

Literature Review: “John School” Programs in the United States

June 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	CONTEXTUALIZING DEMAND-REDUCTION EFFORTS.....	1
III.	PENALTIES FOR SEX BUYERS	4
IV.	RESEARCH ON SEX BUYERS.....	6
V.	ADDITIONAL DATA ABOUT SEX BUYERS.....	8
VII.	ABOUT JOHN SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES	9
A.	Purpose and Definition.....	9
B.	Impetus for and Prevalence	9
C.	Criminal Justice Approach (Diversion or Sentence)	10
D.	Participant Eligibility.....	11
E.	Program Location and Length	12
F.	Participant Fees and Operational Costs.....	12
G.	Partners	13
H.	Curriculum	14
I.	Program Example: San Francisco's First Offender Prostitution Program.....	15
VII.	EVALUATIONS OF JOHN SCHOOLS.....	17
A.	FOPP (San Francisco)	17
B.	Sexual Exploitation Education Program (Portland)	18
C.	Other Programs in the United States	19
VIII.	SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION.....	20
	REFERENCES.....	22

I. INTRODUCTION

Community Solutions contracted with the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) in the spring of 2017 to conduct a literature review of existing information and research about “john” or sex buyer schools¹ as a strategy for reducing demand for commercialized sex. NCCD, which has locations in Oakland, California, and Madison, Wisconsin, is a nonprofit organization that conducts research and provides training and technical assistance in areas including juvenile justice, criminal justice, and child welfare.

NCCD’s literature search found that several reports and evaluations, supported by funding from the US Department of Justice, currently comprise the primary knowledge base regarding such programs in the United States; these documents are supplemented by news articles, websites, and other materials. This information is summarized and discussed in this literature review.

II. CONTEXTUALIZING DEMAND-REDUCTION EFFORTS

In recent years, legal remedies, law enforcement approaches, and advocates’ responses to commercialized sex have inextricably linked prostitution and sex trafficking in the United States. At the state level, prostitution is criminalized throughout the country other than in Nevada, where it is legalized in some counties (Heineman, MacFarlane, & Brents, 2012). As part of the federal Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA), which was passed in 2000 and subsequently reauthorized four times, “sex trafficking” is defined as “the recruitment, harboring,

¹ Throughout this literature review, the terms “john school” and “buyer school” are used to refer to education or treatment programs for individuals arrested for soliciting commercial sex.

transportation, provision, or obtaining of a person for the purpose of a commercial sex act" (US Department of State, 2000).

With the emergence of the TVPA and many state laws that address trafficking, activity that used to be considered prostitution is now often designated as commercial sexual exploitation of minors and sex trafficking of adults. At the same time, a growing number of organizations that address human trafficking and gender-based violence, often with a focus on advocating for trafficking victims and survivors, have brought these individuals' complex, traumatic experiences to the forefront. These factors have helped to set the stage for addressing what is known as the "demand" side of commercialized sex.

While law enforcement efforts nationwide related to prostitution have historically focused on punishing individuals who are prostituted² (McKim & Bottari, 2014);—and in more recent years, traffickers, to an extent—considerably less emphasis has been placed on policing buyers of sex. However, in many jurisdictions, there are some indications that this approach is beginning to shift, through the emergence of state-level anti-trafficking legislation and explicit efforts to actively target and penalize buyers. For example, through the National Johns Suppression Initiative (NJSI), started by the Cook County (Illinois) Sheriff's Department in 2011, more than 80 law enforcement agencies in 23 states have taken part in reverse sting operations (e.g., use of decoy advertisements online or decoy sellers on the street). The NJSI led to the arrest or citation of nearly 6,000 buyers from 2011 to 2016 (Cook County Sheriff's Office, 2017).

² Throughout this literature review, "people who are prostituted" or similar phrasing is used to identify adults who engage in commercial sex acts. This terminology acknowledges that personal agency is usually lacking in this activity and that most affected individuals are victims.

As another example, in King County, Washington (which includes the city of Seattle), a coalition of police departments, city prosecuting offices, social service organizations, and community leaders launched the “Buyer Beware” initiative in 2014 to focus on the demand side of prostitution, as well as emphasizing referral of prostituted people to supportive services. This initiative included implementation of a public education campaign and a buyer school as well as increased law enforcement attention on buyers (CEASE Network, 2014). As this initiative got underway in King County, data for the city of Seattle showed dramatic fluctuations in arrest rates. For example, in 2014, more than twice as many buyers were arrested as prostituted people (Green, 2015).

