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ABSTRACT

This research evaluates a prostitution offender program (commonly called a “johns’ school”) located in a large Midwestern city. I evaluate the components of the program, its philosophy, the short- and long-term effectiveness of the program, and its implementation to determine whether it is effective in deterring men from hiring prostitutes. By comparing pre- and post-test attitudinal forms and participants’ assessment of the effectiveness of the program, I have determined that this program is effective in changing the attitudes of men that attend the program, but there are several improvements that the program organizers could implement to increase its effectiveness.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Prostitution is a widely researched topic in the social sciences. Most past and current research focuses on women involved in prostitution, examining their paths to prostitution: drug use, abuse history and risk for spreading sexually transmitted disease. Little research has focused on the men that frequent prostitutes, though as Bollough and Bollough (1996) point out, “an explanation of prostitution also requires an examination of the patrons and their needs” (166). This dearth in the literature is probably because there is little access to men that solicit prostitutes and their services. A new branch of community policing, commonly referred to as “johns’ schools,” can allow researchers more access to men that seek out prostitutes.

HISTORY OF PROSTITUTION

Despite the common adage, prostitution is probably not the world’s oldest profession, but references to prostitution and prostitutes have certainly had their place in both world and America history. The first appearance of a prostitute in world literature occurs in the epic story Gilgamesh, a story more than four thousand years old (Ringdal, 1997: 11). Recorded instances of prostitution have been recovered among ancient Babylonians; ancient Jews accepted prostitution “without any moral condemnation,” and women in ancient Cyprus were required to become prostitutes to be considered marriageable (Flowers, 1998: 5). Prostitution has likely occurred in most cultures and throughout time, but it is not always equally present across time and place. Ringdal claims that prostitution flourishes when a society is in flux, especially during a “rapid upsurge in the population, urbanization, migration and economic transformation” (1997: 7). This undoubtedly reflects the nature of prostitution in the United States.
**Prostitution in the 19th Century United States**

Prostitution took hold in the United States in the late 18th century (D’Emilio and Freedman, 1997). Industrialization and economic displacement caused many young women to move to cities, where domestic work was often available but highly undesirable—it did not pay well, and domestic workers were often vulnerable to the advances of their male employers (Rosen, 1982). In addition, the increasing presence of single, wage-earning men created, for the first time, high demand for the prostitute’s services. Because of the emphasis on sexual purity of women, and the “natural” lust of men, even higher-class men used the services of prostitutes, and were able to justify their behavior, as it protected the purity of upper-class women. By the 1830s, prostitution became visible on urban streets, even outside of large, urbanized cities such as New York City. In the 1850s, Dr. William Sanger “estimated that there were over six thousand prostitutes, or one for every sixty-four men, in New York City” (D’Emilio and Freedman, 1997: 133).

The Southern states, which urbanized much later, had less prostitution, arguably because white men could rape and seduce slaves with impunity. Regardless of the availability of slaves, prostitutes were present in the Southern states before the Civil War, and the ratio of prostitutes to men was higher in some Southern cites than in the Northern ones (D’Emilio and Freedman, 1997). During the Civil War, prostitution became far more common: women congregated where men were encamped, and it is also likely that the destruction of homes, businesses and farms led more women to prostitution than ever before.

The settlement of Western states also increased the presence of prostitution in the United States in the 19th century. Because of the large numbers of men and few numbers of women in settlements in Western states, there were increased demands for prostitutes and brothels.
(D’Emilio and Freedman, 1997: 135). Prostitution was the most popular occupation for women working outside the home in the Nevada territory, and prostitutes outnumbered women in other occupations by a ratio of twenty-five to one (D’Emilio and Freedman, 1997). Prostitution drew in Native American women living near military encampments in the West, and thousands of Chinese women came were lured to the United States with false promises of marriage and jobs, and then were forced into prostitution (D’Emilio and Freedman, 1997). The 1870s Census reported that two-thirds of Chinese women worked as prostitutes (D’Emilio and Freedman, 1997: 135). At this point, though, prostitution was largely a female profession: madams ran brothels, and men had not yet started to play the role of “pimp.”

Much like today, female prostitutes of the 19th century were likely to become involved in prostitution because of poverty. Many of the prostitutes that Dr. William Sanger surveyed in the 1850s were foreign-born or impoverished. Many decided that despite the risks to their personal safety and health, prostitution was preferable choice over the low-paying and demeaning jobs that were available as domestic servants. City officials tolerated prostitution as a “necessary evil,” but as social reformers attempted to control male sexuality in the late 19th century, more and more emphasis was put on eradicating prostitution (Rosen, 1982).

The sexual “double-standard” facilitated the expansion of prostitution during the 19th century. Women were viewed as needing to control male sexuality (male sexuality was seen as greater than women’s sexual desire), and female purity and honor was highly valued because it maintained the legitimacy of the family (Rosen, 1982). Prostitution was viewed as a “marital safety-valve” that allowed men to express this high sexual desire, and left their wives free from unwanted sex and pregnancy—prostitution was a “necessary evil,” and so laws against prostitution were rarely enforced (D’Emilio and Freedman, 1997).
Social reformers focused on prostitution for many reasons. First, prostitution and sexual commerce epitomized the separation of sex from love and intimacy. Second, prostitution violated the social norm of female chastity and virtue. Third, it exposed the double-standard of sexuality. In addition, prostitution heightened fears of epidemics of disease. D’Emilio and Freedman argue that the expansion of Protestantism also led to the attempts to reform prostitutes and abolish prostitution. The convergence of women’s belief in their role as the preservers of morality, along with Protestantism’s emphasis on solving social problems led to middle-class women founding missions that “ministered to impoverished widows, orphans, and prisoners and tried to convert prostitutes to a purer life” (D’Emilio and Freedman, 1997: 142). Unlike male reformers, though, who targeted prostitutes as a “source of depravity and a threat to men’s health,” these women argued that prostitutes were victimized women led into prostitution by immoral men, and that very few women truly desired to become prostitutes (D’Emilio and Freedman, 1997: 143). They attempted to return prostitutes to the standard of virtuous womanhood—whether the prostitute wanted to, or not. And although it doesn’t seem that many of the prostitutes wanted to live a middle-class lifestyle, and many did not view themselves as victims, the Protestant reformers persisted in their attempts “because they served both real and symbolic functions for women reformers for whom the attack on prostitution was a permissible outlet to question men’s authority, men’s sexual conduct, and women’s dependence on men” (D’Emilio and Freedman, 1997: 144).

Female reformers sought to expose men that sought out the services of a prostitute, either on the street or in brothels. They threatened to publish the names of men who engaged in extra-marital sex in their newsletters, and women outside city limits revealed the name of adulterers,
stopped men while they solicited prostitutes on the street, and targeted employers who made sexual advances on their employees and servants (D’Emilio and Freedman, 1997).

Protestant reformers were largely middle-class women, though, and bought into the ideology of women as the regulators of morality, sexuality, and all things family. Their revolutionary idea was that the female prostitute should not be condemned, but they challenged prostitution because “sexuality outside the family threatened the only identities available to them—that of wives and mothers. Prostitution could destroy the base of their world” (D’Emilio and Freedman, 1997: 145). They were unable to understand the world of the working-class, which had a different sexual ideology. But, their attempts at reform were innovative in that they stepped out of their households, out of their roles as wives and mothers, and organized and became activists based on their belief in “female moral superiority” (D’Emilio and Freedman, 1997: 145).

By the late 19th century, reform efforts changed from converting prostitutes to middle-class values to preventing women from becoming prostitutes in the first place. This goal was difficult to achieve, though, because of the fact that most women entered prostitution for economic reasons, and reformers had almost no ability to remedy the economic deprivation that many women faced. While some reformers literally rescued women from lives of forced prostitution and transported them to safe houses, most worked to create social services that would help women not to become prostitutes in the first place. They established agencies that catered to immigrant women, and taught them how to avoid being exploited; they established clubs of young working-class women to help them avoid entering prostitution. Although the reformers “could be as condescending as they were ‘uplifting’” (demanding that women adopt middle-class ideas of sexuality, for example), they were some of the first reformers to realize that
structural factors had a large role to play in the lives of women, and their prevention efforts provided women with services and resources not available elsewhere (D’Emilio and Freedman, 1997; Rosen, 1982).

The Women’s Christian Temperance Union (WCTU), founded in 1874, focused their reform efforts of elevating men’s sexual standards to that of women’s. They created sex education programs that focused on helping men resist sexual temptation, and encouraged men that were dedicated to resisting temptation to wear white ribbons to symbolize their new-found purity. They lobbied to have age-of-consent laws increased, based on the belief that men led young women into prostitution—a change that protected lower-class women while it simultaneously restricted their sexual freedom. They were successful in confronting many Americans’ minds about the double-standard, challenging attempts to legalize prostitution, and increasing the age of consent in many states. But, prostitution continued to thrive in red-light districts, “away from the view of the middle-class” (D’Emilio and Freedman, 1997: 156).

**Prostitution in the 20th Century United States**

Attacks against prostitution in the 20th century begin with reformers focusing on “white slavery” (D’Emilio and Freedman, 1997: 208). “White slavery” is a term that was first introduced in 1902, and was “meant to differentiate between the enslavement of white women from the age-old practice of black enslavement” (Flowers, 1998: 9). Pamphlets, plays, movies and books warned young women and parents of the threat of being lured into prostitution with false promises of marriage or work; they encouraged young women to stay at home in the country and away from dangerous cities. The federal government addressed the “white slave trade” panic by targeting immigration, passing laws that allowed for traffickers to be deported, along with any immigrant prostitute women. Local and state addressed sexual trafficking by
surveying their towns and cities for sites where prostitutes worked and were solicited. They found that prostitution occurred “wherever [they] chose to look,” in the largest cities and smallest towns in the United States (D’Emilio and Freedman, 1997: 210). “Red-light abatement” laws, allowing citizens to lodge complaints against brothels and houses of prostitution, were passed in thirty-one states between 1909 and 1917, and were successfully used to shut down red-light districts in several large cities (D’Emilio and Freedman, 1997: 211). In fact, until 1918 the only legal definition of prostitution occurred in the Indiana law (Flowers, 1998).

World War I brought new reforms regarding prostitution. Progressive-era reformers focused on troops going overseas, and reformers “descended on military camps to provide GIs with wholesome recreation, instruct them on sexual hygiene, and clothe them…with an ‘invisible armor’ for their protection overseas” (D’Emilio and Freedman, 1997: 211). They encouraged soldiers, through the use of posters and pamphlets, to practice self-control when encountering foreign prostitutes, emphasizing the dangers of venereal disease. They also restricted the areas around military bases, shutting down red-light districts that were established near where men were encamped. The fact that the military had tolerated prostitution during previous wars “would not be repeated” (D’Emilio and Freedman, 1997: 212).

Ultimately, though, the reformers efforts to dissuade soldiers from soliciting prostitutes failed. The army was more concerned about preserving the number of active troops than they were about curtailing their sexual practices, and were far more concerned about treating incidents of venereal disease than preventing it in the first place (dispensing several million treatments for venereal disease during World War I) (Clement, 2006). Reformers again were faced with the challenge of indoctrinating working-class individuals into a decidedly middle-class ideology, and they ultimately failed at that, too. Finally, they failed at convincing the commanding officers of
the army that the double-standard of sexuality was at fault, and that men’s lust was to blame for prostitution. Instead of educating their soldiers, the military simply rounded up prostitutes and held them in detention camps, “forcibly holding more than fifteen thousand [prostitutes] in detention centers for periods averaging ten weeks. No men were arrested for patronizing prostitutes” (D’Emilio and Freedman, 1997: 212).

Reformers were successful in some ways. They were successful in shutting down many of the red-light districts around the country, and changed how the American government dealt with venereal disease. But, they were not successful in ending prostitution—indeed, it simply changed its location and form, and the female-run brothel disappeared, displaced by the streetwalker, call girl, and pimp. “The new structure made the working-class prostitute more vulnerable to police harassment, and shifted control of her day-to-day life from the madame…to the male pimp who controlled her street activities with the threat, sometimes fulfilled, of violence” (D’Emilio and Freedman, 1997: 213).

