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Abstract of thesis

This thesis describes and explains the impact of a number of policy initiatives intended to tackle the demand for, and supply of, street-level markets operating in Nottingham.

The research triangulated survey data undertaken with 104 men attending a Nottingham-based ‘Kerb-Crawler Rehabilitation Programme’ (the ‘Change’ Programme) and interview data with twenty-two ‘working girls’, ten ‘punters’ and ten agency/Criminal Justice professionals.

Current sociological and criminological writings on prostitution suggest that recent policy interventions are broadly representative of a ‘paradigm shift’ away from punitive-only initiatives aimed at working girls, towards the criminalisation of men that pay for (street-level) sex. Whilst these policy interventions are bedevilled by contradictions and inconsistencies, there is an inherent assumption that demand reductions can, and will, lead to a corresponding contraction in supply. In light of this, the thrust of the analysis in this thesis focused on several key questions: do policy interventions – particularly those concerned with ‘re-educating’ punters - reduce the recidivism rates amongst identified street-level punters? Do ‘new’ policy initiatives deter ‘new’ punters into Nottingham’s street-level sex markets? Do they facilitate ‘exiting’ for street-level working girls? And overarching all of this: can we rely upon simplistic economic assumptions about the relationship between supply and demand to street-level markets?

In addressing these questions, the thesis concludes that ‘re-education’ has some notable value in challenging the attitudes and beliefs of street-level punters (particularly ‘first-timers’ and ‘intermediates’) that cannot be achieved by ‘traditional’ Criminal Justice interventions alone. However, it is also argued that any long-term/additive benefits associated with ‘re-education’ (including recidivism reductions) may be compromised in the absence of a better-targeted curriculum and suitable aftercare support. The threat of ‘re-education’ – as opposed to education - is demonstrated to be insignificant as a deterrent, because it appears to be trumped by the threat of this private activity being publicly ‘outed’ and to a lesser extent by traditional Criminal Justice sanctions.

Paradoxically, the findings suggest that moderate demand reductions – on their own - are unlikely to have any significant impact on the number of working girls operating ‘on the street’. More insidiously, there is strong evidence that the combination of demand reductions and a move towards ‘Compulsory Rehabilitation Orders’ will have displacement, operational and safety issues for working girls, all of which remain significant barriers to ‘exiting’ prostitution.
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Chapter 1 - Introduction

This thesis provides an analysis of a number of policy interventions intended to tackle the demand for, and supply of, street-level sex markets in Nottingham, England. Most notably the thesis seeks to assess the impact of a ‘Kerb Crawler Rehabilitation Programme’ – the ‘Change Programme’ – operating in the city since 2004. Importantly, the research requires an understanding of recent paradigm shifts in cultural, policing and Government perceptions regarding notions of choice and coercion of those that ‘buy’ and ‘sell’ street-level sex. A review of the literature provides context to these prostitution developments.

Whilst the detail behind these choice debates is a consistent theme throughout the thesis, it is important to clarify that the approach to terminology used in this thesis for individuals involved in street-level prostitution - both conceptually and ‘in the field’ - could arguably best be described as ‘pragmatic democracy’\(^2\), rather than ideologically driven [see also Chapter 3]. In plain English, labels are almost always necessary (hence ‘pragmatic’) and where research participants express a preference for labelling their own prostitution activities, the most frequently used terms – ‘working girls’ and ‘punters’ - have been adopted as the \textit{de facto} standard throughout this thesis. Consequently, the language used is less about language as a representation of ‘outsider’ standpoints and more to do with allowing those involved have a voice about how their prostitution activities are portrayed\(^3\).

The research template: reducing demand, controlling supply - background information

Attempts at tackling and controlling street-level prostitution have a long and varied history. This introductory overview provides the context for: i) understanding the interventions policymakers have adopted in an attempt to design out the demand for, and supply of, street-level sex markets and; ii) assumptions about the relationship between demand and supply.

Within this contextualisation process, it is important to recognize the influence that other international prostitution models have had in the evolution of recent British\(^4\) prostitution control mechanisms at the national and local level. Rejection of particular policy models has usually been justified on the basis that certain approaches are not suitably aligned with British prostitution ‘markets’ and British social structures. However, there also exist ideological undertones that adopting certain policies is ‘not the right thing to do’.\(^5\)

\(^2\) This term is not believed to be in common currency and is therefore probably peculiar to this thesis.

\(^3\) Unless representing another academic or commentators choice of language.