As a result of these and other efforts, widespread use of methods for decreasing the market for commercial sex and sex trafficking—also known as reducing demand—have become increasingly common. A national assessment of demand-reduction efforts (Shively, Kliorys, Wheeler, & Hunt, 2012) found that intervention programs known as “john schools” or “buyer schools” are among several common tactics that seek to reduce demand; other frequently used tactics include police decoy operations (both in the community and online) and shaming techniques such as publicizing the names and/or photos of individuals arrested for purchasing sex. While most demand-reduction techniques are law-enforcement driven, some may also originate in other sectors, including government and nonprofit. Two examples follow.

- The mayor's office in Atlanta, Georgia, spearheaded "Dear John," a public awareness campaign that included print and broadcast public service announcements and ran from approximately 2006 to 2008. The purpose was to motivate state and local governmental agencies, faith-based organizations, and nonprofits to take tangible steps to combat demand for prostitution and sex trafficking in the Atlanta area. The primary print media message featured a personal plea from the mayor at the time, Shirley Franklin, which stated in part: "Dear John, You have been abusing our kids, prostituting them, and throwing them onto the street when you're done . . . When you buy sex from our kids, you hurt them, you hurt our families and you hurt our city . . . No more—not in my city." While the impact of the campaign was not formally evaluated, complementary efforts began during the same time period. These included creating a john school and revising state criminal codes pertaining to solicitation of prostitution. In addition, individuals interviewed by Shively et al. (2012) in Atlanta cite this campaign as a key factor in galvanizing local government support to address demand.
- The Chicago Alliance Against Sexual Exploitation, an anti-trafficking nonprofit organization, currently facilitates End Demand Illinois, a multipronged initiative that began in 2009 and includes policy advocacy, public awareness, research, and training and technical assistance. This initiative's goals are to divert prostituted people from criminal justice-system involvement to a statewide network of supportive services and to focus law enforcement's attention and resources on traffickers and buyers. One impact of this initiative is the passage of six state laws in Illinois that provide support to sex trafficking survivors; this includes the country's first law (passed in 2010) to prohibit prosecution of children under 18 for prostitution-related offenses, as well as legislation that eliminates felony prostitution and increases focus on traffickers and buyers, also known as safe harbor laws (Chicago Alliance Against Sexual Exploitation, no date).

III. PENALTIES FOR SEX BUYERS

Criminal penalties for sex buyers differ by state. Many states, including California, Florida, New York, and Texas, classify solicitation of prostitution as a misdemeanor; in some states, including Florida and Texas, the offense is classified as a felony if an individual has multiple convictions for solicitation. These penalties apply only to solicitation of sex with adults; penalties

for soliciting minors are generally much more severe (National Conference of State Legislatures, 2016).

Furthermore, in recent years, federal and state legislation that specifically targets human trafficking has rapidly emerged nationwide; in many cases, this includes provisions reframing activity that used to be considered prostitution to commercial sexual exploitation of minors and to sex trafficking of adults. At the federal level, the TVPA designated human trafficking and related crimes as federal offenses with severe penalties associated with them (Polaris Project, no date). Notably, the TVPA's definition of sex trafficking includes "obtaining a person," thus naming sex buyers among the perpetrators of this activity (US Department of State, 2000). From 2005 to 2014, more than 1,000 bills related to human trafficking were introduced in all 50 states and the District of Columbia (Polaris Project, 2014). In California, Proposition 35, which was passed in 2012, expands the definition of human trafficking, increases criminal penalties for trafficking, and mandates law enforcement training on handling trafficking cases (State of California, Office of Attorney General, 2012). Legislation (SB 1322) prohibiting the criminalization of children under 18 for prostitution-related activity and treating minors as victims of commercial sexual exploitation was enacted in 2017 (California Senate Bill No. 1322, Chapter 654, 2017).

These and other recent efforts in California have contributed to increased engagement by law enforcement, including receiving relevant training and identifying and investigating trafficking cases. From 2010 to 2012, more than 25,000 individuals in California—including law enforcement personnel, prosecutors, and victim service providers—were trained in identifying trafficking cases and supporting victims and survivors. During the same time period, human

trafficking task forces in California opened more than 2,500 investigations and arrested nearly 1,800 individuals (Office of the Attorney General, California Department of Justice, 2012).

