483. 10.1016/j.econlet.2012.06.041
- Cunningham S, & Kendall TD (2011). Prostitution 2.0: The changing face of sex work. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 69(3), 273–287. 10.1016/j.jue.2010.12.001
- Dank M, Yahner J, Madden K, Bañuelos I, Yu L, Ritchie A, Mora M, & Conner B (2015). Surviving the streets of New York: Experiences of LGBTQ youth, YMSM, and YWSW engaged in survival sex. Urban Institute. <http://www.urban.org/research/publication/surviving-streets-new-york-experiences-lgbtq-youth-ymsm-and-ywsw-engaged-survival-sex>
- DeAngelo G, Shapiro JN, Borowitz J, Cafarella M, Ré C, & Shiffman G (2019). Pricing risk in prostitution: Evidence from online sex ads. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 59(3), 281–305. 10.1007/s11166-019-09317-1
- Egger PH, & Lindenblatt A (2015). Endogenous risk-taking and physical appearance of sex workers. *The European Journal of Health Economics*, 16(9), 941–949. 10.1007/s10198-014-0640-2 [PubMed: 25330858]
- Gertler P, Shah M, & Bertozzi SM (2005). Risky business: The market for unprotected commercial sex. *Journal of Political Economy*, 113(3), 518–550. 10.1086/429700
- Griffith JD, Capiola A, Balotti B, Hart CL, & Turner R (2016). Online female escort advertisements: The cost of sex. *Evolutionary Psychology*, 14(2). 10.1177/1474704916651270
- Harriman RL, Johnston B, & Kenny PM (2007). Musings on male sex work: A “virtual” discussion. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 53(1–2), 277–318. 10.1300/J082v53n01\_12 [PubMed: 18019078]
- Henriksen TD, Andersen D, & Presser L (2020). “Not a real prostitute”: Narrative imagination, social policy, and care for men who sell sex. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, 17(3), 442–453. 10.1007/s13178-019-00407-y
- Islam A, & Smyth R (2012). The economic returns to good looks and risky sex in the Bangladesh commercial sex market. *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*, 12(1). 10.1515/1935-1682.3059