\(^4\) Or more specifically, English and Welsh. It should be noted that Westminster is responsible for English and Welsh prostitution legislation only. For the sake of expediency, the discussion will be limited to those decisions made in Westminster.

\(^5\) For example, in a discussion of proposed changes to English and Welsh prostitution laws in 2006, the Home Office Minister, Fiona MacTaggart, argued that prostitution should be perceived as the ‘oldest oppression and not the oldest profession’ (Travis, 2005).
Worldwide, there are numerous variations of three dominant models of prostitution control, namely: i) abolitionism; ii) legalisation and; iii) decriminalisation. To contextualise interventions operating in Nottingham at the micro level and Britain at the macro, this thesis examines the discourse underpinning and influencing each model. The ‘problem’ of prostitution is clearly far from homogeneous since local social infrastructures, prevalence variations across spatially distinct sex markets and linkages with drug markets all impinge on the efficacy of prostitution policies. Here, the ‘Realist Evaluation’ approach (Pawson and Tilley, 1997), usefully stresses the need to identify the theories behind programmes adopted to determine the mechanism by, and the context within, which they are each considered likely to be effective. This context, mechanism and outcome configuration is examined at various points throughout the thesis.

To further contextualise any paradigmatic shifts in the regulation of demand and supply in commercial sex markets, it is necessary to examine issues of agency and coercion amongst working girls and punters. This brings us to ask why women enter street-level prostitution markets and why men pay for such sex? Much discourse surrounding prostitution in Western democracies centres on working girl victimhood (for example, Jeffreys, 1997). Generally, this debate has polarised around perceptions that: i) working girls lack agency and choice or; ii) possess a significant degree of voluntarism, and so are undertaking a purely economic activity that requires careful regulation. Critics of the first standpoint argue that if victimisation is indeed the defining characteristic of all prostitution then no space exists to discuss non-victimised working girls or those who do not see themselves as victims (Phoenix, 1999). Conversely, because punters are perceived to lack any coercive influences in relation to their ‘punting’ behaviour, the common perception is that when it comes to paying for sex, these men are making ‘rational’ - but ultimately the wrong - choices.

Importantly, such polarised explanations may overlook the complexity inherent in a ‘continuum of coercion’ and any differences that exist between street-level and off-street sex markets. Moreover, this has the potential to simplify supply and demand. This leads some writers to assign complete agency to punters whilst denying working girls any agency at all. Such labels have the potential to restrict the development of effective long-term harm-reduction strategies, where to be successful programmes require negotiating in ‘particular places at particular times’ rather than ‘in the same way and in all circumstances, or for all people’ (Tilley, 2000). Bifurcation avoidance should clearly not detract from the frequently tragic biographies of those involved in street-level sex markets, but rather than assuming the existence of polarised agency or lack of it, it may well be that prevailing social and cultural conditions actually funnel the choices for both working girls and punters (Phoenix, 1999).

Essentially, ‘Realistic Evaluation’ is concerned with ‘what works, for whom and in what circumstances’ (see Pawson and Tilley, 1997). Although this approach is largely critical of the quasi-experimental approach, my decision to attempt to undertake a ‘realist’ strategy is not intended to be symbolic of my own outright rejection of this alternative approach to social research (Bennett, 1996).
Acknowledging notions of victimisation amongst punters and working girls provides an important context to understand how and why Britain has seemingly experienced a paradigm shift from supply-led abolitionism towards a focus on ‘tackling demand’, not dissimilar to that seen in Sweden. However, in contrast to the ‘Swedish model’, the primary objectives behind this demand-led paradigm shift in Britain appear less driven by a broad attempt by feminists to engender equality between women and men in society, but more to do with community cohesion, anti-social behaviour, and a movement towards increasing ‘social control’ via techniques of ‘risk and responsibilization’ (Scoular and O’Neill, 2007) and a propagation of the social capital\(^7\) message.

Official discourse tends to focus on the idea that where kerb crawling and prostitution go unchecked, communities and successful neighbourhood regeneration is adversely affected at the neighbourhood level (Home Office, 2004:61). As Fiona MacTaggart’s comments testify\(^8\), this is not to say that ‘sex as abuse’ and gender equality are not on the agenda, but that it is unlikely to be the driving force behind local and national policy changes.

Arguably, the ‘public nuisance’ discourse has had more airing in British political circles, than the ‘innocent victim/sex as abuse’ discourse has (Kantola and Squires, 2004). Owing to the prominence of the ‘public nuisance’ discourse, one of the questions that persists is: whom is prostitution legislation meant to protect?