IV. RESEARCH ON SEX BUYERS

Until relatively recently, just as law enforcement efforts related to prostitution tended to focus on prostituted people, research in this area followed a similar trend. In general, most research on prostitution examines risk factors of individuals who are prostituted and criminal justice consequences they experience, leading to a scarcity of information on sex buyers themselves (Farley, Golding, Matthews, Malamuth, & Jarrett, 2015).

While research on sex buyers is limited overall, some of the available data describe the demographics of individuals arrested for buying sex and of john school attendees. These sources include the following.

- The Cook County (Illinois) Sheriff's Department analyzed data provided by approximately 3,500 individuals who were arrested or cited between 2011 and 2016 for buying sex in jurisdictions that are part of the NJSI. (While approximately 6,000 individuals were arrested under this initiative during this timeframe, demographic data is available for about half of this group.) (Cook County Sheriff's Office, 2017).
- Monto and Julka (2009) analyzed surveys administered to men attending john school programs in Las Vegas, Nevada; San Francisco, California; and Portland, Oregon. The total sample size consisted of 700 survey respondents, 84% of whom were from the San Francisco program known as the First Offender Prostitution Program (FOPP).
- The evaluation of the San Francisco FOPP (Shively, Jalbert, Kling, Rhodes, Finn, Flygare, Tierney, Hunt, Squires, Dyous, & Wheeler, 2008) reported data for attendees who completed pre/post surveys for this study ($N = 147$).

- Farley et al. (2015) conducted a study comparing opinions and behaviors of men who buy sex ($N = 101$) with men who do not ($N = 101$), with the two groups matched by age, ethnicity, and education. It is important to note that the study participants identified as men who buy sex were not asked if they had participated in a john school program or other demand-reduction strategy.

Research participants' common characteristics across these sources are summarized in

Table 1. Where additional information is available, these data are summarized in the section following the table.

Data Source	National Johns Suppression Initiative (2017) ($N = 3,673$)*	John School Surveys (San Francisco, Portland, Las Vegas) (2009) ($N = 700$)	San Francisco FOPP Evaluation (2008) ($N = 147$)	Sex Buyer and Non-Sex Buyer Study (2015)	
				Sex Buyer ($N = 101$)	Non-Sex Buyer ($N = 101$)
Race/ethnicity	38% Caucasian	61% White	52% White	56% European American	58% European American
Age range (mean age)	18–60+ years (not provided)	18–84 years (38)	Below 25–66+ years (41)	20–75 years (41)	18–77 years (40)
Education level	47% completed high school	77% attended college***	57% attended college***	80% attended college***	78% attended college***
Employment status	91% employed**	81% employed full time	83% employed part time or full time	Not provided	Not provided
Relationship status (at time of data collection)	56% married or in a relationship	41% married	41% married or in a domestic partnership	61% had wife or girlfriend	70% had wife or girlfriend

* For each source included in this table, N size (or sample size) may differ for each item.

** Available for 2016 NJSI data only.

*** Includes respondents who reported they had attended college and/or earned a college degree (associate, bachelor, and/or graduate or professional degree).

V. ADDITIONAL DATA ABOUT SEX BUYERS

Some studies provide additional information about buyers. In their analysis of surveys administered to men attending john schools in three western states, Monto and Julka (2009) found that about two thirds (64%)³ reported having had sexual relations with a prostituted person at least once during the last 12 months; of this group, about half stated this occurred more than once in the past year but less than once per month.

Shively et al.'s evaluation of San Francisco's FOPP (2008) also found that more than one third of respondents (38%) reported purchasing sex between one and four times during their lifetime; about one quarter (28%) had done so 10 or more times. About two thirds (69%) reported that they had first paid for sex when they were between the ages of 21 and 35 years.

Farley et al.'s (2015) study comparing opinions and behaviors of men who buy sex with men who do not found that 21% of sex buyers were sexually abused as a child, compared to 10% of non-sex buyers; 89% of buyers identified as heterosexual, compared to 93% of non-sex buyers; 76% of buyers had more than 15 sex partners in their lifetime, compared to 33% of non-sex buyers.

Most recently, an examination in Minnesota concluded, based on a mixed-methods data collection approach, that the buyers in the state tended to be married white males (Martin, Melander, Karnik, & Nakamura, 2017).

While in general these studies do not represent random samples of sex buyers (or buyers attending john schools), they do provide a snapshot of characteristics of this population.