- Jackson KJ, & Judge SM (2021). Age- and race-related differences in advertised health behaviors among male sex workers in San Francisco who have sex with men. *Journal of the Association of Nurses in AIDS Care*, 32(1), 57–67. 10.1097/JNC.000000000000199
- Jones A (2015). Sex work in a digital era. *Sociology Compass*, 9(7), 558–570. 10.1111/soc4.12282
- Kille J, Bungay V, Oliffe J, & Atchison C (2017). A content analysis of health and safety communications among internet-based sex work advertisements: Important information for public health. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 19(4), e111. 10.2196/jmir.6746 [PubMed: 28408364]
- Lee-Gonyea JA, Castle T, & Gonyea NE (2009). Laid to order: Male escorts advertising on the Internet. *Deviant Behavior*, 30(4), 321–348. 10.1080/01639620802168858
- Logan TD (2016). The economics of male sex work. In Cunningham S & Shah M (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of the economics of prostitution* (Vol. 1, pp. 255–281). Oxford University Press. 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199915248.013.10
- Logan TD (2017a). Illicit intersections: The value of sex worker services. In *Economics, sexuality, and male sex work* (pp. 111–141). Cambridge University Press. 10.1017/9781316423899
- Logan TD (2017b). Service fees: Masculinity, safer sex, and male sex work. In *Economics, sexuality, and male sex work* (pp. 171–203). Cambridge University Press. 10.1017/9781316423899
- Logan TD, & Shah M (2013). Face value: Information and signaling in an illegal market. *Southern Economic Journal*, 79(3), 529–564. 10.4284/0038-4038-2011.119
- MacPhail C, Scott J, & Minichiello V (2015). Technology, normalisation and male sex work. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 17(4), 483–495. 10.1080/13691058.2014.951396
- McLean A (2015). ‘You can do it from your sofa’: The increasing popularity of the internet as a working site among male sex workers in Melbourne. *Journal of Sociology*, 51(4), 887–902. 10.1177/1440783313480416
- Meunier É, Cai X, Bamonte A, Callander D, & Schrimshaw EW (2021). Exchange sex and condom use among gay, bisexual, and other men who have sex with men who use social and sexual networking technologies. *Annals of LGBTQ Public and Population Health*, 2(2), 170–184. 10.1891/LGBTQ-2020-0058
- Mimiaga MJ, Hughto JMW, Klasko-Foster L, Jin H, Mayer KH, Safren SA, & Biello KB (2021). Substance use, mental health problems, and physical and sexual violence additively increase hiv risk between male sex workers and their male clients in Northeastern United States. *JAIDS Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes*, 86(3), 305–312. 10.1097/QAI.0000000000002563 [PubMed: 33148992]
- Mimiaga MJ, Reisner SL, Tinsley JP, Mayer KH, & Safren SA (2009). Street workers and internet escorts: Contextual and psychosocial factors surrounding HIV risk behavior among men who engage in sex work with other men. *Journal of Urban Health*, 86(1), 54–66. 10.1007/s11524-008-9316-5 [PubMed: 18780186]
- Minichiello V, Marino R, Browne J, Jamieson M, Peterson K, Reuter B, & Robinson K (2002). Male sex workers in three Australian cities. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 42(1), 29–51. 10.1300/J082v42n01\_02
- Minichiello V, Scott J, & Callander D (2013). New pleasures and old dangers: Reinventing male sex work. *Journal of Sex Research*, 50(3–4), 263–275. 10.1080/00224499.2012.760189 [PubMed: 23480072]
- Minichiello V, Scott J, & Callander D (2015). A new public health context to understand male sex work. *BMC Public Health*, 15. 10.1186/s12889-015-1498-7
- Moffatt PG, & Peters SA (2004). Pricing personal services: An empirical study of earnings in the UK prostitution industry. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, 51(5), 675–690. 10.1111/j.0036-9292.2004.00327.x
- Morris M (2021). The limits of labelling: Incidental sex work among gay, bisexual, and queer young men on social media. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, 18(4), 855–868. 10.1007/s13178-021-00603-9
- Nerlander LM, Hess KL, Sionean C, Rose CE, Thorson A, Broz D, & Paz-Bailey G (2017). Exchange sex and HIV infection among men who have sex with men: 20 US cities, 2011. *AIDS and Behavior*, 21(8), 2283–2294. 10.1007/s10461-016-1450-6 [PubMed: 27307181]