One important element underpinning the authority of the ‘public nuisance’ discourse in Britain is the strong links between problematic drug (mis)use, criminality and street-level sex work (May\(\text{ et al, } 1999;\) May and Hunter, 2006; Home Office, 2004). This association with illegal drugs (and criminality) may partially explain the apparent contradiction between working girls being labelled ‘victims’ and the policy interventions intended to control supply in street-level sex markets. Accordingly, the complex ‘exiting needs’ of working girl ‘victims’ is currently seen to be best fulfilled by the police drawing on the skills and experiences of working girl support agencies (Matthews, 2005). In circumstances where working girls fail to take the help on offer (NCC, 2009), then the view increasingly taken is that working girl accountability and ‘responsibilisation’ (Scoular and O’Neill, 2007) can only be engendered through a ‘support plus enforcement’ policy approach.

The corollary to primarily seeing working girls as victims (even if policy does not always correspond with this status) is that the shift of blame is increasingly falling on men who pay for sex. Rather than ‘privileging male sexual desire’ (Brooks-Gordon and Gelsthorpe, 2003), over the past two decades the Government have attempted to ‘reposition the client’ (Sanders, 2008) as the problem in order ‘to send a clear message to force men to think twice about paying for sex’ (Home Office, 2008). The moral underpinning of this policy is the belief that the majority of working girls do not want to be involved in prostitution (BBC, 2008). Conceivably the logic of this

\(^7\) As defined by Putnam (2000: 19), social capital is ‘connections among individuals – social networks and norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them’.

\(^8\) See footnote 5.
position assumes that the potential to disrupt the demand-supply nexus is more pronounced when punitive legislation is applied to demand rather than supply.

Against this ideological background, agencies within, and to a lesser degree, outside, the Criminal Justice System (CJS) have a number of programmes at their disposal that seek to control and reduce the number of punters and working girls involved in street-level prostitution. One of the main objectives of the research, therefore, is to determine how measures operating in Nottingham including Kerb-Crawler Rehabilitation Programmes (KCRP’s), Anti Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs), environmental measures, drug treatment programmes, housing strategies, ‘naming and shaming’, as well as more ‘traditional’ control measures (for example, court prosecutions), impact on street-level sex markets. Increasingly, agencies are looking at ways that they can work together to maximise the impact of these policies (Matthews, 2005; Gilling, 2005).

There is a broad consensus in the literature that crime and social problems often accompany street-level sex markets. Because sex markets are likely to be shaped by aspects of demand and supply, both of these factors need to be examined when determining the likely impact of policy interventions.

Essentially, this thesis is concerned with examining, understanding, elucidating and disentangling the relationship that may exist between demand and supply reduction policies. If, for example, policy initiatives prove successful in reducing the demand for street-level sex markets, does it necessarily follow that there will be a contraction of supply? A reduction in demand may simply result in longer working hours and reduced prices. It may also mean street-level working girls take more risks to maintain income levels. Conversely, does it follow that if the demand for street-level sex markets were to increase, so would the number of working girls?

**Research aims**

Using the theoretical template described above, this thesis examines the effects of demand and supply policy interventions in tackling street-level sex markets, and the impacts these have on: (i) working girls; (ii) punters, and to a lesser extent; (iii) communities.

Related to the above, the research analyses the direct and indirect recidivistic, attitudinal, behavioural and emotional impact of a number of policy initiatives in Nottingham designed to:

- i) Reduce recidivism amongst identified street-level punters;
- ii) Deter new punters from Nottingham’s street-level sex markets;
- iii) Facilitate ‘exiting’ strategies (both punitive and rehabilitative) for street-level working girls.
The Main Aim

Importantly, the research seeks to examine the academic literature relating to the inter-relationship between the three areas of impact listed immediately above. In other words, the core research aim is to examine to what extent, and in what ways (if at all), are demand and supply interrelated and how to explore their relationship to policies aimed at reducing the scale and scope of Nottingham’s street-level sex markets.