³ The remaining percentage consists of respondents who said they were arrested for approaching/soliciting the police decoy (17%) and those who reported they did not have sex with a prostituted person during the previous year (19%) (Monto & Julka, 2009).

Furthermore, these data may be informative to jurisdictions or organizations that are implementing or considering implementing a john school.

VII. ABOUT JOHN SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES

A. Purpose and Definition

Shively et al. (2012) defined john school as "an education or treatment program for men arrested for soliciting illegal commercial sex," which provides instruction focused on discouraging participants from further engagement in this behavior. The general purpose of a john school is to decrease the demand for purchasing of sex by impacting the behavior of individual buyers.

B. Impetus for and Prevalence

In some jurisdictions, the implementation of a john school may be due to the passage of legislation or policy, implementation of local initiatives targeting sex trafficking, and other factors. For example, the city of Atlanta's code of ordinances includes a provision regarding a john school diversion program (Code of Ordinances, City of Atlanta, Georgia, 2017) as does the state of Texas's health and safety code (State of Texas, Health and Safety Code, 2011). In other jurisdictions, a john school may be started as one element of an overarching demand-reduction effort; this was the case in Atlanta with the implementation of a public awareness campaign, as noted above.

The first known john school program, located in Grand Rapids, Michigan, began in 1981. Other locations that were early adopters of a john school, between 1988 and 1992, included

Minneapolis/St. Paul, Minnesota; Rochester, New York; West Palm Beach, Florida; and Kansas City, Kansas. One of the most well-known programs, the San Francisco FOPP (discussed in more detail below), began in 1995. Shively et al.'s 2012 assessment found that 58 cities and counties in the United States have used the john school approach; most of these programs were still operating upon publication of this assessment. A recent article on DemandAbolition.org states that more than 60 distinct john school programs in the country provide services to more than 100 cities and counties (Demand Abolition, 2016). Some john school programs serve a single city or community, while others provide services to several neighboring locations.

Additionally, some locations in the United States have proposed or pending john school programs, either adding to established programs in a region or state or creating the first such program in a particular area. For example, the North Dakota legislature recently authorized the use of a john school for sex buyers, and the University of Mary (in Bismarck, North Dakota) developed a curriculum for the john school program that is expected to launch later in 2017. This appears to be the first john school effort in this state (Dalrymple, 2017). In Texas, which already has had john school programs in areas including Dallas, San Antonio, and Waco, programs are now slated to form in the Amarillo and Austin areas (News 4 San Antonio, 2017; Schwaller, 2016).

C. Criminal Justice Approach (Diversion or Sentence)

Because the criminal justice system tends to view sex buying as a misdemeanor, john schools have emerged as an option for handling this offense. John schools generally function as either criminal justice diversion programs or as terms of a sentence for individuals who have

been arrested for soliciting commercial sex. In the case of programs that use a diversion approach, individuals' charges will typically be dismissed upon completion of the john school program. When attending john school is a condition of a sentence, an individual's charges are not dismissed upon completion. According to Shively et al. (2012), about half of john schools in the United States are diversion programs, and one third are part of sentencing conditions; additionally, about one fifth allow for both options.

D. Participant Eligibility

The eligibility guidelines for participation in a john school tend to focus on adults who have not previously been arrested (whether for solicitation or for any other offenses). For example, the San Francisco FOPP targets men who do not have a criminal record and do not have previous adult contact with the criminal justice system. However, there appears to be some latitude in FOPP eligibility, as individuals who have non-violent offenses that occurred more than five years prior to their arrest for solicitation or were arrested for solicitation before implementation of the FOPP may also be admitted to the program; "in the interest of justice" is another reason for admittance of those with previous criminal justice contact. Individuals who have been convicted for weapons offenses or violent offenses, or who have previously had justice system contact due to domestic violence, are not eligible for the FOPP (City and County of San Francisco, Office of the District Attorney, 2017). As another example, Denver's program does not enroll individuals with felony convictions (Denver City Attorney's Office Alternative Resolution Program, no date). Shively et al. (2012) report that john schools do not accept individuals who have been arrested for soliciting sex from a minor. Additionally, while not

necessarily explicitly stated in program materials, it appears that john schools are generally designed for male attendees.

E. Program Location and Length

The majority of john schools are offered in person, with locations at community-based organizations, courthouses, or other sites; however, there are some online programs as well. In terms of program duration, most in-person schools provide a one-day program ranging from four to eight hours in length. The FOPP approach, which originated in San Francisco and was subsequently implemented in many other communities nationwide, has a length of eight hours (Shively et al., 2008). Shively et al. (2012) note that most one-day programs will hold a session four to six times annually; the frequency also depends on the number of referred individuals.