D’Emilio and Freedman argue that American attacks against prostitution have often been “a master symbol, a code word, for a wide range of anxieties” (1997: 215). By attacking prostitution and the red-light districts, Progressive-era reformers simultaneously voiced their displeasure with the changing sexual politics of the early 20th century—women were leaving the home to work, commercialization of all things sexual, and the changing of sexual norms and mores. They virulently opposed any suggestion of female sexual desire outside of marriage and they were unwilling to listen to prostitutes about why they engaged in the work that they did. After listening to prostitutes give plausible reasons as to why they had entered prostitution, including more pay, freedom, and less degrading working conditions than other jobs available to them, George Kneeland wrote that few of the prostitutes he interviewed were willing to admit
that they had been tricked or forced into prostitution—“apparently, it was easier for him and others to believe in a vast underground traffic in women than to accept that working-class women might choose sex either for more or the excitement it brought” (D’Emilio and Freedman, 1997: 214). Reformers’ obsession with prostitution and venereal disease also tapped into the latent, and sometimes overt, racism of American society in the early 20th century. Problems with prostitution were often blamed on immigrants—either immigrant women becoming prostitutes, or traffickers in women that were foreign-born, despite the fact that most research showed that most prostitutes were native-born women (D’Emilio and Freedman, 1997). Dominant ideas about protecting white womanhood, and white womanhood alone, and ideas of the overactive sexuality of immigrants and African-Americans played into mainstream America’s fears of being “overrun” by corrupt foreigners (D’Emilio and Freedman, 1997: 215).

The American legal response to prostitution has remained stable over the past four decades (Weitzer, 2000: 159). Criminalization is the response that most American states use, excepting several counties in Nevada where brothels are allowed to operate legally. Approximately 90,000 arrests are made in the United States every year for violating anti-prostitution laws (Weitzer, 2000: 159). Despite $120 million in total expenditures in the country’s sixteen largest cities, police enforcement of anti-prostitution laws have had either one of two effects: prostitution is “(1) contained within a particular area where prostitutes are occasionally subjected to the revolving door of arrest, fines, brief jail time, and release, or (2) displaced into another locale where the same revolving-door dynamic recur” (Weitzer, 2000: 160; emphasis in original). Containment is the standard in the United States because displacement requires constant police activity that often cannot be sustained by local police forces (Weitzer, 2000). There are been very few movements toward legalization or
decriminalization of prostitution in the United States, except for the legalization of prostitution in brothels some areas of Nevada, which occurred in 1971. Legislators are reluctant to advocate for legalized or decriminalized prostitution, because of the implicit belief that legalizing prostitution simultaneously means condoning it.

Public support for a change in the prostitution laws is also not present in the United States: 61% of Americans surveyed believed a man spending the night with a prostitute was “morally wrong” and very few American citizens support the decriminalization of legalization of prostitution, although men are more likely to support decriminalization or legalization than women (Weitzer, 2000: 163). Despite the fact that there is almost no movement in toward regulating or controlling prostitution on the local, state or national levels of government, local and grass-roots organizations have developed to take a stance against prostitution. They have begun to take action against johns that patrol the streets for streetwalking prostitutes, including recording their license plates, coordinating citizen patrols of the streets, and public shaming (Weitzer, 2000). Public shame is “all the rage” in many American communities, and surveys have shown that the general public supports the public shaming of men who solicit prostitutes (Weitzer, 2000). Johns’ schools are attempt to more beyond the popular shaming techniques—the programs are designed to “shame, educate, and deter the men from future contact with prostitutes” (Weitzer, 2000: 172, emphasis in original).

Johns’ schools are rare in the United States, but they usually consist of an eight-hour program that addresses the physical, emotional and economic consequences of street prostitution (Van Brunschot, 2003). Speakers from the community, district attorney’s office, public health office, and former prostitutes address how street prostitution affects the community, the client’s health and family, and the prostitute’s health and well-being, “much like the classic ‘Scared
Straight’ programs for young offenders” (Wortley, Fischer and Webster, 2002:373). Attendance requires payment of the court fee, the fine for soliciting, and an additional fee (often several hundred dollars), which helps assume some of the costs of running the program. While the additional cost varies by location, successful completion of the program often results in the original solicitation arrest being expunged from the participant’s criminal record (on the condition that they are not re-arrested for a similar offense within one year).

An analysis of the customers of street prostitutes, and of the men that attend johns’ schools, can help researchers understand why men seek prostitutes and how programs can be designed to reduce recidivism. This evaluation research analyzes the program offered and its effectiveness by examining materials and measuring attitude changes of men that attended a johns’ school in a large Midwestern city.

Johns’ schools are a unique way to address the “double standard in which women are seen as responsible for male deviance...they are based on the idea that the current practice of arresting prostitutes but not their customers is ineffective and reflects a double standard in which women but not men are held accountable” (Monto, 2000:69). In addition, by focusing on the “demand side of the equation, holding men responsible for prostitution helps to redefine the prostitution encounter, in which men are seen as having a choice as to whether to buy sex and female prostitutes are seen as having less of a choice” (Monto, 2000:69).

This research is important for many reasons. First, knowledge about the clients of prostitutes adds valuable information to the body of knowledge about clients of prostitution. Like any other industry, the sex industry is one of supply and demand, and as of yet the “demand” side of the equation has largely been ignored. In fact, Joseph Parker claims “the first step in understanding the sex industry is to understand the customers, the johns” (Parker, 1998:1), and
Sven-Axel Månsson argues that “without men’s demand for prostitute women, there would be no such women” (Månsson, 2004:9). Second, advocates working toward ending prostitution are in need of this information if they are to successfully target the male clients of street prostitution. Thirdly, because this kind of re-education program is so rare in the United States, an evaluation of the effectiveness of the program is important to make other jurisdictions aware of “johns’ schools” as an option, and information about its effectiveness would be helpful if they are considering implementing this model. Fourth, an evaluation of this type of program is important to the program organizers themselves; with more knowledge about the effectiveness and areas of improvement, organizers can allocate resources more efficiently for maximized results.

In the remaining chapters, I examine the history of prostitution and johns’ schools in the United States, the theories that guide the organizers, and assess the effectiveness of a johns’ school located in a large Midwestern city. I also critically examine johns’ schools as a form of community policing, and suggest changes to the program that could increase its short- and long-term effectiveness. In Chapter 2, I detail the literature surrounding johns’ schools in the United States, including the history and evolution of johns’ schools, their components, their relationship to batterer intervention programs, information about men that frequent prostitutes and critical examination of johns’ schools. In Chapter 3, I describe the theories that have informed the creation and evolution of johns’ schools, especially shaming and re-integration theory, and use these theories to explain the strategies that johns’ school organizers use to attempt to deter men from future solicitation of prostitutes. Many johns’ school organizers use a technique that combines both educating and shaming the male participants—I have determined that this technique can be effective, if the education and shaming components are combined so as not to alienate the participants.
Chapter 4 describes the methodology for this research: its aims and goals, research design, data management, measurement, and demographic information of the participants. The goal of this research was to assess whether or not the program was effective in deterring men from hiring prostitutes, in both the short- and long-term future. By using pre- and post-test attitude forms and comments forms filled out by participants, I assessed whether the johns’ school was effective in changing the attitudes and preconceptions that participants had about prostitution. Chapter 5 reports the findings from this research, including the effectiveness of the program. I determined that the program is effective in changing the attitudes of the participants, but was unable to assess whether the program is effective in the long-term. Chapter 6 discusses these findings in the context of improvements for johns’ schools and similar programs.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Most research concerning street prostitution concerns the women involved in selling sex: what led them to prostitution (primarily drug abuse and physical, emotional and sexual abuse in their families of origin), and their experiences of drug abuse, physical and sexual abuse while in prostitution. The focus of my research, however, is on men who are arrested for frequenting prostitutes and the effectiveness of a program designed to reduce recidivism among these men (johns’ schools).

Because johns’ schools are so rare, little research addresses them at all, and the research that is available often does not address the effectiveness of the program. Most research addresses why men seek out prostitutes, and what their attitudes about prostitution are. In addition, some of the most valuable research on johns’ schools comes from Canada, whose provinces often have very different prostitution statutes than American states.

TYPES AND THEORIES OF PROSTITUTION

Types of Prostitution

Because much of the research on prostitution has focused on why women enter prostitution, several researchers have classified prostitutes in different ways. Prostitution can be classified by why a woman entered prostitution: either voluntary or compulsive prostitution with compulsive being defined as tending to “act under compulsion due to ‘psychoneurotic’ needs or addiction to narcotics” (Flowers, 1998: 16). Prostitution can also be classified by frequency of prostitution (“occupational commitment”), and can be divided into three sub-groups: temporary (no more than six months), occasional (two or more instances of prostitution, each lasting no more than 6 months) and continual (lasting more than six months on a regular basis) (Flowers, 1998: 16-17). Prostitutes and prostitution can also be classified by “occupational milieu,” or the
specific type of prostitution (Flowers, 1998: 17). The type of prostitute most pertinent to this research is the “streetwalker” or “a woman who overtly solicits men on the street and offers sexual favors for pay” (Flowers, 1998: 17). Streetwalkers are often seen as the lowest rung on the prostitution hierarchy: getting paid the least for the most dangerous work (Flowers, 1998). They are also seen as having existing in a “vastly different world” from higher-status prostitutes such as call-girls or women working in brothels or for escort services (Flowers, 1998: 18).

Theories of Prostitution

Social scientists, researchers, policy makers and reformers have long struggled to understand the existence of prostitution. Flowers (1998) argues that most explanations of prostitution can fit into one of at least seven main theories: biological (prostitutes are biologically deficient compared to non-prostitute women), psychological (prostitutes are psychologically deficient or inferior to non-prostitute women), economic (women become prostitutes because other avenues to economic success are closed to them), drug-related theories (women become prostitutes to support previously established drug habits), abuse theories (implies a causal relationship between childhood sexual and/or physical abuse and prostitution later in life), sexual adventure/promiscuity theories (women become prostitutes because they find it exciting, or because they simply want to have sex), and mental illness theories (women who become prostitutes are more likely to be mentally ill than non-prostitute women). Most of these theories are no longer posited by researchers, and current research focuses largely on antecedent factors to prostitution—childhood abuse, economic factors, and drug abuse.

One of the most important factors to consider when examining causes of prostitution is to consider race. Although some studies have found that eight out of ten prostitutes are white, it is important to note that streetwalking prostitutes are largely comprised of women of color.
In inner-cities with large areas of prostitution, the rate of prostitutes that are women of color increases to almost fifty percent (Flowers, 1998: 45). African-American women in particular seem to be singled out for arrest—they are seven times more likely to be arrested for prostitution than women of other races (Flowers, 1998: 45). In 2005, African-American women comprised nearly forty-two percent of arrests for prostitution and commercialized vice, showing that they are greatly overrepresented in prostitution arrests compared to their percentage in the overall population (United States Department of Justice, 2005: 1). The intersectionality of race, class and type of prostitution cannot be ignored. African-American women seem far more likely to engage in the most dangerous and least profitable form of prostitution, putting them at more risk for arrest, prosecution, and drug addiction (Flowers, 1998).

PERSPECTIVES ON PROSTITUTION

It is important to acknowledge that not all researchers and activists view prostitution as “violence against women,” as the organizers of the johns’ school I studied did (Unbound, 2006). Some activists and researchers believe that engaging in prostitution is part of a woman’s right of expression, and oppose the “abolitionist” movement that would ban all paid sex acts, whether or not prostitutes themselves want the ban (Nathan, 2005:2). These advocates believe that if prostitution were decriminalized, prostitutes would be better able to protect themselves from violence, sexually transmitted infection and exploitation, and would “promote gender and socioeconomic equality—making it easier for sex workers to leave the trade if they wish to” (Nathan, 2005:2).

The converse of this argument is the one that many researchers take, and the one that the organizers of the johns’ schools take and try to teach to their participants: they believe that prostitution is violence against women, and that women do not “choose” to be prostitutes the
way one chooses to be a lawyer or a clerk in a retail store: “women who ‘choose’ prostitution were sexually abused as kids at much higher rates than other women. That’s one way women end up ‘choosing’ prostitution: getting paid for the abuse they have grown up with and believing that’s all they are good for. Other forces that ‘choose’ them for prostitution include poor or no education and no job that pays a living wage. Prostitution exploits women’s lack of survival options. Sex discrimination, poverty, racism and abandonment are the forces that drive girls into prostitution” (Farley, 1998: 2, emphasis in original). Even the language used by activists and researchers comes into play: use of the term “sex work,” in particular, illuminates the ideological difference between these groups. “In that one word – work – the sexism and the physical and psychological violence of prostitution are made invisible” (Farley, 1998: 2). Johns’ schools usually take the latter perspective, because without the belief that there is a problem with prostitution, there is no reason, other than the legality of prostitution, to challenge a man’s ability to hire a prostitute.