Research objectives

Addressing the overall research aim(s) necessitated the inclusion of a number of affiliated research objectives. Accordingly, the following sub-themes were identified:

- **Why** do men [in Nottingham] pay for sex?
- **Who** are these men? Is there any value in producing punter ‘typologies’ in relation to evaluating the efficacy of [local] policy interventions?
- **How** do men pay for sex [in Nottingham]?
- **What** are the known antecedents that ‘compel’ women to sell street-level sex [in Nottingham]?
- **Who** are these women?
- In relation to the above objectives, how realistic is it to seek direct causal explanations between: i) heterogeneous ‘risk factors’ and, ii) involvement in street-level prostitution? 
  How, and in what ways, do these ‘risk factors’ interact?
- **How** helpful/relevant is the notion of ‘choice’ when buying and selling street-level sex?
- **What** evidence is there for a ‘hierarchy’ of ‘sex markets’ [in Nottingham] and how strong is the delineation between ‘on-street’ and ‘off-street’ sex markets [in Nottingham]?
- **What** is the current regulatory position of controlling prostitution in England and Wales and importantly how have national prostitution policies been implemented at the local level [in Nottingham]? Is there any justification for legislative reform?
- Has policy been sensitive to the socio-cultural constructions of female sexuality and the ‘power of sexual imagery’ (Hawkes, 1996:9)?
- Assuming that a ‘paradigm shift’ in the control of street-level prostitution exists, to what extent does this reflect a change in approach to criminal/social policy interventions more generally within the Criminal Justice System?
- **What** is the relationship between ‘attitudinal change’ and ‘behavioural change’?

The Investigation

The principle (although by no means exhaustive) methods by which this research seeks to answer the core research aim and related research objectives, includes the following six approaches:
i) Being involved with fourteen KCRPs operating in Nottingham (known locally as the ‘Change Programme’) over a 17 month period;

ii) Designing, disseminating, collecting and analysing 208 self-completed questionnaires (pre and post programme) from men caught paying for sex and attending the aforementioned Change Programme;

iii) Interviewing twenty-two street-level ‘working girls’;

iv) Interviewing ten Change Programme attendee’s post-engagement on the Programme;

v) Analysing third party statistical data and internal reports;

vi) Formal and informal discussions with ten agency professionals.

Triangulating qualitative and quantitative data across a number of sources was seen as the best mechanism of engaging in a broad examination of punter and working girl involvement in street-level prostitution. Moreover, the research was designed to discuss and analyse which discrete policies appear most effective at reducing punter recidivism and encouraging working girls to ‘exit’ prostitution. Given the research aims and objectives, it was also anticipated that the research framework would facilitate an examination and discussion of any (inter)relationships between demand and supply.

It is of course necessary to recognise the boundaries and limitations of the thesis. Accordingly, research findings contained herein are merely the starting point for a wider evaluative process, in which there is a need to employ longitudinal and detailed biographical research beyond the scope of this thesis.

**Structure of thesis**

Fundamentally, this thesis has two distinct parts: Part One and Part Two. Part One consists of five chapters exploring the relevant theoretical and policy contexts underpinning notions of ‘supply and demand’ in commercial sex markets (primarily street-level prostitution).

The first of these chapters (Chapter 2) posits the complex dynamics between the demand for, and supply of, commercial sex within the wider narrative framework that encompasses political, economic, ideological and cultural histories. In particular, it explores the historical imperative that frames prostitution as both inevitable and permanent.

Discussing notions of inevitability, leads to an assessment of how language is representative of the key debates in prostitution (see Chapter 3). Although there is a temptation to reduce the discussion of language and definitions down to mere political correctness (May *et al*, 1999:2), Audet (2003) recognises that in relation to prostitution labels ‘all words are loaded’ and therefore important. In short, either accepting or denying the permanence of prostitution affects the way one describes the acts and actors associated with commercial ‘sex markets’.


Consequently, Chapter 3 provides the theoretical rationale for the definitions and language adopted and used throughout this thesis.

Chapter 4 builds on the ideological disputes suggested by these linguistic contestations, by using the experiences of Sweden, the Netherlands and New Zealand to explore the different ways in which policy has been implemented to control and regulate street-level prostitution. This provides the necessary context to explore how British prostitution policy has been influenced to a lesser or greater extent by ‘abolitionist’, ‘legalisation’ or ‘decriminalised’ frameworks. Having assessed the relative strengths and limitations of each model of control, this chapter discusses the dangers of manipulating policy to fit an ideological agenda, rather than committing to a rigorous and objective evaluation of the local/national evidence-base. By way of illustration, Sweden has opted to control prostitution by criminalising demand. Essentially, this decision was grounded in a rejection of the ‘permanency’ of prostitution, a commitment to gender equality and a wholesale acceptance of the ‘working girls as victim’ paradigm. Rejecting the inevitability of prostitution as a prevalent social phenomenon stands in direct contrast to the decision made in New Zealand that prostitution remains a socio-historical facet of social life (PLRC, 2005) and that the most effective way of controlling prostitution (or at least to reduce the negative effects of street-level prostitution) is through a process of ‘decriminalisation’ of all actors.