Some programs last longer than one day. For example, the Stopping Sexual Exploitation program in King County, which began in the Seattle area in the last few years, is a 10-week program with one session per week (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, 2017); the now-defunct Sexual Exploitation Education Program in Portland consisted of a three-day session (Shively et al., 2012).

F. Participant Fees and Operational Costs

Most john schools charge a fee to participants. The assessment conducted by Shively et al. (2012) found that the average fee per attendee is approximately \$400, with a range from \$0 to \$1,500. Occasionally, the fee is charged on a sliding scale (Shively et al., 2012).

The operation of a john school is generally not an expensive endeavor. The fees paid by attendees typically defray or cover all operational costs. Program presenters may receive small stipends or may provide their time free of charge. Moreover, in some cases, excess revenue is directed (all or in part) toward other demand-reduction and/or survivor efforts in the same community (Shively et al., 2012; Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, 2017).

G. Partners

John schools often represent a partnership of multiple organizations, in terms of coordination of services and/or program presenters. According to data provided in the national assessment for 50 programs (Shively et al., 2012), the most common conveners or partners tend to include the jurisdiction's city or district attorney, police or sheriff's department, health or public health department, and one or more community-based organizations (which may specifically address gender-based violence or have a broader focus such as serving children, youth, and families).

In terms of who provides content during the program itself, many john schools draw on speakers or presenters from several organizations, typically including multiple city and/or county agencies, as well as relevant community organizations and their clients/survivors. Presenters for the San Francisco FOPP have included representatives from the district attorney's office, city public health department, city police department, a community-based organization that works with victims and survivors, and survivors themselves. Presenters at the Prostitution Impact Panel program in San Diego, California, have included a program coordinator with the city attorney's

office, a program facilitator who has a background in conflict negotiation, community residents, a former sex buyer, a police officer, survivors, a mental health specialist, health department staff, and a Spanish-language interpreter (Nurge, Shively, & Hunt, 2012).

H. Curriculum

Until a recent update, the FOPP curriculum in San Francisco featured the following major content areas: prostitution law and street facts, health education, effects of prostitution (featuring survivor testimony), dynamics of human trafficking, effects on communities, and sex addiction (Shively et al., 2008). The updated curriculum covers many of these topics and has an added section on male role belief systems (City and County of San Francisco, Office of the District Attorney, 2017). As noted above, the FOPP served as a template for many other john school programs, which also often incorporated these types of topics into a one-day intervention.

Some programs cover additional curriculum topics outside of those traditionally used in the FOPP model, or include other components (e.g., completing community service, testing for sexually transmitted infections, and participating in counseling). The curriculum for the King County Stopping Sexual Exploitation program includes a one-hour individual intake meeting; a one-hour individual orientation session; and an eight-week module comprised of weekly three-hour group meetings, followed by an optional group meeting upon completion of the required 10 sessions (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, 2017). However, as specific curriculum information for this

program is not publicly available, adequate comparison to other john school programs requires further exploration.

The Salt Lake City, Utah, program also has a 10-session group counseling format, accompanied by weekly homework assignments. Topics covered in the sessions include male and female socialization, anger, communication, healthy relationships, prevention of sexually transmitted infections, and survivor testimony. (Shively et al., 2012).

I. Program Example: San Francisco's First Offender Prostitution Program

One of the most well-known john school programs is the FOPP, which began in San Francisco in 1995 and is considered the basis for many other john schools nationwide. In fact, many jurisdictions with john schools have replicated or adapted the FOPP. For many years, the FOPP was a partnership of the San Francisco District Attorney's office; San Francisco Police Department; and Standing Against Global Exploitation (SAGE), a community-based organization providing survivor-led services including trauma recovery, substance abuse treatment, and legal advocacy (Standing Against Global Exploitation, 2005). These partners were supported in implementing the FOPP by the San Francisco Public Health Department and other agencies (Shively et al., 2008).

The San Francisco FOPP is a one-day, lecture-format diversion program with a goal of effecting change in participants' attitudes and beliefs regarding sex buying. By providing education about the legal, health, and crime victimization risks associated with soliciting sex, the FOPP seeks to discourage men from buying sex and to develop their empathy for prostituted individuals and community members impacted by street prostitution.