JOHNS’ SCHOOLS AND MEN WHO FREQUENT PROSTITUTES

Johns’ schools were first developed in 1995 in San Francisco, California, through a joint partnership between the San Francisco Police Department Vice Crimes Unit, the District Attorney’s Office, Department of Health, and SAGE (Standing Against Global Exploitation), a prostitution rights/advocacy group (Van Brunschot, 2003). This program has served as a model for other police departments that have adapted this approach.

Johns’ schools typically consist of six major components. First, there is an introduction to the local prostitution law and the legal ramifications for participating in prostitution. This typically addresses the types of sentences that a client could receive when arrested, and addresses the types of crimes that could be perpetrated against them by prostitutes. Second, health risks
associated with prostitution are addressed. This often includes graphic photographs of the effects of sexually transmitted infections. A third component often consists of testimonials from former prostitutes, including their lives on the street, drug and alcohol addiction, and their efforts to leave prostitution. Fourth, community members and merchants attest to the concerns and problems that prostitution has caused them. The final two components are less frequently discussed during johns’ schools: pimping and pimping dynamics (detailing how young women are lured or forced into prostitution, and how pimps sustain a woman’s involvement in prostitution), and an additional component often deals with sexual addiction and management of a sexual addiction.

Demographics of Johns

Estimates of the number of men that frequent prostitutes vary greatly. Early studies found that almost 69% of American men have used the services of a prostitute; more recent studies have found that percentage to be closer to 16%, with only .6% of men seeking the services of prostitutes annually (Monto, 1999:6). Demographic information about participants in johns’ schools varies widely, depending on how participants are recruited and what type of prostitute they frequent—men who solicit street prostitutes might be very different from those that solicit call girls or escorts. Most research focuses on traditional demographic information, such as age, race or ethnicity, education level, income, marital status and employment status.

Monto (2000) collected all of this basic demographic information, but framed questions on his survey to reflect questions on the General Social Survey in order to compare clients with the general population of American men. Monto found that clients were significantly less likely to be married and more likely to never have been married than was the national sample; of those that were married, clients reported less marital happiness than those in the national sample. In
addition, “clients were much more likely to report that they had more than one sexual partner over the past year (56 percent) than the national sample of men (19 percent)” (Monto, 2000:72).

On the other hand, many surveys of prostitutes’ clients find that married men make up a large percentage of customers. Monto (2000) found that 41% of the men surveyed while arrested for soliciting a prostitute were married, and Wortley, et al. (2002) found that 46% were married. This information, in addition to other demographic information collected, may help researchers to understand the motives that clients have for seeking out a prostitute’s services.

Why Do Men Seek Out Prostitutes?

Most researchers and lay people assume that the reason men seek out prostitutes is obvious and does not require further examination. “Kinsey’s research supported the assumption that most men would take advantage of the services of a prostitute if they had the opportunity. However, most recent research contradicts the notion that buying sexual services is conventional behavior among men” (Monto, 2000:77). Men who frequented prostitutes offer several explanations for their use of prostitutes, including: acquiring sexual services their partners won’t perform, wanting to have sex with a large number of partners, attraction to certain physical characteristics, wanting limited emotional involvement with a sexual partner, and excitation from the illicit nature of the transaction (Monto, 2000). In addition, some men sought out prostitutes because they felt unable to enter into a conventional relationship, and still others sought out prostitutes for intimacy and companionship. Finally, some men sought out prostitutes “in order to inflict violence upon them” (Monto, 2000:77).

Monto’s own research with clients of prostitutes holds true to these patterns, with the largest proportion of men stating that they sought out prostitutes because they “liked to be with a woman who likes to get nasty” (53.3%), they were “excited by the idea of approaching a
prostitute” (46.6%), they liked to have a variety of sexual partners (44.1%) and they wanted a “different kid of sex than [their] regular partner wants” (42.6%) (2000, 78-80)\(^1\). Each of these items was more likely to be indicated by a repeat user of prostitutes rather than “first-timers,” and college graduates were more likely than non-graduates to say that an interest in other partners, different sexual acts, and excitement through soliciting a prostitute were the reasons they frequented prostitutes. Non-graduates more often cited difficulty entering into a conventional relationship or difficulty meeting women that were not sex workers (Monto, 2000). Interestingly, Hughes (2004) reports that only one-third men that had engaged in sex with a prostitute reported that they enjoyed it, and 57% of them reported they had tried to stop going to prostitutes (15:372). This finding could indicate that these men believe that their behavior is problematic, and with help could cease this behavior.

Some researchers have found a difference between “occasional buyers” (those who use prostitutes on a few occasions over their lifetime) and those that are “habitual buyers.” Occasional buyers are more likely to respond to legal measures taken against men who solicit prostitutes, whereas habitual buyers often suffered from “heavy sexual dependency problems, excessive involvement in prostitution and pornography that led to financial, occupational, relationship and personal difficulties,” and are not likely to be affected by legal measures and would probably continue their behavior regardless of the legal consequences (Hughes, 2004:14). Although habitual buyers are relatively few in number, some researchers have concluded that “habitual buyers...sustained the ‘buyer side’ of the sex trade and that aiming intervention strategies at these men would significantly reduce the number of sex acts purchased” (Hughes, 2004:14).

\(^1\) Respondents were allowed to select more than one reason for their use of prostitution, explaining why totals equal more than 100%.
Attitudes of Johns

The education level of clients is often held to be an important factor in their attitudes and perceptions of prostitutes and prostitution. Sawyer, et al., (2001) found that more educated participants were less likely than less educated men to believe inaccurate myths about prostitution.

In independent research focused on johns’ schools, client attitudes regarding prostitution are assessed through pre- and post-test attitudinal surveys. Many of the questions address “myths” of prostitution, including “women are prostitutes because they want to be prostitutes,” “there is nothing wrong with prostitution,” “it would be ok if my daughter grew up to be a prostitute,” “prostitutes make a lot of money,” and “prostitutes enjoy their work” (Sawyer, et al, 2001:366 and Jungels, 2005:33) (See the Appendix for examples).

In preliminary research for this project, changes in attitudes of Johns that attended Unbound, Inc.’s Johns’ school in 2005 were examined\(^2\). For the statement “women are prostitutes because they want to be prostitutes,” a drop of 28 percentage points occurred between the pre- and post-tests (from 39% agreeing to only 13% agreeing)—this is a drop of more than 300% (Jungels, 2005:33). Similarly, a change of 22 percentage points was indicated for the statement “prostitutes enjoy their work” (from 25% in the “pre-test” to 3% in the “post-test”) (Jungels, 2005:33). Similarly, Wortley et al., (2002) found that in response to the question “most prostitutes enjoy what they do for a living,” pre-test attitudinal surveys indicated that 6% of respondents strongly agreed, 23% agreed, 17% did not know, 37% disagreed and 18% strongly disagreed. In a post-program attitudinal assessment, only 7% strongly agreed, 8% agreed, 11% did not know, 25% disagreed and 49% strongly disagreed, which constituted statistically significant changes in opinion.

\(^2\) Name and location of the program have been changed.
Wortley, et al., found that while 79% of participants in a Toronto johns’ school said that there were victims of prostitution before attending the program, this acknowledgement increased significantly to 95% after attendance. Ironically, Wortley et al., (2002) found that participants were less likely to identify prostitutes as victims after they had completed the program. The authors attempt to explain this finding by indicating that after completion of the program, 15% of the participants acknowledged that “everyone” was a victim of prostitution, whereas only 2% of participants acknowledged “everyone” as a victim pre-program, and that “it is probably safe to assume that by ‘everyone’ these respondents are including prostitutes” (Wortley, et al., 2002:382). But, Wortley et al., admit that it is possible that participants might be less sympathetic toward prostitutes after attending johns’ school, perhaps because the “focus on the lifestyles of prostitutes (which often include descriptions of high levels of drug and alcohol abuse), combined with a focus on the johns themselves as victims of prostitution, has the unintended consequence of making some men more negative toward prostitution” (2002:383). This may reflect ideological differences of different program organizers: “some programs use a confrontation ‘shaming ritual’ that includes a description of the damage and pain they have caused...other instructors believe that most of the men that purchase sex acts are so self-centered it is more effective to appeal to men’s self-interest to stop participating in an activity that will hurt them” (Hughes, 2004:32).

Also of importance was Wortley, et al’s finding that “participation in the John School education program has relatively little impact on the Johns’ anticipated future use of prostitutes” (Wortley, et al., 2002:389). Both before and after attending the program, 90% of men stated that they would not or probably would not use prostitutes again; but, 12.8% of the respondents indicated they would definitely use or might use prostitutes in the future, and that figure drops to
11% after completion of the program (Wortley, et al., 2002:389). The authors note that even after completing the program, “one out of every ten respondents report that they might still use prostitutes in the future...this figure is more than four times greater than the official program recidivism rate [of 2.4%]” (Wortley, et al., 2002:389). This finding could reflect the proportion of Wortley, et al.’s sample that are habitual users of prostitution, and are unlikely to be deterred no matter what the consequence. Other researchers have found recidivism rates similar to Wortley, et al.’s finding of 2.4% in other johns’ schools: the johns’ school in San Francisco reports a recidivism rate of less than one percent over a four year time period, and Toronto reports that of their 600 participants between 1996 and 1997, none were rearrested (Weitzer, 2000: 173).

Wortley et al., also indicate that whether a participant intends to use a prostitute again depends on their past experience with prostitution. “Sex-trade veterans” (all respondents that have used prostitutes five or more times in their life, constituting 22% of their sample) were much more likely to report that they will use prostitutes in the future, (46% said “might use again/will definitely use again” pre-program) and this figure held stable after program completion (32% said “might use again/will definitely use again”). Their results indicate that the johns’ school had “no impact on the anticipated behavior of seven out of every ten respondents...most of these men maintain [at both pre- and post-program assessment] that they would never use prostitutes again. Ironically, while 13.1% of the men in our sample were less likely to purchase sex after attending John School, 17.5% were apparently more likely to use prostitutes” (Wortley, et al., 2002:391). It appears that the johns’ school that Wortley, et al. studied had mixed effectiveness on the men that participated—some were less likely to want to
hire prostitutes after attending, but some were more likely to want to hire a prostitute after attending. Again, this could reflect the persistence of habitual users of prostitutes.

This indicates that programs that aim to change the attitudes of men that frequent prostitutes may be effective, at least in the short term (recidivism rates are often lower than 3%), but that effectiveness is mediated by the experience and pre-existing attitudes of men attending the program.

Evolution of Johns’ Schools and Community Policing

Most police forces in the United States focus on arresting the women involved with prostitution. Van Brunschot (2003) argues that arresting and charging women who sell sex is an ineffective way to curb prostitution:

Despite a range of sentencing options available to the courts, participants in prostitution (sellers and buyers) are typically fined. For women working as prostitutes, fines may do little to deter future prostitution activity, as many may resort to prostitution not only as a means of paying fines, but also due to reduced opportunity from the stigma that such charges may generate...on the other hand, fining customers...may do little to deter future involvement in prostitution since customers, one assumes, may have somewhat greater financial means to pay fines, certainly if the money they are prepared to spend on prostitution is any indication (:219).

Van Brunschot (2003: 219) argues that prostitution is a “prime candidate” for a community policing focus, because of the social and physical disorder. Residents of communities where prostitution occurs often complain about the physical disorder associated with prostitution: used needles and condoms litter the streets, traffic jams, sex acts occurring in public and semi-public areas such as alleyways, bushes, and cars, and non-prostitute women and children are harassed by customers. In addition, it is a prime candidate because of the “hypocritical stance of prostitution-related law” in which women prostitutes are arrested more frequently, and often punished more harshly, than male clients (Van Brunschot, 2003:219). Indeed, Flowers reports that while one in five men solicits a prostitute during their life, “official
statistics reveal that only two johns are arrested for every eight prostitutes. A report on female prostitutes in the District of Columbia found that whereas 1,110 women were arrested for prostitution that year, only four men were charged with solicitation” (1998:8). Similar statistics have been found around the country; in 1995 in Portland, Oregon, 402 women were arrested for prostitution, compared with 10 men for soliciting prostitutes and 18 men for pandering (Flowers, 1998:42).

Community policing is an increasingly popular technique in law enforcement circles. Guided by the principle that “there are times when, despite the technical requirements of the law, arrest is not the best choice” (Van Brunschot, 2003:216), community policing “widens the net of methods with which...offenses and offenders might be dealt, while apparently guided by the preferences of the community” (Van Brunschot, 2003:217, emphasis in original). Prostitution offender programs such as johns’ schools conform to the aims of community policing in a variety of ways: allowing the community to define problems, by keeping offenders in the community, by placing the police as members of and advocates for the community, and by rehabilitating certain individuals (Van Brunschot, 2003).