Themes of agency and coercion as precursors of victimisation are present in Chapters 5 and 6. Ascribing a ‘victim’ identity to all working girls inevitably shapes any interpretation of what it means to ‘sex work’, since it assumes that victimhood is inextricably linked with issues of power, abuse and coercion, all of which are widely assumed to play a central role in determining the authenticity of the permanency discourse in relation to street-level prostitution. Chapter 5 explores concepts of ‘victimisation’ through a discussion of the known antecedents to working girls entry and continued involvement in street-level sex prostitution. These include: childhood maltreatment, the ‘feminisation of poverty’, psychological trauma and problematic drug use. Importantly this chapter makes explicit the difficulties in assigning homogeneous causal explanations.

The final chapter in Part One (Chapter 6) addresses similar themes to enable an assessment of the extent to which the paradigm shift of punters from ‘victims’ to ‘offenders’ has been informed about what we know about why men pay for sex and who these men are. Whereas working girls’ antecedents to involvement suggests a significant lack of agency (and therefore a ‘victimised’ status), it is argued that purchasing sex is very much a choice (Hughes *et al*, 2004:9). Accordingly, this chapter draws on existing research findings to place the concept of punter ‘choice’ within a socio-cultural and psychological motivational framework - including the need to fulfil ‘biological urges’, wanting ‘another kind of sex’, ‘another kind of woman’, notions of risk and cultural constructions of male sexuality. Incorporated into this analysis is a discussion of what recent research evidence tells us about the prevalence and socio-demographic homogeneity of punting amongst British men.
Part Two of the thesis is split into four chapters and utilises the theoretical discussions from the previous six chapters to construct an empirical study of the recidivistic, attitudinal, deterrent and ‘exiting’ effects of prostitution policy reform and initiatives at the local level (Nottingham), together with any evidence of policy divergence away from the national model. Closely associated with this latter point, Part Two also examines the claim that ideological presuppositions have more often framed policy implementations than have policies grounded in evidence.

Chapter 7 provides the methodological groundings of the empirical investigation. Primarily concerned with issues of sampling, reliability, validity, interview and questionnaire design, ethics, techniques of analysis, methodological reflection and the politics of research, this chapter describes how the research design has been aligned with the core research questions, as well as the broader theoretical and philosophical framework guiding this research (see above). Ultimately, prostitution research has been criticised for its lack of methodological transparency (Weitzer 2005) and this chapter seeks to address this legitimate concern. Similarly, whilst being: i) cognisant of the potential transferability of the findings in this thesis to other prostitution markets and; ii) confident of the validity and reliability of the methodological approach, it must be borne in mind that the research fieldwork is spatially, and temporally distinctive to policy interventions in Nottingham.

Building on the discussion in Part One outlining how the paradigm shift in ‘victimisation’ has coincided with a challenge to the notion that prostitution be seen through the lens of inevitability (Home Office, 2006:1), Chapter 8 explores the extent to which national and local prostitution policy reflects these theoretical and ideological changes. In particular, policy developments are analysed for evidence that demand is increasingly being tackled through penal policies enacted within the CJS, whilst working girls are being encouraged to leave prostitution through a ‘support plus enforcement’ approach. Inevitably this chapter examines the extent to which policy has coalesced with an understanding of the antecedents to demand and supply (and the relationship between buying and selling sex) as a means of legitimising the paradigm shift underpinning this ‘new’ policy approach, both nationally and locally in Nottingham.

Chapters 9 and 10 provide further substantive data from the empirical study carried out in Nottingham and are broadly split into supply-side and demand-led analyses. The first of these substantive chapters attempts to understand if (and how) specific policy interventions – primarily the Nottingham Change Programme, but also media campaigns and environmental measures - reform men’s attitudes and motivations towards ‘punting’, and ultimately how this may manifest itself in behavioural change. There is also an attempt to translate these findings more generally, in terms of ascertaining what deters other men within the general population, from entering the market. In order to determine the legitimacy of assumptions about variations in punters motivations, Chapter 9 seeks to understand the impact of anti-demand policy interventions at the socio-demographic level. The findings from this chapter are taken from an analysis of questionnaires distributed to Change Programme attendee’s together with a number of follow-
up interviews with Programme volunteers. Again, it is worth stressing that this thesis makes no
claims to have reached ‘theoretical saturation’ (Bryman, 2005) in this area of investigation. As
such, the demand-led findings from this chapter should only be taken as a useful starting point
of a wider evaluative process.