FOPP participants are eligible individuals arrested for soliciting sex (often through street-level or web-based operations employing the use of a decoy). The program is specifically designed for adult males who solicit females who are prostituted. Between 1995 and 2008, more than 5,700 men participated in this intervention (Shively et al., 2008).

An external evaluation found that the FOPP significantly decreases recidivism among participants. This evaluation also found that similar programs modeled after the FOPP have been replicated or adapted in approximately 40 sites nationwide, often with modifications for local needs (Shively et al., 2008).

In recent years, the San Francisco Office of the District Attorney has sought to update the FOPP. The program's community-based partner, SAGE, ceased operations in 2015. That same year, the district attorney's office issued a request for proposal (RFP) for FOPP program enhancement and service provision. This had a stated goal of implementing the program in a contemporary context, both in terms of recognizing the changing nature of solicitation (away from street-based and toward online activity) and in updating the curriculum to include evidence-based components, including cognitive and social learning approaches (e.g., role modeling, role playing, skills practice, etc.) and a focus on developing and maintaining healthy relationships (City and County of San Francisco, Office of the District Attorney, 2015). Following this RFP process, the contract was awarded to Community Works West, a nonprofit organization with locations in Oakland and San Francisco (Community Works West, 2016). In June 2017, the district attorney's office again issued an RFP for facilitation of the FOPP.

VII. EVALUATIONS OF JOHN SCHOOLS

As with other research related to the demand side of prostitution, published evaluations of john schools are relatively limited.

A. FOPP (San Francisco)

One of the most well-known studies to date was funded by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) to evaluate San Francisco's FOPP. The evaluation drew on numerous primary data sources including program site visits and observations, stakeholder interviews, ride-alongs with law enforcement, and pre- and post-surveys and course evaluations completed by FOPP participants. Researchers also analyzed criminal history data on FOPP participants and a larger sample consisting of men with similar solicitation charges to understand the program's impact on recidivism (Shively et al., 2008).

Regarding outcomes, Shively et al.'s evaluation found that FOPP was effective in educating buyers about the consequences of their behavior; however, based on self-reported data, the program did not significantly decrease the prospect of participants buying sex in the future. To evaluate FOPP's impact on recidivism, researchers used time-series analysis to review 20 years of de-identified arrest data, before and after the implementation of FOPP, in San Francisco and throughout California. (The arrests of interest were a charge of soliciting prostitution (California Penal Code 647(b)) or loitering with intent to solicit [653.22]). The results were statistically significant and found that FOPP reduces recidivism on these types of arrests (Shively et al., 2008).

A subsequent report questioned the recidivism findings of Shively et al.'s analysis. Lovell and Jordan (2012) state that the analysis conducted by Shively et al. used faulty methodology to conclude that FOPP has an impact on decreasing reoffending related to sex buying. Lovell and Jordan's analysis of the data presented by Shively et al. finds that San Francisco's rate of recidivism on soliciting charges *increased* after implementation of the FOPP, while rates in the remainder of the state—the majority of which did not have an FOPP or other john school program during this timeframe—decreased (Lovell & Jordan, 2012).

B. Sexual Exploitation Education Program (Portland)

The Sexual Exploitation Education Program (SEEP), which operated in Portland from 1995 to 1997, consisted of a 17-hour weekend training with the following goals (as stated in the program materials): "reframing prostitution from a victimless crime to a system of violence against women; deconstructing male sexual identity to identify how men's socialization leads to an increased propensity for committing acts of violence against women; and stressing the choice and responsibility that men have to create egalitarian relationships without coercion or violence" (Monto & Garcia, 2001).

An evaluation of SEEP (Monto & Garcia, 2001), supported by a grant from NIJ, examined three groups of men convicted of a prostitution-related offense in Portland: those who were required to attend SEEP as part of their sentence and did attend, those who were required to attend SEEP but did not, and those who did not have a sentence that included a requirement to attend SEEP. The analysis, which used a total sample size of 215 men, found a low recidivism rate overall, both for SEEP attendees and non-attendees; and there was not a statistically significant

difference in recidivism among these groups. In other words, whether or not men attended SEEP did not appear to impact the likelihood of reoffending. The authors of the study note that while small sample size may help to explain this finding (i.e., a larger sample size may lead to more variability and greater statistical power), this information may also suggest that recidivism may not be the most appropriate measure for determining the effectiveness of a john school program (Monto & Garcia, 2001).