Critical Examination of Johns Schools

Van Brunschot (2003) is one of the few authors that criticizes johns’ schools as an emerging form of rehabilitation and community policing, but as the research was done outside the United States (in Toronto, Ontario), many of her concerns address a loophole in Canadian law that is not addressed by local Canadian offender rehabilitation programs. Canadian law prohibits “communicating for the purposes of prostitution,” but the sale or purchase of sexual acts is legal (Van Brunschot, 2003). Nonetheless, many of Van Brunschot’s concerns extend to similar programs in the United States.
By taking a “community” approach, one assumes that all members of the community are included and have a shared opinion about prostitution; Van Brunschot alleges that residents often resist involvement with police, and therefore participation is largely from those that have a “great (and, often, vested) interest in the issue of prostitution” (2003:224). Furthermore, those who are not inclined to view prostitution as problematic “perhaps, rather, as ‘work,’ are not part of the program. Prostitute advocacy groups, who indeed might view prostitution offender programs as a detriment to women’s rights to earning a living, are not typically part of the program.Prostitue advocacy groups, who indeed might view prostitution offender programs as a detriment to women’s rights to earning a living, are not typically part of the program” (Van Brunschot, 2003:224). Similarly, these types of programs may be viewed by sex workers as an attempt to “obliterate” their livelihood, and may contribute to the continued surveillance and stigmatization of prostitution (Van Brunschot, 2003:224). Van Brunschot concludes that “those who constitute ‘the community’ within the context of these programs are a select few who subscribe to a particular point of view” (2003:224).

Van Brunschot alleges that there is no place in the program for participants to be heard, indeed, “the only customers who are heard within these programs are recovering sex addicts,” who not only represent a limited segment of the client population, but often reinforce the image of the “sick” customer (Van Brunschot, 2003:224).

Perhaps one of the most relevant concerns for the organizers of johns’ schools is whether or not attending such a program is actually a choice for arrestees. “While john schools avoid public or formal admonitions, the ever-present threat of failing to conform informally is that the offender will be *required* to conform formally...the option really amounts to choosing between paying a relatively high price for attending a program, or appearing before a judge and getting a criminal record. In other such contexts, such ‘options’ may be defined as extortion” (Van Brunschot, 2003:226). Another serious concern for organizers of johns’ schools is whether or
not johns’ schools replace other formal (and traditional) methods of controlling prostitution; Van
Brunschat alleges that this is not usually the case, and police direct male clients toward
“rehabilitation” while continuing to arrest and imprison female sex workers. In addition, few
communities have similar rehabilitation programs for women that wish to leave prostitution,
which again treats women hypocritically, as simultaneously victims of clients, but responsible
for their own escape from prostitution.

Van Brunschot also addresses a disparity between those that are recruited for the johns’
schools, in that “informal control through john schools is only offered to a specific prostitution
clientele” (Van Brunschot, 2003:227). Street prostitution is often regarded as the venue that
allows for sexual services to be purchased for the least amount of money, and Van Brunschot
claims that this is reflected in the financial means of the clients (49% of the respondents in her
research carried less than $20), and that those that are informally controlled are those of lesser
social and financial means (Van Brunschot, 2003:225). Van Brunschot argues that community-
policing measures reflect the ideal of panopticism, which involves

being visible, with its emphasis on surveillance (the few see the many) and being
invisible, with its emphasis on the detection and public display of deviance (the many see
the few)...prostitution offender programs capitalize or trade on the threat of exposure—
customers can either participate in the program (maintain their invisible status) or be
exposed through formal proceedings. At the same time, the police become visible—they
are seen to be doing something about prostitution (2003:227).

Relationship to Batterer Intervention Programs

Johns’ schools, while primarily based upon community policing policies, are similar to
batterer intervention programs. Just as “the traditional response to domestic violence has been to
pretend it does not exist, accept it, or attribute it to various physiological or psychological
explanations... [and is] viewed as insignificant and attributable mainly to individual—and
frequently female—pathology” (Hanson, 2002:422), so too has street prostitution. The first
domestic violence intervention programs were created with a decidedly feminist and anti-patriarchal ideology, arguing that “male dominance and misogyny were the root of violence against women, and that abusive men were willful and responsible and should be held accountable for their behavior” (Hanson, 2002:422). Many of the prostitution offender programs currently in existence use the same philosophy—they challenge the pre-existing beliefs that clients of street prostitutes hold, especially that street prostitutes enjoy their “profession” and that they make a lot of money in prostitution. In educating clients of street prostitutes, program organizers attempt to hold men accountable for actions that they view as exploitative of women.

Many batterer intervention programs stem from different ideologies. “Individual models” attempt to “identify the root cause of violence as grounded in the psychology and history of the individual batterer” (Hanson, 2002:428). Family models see “violent behavior as a relationship issue and part of a chain of escalating retributive strategies…and focus on solving the problem rather than looking for causes,” and social and cultural models attribute domestic violence to “the social structure and to cultural norms and values, with the primary factor being men’s subordination of women” (Hanson, 2002:429-430). Johns’ schools seem to unite these various ideologies for a more comprehensive outlook on ending prostitution. Inclusion of sexual addiction components and increasing the awareness of victimization that can befall clients of street prostitutes (and the possibility of sexually transmitted infection) is an attempt to identify the individual factors that can lead a man to hire a street prostitute. This is also addressed by the research that attempts to understand why men seek out prostitutes. Social and cultural models are included in discussions of the lived reality of street prostitutes, the causes that drive them into prostitution, victimization that happens to street prostitutes at the hands of clients and pimps, and the effect that street prostitution has on female prostitutes, male clients, and their respective
families. Family models are addressed less directly, but can be seen in the discussions of the effects that hiring a prostitute can have on a clients’ family, and the relationship status that a client has when seeking out a prostitute. By combining these models, johns’ schools may have an advantage over domestic violence intervention programs that often take one stance and do not include other models.

Most importantly, johns’ schools also fuse the many expectations that batterer intervention program organizers hold. Many of the expectations and goals of batterer intervention programs cited by Hanson (2002) are also goals, explicit and implicit, held by johns’ schools program organizers. Both intervention programs attempt to punish men and hold them accountable for their actions; both try to challenge the sexist and patriarchal beliefs of men, and reeducate them; both attempt to change behavior; and both types of programs seek to and identify and resolve inter- and intrapersonal issues that can lead a man to hire a prostitute (or abuse their partner). While a multi-week batterer intervention program is more capable of identifying and resolving the intrapersonal issues of a batterer than a johns’ school is of a client of street prostitutes, organizers of johns’ schools are usually equipped to refer participants to other services. And, because some johns’ schools seek to educate men about sexual addiction, they may also be educating men about a problem they may not have known they had, allowing the client to seek help on his own.

Because of the variety of programs offered to male batterers, the effectiveness of batterer intervention programs has been mixed, often showing strong short-term deterrent effect and less effectiveness as time passes (Wallace, 2002). Some studies have found that men that participate in longer-term batterer interventions programs have significantly lower recidivism rates than those that are attend shorter programs or those that are not required to attend the program.
Other evaluations of batterer intervention programs have found that male batterers who attend an intervention program are only slightly less likely to abuse their partners than those that do not attend such a program; still others have found that batterers who do not attend an intervention program are less likely to batter than those that do (Hanson, 2002). It is also important to note that many evaluation studies have found that arresting a batterer, whether for a long or short period of time, does appear to have a deterrent effect on men who batterer—whether it is a lasting effect seems to depend largely on the type of program (Wallace, 2002). It has also been widely acknowledged that arrest of a batterer has the most deterrent effect on those with “the most to lose”—perhaps targeting those with “the most to lose” (married men, middle- to-upper class) would help eliminate the problem of prostitution, especially given the stigmatizing effect that an arrest would have on the male client. Perhaps most important is the overall belief that men have to be motivated to change their behavior in order for any deterrent effect to occur; “interventions cannot be expected to work for individuals against their will” (Hanson, 2002:436).

Although johns’ schools have a relatively short history in the United States, they are similar to many long-lasting and successful programs, such as batterer intervention programs and other forms of community policing. By attempting to change the attitudes and preconceptions of the participants, organizers of the johns’ school focus on deterring future arrests. But, it is important for organizers to consider the wide range of consumers of prostitution that exist—one may need use a different strategy to change the behavior of a habitual user of prostitution than one would use on an infrequent consumer of prostitution. Organizers also must consider, and address, the reasons that men hire prostitutes. It is also important for organizers to acknowledge
that in order to take a “community” approach to ending prostitution, they must consider all perspectives in the community, not just those that share their opinions about prostitution.

In Chapter 3, I explore the sociological theories that inform many johns’ schools. By using a technique derived from shaming and re-integration theory, organizers seek to shame their participants by showing them that the community does not condone, nor will it ignore, their participation in prostitution. Organizers attempt to re-integrate their participants (and avoid alienation) by challenging the participants’ belief in the myths surrounding prostitution, and educating participants about how their participation as clients impacts the community, the women involved in prostitution, the participant, and his family. By expunging the participant’s arrest record, the organizers offer the participants forgiveness and re-integration into the community. Crucial to the use of shaming and re-integration theory is the organizers’ ability to use the appropriate amount of shaming—too much shaming can lead to the alienation of participants, and too little can lead to an ineffective program. Chapter 3 explores how shaming and re-integration can be an effective technique in the implementation of johns’ schools, if each component is in equal proportion to the other.
Chapter 3: Theory Informing Research

Although johns’ schools and other prostitution offenders’ re-education programs are founded on community policing principles, they also have a firm foundation in criminal re-integrative shaming theory. Re-integration shaming theory asserts that the most crime-deterrent programs should focus on a combination of shaming and re-integration, in that “expressions of community disapproval, which may range from mild rebuke to degradation ceremonies, are followed by gestures of reacceptance into the community of law-abiding citizens” (Braithwaite, 1989:55). Braithwaite argues that too much emphasis is put on labeling deviance, and that too little attention is paid to “ensuring that the deviance label is applied to the behavior rather than the person, and that this is done under the assumption that the disapproved behavior is transient, performed by an essentially good person” (Braithwaite, 1989:55).

Re-integrative shaming theory is based on the principle that punishment and shaming should be coupled together when dealing with criminal offenders; Braithwaite argues that the shame of being caught in a criminal act and the “rejection and contempt of society” is often more powerful than the punishment itself; in fact, this fear of shame and exposure often prevents criminal activity in the first place (1989:59). In his book Crime, Shame and Re-integration, Braithwaite argues that Western society, with its emphasis on the individual rather than the community, has moved away from punishment and shame working together to prevent re-offense. He argues that community-based societies (Japan is Braithwaite’s main example) use these concepts together so effectively that they are the only societies in the world that have experienced a reduction in crime rates since World War II. By using shame as a form of punishment, and by effectively re-integrating offenders back into the community (usually with
an apology and compensation to the victim), they avoid stigmatizing offenders, and offenders avoid joining criminal subcultures.

Shaming works through social control and a developed conscience, which Braithwaite argues are more powerful weapons than the threat of actual punishment...

shaming is more pregnant with symbolic content than punishment. Punishment is a denial of confidence in the morality of the offender by reducing norm compliance to a crude cost-benefit calculation; shaming can be a reaffirmation of the morality of the offender by expressing personal disappointment that the offender should do something so out of character, and if the shaming is re-integrative, by expressing personal satisfaction in seeing the character of the offender restored (1989:73)

Most importantly, re-integrative shaming not only reinforces the conscience of the offender and deters them from re-offending, but informal shaming (gossip, for example) deters others from committing similar offenses. Informal shaming techniques are often most effective for crimes that most adults were not socialized to avoid as children; this “integrates new categories of wrongdoing...into the moral framework pre-existing from their childhood” (Braithwaite, 1989:79). In addition, “the effectiveness of shaming is often enhanced by shame being directed not only at the individual offender but also at her family...when a collectivity as well as an individual is shamed, collectivities are put on notice as to their responsibility to exercise informal control over their members, and the moralizing impact of shaming is multiplied” (Braithwaite, 1989:83).

Obviously, shaming as punishment cannot be applied to every type of criminal and every type of crime. In fact, Braithwaite argues that shaming as punishment should only be applied to criminal acts where there is an overwhelming consensus in society as to whether or not the behavior is criminal or is a “victimless” crime (where there could be less consensus). Braithwaite includes prostitution in this category of crimes on which there is no strict agreement by members of the society, although many researchers and organizers of johns’ schools would
argue that there are many victims of street prostitution, and that the actions that most members of a society can agree upon as criminal (murder, for example) are those least likely to be deterred by shame and re-integration. Excessive shaming can lead to stigmatization, and makes criminal subcultures more attractive because they “reject the rejectors,” and the mainstream cultures’ ability to maintain informal control over the conscience of the offender is dependent upon their ability to reintegrate them into society after shaming (Braithwaite, 1989:102). Without re-integration, the shame no longer matters to us, claims Braithwaite.

Coupled with re-integrative shaming theory is the concept of inclusive versus exclusive reactions to deviance, put forth by James D. Orcutt (1973). Orcutt describes the differences between inclusive and exclusive reactions to deviance as follows:

Inclusive reactions will designate those attempts at social control which are premised on the assumption that the rule-breaker is and will continue to be an ordinary member of the group. This forms of reaction attempts to control rule-infractions by bringing the present or future behavior of the rule-breaker into conformity with the rules of the group without excluding him from it. Exclusive reactions are those attempts at social control which operate to reject the rule-breaker from the group and revoke his privileges and status as an ordinary member. In short, exclusive reactions treat the rule breaker as an outsider (1973:260).

Inclusive reactions to social deviance are premised on the notion that the rule-breaker is essentially a normal member of the group, with shared perspectives on social meaning and responsibility, and inclusive reactions primarily “attempt to cope with ‘situation deviance’ and operate to limit the deviation to the specific situation in which occurs” (Orcutt, 1973: 264). Unlike exclusive reactions, in which the assumption of shared perspectives breaks down, “character deviance” takes its place and members of the group attempt to isolate the deviant himself, the effectiveness of inclusive reactions depends on the rule-breakers’ status as an ordinary member of the group (Orcutt, 1973: 264-265). Just as Braithwaite claims that without re-integration shaming no longer matters to the criminal, Orcutt claims that exclusive reactions to
deviance isolate the member so completely that the groups’ interactions hold little sway over his actions. Indeed, Orcutt claims that exclusive reactions are often the measure of last resort—in families who used inclusive reactions to deviance, “exclusive reactions occur only after prolonged and intensifying efforts to exercise control through inclusive reactions…the transition to exclusive reactions often develops at a point where the assumption of common interactional perspectives between the deviant and the rest of the family has broken down” (Orcutt, 1973: 265).

Many American communities have tried to use this “shaming-as-punishment” and “inclusive reactions” approach with men arrested for soliciting street prostitutes, with varying degrees of success. Examples include publishing the contents of a sex workers’ “black book,” and posting photographs and names of male clients on the internet, on billboards, in the newspaper or on television. Whether or not these efforts are effective deterrents depends on their level of shaming, whether or not stigma is permanently attached to the offender, and whether re-integration into the group is possible. In fact, many organizers of johns’ schools argue that their function is not to shame participants the way that publication of their names and identification does. One organizer said, “one of the reasons we allow you to come here today, and we don’t do a John TV or send your names into the paper is that this is a chance to sit and think about your life and not tear apart any personal relationships you might have or not embarrass you or shame you...” (Hughes, 2004:35). Other organizers argue that their participants know that they have violated a moral and legal code in hiring prostitutes, and in response to critics who allege exposing the man’s criminal activity unfairly and negatively impacts his family, one organizer said: “it’s the johns who don’t have any concern for their families, or they wouldn’t be carrying on like this” (Hughes, 2004:43). Indeed, Braithwaite
would argue that the most effective shaming and re-integration also targets the offender’s family:
“the effectiveness of shaming is often enhanced by shame being directed not only at the individual offender but also at [her] family...when a collectivity as well as an individual is shamed, collectivities are put on notice as to their responsibility to exercise informal control over their members, and the moralizing impact of shaming is multiplied” (Braithwaite, 1989:83).

The key to the effective implementation of a johns’ school seems to be the balance between shaming the individual for their transgression (which is made clear by the participation of community members, law makers, and former prostitutes and the initial arrest and threat of harsher punishment for a second-time offense) and the education that comprises much of the attempt to re-integrate men after the completion of the program. Because there are so many myths and misconceptions about street prostitutes—what their lives are like, why they become involved in prostitution and the difficulty they have in leaving prostitution—organizers try to address the “customers’ ignorance—whether willful or otherwise, about the actual nature of the sex industry...how they [are] implicated as supporters of a brutal system, thus discouraging further participation” (Hughes, 2004:33). Organizers and researchers believe that men “cling to these [false] beliefs as a way to justify their behavior to themselves” (Hughes, 2004:17). Re-education attempts to break down these myths, and through education and expunging of the crime from permanent criminal records, offers forgiveness and re-integration to men if they acknowledge their wrongdoing and the effect their actions have on others.

Johns’ schools have developed through many different fields, including batterer intervention programs, community policing, feminism, and shaming and re-integration theories. The extent to which they are successful largely depends on their ability to successfully meld these complex and diverse theories together to create an integrative whole. Because the johns’
school is often the only way to rehabilitate male clients of prostitutes, a program’s ability to reach as many of their participants as possible is essential, and this is often accomplished by using the most successful components from other offender rehabilitation programs and criminology theories. In Chapter Four, I detail the components that organizers of the johns’ school in a large Midwestern city use to educate their participants, and the ways that I assessed the effectiveness of the program.
Chapter 4: Methodology

EVALUATION RESEARCH

Evaluation has been, and is, crucial to the evolution of human beings (Davidson, 2005: 1). Every time we try something new, whether it is social policy or technology, we evaluate it—is it better than what we had before? How could we make it more successful? Is it better than any other options we have? Evaluation research seeks to answer these questions through a systematic determination of the value and quality of whatever it is we are evaluating (Davidson, 2005: 3).

This evaluation research is based on guidelines created by Michael Scriven (2005). The Key Evaluation Checklist (or KEC) consists of eleven benchmarks that should be met in order to create a sound evaluation (Scriven, 2005).

“Background and Context”: Why is the program is in place?

This component of evaluation research is addressed through the focus of the johns’ school run by Unbound, Inc.: to challenge the existing double standard of prostitution-related law, where far more female prostitutes are arrested than male clients, to educate male clients about the nature of street prostitution and how their participation in prostitution effects the community, and to challenge participants’ belief in the myths surrounding street prostitution.

“Description and Definitions”: Description of the program to be evaluated.

This component is addressed primarily through each component of the johns’ school, including HIV/STD education, addressing the myths of street prostitution, the legal implications of participating in street prostitution, how the men are recruited, and the costs and benefits of attending the program.
“Consumers”: Demographics of the consumers of/clients of the program.

This step of evaluation research is addressed more later in this chapter (see Table 1), but the demographics of the participants vary greatly, as does their previous experience in prostitution and their attitudes about prostitution.

“Resources”: What resources are/were available to assist in the creation of, and maintenance of, the program?

This key component of evaluation research is addressed in Chapter 6, but it is important to acknowledge that johns’ schools are rare and often not well funded. They are often privately funded through grants and donations, and require a great deal of dedication on the part of organizers if they are to stay open and effective.

“Values”: What criteria will be used to evaluate the program?

This criteria is addressed more later in this chapter, but the primary criteria used to address the effectiveness of the program were participant attitude change (through pre- and post-tests), participant rating of the program, and the overall recidivism rate of the program.

“Process evaluation”: How good/efficient is the programs’ content and delivery?

This key criteria of evaluation research is addressed in this research through the analysis of assessment tools used, and the responses of the participants as to how they believed the program was implemented and which portions of the program they valued the most.

“Outcome evaluation”: How good are the impacts (intended and unintended) on the consumers of the program?

This aspect of evaluation research is addressed through the stated recidivism rate of the program and the respondents’ attitude change (intended impacts). Unintended impacts are addressed more in Chapters 5 and 6, but they include participants’ rejection of the material
presented, negative opinions of law enforcement, and Wortley, et al.’s finding that some participants may be more likely to hire a prostitute, or may have more negative opinions about prostitutes, after attending the program (2002).

“Comparative Cost-Effectiveness”: How cost effective is the program, compared to other alternatives?

This component of evaluation research is not addressed in this research.

“Exportability”: What elements of the program make it potentially valuable in another setting?

This component is addressed more in Chapter 6, but the exportability largely depends on the population that the organizers are trying to reach, the ways in which participants are recruited, how the program is implemented, and how the program’s effectiveness is assessed.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Data were collected through Unbound, Inc., a prostitution rehabilitation center located in a large Midwestern city. Unbound, Inc. specializes in helping women leave prostitution by offering drug rehabilitation, housing, job training and placement, childcare, group therapy and individual counseling. Unbound, Inc., in coordination with the city and county it is located in, also runs a johns’ school for men that are arrested for soliciting prostitutes. Men arrested for soliciting an under-cover police officer pay $325 (plus court fees and the fine for soliciting a prostitute) to attend this seven hour program; in return, after one year of having no similar arrests, attendees are able to have their solicitation arrest expunged from their record. The format of the johns’ school is similar to the structure as outlined by Van Brunschot: health and legal advocates, community members and former prostitutes attempt to increase awareness of the ramifications that prostitution has for women involved, men who frequent prostitutes, and the community at large.

3 Name and location of the program have been changed.
The aims of this process evaluation research were: 1) to gain knowledge about the history of the program and philosophies that guide it, 2) to ascertain whether this program is effective in reducing recidivism among men that seek out street prostitutes, and 3) to suggest improvements to the program. Several measures were used to assess the effectiveness and success rate of the program, including pre- and post-program attitudinal data (secondary data already collected by program organizers) which were examined for change using t-tests. In addition, content analysis of program materials was conducted to assess the effectiveness and history of the program. Client satisfaction with the program was assessed using an open-ended questionnaire and rating scale that participants complete following the program.

Convenience sampling was used in this study—all surveys, demographic information and feedback forms from every participant of the johns’ school from its inception were collected and analyzed. Demographic information was widely distributed (see table 1). There were 308 respondents. The average age of the participants was 41, ranging from 19 to 74. Fifty-nine percent of the respondents were white, 24.1% of the respondents were African-American, and 10.4% were Latino. Fully 50% of the respondents were married, and 70.6% of the respondents had children. Eighty-three percent of the respondents had no criminal record. Fifty-six percent of the respondents that were employed were categorized as having blue-collar jobs, 22.9% were categorized as have white-collar employment, and the remainder were either unemployed, retired, or uncategorizable. Fifty-four percent of the respondents earned less than $30,000 per year (with 29.9% earning less than $18,000 per year), and an additional 24.6% earning between $30,001 and $50,000. Fourteen percent of respondents had not graduated from high school, but 41.9% of participants had some form of college education (technical degree, some college, or a college or graduate degree).
Table 1: Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Ever had sex with a prostitute?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>Sex with a prostitute (# of times)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 and over</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100+</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, I have children</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No, I do not have children</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less than $18,000</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$18,001-$25,000</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,001-$30,000</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,001-$40,000</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,001-$50,000</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,001 and over</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirty-five percent of the participants said that they had paid to have sex with a prostitute before their most recent arrest, but this statistic may be problematic. First, asking whether or not the attendee had paid to have “sex” with a prostitute may be misleading, because that leads defining sex to the respondents; the most common sexual act with sex workers is oral sex, and it is unknown whether or not a respondent would count this as “sex.” Second, men participating in the johns’ school were arrested in a police sting (soliciting an undercover female police officer posing as a prostitute), so it is feasible that some of them could have been arrested during their first attempt to solicit a prostitute. Finally, the follow-up question “how many times have you paid to have sex with a prostitute” was problematic: there was no “0 times” option on most of the surveys, so many respondents wrote in “0” or left the question blank. I created a category for
these write-in “0” responses, and they totaled 36.7%, just over the number that said that they had paid to have sex with a prostitute. Forty-four percent said that they had paid to have sex with a prostitute between one and five times, and 8.3% said they had hired a prostitute between six and ten times. Seven men claimed to have hired prostitutes more than 100 times.

MEASUREMENT

Attitude change was measured by using data collected by program organizers (see Appendix). Pre- and post-program attitude questionnaires include fifteen questions to assess the participants’ views of prostitution through dichotomous “agree” or “disagree” questions such as, “most prostitutes make a lot of money” and “women are prostitutes because they want to be. It’s their choice.” Demographic information (including age, marital status, race, annual income, history of use of prostitutes, educational attainment and drug use history) was also collected by program organizers, and was analyzed, although they were used primarily as control variables. Attitude and demographic information was entered into SPSS for analysis in order to assess the immediate impact of program materials and effect on client opinions of prostitution.

DATA MANAGEMENT

Data were collected in the fall of 2006 at the offices of Unbound, Inc. Data were entered beginning in the fall of 2006 through the winter of 2007. Approximately 400 pre- and post-tests were collected; 170 were pre-tests and 244 were post-tests. About 350 evaluation and comment/suggestion forms were collected, and approximately 315 demographic forms were gathered. Unfortunately, the forms that the participants filled out could not be linked with each other—participants were not given a number or other identifier that would have allowed for the connection of specific attitude pre- and post-tests to specific demographic forms or evaluation forms. It would be useful to be able to correlate attitudes, participant assessment of
effectiveness, and demographic information, for example, to assess whether a certain demographic characteristic is associated with a certain amount of attitude change, but I was unable to conduct that kind of test.

Demographic forms, pre- and post-tests, and evaluation forms were entered into SPSS for analysis, and comment and suggestion forms were entered into Excel worksheets for easier data analysis. Analysis commenced in the winter and spring of 2007.

ANALYSIS

Client satisfaction with the program was assessed using the two evaluation forms each participant completes at the end of the program. An open-ended questionnaire including questions like “what did you like best about today’s program?” and “what would you change about today’s program?” was collected by organizers and analyzed for possible improvements in the program. A satisfaction survey was also gathered by program organizers, allowing clients to rate the program. The rating scale was entered into SPSS for basic analysis (including mean, median and mode), and the open-ended questionnaire was examined using thematic and content analysis. Both measures were used in order to assess the impact the program has on the clients, and the assessment clients have of the program upon completion.

Content analysis of the program materials allowed for an analysis of the goals of the program, the adequacy of the program materials (readability and relevance) and suggestions for improvements in the materials. In addition, content analysis of the program materials allowed for comparison between concepts being taught to participants (specifically, challenging myths and preconceived notions of street prostitution) and current research about street prostitution.
In Chapter five I assess the effectiveness of the program, including those pre- and post-test responses that were statistically significant, and how the participants rated the program and its effectiveness.
Chapter 5: Findings

PRE-AND POST-TEST ANALYSIS

Participants in the program were given a pre- and a post-test to assess their attitude change after completion of the program. Participants were asked 15 questions, assessing whether or not they “strongly agreed,” “agreed,” “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” with the statement. Negative mean change indicates that after completion of the program, participants would be less likely to agree with the statement (low scores indicate stronger disagreement). Only eight of the questions had a mean change that was statistically significant.

Table 2: Pre-and Post-Test Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean Diff.</th>
<th>Sign.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“There is nothing wrong with prostitution”</td>
<td></td>
<td>165</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I wouldn’t mind marrying a prostitute”</td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Prostitution should be legalized”</td>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>-.167</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Prostitutes are the victims of pimps”</td>
<td></td>
<td>166</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Most prostitutes make a lot of money”</td>
<td></td>
<td>165</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Prostitutes enjoy their work”</td>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>-.223</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Prostitutes genuinely like men”</td>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>-.177</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Women are prostitutes because they want to be. It is their choice”</td>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>-.322</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“There is nothing wrong with prostitution”

Men enrolled in the johns’ school had an average pre-test mean of 2.08 for this question, indicating that they agreed more with this statement than they disagreed with it. Their average post-test mean decreased to 1.94, indicating that after they completed the program, they were less likely to agree with the statement “there is nothing wrong with prostitution.” This change is
significant when $\alpha = .05$. This could indicate that the program is effective in change participants’
minds about the nature of prostitution, at least in the short term. Unfortunately, the change is not
great, and it appears that the participants didn’t firmly agree with this statement before attending
the program in the first place.

“...I wouldn’t mind marrying a prostitute”

Participants had a pre-test mean of 1.92 for this question, indicating that they were
unlikely to want to marry a prostitute. Their post-test mean increased to 2.11, a change that is
significant when $\alpha = .01$. After attending the program, men were more likely to agree that they
wouldn’t mind marrying a prostitute, which could indicate that the program is successful in
decreasing the stigma associated with prostitution and prostitutes, and may have humanized the
women involved in it.

“Prostitution should be legalized”

Attendees of the johns’ school fell in the middle of the spectrum on this question. With a
pre-test mean of 2.27, they were closer to agreement with this question than disagreement, and
their post-test mean of 2.10 indicates that they disagreed more with the statement after attending
the johns’ school. This difference was significant when $\alpha = .05$. Men were less likely to believe
that prostitution should be legalized after attending the program, and it is highly possible that
after attending the program they are more aware of the damaging effects that prostitution has on
the women involved, the men who partake of their services, and society in general.

“Prostitutes are the victims of pimps”

With a pre-test mean of 2.50, the attendees of the johns’ school were more likely to agree
with this statement than disagree with it. Their post-test means, though, indicate that after
attending the johns’ school program, they were even more likely to agree with this statement,
with a significant increase in the mean to 2.69. This change was significant when \( \alpha = .05 \), and could indicate that the program is successful in creating sympathy for the female prostitutes, and portraying them as victims of their circumstance and of abusive men, rather than calculating, money-hungry women who chose street prostitution as a career.

“Most prostitutes make a lot of money”

Before attending the johns’ school program, men were more likely to agree with this statement, indicated by a pre-test mean of 2.21. Their average post-test mean of 2.09 indicates that they were less likely to agree with this statement after attending the program, and this negative change is significant when \( \alpha = .05 \). This finding signifies that the program is effective in challenging the assumption that all prostitutes make a great deal of money.

“Prostitutes enjoy their work” and “Prostitutes genuinely like men”

Before attending the program, a pre-test mean score of 2.16 indicated that men were likely to agree that prostitutes enjoyed their work. After attending the program, attendees had an average post-test score of 1.94, indicating that they were less likely to agree that prostitutes enjoy their work after attending the program. This negative change was significant when \( \alpha = .001 \). This indicates that the program is effective in challenging the myths that prostitutes enjoy their work.

With a mean pre-test score of 2.23, men were more likely to agree that prostitutes genuinely like men. After completing the program, the attendees’ mean post-test score of 2.05 indicates that they were less likely to believe this statement. This finding is significant when \( \alpha = .01 \). This may indicate that the program is effective in challenging the perception that prostitutes like men and enjoy their work, or that they enter prostitution because of their desire to be with and have sex with men.
These questions likely address Arlie Hochschild’s concept of “emotional labor” and “management of feeling” (Hochschild, 2003). Management of feeling involves either “the feeling that is displayed (surface acting) or the private experience of the emotion itself (deep acting)...[it] requires workers to mask, hide, or suppress emotions they feel in order to create a suitable emotional display” (Erickson, 2001: 148-149). A “suitable emotional display” in the prostitute-john relationship is one of sexual pleasure, submission and happiness with the sexual act—falsely giving their clients that they enjoy their work and the company of their customers.

“Women are prostitutes because they want to be. It is their choice.”

Before completing the program, attendees had a mean pre-test score of 2.38, indicating that they were more likely to agree with the statement that prostitution was a choice for the women involved. Attendees of the program had a mean post-test score of 2.06, indicating that they were significantly less likely to agree with this statement after attending the program (significant when α=.001). This indicates that the program is effective in challenging the idea of prostitution as a career choice.

EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM BY PARTICIPANTS

Evaluations were rated on a scale from one to five, with one being “poor” and five being “excellent”. Respondents were asked to review all five of the components of the program: “prostitution 101/reallities of the streets,” “legal implications” of prostitution, “HIV/STD information,” “ex-prostitute speak-out,” and “community members”. Overall, the program was rated very highly by its participants, with a mean of 4.19 and 71.7% of respondents rating the program either a four or a five. Every component had an individual rating of four or higher. The STD/HIV component and the “realities of prostitution” section rated the highest among participants, with mean scores of 4.62 and 4.33, respectively. These were also the most
commonly cited parts of the program when respondents were asked what their favorite part of the program was. Sample sizes for these questions vary greatly because several forms were used to assess the participants’ rating of the program and its components, and combining the variables for analysis proved to be too time consuming and cumbersome.

Table 3: Program Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>% that rated 5 (excellent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Rating</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution 101</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Implications</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/STD Component</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Prostitute Speak Out</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Members</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROGRAM’S EFFECT ON PARTICIPANTS

Participants were asked to complete open-ended evaluations of the program, consisting of six questions, including questions such as “what was your favorite part of the program” and “what would you change about the program?”

“What did you like best about the program?”

Many participants stated that they enjoyed the program in its entirety, but those who cited a specific component of the program stated that the “ex-prostitutes speak out,” the legal implications of prostitution, or the HIV/STD component was their favorite. Many participants cited the non-judgmental nature of the program and the speakers, and the straight forward, “brutally honest” nature of the program and the information delivered. Illustrating this, one participant wrote “the open frankness of the speakers and their sensitivity in not ridiculing me, but helping me to see the effects of my actions.” Another wrote “this program is excellent because the session was not condemning. I felt more comfortable as the speakers associated us
with normal people.” Many respondents wrote that they didn’t realize how the lives of prostitutes and community members were affected by prostitution, and numerous participants wrote that they now understood the community members’ anger and the dangerous nature of prostitution for the women involved in it.

Very few of the participants responded negatively or unenthusiastically; comments such as “it completed the conditions of my probation,” “boring” and “it’s off my record in one year” were very rare. Only one comment was particularly negative (“information of how hookers don’t really care about anybody”).

“What would you change about today?”

The most common response to this question was “nothing.” A few respondents mentioned wanting the program to be shorter, on a day other than Saturday, or a larger, less crowded room. The more constructive criticisms consisted of suggestions like “more feedback time with speakers,” and more assistance for long-time johns and sex addicts. Again, there were very few negative comments, and those were often centered around the fact that the participants were recruited for the program through an undercover sting operation—it was possible that some of the participants were arrested trying to solicit their first sexual experience with a prostitute. Comments like “there should be differences between those that do these things and those who were not actually doing these things,” “don’t make it seem like we all rolled up in Rolls Royces just to bring women down. That’s bullshit. Most of us are here because a cop brought up the subject” and “not having a sting program to entice customers to do bad things” illustrate that whether or not they had solicited a prostitute before unknowingly soliciting a police officer, some men were bitter about their arrest and viewed it as entrapment.
“How do you think you will change your behavior?”

Common answers to this question were “not solicit women,” “not picking up women,” “just say no” and “stop engaging in prostitution.” Several participants stated that they no longer would travel through areas where prostitution is common. Many participants stated that they would spend more time with family and with their wives, or would start or continue therapy or a twelve-step program (Alcoholics Anonymous or Narcotics Anonymous were cited repeatedly). Some participants stated that they would simply ignore women that they didn’t know (“don’t talk to strange women,” for example). One participant in particular stated that he would no longer try to “help” women on the streets, implying that that was what he was trying to do when he was arrested. Again, respondents occasionally cited that they were “lured” into soliciting a prostitute and expressed resentment that they were attending the program for “falling for a sting.” In addition, comments such as “I don’t believe my behavior is wrong” are difficult to interpret because of the fact that men were arrested and recruited for the program during a sting operation. It is open to interpretation whether these participants still believe that there is nothing wrong with prostitution, or whether they were arrested on their first attempt to solicit a prostitute, and so do not believe what they actually did (soliciting an undercover officer, and being ensnared in a sting), rather than what they were attempting to do, is wrong.

“How has prostitution affected your life?”

Many participants remarked that they had lost the trust of wives or girlfriends, loss of employment, loss of respect or diminished reputation, and occasionally loss of income. “Loss of income” is difficult to interpret, because it’s difficult to know whether they mean the cumulative cost of paying court fees, fines, and the cost of attending the program, or if they mean the cumulative cost of hiring prostitutes. Many men cited that they felt shame and embarrassment
for their actions, and many stated that their arrest was a “wake-up call”—many participants stated that they didn’t understand the effect that their actions had on women involved in prostitution and the community. Even with this acknowledgement of the effect on the community and women involved, few men stated that they regretted the impact that their own actions had, perhaps because of the nature of the way that men became involved in the johns’ school. Because few, if any, of the participants were caught having sex with, or soliciting, a prostitute, they probably do not view their actions as extremely problematic.

“How will you change how you relate to your wife, son, daughter, girlfriend?”

Of all of the evaluation questions, this was most likely to be skipped by participants, although these missing answers did not total more than ten percent of the responses. Nearly every respondent that answered this question wrote that they would have more respect for their wives and children, would “love them more,” spend more time with them, and “appreciate what a good life I have and what I can have towards everything/everybody in my life.” Participants frequently wrote about being more grateful for their families, and would no longer take them for granted. Respondents wrote about being more honest in their interpersonal relationships, and that the program helped them identify “problems at home” that they needed to deal with. Respondents also spoke about telling their family members what they learned in the program, and working to educate their children about prostitution and its effect on the community, the women involved, and the families of people that participate in it.

In addition, more than half of the evaluations had this question phrased slightly differently: rather than asking “how will you change how you relate to….” forms asked a yes/no question: “Will you change how you relate to your wife, girlfriend, son, daughter?” allowing for
an open section to answer “how?” Of the 187 responses that included the yes/no option, 138 answered that yes, they would change how they related to their families (73.8%).

“If you had a son or daughter, what would you tell them?”

The most common response to this question spoke about the negative aspects of prostitution, and that they would educate their children about the effects that prostitution has on the people involved and the communities it occurs in. A few respondents stated that they would encourage their children to come to the johns’ school to learn about it for themselves. Respondents spoke about being more open with their children, allowing their children to come to them with questions and problems. This question elicited the most poignant comments, perhaps because respondents were required to reflect upon the program and what they had learned. Responses generally fell under three themes: first, that prostitution is immoral, second, that it is illegal, and third, that it hurts women. Several responses fell under more than one or all of these categories; for example, one respondent wrote, “my son will be taught that prostitution is evil and is bondage, slavery and against the law! I will teach him to [be] a gentlemen and respect.” Another wrote, “prostitution victimizes the women, it is degrading to women and the consequences will change you, the other person and the community.” Yet another wrote, “I would tell him/her that prostitution is bad, not a job, morally unacceptable, distressful, and against the law.”

One respondent wrote specifically about the myths about prostitution that the program challenges: “it is a lot more than the ‘myths’ (Hollywood image) and it is not glamorous by any means. By no way should be legalized!!”

Again, a small number of the responses were negative—very few respondents wrote that they would never talk to their children about their experiences, primarily because they didn’t
want their children to find out they’d been caught in a sting (“I would not want them to know I was stupid enough to get caught in a sting program”).

While the program is effective in changing the attitudes of the participants, there are still many things that the organizers could do to increase the effectiveness of the program. Chapter six discusses these improvements, including policy and programming recommendations and improved tools for assessing effectiveness.

ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM MATERIALS

Content analysis of the program materials allowed for an analysis of the goals of the program, the adequacy of the program materials (readability and relevance) and suggestions for improvements in the materials. In addition, content analysis of the program materials allowed for comparison between concepts being taught to participants (specifically, challenging myths and preconceived notions of street prostitution) and current research about street prostitution.

The goal of the johns’ school coordinated by Unbound, Inc. is clear: to decrease the likelihood that men will solicit prostitutes. Whether or not this goal is achieved has been addressed through the program’s short- and long-term effectiveness. One of the main obstacles to this goal is the accessibility and relevance of the program materials. I assessed the accessibility of the written program materials by using the Flesch Reading Ease formula. The Flesch Reading Ease formula computes a written passage’s reading ease based on the average number of syllables per word, and the number of words per sentence (DuBay, 2004). The score is based on a 100-point scale, with 100 being the easiest to read and one being the hardest—Flesch determined that a score of 30 indicates “very difficult” writing, and a score of 70 being “easy” (DuBay, 2004: 21). I averaged the scores of all the forms given to participants of the johns’ school run by Unbound, Inc. (see Table 4), and all of the forms rated above 60. The total
average score was 74.23, indicating that the forms used by this organization are easy to read and understand for most of the participants. The Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level score uses the same criteria and rates the material on an American grade-school level (DuBay, 2005). All of the forms were readable to someone who had completed the seventh grade (which was the vast majority of the respondents). Forms were not available in other languages, and there appears to be a need for forms in other languages (several were completed in Spanish or by a translator) for those who are not native speakers.

Table 4: Material Readability Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Flesch Reading Ease Score</th>
<th>Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Form</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre- and Post-Test Forms</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Forms</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Rating Forms</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relevancy of the program materials can be assessed by comparing the myths that the program attempts to debunk (seen primarily on the pre- and post-program attitude forms) and current research on prostitution. Many of the questions address the participants’ attitudes toward prostitutes and prostitution (whether prostitution should be decriminalized, for example). Questions such as “I wouldn’t mind marrying a prostitute” or “it would be OK if my daughter grew up to be a prostitute” are included to address what the organizers view as contradictions in the participant’s opinions of prostitution—if they would disapprove of their daughter becoming a prostitute, they should be able to acknowledge that the woman they attempted to hire is someone’s daughter. Questions such as “prostitutes make a lot of money,” “women are prostitutes because they want to be,” and “prostitutes genuinely like men” directly address
commonly held myths about the nature of street prostitution. Street prostitution is viewed by most researchers and advocates being on the lowest rung of the prostitution hierarchy, with street prostitutes earning the least and placing themselves at most risk of arrest, victimization, violence and addiction (Flowers, 1998). Street prostitutes are also seen as having existing in a “vastly different world” from higher-status prostitutes (Flowers, 1998: 18). It is this conflation of street prostitution and higher-class forms of prostitution that the organizers are attempting to expose. Contemporary research on street prostitution indicates that street prostitutes are more likely to have been abused as children, have drug addictions, and be victimized while working as prostitutes than women working in higher-status forms of prostitution, and these characteristics are also risk factors for entry into prostitution (Romero-Daza, Weeks and Singer, 2003; Dalla, 2002; Widom Spatz and Kuhns, 1996; Parriott, 1994). Most researchers and advocates argue that street prostitution is not a career choice, but rather is the only viable alternative for women who have few other economic opportunities (Dalla, 2002).

Overall, the program appears to be effective, at least in the short-term, in deterring men from hiring prostitutes. The program appears to be effective in challenging their preconceived ideas about prostitution and prostitutes, and so also challenge their willingness to hire a prostitute. The program information appears to be accurate, and works well in debunking the popular myths about prostitution that allow men to participate in the sex industry guilt-free. Organizers and researchers believe that men “cling to these [false] beliefs as a way to justify their behavior to themselves” (Hughes, 2004:17), so debunking these myths, and humanizing the women involved in prostitution, is a key element in deterring men from hiring prostitutes in the future.
Chapter 6 addresses improvements that could be made to the program in order to increase its effectiveness. By increasing the number of men that they target, and changing the ways that participants are recruited, organizers could be more effective in their efforts to deter men from hiring prostitutes. In addition, standardizing their forms and information would allow for a systematic analysis of the effectiveness of the program. Chapter 6 addresses these concerns, and the needs of programs such as the one run by Unbound, Inc. if they are to continue to exist and be effective.
Chapter 6: Discussion and Conclusion

The johns’ school run by Unbound, Inc. appears to be effective in changing the attitudes of participants toward prostitution (at least in the short term), it is rated highly by participants, and they state that the program will change their future behavior. Its long-term effectiveness is uncertain, though, because Unbound, Inc. does not keep records of any men that have re-offended within the one year probation period, and it is also unknown if any men re-offend after the probation period. There are several ways that the effectiveness of the program could be improved, and many ways that the employees and organizers of the johns’ school could more accurately assess the effectiveness of the program.

First, there are flaws in the forms that the program’s organizers use to assess the effectiveness of the program. The fact that there are many variations of the forms used makes it difficult to assess the program’s effectiveness since its beginning. It appears that there was a restructuring of the assessment tools about halfway through the life of the program, so there are at least two versions of each form. For example, one half of the pre- and post-test assessment tools contains a four-point Likert scale to indicate agreement or disagreement, and the other half uses only “agree” or “disagree,” which does not offer enough distinction in the responses to accurately assess whether any major change has occurred. In addition, none of the forms are linked through participant numbers or any other form of identification. It would be especially useful to be able to correlate attitudes, participant assessment of effectiveness, and demographic information, for example, to assess whether a certain demographic characteristic are associated with a certain amount of attitude change, or the likelihood of re-offense. Most importantly, organizers must be able to assess whether men have re-offended in order to know whether the program is truly effective. Organizers state that they are aware of only one man having re-
offended within the one-year probation period—if this is true, the program is extremely effective. It is also important to acknowledge that social desirability bias could play a part in the attitude changes of participants—it is entirely possible that after attending the program, they know what the “correct” answer is, and complete their post-program attitude forms accordingly.

As mentioned earlier, the fact that men are recruited for the program after being caught in a police sting is problematic. Not only are a large proportion of the men soliciting prostitutes ignored by using this method, but it is possible that men who have never before solicited a prostitute are caught in the same net as men that are frequent users of prostitutes, or that habitual users of prostitutes, who are likely the most difficult population to reach and deter, are savvy enough to be able to avoid a police sting. While it is important to educate these men, too, it would be useful to have a method to recruit the other men. In addition, only one man mentioned that he had been arrested while soliciting a prostitute from an advertisement in a local newspaper—targeting these men, too, would be useful if the true goal of the program is education and alleviating the problem of prostitution wherever and however it occurs. In addition, the cost of the program could be prohibitive for some potential participants. While requiring participants to pay to attend the program is necessary to help compensate for the cost the organization and county incurs to run the program, this is yet another segment of the population of potential johns that is in need of education.

It is important to address Wortley et al.’s finding that participants might be less sympathetic toward prostitutes after attending johns’ school, perhaps because the “focus on the lifestyles of prostitutes (which often include descriptions of high levels of drug and alcohol abuse), combined with a focus on the johns themselves as victims of prostitution, has the unintended consequence of making some men more negative toward prostitution” (2002:383).
While there is not an emphasis on the john as victim in this program, it is possible that this lack of sympathy also occurs among participants. This lack of sympathy is found primarily in the open-ended evaluations: respondents who wrote that they learned that “hookers don’t really care about anybody” could have been affected in this way, an attitude perhaps compounded by the bitterness they feel about being “entrapped” by police. Obviously, not all participants can be reached, but given this finding it is important for organizers to be aware of how they depict prostitutes and prostitution.

Given this finding, it is interesting that the most highly rated portion of the program, the STD/HIV awareness component, could be the most problematic. While it is important to educate the participants about the risk of acquiring an STD or HIV, it is also very important that the organizers and speakers take care not to imply that all prostitutes are diseased and dirty, which is a common perception. It is too easy to assume that being explicit and graphic with this component will scare men away from hiring prostitutes—it very well may, but organizers also run the risk of building up an inaccurate stereotype.

Similarly, something is lacking in the organizers’ ability to convince men that it is their behavior, not the behavior of prostitutes, that has brought them to their illegal activity and to the johns’ school. Many participants, when asked what they would do to change their behavior after attending the program, said that they would no longer talk to women on the streets, or they would not travel in certain neighborhoods or drive down certain roads. This implies that if only they could avoid these situations, they would not hire prostitutes. While this avoidance technique could be useful and effective, they fail to acknowledge that their behavior is problematic in the first place, placing the blame upon the women for tempting them. For these men, the fact that there is a “supply” of sex workers negates their own “demand” for the
women’s services. Some men tried to represent their actions as “helpful” toward the women that they solicited, and stated that they would no longer try and “help” women working and living on the streets—what helpful action they claim they were taking are not specifically stated, but this is probably another attempt to make themselves appear innocent of the offense they committed, one that is not only against the law but, as they now know, an act against both the women involved and the community.

Outside the control of the organizers is the lack of funding for such programs. It did not appear that there was one person assigned to assessing the effectiveness of the program. They do not use a computer program to analyze the material that is gathered—hand-written notes were found along with all of the material. The material was not well organized at the location, making it very difficult for an employee to conduct a long-term evaluation. There simply is not adequate funding for an innovative program such as this to continue without support from the community and other independent funding organizations.

One tragic incident brings to light the tenuous hold such programs have on their existence. In May of 2005, local Police Officer Sergeant Michael Anderson⁴ was murdered in a bar while working undercover. Anderson was a decorated police officer with 16 years of experience, and he had only recently been assigned to the vice unit to investigate prostitution, child prostitution and human trafficking, and was an avid supporter of the johns’ school at Unbound, Inc.. He not only supported the johns’ school, but he was known for being kind to women that he encountered during his work in the vice unit: “many times, Anderson would convince the women mired in prostitution that they deserved a better life and give them some supportive words instead of a trip to jail” (Brown, 2005). He was known for bringing women to Unbound, Inc.’s offices rather than taking them to jail. Because he was one of the few officers

⁴ Name changed to protect the confidentiality of the program.
that helped to coordinate sting operations, Unbound, Inc. has had an extraordinarily difficult time recruiting men for the johns’ schools since his death. Johns’ schools were held almost every month before Anderson’s death, and now they are held only a few times a year. This threatens their ability to get and retain funding, and jeopardizes the existence of the program altogether. That such an innovative and effective program could end because of the untimely death of one person illustrates how important community support is.

Finally, it is important to note that very few, if any, programs similar to the johns’ school exist for women that are prostitutes. Employees at Unbound, Inc. insist that they want the police to become more aware of the discrepancy of arrest rates between male customers and female prostitutes. While some men are arrested and redirected through to the johns’ school, there is no similar program for women attempting to leave prostitution. This further victimizes women by sending them to jail when their customers are allowed to attend a one-day program and have their arrest expunged. Programs must be created to assist women in leaving the streets, ones that are not punitive and that do not unfairly require women to pay for their attendance.

Prostitution is a serious problem in many communities around the country, and john schools are an effective, inexpensive way to target some purchasers of sex acts. Prostitution affects not only the women involved, but their families, their clients, their clients’ families, and the communities in which prostitution occurs. It damages the health, emotional and psychological states of the men and women involved and their families. More programs like this should be implemented around the country, created to specifically target individual populations. In addition, it is important for communities to address the “supply” part of the sex work equation by helping women leave prostitution through inexpensive or free drug-treatment programs, employment assistance, assistance finding housing and child care.
Braithwaite and Orcutt argue that in order for a punishment to be effective, it is important that the punishers are able to reintegrate the offender back into the community. The organizers of this johns’ school seem to be effective in this aspect—in fact, participants often noted that the speakers and organizers of the program didn’t “speak down to them” and spoke to them like “real people.” The organizers’ primary objective is to educate the participants about the nature of prostitution, and challenge the myths that men have about prostitution and prostitutes. In fact, the organizations’ stated goals for the john school is to “implement a program that would target the offender, educate and attempt to sensitize them to the social community and human consequences of their behavior” (Unbound, Inc., 2006). In doing so, they utilize Orcutt’s concept of inclusive reactions to deviance, and Braithwaite’s concepts of shaming and re-integration. They seem to be effective in doing this, perhaps because they do not isolate and ostracize the men that participate. Obviously, not all of the participants are receptive to the attempts to educate them, and the way that men are recruited for the program may be problematic in that it further alienates men. But, the vast majority of the participants are receptive to the information that they are given, and after completing the program are able to fully understand their role in prostitution, and the impact that it has on their families, the women involved, the community, and themselves.

The organizers also appear to largely avoid the stigmatization of participants that Wortley, et al. claim can result in the participants feeling less sympathy toward women involved in prostitution. As Wortley claims, over-emphasis on the “lifestyles of prostitutes…combined with a focus on the johns themselves as victims of prostitution, has the unintended consequence of making some men more negative toward prostitution” (2002:383). As noted before, this may reflect ideological differences of different program organizers: “some programs use a
confrontation ‘shaming ritual’ that includes a description of the damage and pain they have caused...other instructors believe that most of the men that purchase sex acts are so self-centered it is more effective to appeal to men’s self-interest to stop participating in an activity that will hurt them” (Hughes, 2004:32). Unbound, Inc. appears to be able to successfully integrate both a shaming ritual (largely through their use of ex-prostitutes’ stories and the participation of community members) and the “self-centeredness” of the john (through HIV/STD counseling and information, sexual addiction information, referrals to addiction counseling, and the legal ramifications of prostitution). In doing so, the organizers successfully reintegrate the participant into the community by allowing them to rejoin the community and have their arrest expunged after one year without a similar offense. The effectiveness of this method can be found in the participants’ rating of the program components: the two most highly rated components (“realities of prostitution” and “HIV/STD information”) address both the need to shame participants, and to address their “self-centered” nature. The fact that they are educating and reintegrating the participants shows the participants that the community has not isolated and ostracized them, and if the participants are willing to amend their behavior, they will be accepted back into the group (Braithwaite, 1989).

In addition, the organizers do not believe that hiring a prostitute, or attempting to hire a prostitute, is an example of the “situational deviance” required of inclusive reactions to deviance, they also do not believe that the frequenting of prostitutes is a matter of “character deviance” for all of the participants (Orcutt, 1973), or they would not try to re-educate them and release them back into society.

Finally, legalization and decriminalization of prostitution needs to be addressed. The organizers of Unbound’s johns’ school do not believe that the legalization or decriminalization
of prostitution is a viable solution to the program, because it simply legalizes what, in their minds (and in their mission statement) is “violence against women” (Unbound, Inc., 2006). They cite Raymond (1998: 4) as evidence of why legislation of prostitution has not worked in the past and will not work in the future: because women don’t want to register as sex workers, creating a permanent record of their prostitution, and because women will avoid registering to avoid this stigma, creating a separate, illegal underworld of prostitution. Furthermore, these efforts almost always focus on the female prostitutes, not the pimps or clients.

Legalized or decriminalized prostitution could have its benefits, such as HIV/STD testing, condom distribution, medical care, and protection by law enforcement. But such regulation must be implemented carefully, with recognition that few women choose to be prostitutes, and they must be able to leave prostitution when they want to. Legalization and decriminalization are unlikely to remove the stigma of prostitution, which, as Raymond noted, is the main obstacle to getting women to register and use the services that legalization would provide.

Innovative program such as johns’ schools and other community policing strategies have a precarious hold on their existence. Without community support and adequate funding, not only is the effectiveness of such programs threatened, but their very existence. While more research is necessary to assess the long-term effectiveness of this and similar programs, proving the effectiveness of the program could persuade other communities to implement a similar program. Similar programs could help bring about awareness of the real nature of street prostitution, helping to end the problem in communities around the country.
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Appendix: Program Materials

John School Demographics

1. How old are you?
2. What is your race?
3. What city and county do you live in?
4. Were you arrested or ticketed? ___________ In what location? ___________
5. Are you married? Yes No
6. Do you have children? Yes No
7. Do you have a criminal record? Yes No If so, for what? ______________
8. What is your income? Please check one

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than $18,000</th>
<th>$18,001-$25,000</th>
<th>$25,001-$30,000</th>
<th>$30,001-$40,000</th>
<th>$40,001-$50,000</th>
<th>$50,001-$60,000</th>
<th>$60,001 and up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. What is your occupation?
11. Have you ever had a sexually transmitted disease (STD)? Yes No
12. Have you ever paid to have sex with a prostitute? Yes No
   How many times?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>21-40</th>
<th>41-50</th>
<th>50-100</th>
<th>Over 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. How many years of school did you complete?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than 8th grade</th>
<th>9th through 11th grade</th>
<th>High school or GED</th>
<th>Technical College</th>
<th>Some College</th>
<th>College Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Have you ever used or abused alcohol or drugs? Yes No
   If abuse occurred, what drugs?
15. Have you ever traded or paid for sex with drugs? Yes No
Offenders’ Prostitution Program Pre-Survey Version A

Date: __________________

Please indicate your response (agreement or disagreement) with the following statements by putting a check in the box that most closely matches your views or beliefs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. There is nothing wrong with prostitution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If I were thinking about getting married, I wouldn’t mind marrying a prostitute.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Prostitution should be legalized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Prostitutes are victims of pimps.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Most prostitutes make a lot of money.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Prostitution should be decriminalized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It would be OK if my daughter grew up to be a prostitute.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Women are prostitutes because they want to be. It’s their choice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. As long as a wife doesn’t know, no harm is done to a marriage if a man goes to a prostitute.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Most men prefer young prostitutes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Prostitutes enjoy their work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It would be OK if my son went to prostitutes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Men who go to prostitutes have broken their marriage vows.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Most men go to prostitutes once in a while.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Offenders’ Prostitution Program Pre-Survey Version B

Date: ______________

Please indicate your response (agreement or disagreement) with the following statements by putting a check in the box that most closely matches your views or beliefs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. There is nothing wrong with prostitution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If I were thinking about getting married, I wouldn’t mind marrying a prostitute.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Prostitution should be legalized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Prostitutes are victims of pimps.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Most prostitutes make a lot of money.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Prostitution should be decriminalized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It would be OK if my daughter grew up to be a prostitute.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Women are prostitutes because they want to be. It’s their choice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. As long as a wife doesn’t know, no harm is done to a marriage if a man goes to a prostitute.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Most men prefer young prostitutes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Prostitutes enjoy their work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It would be OK if my son went to prostitutes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Men who go to prostitutes have broken their marriage vows.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Most men go to prostitutes once in a while.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Offenders’ Prostitution Program Post-Survey Version A

Date: ________________

Please indicate your response (agreement or disagreement) with the following statements by putting a check in the box that most closely matches your views or beliefs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. There is nothing wrong with prostitution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If I were thinking about getting married, I wouldn’t mind marrying a prostitute.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Prostitution should be legalized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Prostitutes are victims of pimps.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Most prostitutes make a lot of money.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Prostitution should be decriminalized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It would be OK if my daughter grew up to be a prostitute.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Women are prostitutes because they want to be. It’s their choice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. As long as a wife doesn’t know, no harm is done to a marriage if a man goes to a prostitute.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Most men prefer young prostitutes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Prostitutes enjoy their work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It would be OK if my son went to prostitutes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Men who go to prostitutes have broken their marriage vows.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Most men go to prostitutes once in a while.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Offenders’ Prostitution Program Post-Survey Version B

**Date:** ________________

Please indicate your response (agreement or disagreement) with the following statements by putting a check in the box that most closely matches your views or beliefs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. There is nothing wrong with prostitution.

2. If I were thinking about getting married, I wouldn’t mind marrying a prostitute.

3. Prostitution should be legalized.

4. Prostitutes are victims of pimps.

5. Most prostitutes make a lot of money.

6. Prostitution should be decriminalized.

7. It would be OK if my daughter grew up to be a prostitute.

8. Women are prostitutes because they want to be. It’s their choice.

9. As long as a wife doesn’t know, no harm is done to a marriage if a man goes to a prostitute.

10. Most men prefer young prostitutes.

11. Prostitutes enjoy their work.

12. It would be OK if my son went to prostitutes.

13. Men who go to prostitutes have broken their marriage vows.


15. Most men go to prostitutes once in a while.
## Rating Form A

**Date:** __________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall how do you feel today’s training met your expectations?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Please rate legal implications session:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Please rate the HIV/STI training session:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Please rate the Prostitution 101 training session:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Please rate the Ex-Prostitutes Speak Out.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments (please indicate which speaker):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker #1:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker #2:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker #3:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Please rate Community Members Panel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Please rate the interactive Job Exercise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any Additional Comments:
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## Rating Form B

Date: ____________________

1. How did you feel this day’s overall training met your needs?  
   Poor 1 2  Fair 3 4  Excellent 5

2. Please rate session #1: Realities of the Street  
   Teaching style in which material was presented 1 2 3 4 5  
   Usability of the information 1 2 3 4 5

3. Please rate session #2: Legal Implications:  
   Teaching style in which material was presented 1 2 3 4 5  
   Usability of the information 1 2 3 4 5

4. Please rate session #4: Ex-prostitutes Speak Out  
   Teaching style in which material was presented 1 2 3 4 5  
   Usability of the information 1 2 3 4 5

5. Please rate the Ex-Prostitutes Speak Out  
   First speaker’s teaching style : 1 2 3 4 5  
   Second speaker’s teaching style 1 2 3 4 5  
   Third speaker’s teaching style 1 2 3 4 5  
   Usability of the information 1 2 3 4 5

6. Please rate session #5: Community Members  
   Teaching style in which material was presented 1 2 3 4 5  
   Usability of the information 1 2 3 4 5

7. Please rate session #6: Sexual Addictions  
   Teaching style in which material was presented 1 2 3 4 5  
   Usability of the information 1 2 3 4 5
Feedback Sheet Version A

Please give us any other comments or suggestions about today’s training. Use the back if you need more room.

- What did you like best about today’s program?

- What would you change about today’s program?

- How has prostitution affected your life?

- How do you think you will change your behavior?

- How will you change how you relate to your…. Family, Significant Other, or Children

- If you had (or do have) a son or daughter, what would you tell them about prostitution?
Feedback Sheet Version B

Please give us any other comments or suggestions about today’s training. Use the back if you need more room.

- What did you like best or find most valuable about this program?

- What would you change?

- How has prostitution affected your life?

- How do you think you will change your behavior?

- Are you going to change how you relate to your wife, daughter, son and/or girlfriend?
  
  YES_____  NO_____  
  How?

- If you had (or do have) a son or daughter, what would you tell them about prostitution?