Paying for sex is only one side of the demand-supply nexus and on its own an examination of
this area cannot adequately answer the research questions key to this thesis. Chapter 10
attempts to plug this gap by exploring the complexity of meaning that working girls in
Nottingham attach to their ‘decision’ to become involved in prostitution in the first place and how
these entry and retainer risk factors may ultimately determine the success of any speculative
demand reductions and/or an ‘enforcement plus support’ policies to reduce ‘supply’. Concomitantly, part of this process involved interviewing twenty-two working girl respondents to
seek to understand their experiences of, and attitudes towards, demand reductions. For
example, if changes in the number of punters operating in Nottingham have been observed (in
an era where interventions have increasingly been directed towards those who pay for sex),
what impact would (or has) reduced punter numbers have on the lives of working girls (including
crime, safety and working practices) and do they subscribe to the ‘permanency’ of the market
idea? Like punters, working girls demonstrated a number of paradoxical narratives that could
only be rendered subjectively meaningful through a detailed understanding of the antecedents
to involvement, together with some recognition of the socio-cultural nuances of the market.

Finally, Chapter 11 pulls together these findings to determine what conclusions can be drawn in
relation to the main aim and research objectives posed in this introductory chapter. For
example, taking the findings from Chapters 9 and 10, which – if any - interventions used to
tackle and deter street-level prostitution appear to have been effective, who have they been
effective for, and are there any unintended negative or positive consequences that we should
be concerned about? Furthermore, what seems to be the relationship between demand and
supply in Nottingham’s street-level sex markets? Having reached some tentative – and
invariably limited - conclusions about the way in which policy interventions have failed or
succeeded in reducing demand and controlling supply in Nottingham’s red-light district, this final
chapter subsequently makes suggestions for appropriate ways forward, with a focus upon:

- Carrying out future methodologically rigorous, longitudinal research on the impact -
directly upon punters and indirectly upon working girls and the local community - of
new demand interventions, such as the Change Programme;
- Using this information as a springboard to re-assess the legislative model in operation
in the UK and to examine the need for a consistent ‘cultural’ criminological
understanding towards commercial sex and;
- To make recommendations for more effective, quality, evidence-based policy
interventions that seek to minimize harm to punters, working girls and communities
alike.
Chapter 2 - Prostitution and the ‘Delusion of Permanence’: Historical Reflections on the Inevitability of Commercial Sex Markets

Manifestly, understanding the complex dynamics between the demand for, and supply of, commercial sex is posited within the wider narrative framework that encompasses political, economic, ideological and cultural histories. Perhaps one of the most frequently quoted clichés in social history is that prostitution is amongst the world’s oldest professions (Scambler and Scambler, 1997). The premise of this cliché is not without some intuitive legitimacy; history is, after all, littered with evidence of women’s ‘willingness’ to sell – and men’s eagerness to purchase sexual services (Bullough and Bullough, 1987).

Positing prostitution in a historical framework that stresses its social inevitability, serves well those who wish to legalise or decriminalise the act of selling sex for commercial gain; if prostitution has always been with us, why should we assume that the future would (or could) be any different? As Maslow (1943) argues, all humans have a hierarchy of needs, and sex is amongst the most primitive needs that have to be fulfilled before humans can begin to think about more complex self-actualisation motivations, such as creativity. Accordingly, this innate drive, evolved, biological and predominantly male (Buss, 1994) drive for sex (whether ‘free’ or ‘purchased’) is often presented as a justification for why prostitution always will accompany human civilisation and why we should concern ourselves more with issues of safety and working conditions for those involved in prostitution and rather less with unrealistically trying to use policy interventions to reduce the numbers of punters and working girls.

Arguably, what this ‘oldest profession’ platitude does, however, is disguise the heterogeneity of prostitution’s meaning and significance over the past 4500 years. Those who argue for the elimination of prostitution for emancipatory purposes, oppose prostitution’s inevitability on the basis that it is neither universal nor found in all societies (Ringdal, 2004). Moreover, this view states that far from being inevitable and innate, prostitution is not really about sex at all. Rather, prostitution denotes a manifestation of unequal social and economic structures (primarily inter-gender, but also intra-gender) and is representative of a skewed historical and social construction of human sexuality (O’Neill, 1997).

Adversaries of the inevitability of prostitution theory dispute that notions of permanence, regardless of prostitution’s contested universality, is a sufficient condition to justify legalising or decriminalising it (MacKinnon 1987; Barry, 1995; Jeffreys 1997 and Pateman, 1988). In this worldview, prostitution is inextricably linked with coercion, abuse and victimhood. For others (Doezema, 2001, Pheterson, 1989, Bell, 1987, Delacoste and Alexander, 1987, and ‘sex worker rights’ organisations including the English Collective of Prostitutes (ECP)) providing the ‘client

---

9 As Brooks-Gordon (2006) points out, accounts of prostitution prior to 2500 BC are sketchy (and heavily contested) and therefore deemed to be insufficient for any reliable analysis to take place here.
behaves decently, the relationship between the sex buyer and the sex seller must be considered a purely private transaction’ (Ringdal, 2004:4) between two consenting adults.

To represent the debate dichotomously is, of course, a gross simplification; the contestations are inevitably more complex than the simple binary opposites conveniently described here. Many feminists fall somewhere between these two ‘extremes’. However, this simple treatment provides an insightful appreciation that the ‘history of prostitution’ in the ‘West’ is as much to do ideological contradictions as it is to do with legislative and social upheavals.

**The history of prostitution, or prostituting history?**

Bell (1994:1) argues that ‘prostitution as a discursive domain has had a marginal place in the cultural exchanges of the West’ (1994:1). Even as recently as the 1980s there may have been some validity in this assertion. Brooks-Gordon (2006), however, observes that during the second half of the last century: (i) the women’s movement; (ii) the 1960s sexual revolution; (iii) tolerance towards sexual diversity; (iv) a 24-hour mass media culture and; (v) the onset of HIV/AIDS, ensured that prostitution increasingly filtered into the ‘mainstream’. Owing to these social developments, questions associated with prostitution (and sexuality generally) have become increasingly politicised and debated.

Whilst the debate is widening and increasingly mainstreamed, this should not detract from the claim that the history of prostitution is riddled with misogyny, double standards and contradictions (MacKinnon, 1987; Jeffreys, 1997). Inevitably, any discussion about history has a potential for subjective interpretations to be presented as universal truths by those propagating partisan views. The debate between ‘radical feminists’ (for example, Barry, 1995, Pateman, 1988 and MacKinnon, 1987) and ‘sex radicals’ (for example, Bell, 1994 and Califia, 1994) often disregards the epistemology of historical truth and subjective interpretations. The implication is that the past contains a number of truths and stories to be discovered - in favour of a universal omnipresent truth – and ignoring this diversity renders the history of prostitution as little more than an unchallenged empirical receptacle for legitimising one’s own pet theories. As Jeffreys (1997) points out, for example, depending on which account you read of the so-called ‘golden age’ of prostitution in Ancient Greece, the *hetaerae* were either (i) uniquely

---

10 For reasons of expediency, the discussion relating to the history of prostitution incorporates both on-street and off-street accounts. Similarly, the discussion is primarily restricted to female prostitution within the geographical boundaries of Europe.

11 The debate between radical feminists and sex radicals is opened up in later chapters. Briefly, radical feminists oppose prostitution on the grounds of men’s domination over women (Pateman, 1983), whilst sex radicals oppose this opposition and subsequently emphasise the possibility that selling sexual services can be empowering and should be seen as a Civil Rights issue (Outshoorn, 2004).

12 The term *hetaerae* came to be used as a euphemistic term for ‘prostitute’. Not unlike more informal ‘hierarchies’ in modern prostitution structures, the *hetaerae* represented the so-called upper echelons of Ancient Greek prostitutes (perhaps equivalent to modern day ‘escorts’), affordable by only the wealthiest members of Greek society. ‘Ordinary’ citizens had to be content with *dicteriaides* or ‘common prostitutes’ which included the dancer-musician prostitutes known as *aulenrides* (Roberts, 1992 and Scott, 1968). In light of this, it is important to guard against the assumption that the *hetaerae* are directly comparable to modern-day ‘streetwalkers’.
liberated amongst women in terms of wealth, independence, education and status (Roberts, 1992) or; (ii) generally not much better off than the average Greek woman (see Keuls, 1993 in Jeffreys, 1997). These two strangely incompatible accounts are symptomatic of the difficulty of unpicking the ‘politicisation of history’ to discover what is was like to be a ‘prostitute’ in the past.