C. Other Programs in the United States

Some john school programs have been the subject of master degree-level thesis research. For example, one student completed an ethnographic study (Valenzuela, 2013) of the Nashville John School, a one-day diversion program with a curriculum similar to the San Francisco FOPP. This research, which drew on participant observation and interviews with john school presenters and attendees, found that the program can diminish buyers' feelings of "hostility" toward law enforcement or the legal system and can expand their empathy as it relates to victims and survivors. Although representing a small sample size, several of the 10 buyers that Valenzuela interviewed for the study expressed feeling shame and guilt for their actions and demonstrated a degree of compassion for people who are prostituted. One interview participant stated, "You know I'm not a bad guy. When I was arrested, I apologized to this girl . . . Even when I went to court I apologized to the judge and to the court . . . I really still can't see why I did that. It bothers me every day. Why would I even approach somebody like that?"

Another example of a master's thesis that explores a john school program is a process evaluation of an unnamed john school in a large Midwestern city; this intervention is a one-day program with a curriculum based on the FOPP. This evaluation, which included analysis of participant pre- and post-surveys, concluded that the program is useful in producing attitude change among program participants (Jungels, 2007).

VIII. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

NCCD's review of the literature found that john schools are situated in the larger landscape of techniques to reduce demand for prostitution and sex trafficking, with tactics that originate in sectors including criminal justice, government, and nonprofit. The general goal of a john school is to reduce demand by deterring or altering behavior of buyers. John schools have existed nationwide over approximately the past 30 years, with a recent estimate showing over 60 programs serving more than 100 cities and counties. Many of these programs are still operational and more continue to be introduced.

The FOPP, which was launched in San Francisco in 1995, has served as the basis for the format and curriculum used by many other john school programs. An external evaluation of this program found that the FOPP produced attitude change and reduced recidivism among participants; however, the finding of recidivism reduction has been disputed by another group of researchers. Furthermore, there is a general lack of agreement in the field regarding how to appropriately measure the effectiveness and impact of john schools, including types of outcomes on which to focus.

Although San Francisco's FOPP has served as a longstanding model for many other programs, it also appears that some programs are shifting to a more holistic approach in terms of format and curriculum. For example, the original FOPP recently introduced curriculum components that include development and maintenance of healthy relationships, while the King County program focuses on social justice and personal transformation.

Overall, limited current research exists to help jurisdictions determine whether john schools are effective in reducing the demand for commercial sex and are an appropriate consequence for buyers. This scarcity of information seems to dovetail with the general lack of research on buyers. As law enforcement's efforts to police prostitution and sex trafficking gradually shift to addressing the demand side, it is likely that more comprehensive information and research on buyers and demand-reduction tactics will be produced and disseminated.

REFERENCES

California Penal Code. Article 1, Of Crimes and Punishments, Title 15, Miscellaneous Crime, Chapter 2, Of Other and Miscellaneous Offenses, 647. Retrieved from <https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov>

California Senate Bill No. 1322, Chapter 654. Commercial sex acts: minors. Retrieved from https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201520160SB1322

CEASE Network. (2014, November 21). Washington state communities unite to reduce demand for commercial sexual exploitation [Blog post]. Retrieved June 23, 2017 from <https://www.demandabolition.org/blog/seattle-reduce-demand/>

Chicago Alliance Against Sexual Exploitation. End Demand Illinois [Webpage]. Retrieved from <http://caase.org/end-demand-illinois>

City and County of San Francisco, Office of the District Attorney. (2015). 2015 Request for Qualifications (RFQ): First Offender Prostitution Program (FOPP), Program Enhancement & Primary Service Provider.

City and County of San Francisco, Office of the District Attorney. (2017). 2017 Request for Qualifications (RFQ): First Offender Prostitution Program (FOPP), Primary Service Provider.

Code of Ordinances, City of Atlanta, Georgia. Article IV, Offenses Against Public Morals; Sec. 106-127, Solicitation for an Illicit Sexual Act; 7a-c, Diversion Program. Online version of code updated May 26, 2017; retrieved June 22, 2017 from https://library.municode.com/ga/atlanta/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIICORE_NOR_CH106OFMIPR_ARTIVOFAGPUMO_DIV1GE_S106-127SOILSEAC

Community Works West. (no date). Our Approach/Programs [Webpage]. Retrieved from <http://communityworkswest.org/what-we-do/our-approach-programs>

Cook County Sheriff's Office. (2017). *Buyers and sellers: A window into sex trafficking*. Chicago, IL: Author.

Dalrymple, A. (2017, February 18). 'John School' program ready to educate ND buyers of sex. *Grand Forks Herald*.

Demand Abolition. (2016, October 5). John Schools: A practical, cost-effective way to reduce demand [Blog post]. Retrieved June 22, 2017 from <https://www.demandabolition.org/blog/john-schools-practical-cost-effective-way-reduce-demand/>

Denver City Attorney's Office Alternative Resolution Program (no date). Adult Diversion Terms and Conditions.

Farley, M., Golding, J. M., Matthews, E. S., Malamuth, N. M., & Jarrett, L. (2015). Comparing sex buyers with men who do not buy sex: New data on prostitution and trafficking. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*: 1–25.

Green, S. J. (May 16, 2015). 'Buyer Beware': Early success for initiative targeting johns instead of prostitutes. *Seattle Times*.

Heineman, J., MacFarlane, R., & Brents, B. G. (2012). Sex industry and sex workers in Nevada. In *The Social Health of Nevada: Leading Indicators and Quality of Life in the Silver State*, edited by Dmitri N. Shalin. Las Vegas, NV: UNLV Center for Democratic Culture.

Jungels, A. M. (2007). "Just Say No": A process evaluation of a johns' school. Thesis, Georgia State University. Retrieved from http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/sociology_theses/18

Lovell, R., & Jordan, A. (2012). *Do john schools really decrease recidivism? A methodological critique of an evaluation of the San Francisco First Offender Prostitution Program*. Chicago and Washington, DC: DePaul University and American University Washington College of Law.

Martin, L., Melander, C., Karnik, H., & Nakamura, C. (2017). *Mapping the demand: Sex buyers in the state of Minnesota*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

McKim, J. & Bottari, M. (2014). *Huge gender divide in prostitution-related arrests*. Boston, MA: New England Center for Investigative Reporting.

Monto, M. A., & Garcia, S. (2001). "Recidivism among the customers of female street prostitutes: Do intervention programs help?" *Western Criminology Review* 3(2).

Monto, M. A., & Julka, D. (2009). "Conceiving of sex as a commodity: A study of arrested customers of female street prostitutes." *Western Criminology Review* 10(1):1–14.

National Conference of State Legislatures. (2016). Human Trafficking Enactment Database. Retrieved from <http://www.ncsl.org/research/civil-and-criminal-justice/human-trafficking-enactment-database.aspx>

News 4 San Antonio. (2017, May 19). Support groups help sex trafficking survivors in Amarillo during recovery process. News 4 San Antonio.

Nurge, D., Shively, M. & Hunt, D. (2012). *An overview of San Diego's john school program: The Prostitution Impact Panel*. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, Inc.

Office of the Attorney General, California Department of Justice. (2012). *The state of human trafficking in California*. Sacramento, CA: Author.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges. (2017). Reducing demand for the commercial sexual exploitation of minors in your community [webinar].

Polaris Project. (no date). Current Federal Laws [Webpage]. Retrieved from <https://polarisproject.org/current-federal-laws>. Accessed June 23, 2017.

Polaris Project. (2014). *A look back: Building a human trafficking legal framework*. Washington, DC: Author.

Shively, M., Jalbert, S. K., Kling, R., Rhodes, R., Finn, P., Flygare, C., Tierney, L., Hunt, D., Squires, D., Dyous, C., & Wheeler, K. (2008). *Final report on the evaluation of the First Offender Prostitution Program*. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, Inc.

Shively, M., Kliorys, K., Wheeler, K., & Hunt, D. (2012). *A national overview of prostitution and sex trafficking demand reduction efforts*. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, Inc.

Schwaller, K. (2016, December 20). 'John School' for men arrested after soliciting sex gets approval. KXAN-TV.

Standing Against Global Exploitation. (2005). What is SAGE? [PowerPoint presentation.] Accessed June 20, 2017.

State of California, Office of Attorney General. (2012). Proposition 35, Official Title and Summary.

State of Texas, Health and Safety Code, Title 2. Subtitle H. Public Health Provisions, Chapter 169. First Offender Prostitution Program. Retrieved from <http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/docs/HS/htm/HS.169.htm>

U.S. Department of State. (2000). *Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000*. Retrieved from <https://www.state.gov/j/tip/laws/61124.htm>

Valenzuela, R. M. (2013). The Nashville John School: risk deterrence and the reintegrative shaming approach. *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 1480. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/1480>