- Pruitt MV (2005). Online boys: Male-for-male internet escorts. *Sociological Focus*, 38(3), 189–203. 10.1080/00380237.2005.10571265
- Quaife M, Lépine A, Deering K, Terris-Prestholt F, Beattie T, Isac S, Paranjape RS, & Vickerman P (2019). The cost of safe sex: Estimating the price premium for unprotected sex during the Avahan HIV Prevention Programme in India. *Health Policy and Planning*, 34(10), 784–791. 10.1093/heapol/czz100 [PubMed: 31603470]
- Raine G (2021). Violence against male sex workers: A systematic scoping review of quantitative data. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 68(2), 336–357. 10.1080/00918369.2019.1656029 [PubMed: 31469348]
- Rao V, Gupta I, Lokshin M, & Jana S (2003). Sex workers and the cost of safe sex: The compensating differential for condom use among Calcutta prostitutes. *Journal of Development Economics*, 71(2), 585–603. 10.1016/S0304-3878(03)00025-7
- Reisner SL, Mimiaga MJ, Mayer KH, Tinsley JP, & Safren SA (2008). Tricks of the trade: Sexual health behaviors, the context of HIV risk, and potential prevention intervention strategies for male sex workers. *Journal of LGBT Health Research*, 4(4), 195–209. 10.1080/15574090903114739 [PubMed: 19928046]
- Sanders T (2016). Inevitably violent? Dynamics of space, Governance, and stigma in understanding violence against sex workers. In Special issue: problematizing prostitution: Critical research and scholarship (Vol. 71, pp. 93–114). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. 10.1108/S1059-433720160000071005
- Sanders T, Brents B, & Wakefield C (2020). *Paying for sex in a digital age: US and UK perspectives* (1st ed.). Routledge. 10.4324/9780429454370
- Scott J, Minichiello V, Mariño R, Harvey GP, Jamieson M, & Browne J (2005). Understanding the new context of the male sex work industry. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20(3), 320–342. 10.1177/0886260504270334 [PubMed: 15684140]
- Shah M (2013). Do sex workers respond to disease? Evidence from the male market for sex. *American Economic Review*, 103(3), 445–450. 10.1257/aer.103.3.445 [PubMed: 29524928]
- Siegel K, Cabán M, Brown-Bradley CJ, & Schrimshaw EW (2023a). Male sex workers' strategies to manage client-related risks of violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 38(19–20), 10814–10838. 10.1177/08862605231176804 [PubMed: 37232155]
- Siegel K, Chen A, & Schrimshaw EW (2023b). Dating and hookup apps and websites as facilitators of entry into sex work. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, 20, 1830–1847. 10.1007/s13178-023-00809-z
- Siegel K, Sundelson AE, Meunier É, & Schrimshaw EW (2022). Perceived stigma and stigma management strategies among online male sex workers. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 51(5), 2711–2730. 10.1007/s10508-021-02266-4 [PubMed: 35676566]
- Smith MD, Grov C, Seal DW, & McCall P (2013). A social-cognitive analysis of how young men become involved in male escorting. *Journal of Sex Research*, 50(1), 1–10. 10.1080/00224499.2012.681402 [PubMed: 22880726]
- Uy JM, Parsons JT, Bimbi DS, Koken JA, & Halkitis PN (2004). Gay and bisexual male escorts who advertise on the internet: Understanding reasons for and effects of involvement in commercial sex. *International Journal of Men's Health*, 3(1). <http://www.mensstudies.info/OJS/index.php/IJMH/article/view/436>
- Valente PK, Mantell JE, Masvawure TB, Tocco JU, Restar AJ, Gichangi P, Chabeda SV, Lafort Y, & Sandfort TG (2020). “I couldn't afford to resist”: Condom negotiations between male sex workers and male clients in Mombasa, Kenya. *AIDS and Behavior*, 24(3), 925–937. 10.1007/s10461-019-02598-2 [PubMed: 31321637]

**Table 1**Participant characteristics ( $N = 180$ )

	<i>n</i>	%
Age group (in years)		
18 to 24	59	(32.8)
25 to 29	44	(24.4)
30 to 35	47	(26.1)
36 to 45	30	(16.7)
Race/ethnicity		
White, not Hispanic	68	(37.8)
Latino, any race	66	(36.7)
Black, not Hispanic	46	(25.6)
Born in the USA	155	(86.1)
Gender identity		
Cisgender man	170	(94.4)
Gender nonconforming	10	(5.6)
Sexual identity		
Gay/Queer	154	(85.6)
Bisexual/Pansexual/Heterosexual/Other/No label	26	(14.4)
Residence		
NYC	85	(47.2)
Washington, DC	23	(12.8)
Philadelphia	22	(12.2)
Chicago	19	(10.6)
Baltimore	9	(5.0)
Atlanta	10	(5.6)
Boston	6	(3.3)
Detroit	6	(3.3)
Education		
High School or less	31	(17.2)
Some college or Associates	59	(32.8)
Bachelor's	56	(31.1)
Graduate	34	(18.9)
Student status		
Not currently in school	132	(73.3)
Currently in school	48	(26.7)
Income (from all sources) ( $N = 177$ )		
Under \$20,000	72	(40.7)
\$20,000 to \$59,999	72	(40.7)
\$60,000 or more	33	(18.6)
Number of clients in the past 3 months		
Mean	6.9	



	<i>n</i>	%
Median	4	
Interquartile range	3–7	

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript