

Record: 1

Title:

Vice lessons: A survey of prostitution offenders enrolled in the Toronto John School Diversion Program.

Authors:

Wortley, Scot

1
1

Fischer, Benedikt

2

Webster, Cheryl

3

Source:

Canadian Journal of Criminology. Oct2002, Vol. 44 Issue 4, p369- 402. 34p.

Document Type:

Article

Full Text Word Count:

11058

ISSN:

0704-9722

Accession Number:

8504478

Database:

Academic Search Premier

Vice lessons: A survey of prostitution offenders enrolled in the Toronto John School Diversion Program

This paper provides a description and evaluation of the Toronto 'John School' Diversion Program. This alternative sentencing strategy is designed for the male clients of female prostitutes who have been charged with an offence under Section 213 of the Criminal Code. Upon entering a guilty plea, these men are diverted into a one-day educational program that focusses on the social harms caused by the sex trade. After completing the program, the original prostitution charge is withdrawn. Results from a pre- and post-program survey of John School participants (N=366) indicate that the program is somewhat successful in achieving some of its principal objectives.

After attending the program, participants are more likely to accept responsibility for their actions, more likely to admit that they might have a sex addiction and are less likely to report favourable attitudes towards prostitution. There is also evidence of significant post-program improvement in the respondents' knowledge of Canadian prostitution law and an increased awareness of both the victims and dangers associated with the sex trade. After completing the program, the vast majority of John School participants indicate that they will never again attempt to purchase sexual services from a prostitute. However, one out of every ten participants indicates that he will continue to use prostitutes in the future. The paper concludes with a discussion of the potential benefits and problems associated with the John School model.

Introduction The last quarter century, grosso modo, has witnessed the emergence of a myriad of strategies to prevent or control street prostitution in Canada. On the legislative front, a bill (C-49) was passed in 1985, permitting the prosecution of the client (or John) as well as the prostitute (Federal, Provincial, and Territorial (F/P/T) Working Group) 1998; Robertson and Morris 1991). ([n4](#)) On the institutional level, changes in law enforcement practices have been introduced whereby police have begun targeting street prostitution through more regular patrol and increased large-scale "sting operations" (Wortley and Fischer 2002). In the social arena, experimental shaming practices have been promoted - including the publication of the names of Johns in local newspapers (Roach 1999).

This multitude of responses to the "prostitution problem" has been met with a singular dissatisfaction on the part of the general public (F/P/T

Working Group 1998). This discontentment is particularly acute in certain urban neighbourhoods in which street prostitution continues to thrive. As a result, local pressure to find more effective strategies to deal with street prostitution has intensified. In the early 1990's, several political and law enforcement representatives from Toronto proposed the adoption of the American model of "John School" diversion for first-time male prostitution offenders (Small 1995; Larsen 1996). Originally created in San Francisco (Monto 2000), this approach represents an innovative solution to street prostitution - while simultaneously reflecting the current social and political orientation toward more cost- effective, victim-oriented and deinstitutionalized criminal justice measures (Fischer, Wortley, Webster, and Kirst forthcoming).

Launched in 1996 under the joint auspices of the Ontario Attorney General's Office, the Mayor's Task Force on Prostitution, the Toronto Police Service, and the Salvation Army, the Toronto John School Diversion Program is a post-charge, pre-trial option in the classical sense. Upon successful completion of a one-day education session, the initial prostitution charge is dropped and no criminal record is generated. This strategy is based on the expectation that the information provided by the educational program will cause the offender to abandon the use of street prostitutes. The Toronto John School has been heralded as a success by program stakeholders (Wortley and Fischer 2002) as well as the media (Prokaska 1996; Platiel 1996; Darroch 1996). Similar pilot projects have subsequently been adopted in other Canadian cities (including Ottawa, Hamilton, and Vancouver).

Despite the increasing popularity of diversion in Western criminal

justice systems, very little research has explored the actual impact of such initiatives (Nuffield 1997). Indeed, the expansion of the John School model in Canada has not been based on any formal, published evaluations of its effectiveness. In response to this paucity of research, the National Crime Prevention Council and the Department of Justice sponsored a multi-component, independent evaluation of the Toronto First Offender Prostitution Diversion Program (Wortley and Fischer 2002).^(n5) This evaluation was carried out between 1998 and 2001. Spearheaded by researchers from the University of Toronto, this endeavour constitutes the first comprehensive evaluation of the John School program in Canada.^(n6) This paper presents findings from one component of this independent evaluation - a survey of John School participants. It begins with a brief description of the Toronto John School diversion initiative and the criminal justice process by which offenders come to participate in the program. After discussing research methodology, we examine, in detail, the extent to which the John School achieves major program objectives. The implications of our findings are discussed in the conclusion.

The diversion process The John School is available for men who have been charged under Section 213 of the Criminal Code (communicating for the purposes of prostitution). Typically, the accused is given a court date by the arresting police officer and released at the scene. Men charged with the communicating offence are rarely taken into custody or held in detention before their first court appearance. Most of the individuals who attend the John School are caught in police sting operations which involve undercover police officers posing as prostitutes (Wortley and Fischer 2002). After arrest, the Crown determines whether the accused is eligible for the diversion

program. Eligibility criteria are "no criminal record and the offender's complete lack of criminal antecedence" (Attorney General 1996). In court, eligible offenders are given the choice of attending the John School or following traditional criminal proceedings. If the offender chooses the John School, he must first enter a guilty plea and sign a diversion agreement with the Crown. This accord stipulates that the charge may be withdrawn - at the discretion of the court - if the offender successfully completes the program. The offender is subsequently told to register for John School with Streetlight Support Services (the organization that is currently administering the diversion program). Upon paying a \$400 "tuition" fee, the John is assigned a date on which he is required to attend the John School educational day.

The John School program The actual John School educational program usually takes place on one Saturday per month. During the study period, the number of men attending these sessions ranged from 25 to 45 (mean=32). The John School event begins at 8:30 am. Participants are first required to sign in, receive name tags and find their seat in the classroom. At about 9:00 am the police facilitator introduces himself and welcomes participants. The balance of the John School day involves a series of presentations. Each presentation lasts between 30 to 40 minutes. Much like the classic "Scared Straight" programs for young offenders (Finckenauer 1982), a number of these presentations focus on the consequences that the Johns might face if they continue to engage in the sex trade. In other presentations, the Johns must confront the various victims of prostitution. These victim-oriented presentations seek to educate the Johns - through a confrontational shaming ritual - about the damage and pain that their prostitution-related behaviour has caused. Some

observers have argued that this aspect of the John School process contains elements of the basic restorative justice model (Brathwaite 1989).([n7](#))

The morning speakers focus on the damage that prostitution can cause to the Johns themselves. The first presentation is given by a Crown attorney who describes the nature of prostitution law in Canada and outlines the negative consequences that often accompany a criminal record. The second speaker is a detective from the Toronto Police Service. The detective discusses the many dangers that men face when they decide to engage in street prostitution. The Johns are told, for example, about drug addicted prostitutes who have stabbed their clients with AIDS infected needles, about prostitutes who have drugged their clients and stolen their money, and about Johns who have been beaten, robbed, or even murdered by pimps. The detective also tries to convey the idea that prostitution is an integral part of a much larger criminal underworld. The men are told that, by using prostitutes, they are supporting biker gangs, pimps, drug dealers, and organized crime. The final presentation of the morning session is delivered by representatives from the Public Health Department. These speakers - with the aid of a rather graphic slide show - describe the symptoms and consequences of various sexually transmitted diseases (STD's). They also provide the Johns with detailed information on how to reduce the risks of contracting STD's through safer sex practices. Unlike the other presenters, the health department presenters do not discuss prostitution in moralistic terms. Indeed, they stress that safe sex practices should be followed with all intimate partners. Following this presentation, the program breaks for lunch.

The afternoon session is designed to challenge the idea that prostitution is a victimless crime. The first speaker of the afternoon is a resident from a community that has a problem with street prostitution. This speaker discusses the many problems that prostitution brings to their neighbourhood, including increased traffic, garbage {dirty needles and used condoms}, and drug dealers. The community speakers often discuss how they themselves - or their children - have been harassed for sexual favours by Johns. They also provide numerous examples of the crime and violence that residents experience as a result of the sex trade. The next speaker is a former prostitute who describes how she first became involved in prostitution and the great damage that the sex trade has caused to her life and the lives of the other prostitutes that she has known. This presentation confronts the romantic notion that most prostitutes enjoy the sexual contact with their clients and that prostitution is simply a benign economic transaction between two willing parties. The ex-prostitute typically details a cycle of poverty, childhood sexual abuse, alcoholism, drug addiction, and violence at the hands of both pimps and clients. Most speakers maintain that they did not choose to become prostitutes, but were forced into the sex trade by unfortunate life circumstances. By supporting the sex trade, the John School participants are told that they are directly contributing to the severe pain and suffering that most prostitutes experience.

The final presentation of the day is given by two former Johns from an organization called Sex and Love Addicts Anonymous (SLAA). These men begin by admitting that they were once frequent users of street prostitutes. They then chronicle the damage that this behaviour caused to their families, their careers, their reputations, and their

self-respect. The ex-Johns also ask the men in the room to consider the possibility that they have an addiction to sex and suggest that they may want to seek help for this disease. In this manner, the Johns themselves are actually depicted as yet another victim of the sex trade. After describing the psychology of sex addiction, the ex-Johns conclude by imploring the men in the room to learn from the John School and stop engaging in self-destructive behaviour.

Following the SLAA presentation, the police facilitator wraps up the day by running a few group exercises. These exercises provide the Johns with an opportunity to demonstrate what they have learned from the various speakers and to discuss the events of the day with other participants. The facilitator brings the day to a close by reminding the participants that "everyone is a victim" of prostitution and warning them that the next time they are arrested they will not be treated so leniently. The men then retrieve their exit papers which prove that they have successfully completed the John School program. The men must present these papers to court in order to have their charges withdrawn (see Wortley and Fischer 2002 for a more detailed description of the John School protocol).

Program objectives According to program stakeholders (Wortley and Fischer 2002), the John School initiative has seven major objectives: 1) to ensure that participants take personal responsibility for their actions; 2) to educate participants about the nature of prostitution law in Canada; 3) to increase participants' awareness of the victims of street prostitution; 4) to increase participants' awareness of the dangers of street prostitution; 5) to increase participants' awareness that they may have a problem with their own sexual behaviour; 6) to change participants' attitudes towards prostitution; and 7) to deter

participants from engaging in future prostitution-related activities. The purpose of this paper is to examine the extent to which the program achieves these goals.

Methodology In order to assess the effectiveness of the John School, we conducted a series of pre-program and post- program interviews with John School participants. This one group, pre-test/posttest design (Cook and Campbell 1979) permits an exploration of whether or not attitudes, knowledge, and anticipated future behaviour actually changed as a result of the John School curriculum. The sampling frame consisted of all men who attended the Toronto John School program between March 11, 2000 and March 24,2001. Thirteen different John Schools were conducted during the study period.

Respondents were first contacted during the pre-program registration period,(n8) Registration usually takes place a few weeks before offenders actually take part in the John School educational program. Once a respondent agreed to participate in the study, they were escorted to a private office to be interviewed. These interviews lasted between 25 to 65 minutes (mean=38 minutes). A second set of questions were subsequently administered at the conclusion of the Saturday John School program. When the participants arrived for the program, they were given an envelope, with their name on it, containing the post-program questionnaire. Within the envelope was a questionnaire with a study identification number. This number was used to link responses to the questionnaire with the responses from the original registration interview. Respondents were asked to fill out this questionnaire after the last presentation of the day. This questionnaire contained identical questions to those asked during the registration interview. By comparing responses at Time One

(pre-program) with responses at Time Two (post-program), we are able to determine whether or not the John School had an impact on program participants (see Wortley and Fischer 2002 for a detailed description of the full research protocol - including informed consent procedures).([n9](#))

John School records indicate that a total of 413 men participated in the program during the study period. We were able to obtain pre-program and post-program information from 366 of these participants (final response rate=88.6%). We were unable to conduct registration interviews with 47 of the men who participated in the John School program during the study period. Only 6 of these men (1.4% of all participants) actually refused to participate in the research project. An additional 5 men were not interviewed because they had been given permission by Streetlight to register for the John School program outside of the regular registration period. Finally, we did not interview 36 of the 413 participants (8.7% of all participants) because of a severe language barrier.

Table 1 provides a basic demographic profile of the 366 respondents who participated in the John School survey. The results suggest that - compared to the average adult male resident of Toronto - the typical John School participant is more likely to be middle-aged, is less likely to have a post-secondary education, is more likely to be foreign born, and is more likely to report that English is not his first language. In addition, the data suggest that relatively few John School participants come from an affluent social background or are employed in professional/managerial occupations (see detailed discussion in Wortley and Fischer 2002). While these data may, in fact, describe the typical user of prostitution services in Toronto, it is also possible that

the sample simply reflects the nature of anti-prostitution police work conducted in the Toronto area. Said differently, the types of men who ultimately attend the John School program may reflect the demographics of the neighbourhoods and individuals that are most often targeted by police "sting" operations and other anti-prostitution initiatives.(n10)

Results Responsibilization One of the stated objectives of the John School program is to encourage participants to take responsibility for their actions and admit that they have engaged in an illegal activity. At both Time One (pre-program interview) and Time Two (post-program questionnaire) respondents were asked if they felt that they were guilty or innocent of the prostitution charge that had been laid against them. The results suggest that respondents are more likely to acknowledge guilt after attending the John School. At Time One, only 53% of the Johns admitted being guilty of a prostitution offence. At Time Two, this figure rises to 73% - a difference of 20 percentage points ($p < .001$). (n11) Overall, 72 of the 165 men (44%) who originally declared their innocence subsequently admitted their culpability after attending the program.

There are several possible explanations for this finding. First, we cannot ignore the possibility that John School attendance may have encouraged some participants to take responsibility for their actions - either by assisting them in recognizing their guilt or by placing them in an environment in which little would be gained by declaring innocence. Another potential explanation is that some men, before attending the John School, truly believed that they were innocent because they did not understand Canadian prostitution law. Indeed, several participants explained their innocence during the registration interview by claiming

that no money had been exchanged or sex acts performed. These men claimed that they had simply been talking with a prostitute (or police decoy) prior to their arrest. As one John stated:

I was just walking by and she said hi. She asked me if I wanted company. I started to fool around and asked her how much for this and how much for that. I was just joking. I just did it out of curiosity. Then I was arrested.

In this sense, the John School education program may have made some men aware, for the first time, that "communicating for the purposes of prostitution" is a crime in and of itself and that they were, in fact, guilty of this offence. In addition, we cannot dismiss the potential impact of the different data collection strategies used at Time One and Time Two. As discussed above, the pre-program survey involved a face-to-face interview with each respondent, while the post-program data collection involved a self-administered questionnaire. It is possible that the substantial increase in admissions of guilt witnessed at Time Two can be attributed to the fact that the respondents felt more comfortable confessing their culpability on an anonymous questionnaire than directly to an interviewer. Finally, it is also possible that the participants, at Time Two, were simply more aware of the 'correct' or 'expected' response. Some may even have been concerned that their answers could somehow have an impact on their successful completion of the program. In other words, we simply cannot discount the impact of an "experimental" or "social desirability" effect on post-program responses.

Knowledge of Canadian prostitution law At both Time One and Time Two, respondents were asked whether or not it was against the law to engage in four different prostitution-related activities: a) buying

sex from a prostitute on the street; b) buying sex from a prostitute over the phone or from an escort service; c) just talking to a prostitute about buying sex; and d) stopping your car on the street in order to buy sex. The results (see Table 2) suggest that John School attendance had a significant impact on how the participants viewed the legality of three of these four activities. First, only 65% of the respondents during the registration interview felt that it was illegal to "just talk to a prostitute about buying sex." After attending the John School, this figure jumps significantly to 85% ($p < .001$). Thus, as suggested in the section above, the John School would appear to be somewhat effective at teaching participants that the mere act of "communicating for the purposes of prostitution" is a crime and that a person does not actually have to engage in a sexual act in order to break the law. Similarly, only 75% of the respondents at Time One thought that it was illegal to stop your car on the street in order to buy sex. This figure increases to 88% at Time Two. A significant increase (from 57% to 66%) was also found in the proportion of men who felt that it was illegal to buy sex over the phone or from an escort service. (n12) The John School, however, did not have a significant impact on the perceived illegality of purchasing sex from street prostitutes. Almost all of the respondents already viewed street prostitution as illegal at Time One.

The effect of the John School on the participants' awareness of the sentencing options for a prostitution conviction was also examined. At both Time One and Time Two respondents were asked: According to Canadian Law, what is the maximum punishment for a prostitution offence? The response options were: a) a \$400 fine; b) a \$2,000 fine and 6 months in prison; c) 5 years in prison; d) Community Service; e) Probation with mandatory treatment; and f) Other. The correct answer

is a \$2000 fine and 6 months in prison. At Time One, only 21% of the respondents selected the correct answer, compared to 67% after attending the John School (an increase of 46 percentage points). This finding provides further evidence that the John School may increase participants' knowledge of the Canadian law.

Awareness of the victims of prostitution One of the primary objectives of the John School is to increase the participants' awareness of the various 'victims' of prostitution. Indeed, several of the speakers focus almost exclusively on the harms of prostitution to families, communities, and those who take part in sex trade activities. In order to evaluate how effectively this message was being communicated, the Johns were asked at both Time One and Time Two whether prostitution had any victims. The results suggest that attendance at the John School increases awareness of victims and the damage caused by prostitution. Although the majority of participants (79%) had already acknowledged during the pre-program interview that prostitution had victims, this figure increases significantly ($p < .001$) after John School attendance. In fact, almost all of the Johns (95%) indicated that prostitution had victims after they completed the program.

A comparison of pre-program and post-program responses indicates that participants are also more likely to be aware of specific types of victims after attending the John School (see Table 3). In general, the program significantly increases the proportion of men who report that the Johns, themselves, are victims, as well as the Johns' wives/girlfriends and their children. The program also seems to have a strong effect on the awareness of community harms. Prior to attending the John

School, only 25% of all participants identified "the community" as a victim of prostitution. This figure increases to 58% after John School attendance (a statistically significant increase of 33 percentage points).

Contrary to the general pattern of increased victim awareness, our John School participants were actually less likely to identify prostitutes as victims after they had completed the John School program. At the registration interview, 48% of the Johns identified prostitutes as potential victims, compared to only 41% after attending the John School. There are several possible explanation for this finding. To begin with, at Time Two, 15% of all respondents simply stated that "everyone" is a victim of prostitution (compared to only 2% at Time One). It is probably safe to assume that by "everyone" these respondents are including prostitutes. Thus, if we add the 15% of respondents who stated that "everyone is a victim" to the 41% who specifically identified prostitutes, the percentage of respondents who really feel that prostitutes are victims is 56%. This figure is significantly higher than the 48% who originally listed prostitutes as victims at Time One. We must also remember that at Time One the respondents had to give their answers verbally, in response to the interviewer, while at Time Two they had to write their responses on the questionnaire. Thus, different data collection strategies may also help explain the decline in the number of respondents who name prostitutes as victims. Finally, we must also consider the possibility that some participants actually become less sympathetic towards prostitutes after attending John School. Perhaps the John School's focus on the lifestyles of prostitutes (which often include descriptions of money and 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 towards prostitutes.(n13)

Finally, the data also suggest that the Johns identify a greater number of victims of prostitution after completing the John School Program. During the pre-program registration interview, respondents listed an average of 1.3 victims, compared to 2.3 victims after completing the program. This difference is statistically significant. Additional analysis suggests that both education and language proficiency may have an important influence on how well the John School improves victim awareness. In general, those with better language skills and higher levels of educational attainment show greater post-program improvement. For example, participants with a university degree identified, on average, 1.7 more victims after attending the John School, compared to a mean increase of only .73 victims for those with less than a high school education. Similarly, those with very good English identified, on average, 1.28 more victims, compared to mean increases of only .58 victims for those whose English was rated (by interviewers) as "pretty good" and .43 victims for those whose English was rated as "not very good." One possible explanation for these findings is that those with higher levels of education and better language skills are better able to follow and absorb the various "lessons" provided at the John School. Likewise, they may also be better at filling out the self-administered questionnaire and thus demonstrating what they have learned by attending by the John School program.

Awareness of the dangers of prostitution Another objective of the John School is to increase the participants' awareness of the potential dangers of purchasing sex from prostitutes. Various speakers focus on

these dangers, which include exposure to disease, loss of family, obtaining a criminal record, and becoming the victim of a violent crime. In order to evaluate how effectively the dangers of prostitution are being communicated to program participants, we asked the Johns (at both Time One and Time Two): Do you think that there are any dangers or risks involved with hiring or using prostitutes for sex? The results suggest that attendance at the John School does not significantly increase awareness of the potential dangers associated with prostitution. This lack of evidence of improvement stems from the fact that almost all of the Johns acknowledge that there are at least some dangers associated with prostitution before (96%) and after (97%) they participate in the program.

Although the findings suggest that respondents are no more likely to report dangers per se after attending the John School, additional analysis reveals that they are more likely to report certain types of danger (see Table 4). For instance, a higher proportion of participants identified the danger of being arrested and obtaining a criminal record at Time Two than at Time One. Similarly, after attending the program, a higher percentage of the respondents acknowledged the risk of becoming the victim of a violent crime and the danger of causing harm to family relationships. Contrary to initial expectations, the results also suggest that, after attending John School, respondents are somewhat less likely to identify the threat of disease. Part of the explanation for this finding may once again derive from the respondent's language skills and the broader factor of educational attainment. Given the technical nature of the presentation on the risks of STD's, the significance of this information may have been more easily understood (and expressed in the open-ended questions at Time Two) by those

with strong English language skills. This interpretation would appear to find partial support in further analyses which reveal that those who were less proficient in English and had lower levels of education reported fewer dangers at Time Two than at Time One. By contrast, respondents with good English language skills and higher educational attainment demonstrated a statistically significant increase in the mean number of dangers identified between the pre- and post-program surveys (Wortley and Fischer 2002: 82-84). (n14)

Recognition of a possible sex problem One of the principal focuses of the John School program is to communicate to the participants that the purchase of sex from prostitutes is not a normative behaviour. The facilitator and presenters frequently remind the Johns that their participation in the sex trade harms their family, their community and - most importantly - themselves. The message of self-inflicted damage plays a central role in the presentation given by the ex-Johns from Sex and Love Addicts Anonymous (SSLA). In general, these speakers assert that prostitution-related behaviour is possibly a symptom of a sex problem or "addiction." In order to assess the receptiveness of the John School participants to this "sex addiction" message and the impact that the program has on how the participants view their own behaviour, we asked respondents at both Time One and Time Two whether they thought they had a problem or an addiction to sex. The results suggest that the Johns are much more likely to believe that they might have a sex problem after attending the John School. At the registration interview, for example, only 11% of the respondents indicated that they either had (5%) or might have (6%) a sexual addiction. By contrast, after completing the John School, 42% of the participants admitted that they either had (14%) or might have (28%) a sex problem - a statistically significant increase of 31 percentage

points ($p < .001$). While these findings suggest that the John School may be effective in helping men recognize the possible psychological cause of their prostitution-related behaviour, we cannot ignore the possibility that the program may also have the adverse affect of providing participants with a convenient justification or excuse for their prostitution-related sexual activity.

Attitudes towards prostitution A major goal of the John School program is to change participants' attitudes towards prostitution. In order to estimate attitudinal changes that might be attributed to the program, the respondents were asked (at both Time One and Time Two) to indicate whether they agreed or disagreed with 14 different statements about various prostitution-related issues. The results suggest that, in most cases, John School attendance had a significant effect on the participants' attitudes towards prostitution (see Table 5). For example, only 66% of the Johns indicated at Time One that they either strongly agreed or agreed that "street prostitution causes serious problems in some neighbourhoods." After program completion, this figure rose to 85%. Similarly, the proportion of respondents who agreed that "using prostitutes is a dangerous thing to do" increased from 57% to 76% between Time One and Time Two. (n15)

In order to summarize these results, the responses to all 14 survey items were combined to form a scale measuring overall attitudes towards prostitution ($\alpha = .78$). This scale ranges from 14 to 70 with higher scores indicating more negative attitudes towards prostitution. The results suggest that, on average, respondents score significantly higher on this scale after attending the John School (mean=52) than

they did during the registration period (mean=48). Overall, 69.2% of the study participants demonstrated a more negative attitude towards prostitution at Time Two than at Time One.

Finally, we also examined whether the John School had an impact on the participants' attitudes towards the legalization of the sex trade. At both Time One and Time Two, respondents were asked: In your opinion, do you think that prostitution should be legal or illegal in Canada? One might predict that, if the John School is effective, the participants should become somewhat less enthusiastic about the prospect of legalization. The data support this hypothesis. At Time One, less than half of the respondents (48%) thought that prostitution should be illegal in Canada. After John School attendance, this figure rose to 58% (statistically significant at $p < .001$). It is impossible to determine whether these findings reflect true attitude changes or are simply the manifestation of a "social desirability" effect caused by the respondents' desire to "give the right answer" and please the members of the research team.

Anticipated future use of prostitutes Official John School records indicate that approximately one out of every forty men (2.4%) who attended the diversion program between 1998 and 2000 ($N=867$) were subsequently arrested for another prostitution-related offence. Our investigation also revealed that the John School's recidivism data is both incomplete and tainted by various administrative problems (Wortley and Fischer 2002: 23-28). Furthermore, even high quality recidivism data would not capture those men who have used prostitutes since attending John School but have avoided police detection. Thus, we decided to supplement our analysis of official recidivism data by asking respondents about their anticipated future

behaviour. At both Time One and Time Two respondents were asked: Do you think you will ever try to buy sex from a prostitute in the future? Response options included: a) YES - I will buy sex from a prostitute in the future; b) MAYBE - I might buy sex from a prostitute in the future; c) PROBABLY NOT - I probably will not buy sex from a prostitute in the future; and d) NEVER - I am sure that I will never buy sex from a prostitute in the future.

The results suggest that - besides the possible deterrent effects of being arrested - participation in the John School educational program has relatively little impact on the Johns' anticipated future use of prostitutes. Indeed, both before and after attending John School, the majority of the men we interviewed (approximately 90%) indicated that they either would not or probably would not use prostitutes again (see Figure 1). By contrast, during the registration interview, only 12.8% of the respondents indicated that they definitely would use or might use prostitutes in the future. This figure drops only slightly - to 11% - after John School attendance. This small difference (1.8 percentage points) is not statistically significant. Nonetheless, it is important to note that, even after attending John School, one out of every ten respondents report that they might still use prostitutes in the future. Interestingly, this figure is more than four times greater than the official program recidivism rate (2.4%). This divergence might indicate that some men, after attending John School, continue to engage in prostitution but are able to avoid police detection. Conversely, there may be a significant difference between the stated intentions of some respondents and their actual behaviour (i.e., some men say they will use prostitutes again but never do).

We were also interested in determining whether previous sex trade experience might condition the impact that the John School program has on future behaviour. To this end, we used information about the respondents' perceived guilt or innocence and their previous use of prostitutes in order to identify four different types of John School participant. The first type of John School participant - representing 35% of the sample - is the Denier. Deniers claim that they are completely innocent of the prostitution charge that has been laid against them and maintain that they have never used prostitutes in their life. The second type of John is the First-Timer. These men admit that they were indeed trying to purchase sex from a prostitute at the time of their arrest and are guilty of the communicating charge. First-Timers also claim that they have never purchased sex from a prostitute before and that their arrest was, in fact, their first attempt to do so. First-timers represent 25% of our sample.(n16) The third type of John School participant is the Novice. These men report that they have used prostitutes between 1 and 4 times in their life. Finally, the category of Sex-Trade Veteran includes all respondents who have used prostitutes on 5 or more occasions in their life. Overall, 18% of our sample are Novices and 22% are Sex-Trade Veterans.

The data reveal that Sex-Trade Veterans are much more likely to report they will use prostitutes in the future than men who claim that they have never used prostitutes (see Table 6). For example, at the registration interview, 13% of the Sex-Trade Veterans admitted that, despite their arrest, they definitely would use prostitutes again. By contrast, not a single Denier or First-Timer claimed that they would definitely purchase the services of a prostitute in the future. Similarly, a third of all Sex-Trade Veterans (32.9%) indicated at Time One that

they might use prostitutes in the future, compared to 6% of Novices and only 2% of both the First-Timers and Deniers. Although Sex-Trade Veterans represent only 22% of the total sample, they represent 83% of those respondents who stated - during the registration interview - that they would use prostitutes again and 76% of all respondents who indicated that they might use prostitutes again. Further analysis reveals that John School attendance does little to change this basic pattern. Even after completing the program, Sex-Trade Veterans are much more likely than other participants to report that they will continue to use prostitutes in the future.

To investigate further the impact of John School on anticipated behaviour, we categorized all respondents into three distinct groups: a) those who reported that they were less likely to use prostitutes after attending the John School; b) those who experienced no change in anticipated behaviour as a result of the educational program; and c) those who were more likely to use prostitutes at Time Two.(n17) The results indicate that the John School had no impact on the anticipated behaviour of seven out of every ten respondents (69.4%). Most of these men maintained, at both Time One and Time Two, 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. A large proportion of the men in the "more likely" category are First-Timers and Deniers who moved from stating that they would "never" use prostitutes at Time One to stating that they "probably would not" use prostitutes at Time Two.

Additional analysis (see Table 7) reveals that the positive impact of John School may be greatest for the Sex-Trade Veterans and

Novices. Indeed, 29% of Veterans and 21% of Novices reported that they were less likely to purchase sex after attending the diversion program, compared to only 5% of the Deniers and 4% of the First-Timers. By contrast, the Deniers and First-Timers are most likely to demonstrate no change in anticipated behaviour between Time One and Time Two. Indeed, at Time One, over 90% of the men in these categories already state that they will never use prostitutes again. Thus, unlike Sex-Trade Veterans and Novices, there is little room to observe post-program improvement for either the Deniers or First-Timers.

In sum, the majority of our respondents claim - at both Time One and Time Two - that they will refrain from prostitution-related activities in the future. While a significant proportion of Sex-Trade Veterans state that they will continue to use prostitutes, this group also shows the greatest post-program change with respect to anticipated future behaviour. Hence, despite additional analyses which indicate that Sex-Trade Veterans often adopt prostitution as part of their general lifestyle and develop elaborate justifications for their behaviour (see full discussion in Wortley and Fischer 2002), the John School diversion program may still be able to deter some of these individuals from participating in the sex trade. By contrast, our analysis suggests that arrest alone may be enough to dissuade the less experienced Deniers and First-Timers.

Discussion Results from a pre- and post-program survey of participants indicate that the John School may be somewhat successful in achieving several of its principal objectives. After attending the John School educational session, participants are more likely to accept responsibility for their actions, more likely to admit that

they might have a sex addiction, and are less likely to report favourable attitudes towards the sex trade. Furthermore, there is evidence of significant post-program improvement in the respondents' knowledge of Canadian prostitution law and an increased awareness of both the victims and dangers associated with street prostitution. These changes in the respondents' general knowledge of prostitution issues are particularly noteworthy. Although it could be argued that self-reported attitudes toward prostitution could be easily misrepresented by survey respondents - indicating a possible social desirability or experimental effect - observed post-program changes in personal knowledge would be considerably more difficult to fabricate.([n18](#)) It should be noted, however, that the potential impact of the John School program may be contingent on both education and language proficiency. In general, those with higher levels of educational attainment and better language skills tend to demonstrate greater post- program changes in both knowledge and attitudes. These participants may have a greater ability to absorb, retain, and communicate the "lessons" taught during the John School day.([n19](#))

Although our findings document significant post-program changes in attitudes towards prostitution, these attitudinal changes do not seem to translate into significant changes in anticipated future behaviour. Indeed, the area in which the impact of the John School appears weakest is with regard to deterring future prostitution-related activities. In general, our results suggest that the impact of the John School on self-anticipated behaviour is small and statistically insignificant. This finding is largely a reflection of the fact that the vast majority of respondents claim that they will never use prostitutes again - even before they actually attend the educational component of the John School process. In other words, the John School appears to have no

significant deterrent effect above and beyond arrest and subsequent criminal proceedings. This interpretation is supported by other studies which find little evidence of recidivism benefits for diversion programs over traditional criminal justice interventions (Nuffield 1997). Indeed, the official recidivism rate produced by the Toronto John School (2.4%) is almost identical to the re-offence rate (2.0%) produced by regular criminal justice proceedings brought against male prostitution offenders in Vancouver (Lowman 1998). Nonetheless, the "no-impact on behaviour" conclusion requires some qualification. Our data also reveal that the John School program may work, to some extent, for certain types of John School participant. Sex-Trade Veterans and Novices, for example, are significantly less likely to report that they will use prostitutes after attending John School. It is important to note, however, that the Sex-Trade Veterans are also more likely to be resistant to both the arrest experience and the John School message. Indeed, close to a third of Sex-Trade Veterans maintain - both before and after program completion - that they will probably continue to use prostitutes in the future.

Serious concerns Despite some positive findings, our research also uncovered a number of serious concerns or problems with the John School model (Fischer et al. forthcoming; Wortley and Fischer 2002). A number of these issues reflect specific operational aspects of the program, while others are rooted in wider social and legal concerns. To begin with, there appears to be considerable confusion - even among program administrators - about the main purpose of the John School program. For example, while some stakeholders feel that the John School should stop men from engaging in all forms of prostitution, others maintain that the program should only focus on preventing the use of street prostitutes. Similarly, some stakeholders

claim that the main objective of the John School should not be behavioural change, but increasing awareness of the dangers and victims associated with the prostitution and the promotion of safer sex practices. Clearly, the ambiguity of Canada's definition of prostitution as a social problem is reflected in the John School's confusing mix of educational, informational, attitudinal, and behavioural goals.

Another concern is that the demographic profile of John School participants raises the possibility that anti-prostitution programs and policing strategies may disproportionately target working-class, immigrant populations. Indeed, many have complained that indoor prostitution services (i.e., escort services, massage parlours, and brothels), which are often patronized by Toronto's professional elite, are largely ignored by both the police and the criminal courts (Wortley and Fischer 2002). Similar concerns about class bias have been raised with respect to other diversion initiatives (Abel 1982).

The John School also seems to struggle with issues of language diversity. As discussed above, we were unable to conduct interviews with approximately 9% of the men who attended the John School during the study period because of severe English language difficulties. Without the use of trained interpreters, it may be that the program has little or no educative impact on such non-English speaking participants. We also observed problems with record-keeping. The inadequate or incorrect recording of data pertaining to those men attending the John School impedes the accurate measurement of recidivism rates. Furthermore, complete and precise criminal justice information is needed at the front-end of the John School program to determine program eligibility properly. For example, although the John School is only intended to be an option for men with no criminal history, 20% of our respondents reported that

they had been previously arrested.(n20) Given that the organization administering the diversion program has the ability to refuse 'non-eligible' participants (even if the Crown has agreed to divert them), better screening methods to determine program eligibility would appear to be required.

As with other diversion programs (Rudin 1999; Roach 1999), the John School has also been criticized for compromising due process rights. Currently, offenders must admit responsibility for their offense before they are allowed to participate in the program. As such, they must waive their presumption of innocence and the corresponding opportunity to refute the charges in a court of law. Data from this study indicate that many of our respondents believed that they were innocent and had circumstances surrounding their arrest that would warrant a hearing (Wortley and Fischer 2002). Several of these men explained that they only agreed to participate in the John School program because they feared the outcome of a criminal trial. In light of these findings, it would appear important to recognize that some alleged offenders may feel coerced into accepting diversion programs because their participation is the only way to guarantee that the criminal charges will be dropped (Fischer et al. forthcoming).(n21)

Finally, a number of concerns surrounding the \$400 John School tuition fee have been raised. First, several critics have argued that it is unclear, in principle, why access to this particular program must be 'purchased' while other criminal justice services - including prison, probation and other rehabilitation programs - are provided free of charge (Wortley and Fischer 2002). The underlying issue is clearly one of setting a precedent. More specifically, one must question whether the entrenchment of the John School model will lead to a

system in which other criminal justice 'services' have to be purchased. Furthermore, while officially referring to the \$400 as a 'program fee,' several stakeholders interviewed within the broader confines of the multi-component evaluative study (Wortley and Fischer 2002) were concerned that the money actually operated and was justified as a 'quasi fine.' It added an element of 'just deserts' or punishment to a diversion program that might otherwise be seen as too lenient or soft on offenders. If the function of the \$400 is, in fact, that of a fine, some of those interviewed felt that it should be technically imposed in due process and labelled as such (Fischer et al. forthcoming).

Another concern involves the control and use of the funds generated by the John School program. Currently, the \$400 program fee paid by all program participants is controlled by Streetlight Support Services which use these revenues to fund programs that assist female prostitutes who want to exit the sex-trade. While the appropriation of the fee for this purpose is highly praised by most of the stakeholders interviewed as part of the wider evaluation study (Wortley and Fischer 2002), one cannot ignore the risk that the expansion of the John School model could be used to justify further reductions in social service expenditures and ultimately produce a situation in which the police are encouraged to make arrests in order to generate revenue for social or rehabilitative initiatives. Taken to the extreme, it could be argued that revenue-generating programs like the John School may introduce the funding of social services, if not the broader concern of profitability, as additional objectives of punishment. The expansion of such programs also has the potential to increase conflict between social service agencies (including the police) as they debate how the money generated by arrests should be spent.([n22](#)) Similar concerns

have been raised with respect to both the privatization of correctional services (Schichor 1995; Moyle 2000) and the impact of "proceeds of crime" legislation in the United States (Worrall 2001). In the same way that civil asset forfeiture has become a budgetary necessity for many American law enforcement agencies, it is possible that certain social service agencies could become dependent on criminal justice diversion programs for funding.

In conclusion, we feel that the rather serious operational concerns associated with the John School model may in fact outweigh the rather modest benefits documented by our research. Indeed, we must ask ourselves whether limited post-program changes to prostitution-related knowledge and attitudes - without significant behavioural change - justifies the temporary suspension of due-process rights and the creation of an "arrests for revenue" diversion process. This concern becomes even more pressing when you consider the fact that the John School educational model is currently being proposed as an appropriate means for dealing with other criminal offences including drinking and driving, marijuana use, and shoplifting. Should we really be creating and promoting a series of alternative justice, educational programs that financially benefit the very system that implements them? Diversion advocates still have much to learn about the potential long-term consequences of such "vice lessons."

Notes The research presented in this paper was supported by the National Crime Prevention Council and the Department of Justice, Canada. Please direct all correspondence to Scot Wortley, Centre of Criminology, University of Toronto, 130 St. George St., Toronto, Ontario, M5S-3H 1. Email: scot.wortley@utoronto.ca; Phone:

416-978-7124 (x 228).

Dr. Fischer acknowledges funding support from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) and the Connaught Fund, University of Toronto.

Ms. Webster would like to acknowledge funding support from the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, Lisbon.

(n4.) Throughout this paper the term "John" is used to refer to the male clients of female prostitutes.

(n5.) A copy of the full evaluation report can be obtained from the Centre of Criminology Library, University of Toronto, 130 St. George Street, Toronto, Ontario, M5S-3H1. Phone: 416-978-7068 (extension 236 or 245); Email: criminology.library@utoronto.ca.

(n6.) Despite a growing body of literature on the program (Jerome and Rowlands 1998), we also could not locate any formal evaluations of the American John School initiative. It should be noted that researchers from the University of British Columbia are currently carrying out an independent evaluation of the Vancouver Prostitution Offender Program.

(n7.) However, unlike traditional "re-integrative shaming" or "restorative justice" programs, the offenders involved in the John School program do not have to involve their family or friends. In fact, the vast majority of John School participants have not told anybody about their arrest (Wortley and Fischer 2002).

(n8.) The registration period takes place on Tuesday evenings at the

headquarters of Streetlight Support Services. At this time the men pay their \$400 tuition fee, provide basic demographic information to the program coordinators and are given a date to attend the John School.

(n9.) Experts (Goff 2001; Schmallegger, MacAlister, McKenna, and Winterdyk 2000; Sacco and Kennedy 1994) agree that survey techniques can produce valid and reliable information on various forms of deviant and/or criminal activity. Furthermore, the research team attempted to promote honesty among respondents by repeatedly clarifying their role as independent investigators and reminding subjects that their responses would remain completely confidential. Nonetheless, the possibility that respondents were not completely honest (particularly given the sensitive nature of the topic) cannot be discounted. Consequently, the results of this survey should be interpreted with caution.

(n10.) Indeed, several police informants indicated that the John School and other anti-prostitution initiatives in Toronto focus almost exclusively on street prostitution. Escort services - which tend to cater to a much more affluent clientele - are much less likely to receive police attention (Wortley and Fischer 2002).

(n11.) When the dependent variable is dichotomous (e.g., guilt or innocence) a McNemar test was used to determine if changes between Time One and Time Two were statistically significant. For polynomial categorical variables and scales, a paired samples t-test procedure was employed.

(n12.) It is also important to note that there was an equally significant increase between Time One and Time Two in the proportion of

participants who felt that escort services were legal (from 13% to 26%). This might stem from the fact that the facilitator and several of the speakers claim that they are only concerned with eliminating street prostitution and are not concerned with other aspects of the sex trade. Clearly, despite John School attendance, considerable confusion about the legality of escort services and the purchase of sexual services over the phone still exists.

(n13.) It is also possible that the John School program calls attention to a number of other victims whom the participants had never considered (e.g., the John himself). These additional victim categories may simply have been more salient in the minds of the respondents at the end of the education day. Said differently, at Time Two, the Johns were more likely to identify victims which had not been 'obvious' to them prior to the program.

(n14.) An alternative explanation is that the safer sex practices - taught by the public health presenters - actually made some participants feel that they could better avoid or manage the health risks associated with prostitution.

(n15.) It is interesting to note that, after attending the John School, participants are actually more likely to strongly agree with the statement: "Most men have bought sex from a prostitute at some time in their life." This change might be attributed to the fact that respondents have just spent an entire day with a large number of men who have also been charged with a prostitution offence. It is possible, therefore, that participation in the John School might, unintentionally, create the impression that the use of prostitutes is relatively normal male activity.

(n16.) We were initially quite sceptical about the First-Timers' claims that they had never tried to purchase sex from a prostitute before their arrest. Subsequent discussions with police representatives reduced our doubt. It seems that First-Timers may be particularly vulnerable to arrest because they are not experienced enough to spot police decoys and are thus more likely to enter into conversations with undercover police officers.

(n17.) If a respondent went from saying that they "would use" prostitutes at Time One to saying they "might use" prostitutes at Time Two they were placed in the "less likely" (positive change) category. Conversely, if they moved from saying they definitely "would not use" prostitutes to saying that they "probably would not" use prostitutes they were put in the "more likely" (negative change) category.

(n18.) This evidence of the positive impact of the John School is reinforced by additional data from a series of telephone interviews with 102 of the original respondents of this study, conducted six months after their John School participation. Analyses suggest that, in most cases, the positive effects of the diversion program do not diminish significantly over time (Wortley and Fischer 2002).

(n19.) A more pessimistic interpretation would purport that they may simply be better at identifying the 'correct' or 'expected' responses in light of the principal messages conveyed by the John School.

(n20.) In fact, three of the respondents of this study actually indicated that they had previously attended the Toronto John School.

Furthermore, we observed, on several occasions, men attempting to

register for the John School for a second time. They were, however, recognized by program administrators and turned away.

(n21.) Similarly, several critics (Wortley and Fischer 2002) have charged that the existence of the John School increases the likelihood that the police will lay questionable charges because they know that they will not be required to prove the strength of their case in court.

(n22.) Some evidence already exists to suggest that certain police services want control over part of the John School tuition fee in order to fund sting operations and pay for police overtime (Wortley and Fischer 2002).

Table one Demographic profile of John School participants Legend
for Chart:

B - Number of cases C - % of sample

A B C Age

19-29 years 96 26% 30-39 years 143 39% 40-49 years 69 19% 50 years or older 58 16%

Marital status

Married/Common law 167 46% Single/Never married 152 41% Divorced/Separated 44 12%
Widowed 3 1%

Education

Less than high school 106 29% High school 85 23% Some post-secondary 56 15% Community
college diploma 55 15% University graduate 64 18%

Employment status

Employed full-time 294 81% Employed part-time 23 6% Unemployed 32 9% Student 10 3%
Retired 3 1%

Personal income

\$0-\$19,999 89 25% \$20,000-\$39,999 125 35% \$40,000-\$59,999 76 21% \$60,000 and over 69 19%

First language

English 188 51% Other 178 49%

Nativity

Born in Canada 123 34% Foreign born 243 66%

Parental status

No children 177 39% Has children 189 52%

Home ownership

Own 141 39% Rent 225 62%

Type of residence

House 194 53% Apartment 148 40% Other 24 7%

Table two John School participants' pre-program and post-program knowledge of Canadian prostitution law

Legend for Chart:

A - Question B - Time period C - Responses Yes D - Responses No E - Responses Don't know
F - Significance of T1-T2 change

A B C D E F

In Canada, is it Pre-program 89% 5% 6% N.S. illegal to buy sex Post-program 90% 8% 2% from a prostitute on the street?

In Canada, is it Pre-program 57% 13% 30% p <.05 illegal to buy sex Post-program 66% 26% 8% over the phone or from an escort service

In Canada, is Pre-program 65% 17% 18% p <.001 it illegal to Post-program 85% 11% 5% talk to a prostitute about buying sex?

In Canada, is Pre-program 75% 13% 12% p <.001 it illegal to Post-program 88% 8% 4% stop your car on the street to buy sex?

N.S. = change not statistically significant

T1 = pre-program

T2 = post-program **Table three Percent of John School participants who identify specific 'victims' of prostitution, pre- program and post-program results** Legend for Chart:

A - Type of victim B - Time period

C - Identified D - Not identified E - Significance of T1-T2 change

A B C D E

The John Pre-program 33% 67% p <.001

Post-program 44% 56%

The John's spouse Pre-program 13% 87% p <.001 or partner Post-program 35% 65%

The John's kids Pre-program 2% 98% p <.001

Post-program 10% 90%

The Community Pre-program 25% 75% p <.001

Post-program 58% 41%

The prostitute Pre-program 48% 52% p <.05

Post-program 41% 59%

Everyone Pre-program 2% 98% p <.001

Post-program 15% 85%

Mean number of Pre-program 1.3 victims p <.001 victims identified Post-program 2.3 victims

T1 = pre-program

T2 = post-program **Table four Percent of John School participants who identify specific 'dangers' of prostitution, pre- program and post-program results** Legend for Chart:

A - Type of danger B - Time Period C - Identified D - Not Identified E - Significance of T1-T2 change

A B C D E

Disease (STD's) Pre-program 88% 12% p <.001
Post-program 75% 25%

Arrest/Criminal Pre-program 10% 90% p <.001 record Post-program 22% 78%

Robbery Pre-program 20% 98% N.S.
Post-program 20% 90%

Other violence Pre-program 25% 75% p <.05
Post-program 32% 68%

Theft/Property crime Pre-program 2% 52% p <.05
Post-program 5% 59%

Loss of family/ Pre-program 3% 98% p <.001 Damage to family Post-program 15% 85%

Mean number of Pre-program 1.5 victims p <.01 dangers identified Post-program 1.7 victims

N.S. = change not statistically significant

T1 = pre-program

T2 = post program **Table five John School participants' pre-program and post-program attitudes towards prostitution** Legend for Chart:

A - Items B - Time C - Strongly agree D - Agree E - Don't know F - Disagree G - Strongly disagree H - Significance of T1-T2 change

A B C D E F G H

Street prostitution T1 20% 46% 30% 1% 3% $p < .001$ causes serious T2 30% 55% 11% 3% 1% problems in some neighbourhoods.

Most prostitutes T1 6% 23% 17% 37% 18% $p < .001$ enjoy what they do T2 7% 8% 11% 25% 49% for a living.

Most men have bought T1 7% 32% 11% 22% 27% $p < .001$ sex from a prostitute T2 30% 19% 16% 28% 8% at some point in their lives.

Being charged T1 23% 46% 27% 4% 1% $p < .05$ with a prostitution T2 27% 51% 14% 4% 4% offence can really mess up your life.

It is easy to get T1 19% 43% 32% 3% 3% $p < .05$ a sexually transmitted T2 24% 51% 17% 6% 3% disease from a prostitute.

Prostitution does T1 2% 9% 8% 48% 34% $p < .001$ not hurt anybody. T2 4% 4% 7% 21% 65%

Having sex with T1 4% 32% 2% 57% 5% $p < .05$ a prostitute is safe T2 8% 22% 2% 58% 11% if you use a condom.

Most prostitutes T1 14% 31% 38% 4% 13% $p < .001$ have a drug problem. T2 25% 46% 19% 4% 6%

Most prostitutes T1 16% 21% 36% 9% 19% $p < .01$ are forced by pimps T2 25% 19% 28% 19% 9% to sell their bodies for sex.

Men who use T1 26% 21% 27% 15% 10% N.S. prostitutes don't T2 27% 22% 20% 22% 9% respect their wives or partners.

Using prostitutes T1 18% 39% 37% 4% 2% $p < .001$ is a dangerous T2 28% 48% 19% 4% 1% thing to do.

Most people who T1 30% 12% 25% 19% 15% $p < .001$ use prostitutes have T2 21% 42% 23%

7% 7% a problem with sex.

Prostitution causes T1 12% 44% 38% 3% 3% p <.001 family problems. T2 25% 48% 21% 3% 3%

Most men think T1 5% 30% 11% 41% 13% p <.05 that it is okay to T2 9% 30% 12% 31% 17% buy sex from a prostitute.

Mean score on Pre-program (T1) = 48.1 p <.001 attitudes towards Post-program (T2) = 51.9 prostitution index

N.S. = change not statistically significant

T1 = pre-program

T2 = post-program **Table six John School participants' anticipated future use of prostitutes, pre-program and post- program results, by John type** Legend for Chart:

B - Deniers C - First-timers D - Novices E - Sex-trade veterans

A B C D E

Will definitely use again

Pre-program 0% 0% 3% 13% Post-program 2% 1% 0% 9%

Might use again

Pre-program 2% 2% 6% 33% Post-program 3% 2% 8% 23%

Probably won't use again

Pre-program 5% 8% 30% 29% Post-program 10% 15% 29% 39%

Will definitely not use again

Pre-program 92% 90% 61% 25% Post-program 85% 82% 64% 29%

Pre-program: $\chi^2 = 153.517$; $df = 9$; $p < .001$

Post-program: $\chi^2 = 91.810$; $df = 9$; $p < .001$ **Table seven Impact of the John School on anticipated future use of prostitutes, by John type**

Legend for Chart:

B - Deniers C - First-timers D - Novices E - Sex-trade veterans

A B C D E

Less likely to use prostitutes after completing the program 5% 4% 21% 29%

No change in anticipated use observed 74% 82% 63% 52%

More likely to use after completing the program 20% 13% 16% 19%

$\chi^2 = 37.846$; $df = 6$; $p < .001$ **Figure 1 Anticipated future use of prostitutes, pre-program and post-program estimates** Legend for Chart:

B - Pre-program C - Post-program

A B C

Will use in the future 3.3 2.9 Might use in the future 9.5 8.1 Probably won't use 15.6 21.2 Will never use again 71.6 67.9

N = 366 **References** Abel, R. 1982 *The Politics of Informal Justice*. New York: Academic Press.

Attorney General 1996

The 'John School' Diversion Program: A Criminal Court Diversion

Program Approved for Implementation in Metropolitan Toronto by the Attorney General of Ontario for First Offenders as Customers of Street Prostitutes Under Section 213 of the Criminal Code. Toronto: Attorney General of Ontario. Working Document.

Braithwaite, J. 1989 Crime, Shame and Reintegration. London: Cambridge University Press.

Cook, Thomas and Donald Campbell 1979 Quasi-Experimentation: Design and Analysis Issues for Field Settings. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Darroch, W. 1996 MPP off to John School. Toronto Star. June 6: A1.

Federal, Provincial and Territorial Working Group on Prostitution (F/P/T Working Group) 1998 Report and Recommendations in respect of Legislation, Policy and Practices Concerning Prostitution-Related Activities. Ottawa: Department of Justice Canada.

Finckenauer, James 1982 Scared Straight and the Panacea Phenomenon. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Fischer, Benedikt, Scot Wortley, Cheryl Webster, and Maritt Kirst Forthcoming The social-legal dynamics of diversion: The case study of the Toronto 'John School' diversion program for prostitution offenders. Criminal Justice.

Goff, Colin 2001 Criminal Justice in Canada. Second Edition. Scarborough: Thompson.

Jerome, R. and P. Rowlands 1998 "Street Sweeper". People Weekly. 50: 91-92.

Larsen, N. 1996 The effect of different police enforcement policies on the control of prostitution. Canadian Public Policy XXII: 1-17.

Lowman, J. 1998 Prostitution Law Reform in Canada". In T. Shiibashi (ed.), Toward Comparative Law in the 21st Century. Tokyo: Chuo University Press.

Monto, M.A. 2000 Why men seek out prostitutes. In R. Weitzer (ed.), Sex for Sale: Prostitution, Pornography and the Sex Industry. New York: Routledge.

Moyle, Paul 2000 Separating the allocation of punishment from its administration. British Journal of Criminology 41: 77-100.

Nuffield, J. 1997 User Report: Diversion Programs for Adults. Ottawa: Ministry of the Solicitor General.

Platiel, R. 1996 Prostitution program makes men accountable. The Globe and Mail. April 3: A5.

Prokaska, L. 1996 First john school grads 'hung heads in shame.' The Hamilton Spectator. June 23: A3.

Roach, Kent 1999 Due Process and Victims' Rights. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Robertson, J. and C. Morris 1991 Prostitution: Current Issue Review.

Ottawa: Research Branch, Library of Parliament, Ministry of Supply and Services Canada.

Rudin, J. 1999 Sentencing alternatives. In V. Roberts and D. Cole (eds.) Making Sense of Sentencing. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Sacco, Vincent and Leslie Kennedy 1994 The Criminal Event. Scarborough: Thompson.

Schmallegger, Frank, David MacAlister, Paul McKenna, and John Winterdyk 2000 Canadian Criminal Justice Today: An Introduction for the Twenty-First Century. Toronto: Prentice Hall Allyn and Bacon.

Schichor, David 1995 Punishment for Profit: Private Prisons/Public Concerns. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Small, P. 1995 John school supporters buoyed by U.S. trip. Toronto Star. April 9: A6.

Worrall, John 2001 Addicted to the drug war: The role of civil asset forfeiture as a budgetary necessity in contemporary law enforcement. Journal of Criminal Justice 29: 171-187.

Wortley, Scot and Benedikt Fischer 2002 An Evaluation of the Toronto John School Diversion Program. Toronto: Centre of Criminology, University of Toronto.

~~~~~ By Scot Wortley, Centre of Criminology, University of Toronto; Benedikt Fischer, Department of Public Health Sciences,

University of Toronto and Cheryl Webster, Centre of Criminology,  
University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario

Copyright of Canadian Journal of Criminology is the property of University of Toronto Press and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.