As Popper (1963) notes, it is relatively easy for dogmatic thinking to find confirmatory evidence and to reject inconvenient counterexamples; what is actually required of good science is not verification but falsification, whereby contradictory evidence is actively sought. Ultimately, perhaps we should seek what Popper (1963) describes as ‘verisimilitude’ (or ‘truth likeness’). Set against this proviso, the remainder of this chapter briefly explores what historical accounts tell us about the perceptions of, and attitudes towards prostitution, working girls and punters (particularly in relation to inevitability and notions of coercion/victimisation).

Rome and the growth of Christianity: misogyny, double standards and contradictions

Brooks-Gordon (2006:2) argues that the Roman era is the first historical period from which enough evidence exists to realistically begin to understand attitudes towards ‘commercial sex’. There is good reason to begin here, because it is from Rome that ‘the Western world has obtained its fundamental view of prostitution’ (Ringdal, 2004:85) and marriage.

What the prostitution writings of ancient Rome exemplify is the emergence of a ‘double standard’; namely that paying for sexual services is both frowned upon and accepted as a ‘necessary evil’ to protect the sanctity of marriage and the virtue of ‘good women’ (Roberts, 1992). In one of the West’s most famous quotes about prostitution, the statesman Cato, says to a young Roman leaving a brothel:

‘Blessed be thou for thy virtue...For when your veins are swelling with gross lust, you men should indeed drop in there, rather than grind some husband’s private mill’ (quoted in Ringdal 2004:87)

Herein lies one of the most coherent expressions of prostitution’s inherent contradictions and the implicit structural misogyny that has characterised the West’s attitude towards prostitution from Roman times. The idea that prostitution is simultaneously morally repugnant, yet logically necessary to prevent rape, the purity of the unmarried and protecting the virtues of ‘the proper wife and mother’ (Bullough and Bullough 1987:24), are notions that shaped Western attitudes towards the demand for (and supply of) prostitutes into the twenty-first century. From a biological, evolutionary perspective (Buss, 1994), it is not surprising that promiscuity was carefully channelled in this way; propagating the message that prostitution and promiscuity were
not always wholly undesirable, helped mitigate age old lineage and pecuniary fears of paternity fraud and contributed to the moral certainties of marriage and family.

Interestingly these contradictory sentiments were cemented with the rapid growth of the Church, whereby female sexual impulse\(^{13}\) was seen to be ‘unnatural’ (Karras, 1996) and sex outside of marriage the domain of men (Ranke-Heinemann, 1990 in Brooks-Gordon, 2006). Unofficially the Church subscribed to the ‘hydraulic’ view of masculine sexuality in which ‘pressure builds up and has to be released through a safety valve (marriage or prostitution), or eventually the dam will burst and men will commit seduction, rape, adultery, and sodomy’ (Karras 1996:6).

‘Dichotomy’ lay at the heart of much of Western intellectual discourse throughout this period (and beyond) and the notion of a continuum was not, therefore, seen as an efficient way of establishing ‘truth’ or maintaining the moral fabric of society (Prokhovnik, 1999). As Bell (1994:40) points out, the most general of the Western dichotomous discourses evolved around an inter-gender dichotomy between men and women. These differences are further duplicated with the intra-gender ‘sameness/difference’ framework of duality, in which women were either ‘good girl/bad girl, Madonna/whore, wife/prostitute’ (ibid). Consequently the overriding fear was not that men would pay for sex – for this was a ‘necessary evil’ - but that morally or legally condoning conspicuous acts of supply would inevitably result in turning ‘good’ women ‘bad’, and/or ‘normal’ women into ‘deviants’.

Undoubtedly the Reformation and Counter-Reformation (1560-1648) generated a shift in the attitudes of the religious elite towards the normalisation of demand for ‘sex for pleasure’ activities (Brundage, 1987), but with very few other economic outlets open to them, prostitution persisted to be one of the few ‘occupations’ available for unattached women (Roberts, 1992). Simultaneously, ‘the commercial client, even under conditions of prohibition, was seen as a weak soul to be saved from the depravity of women in brothels’ (Brooks-Gordon, 2006:5).

Ultimately, the puritanical fanaticism of the (Counter) Reformation period gave way to the status quo that had preceded it. For prostitution to reassert itself in the face of such punitive measures, may be regarded as further evidence for the inevitability of prostitution. Equally the continued prevalence of prostitution may be seen as a response to the prevailing social and economic inequalities that created the conditions for prostitution to flourish. The (Counter) Reformation seems unlikely to have done much to improve women’s social and financial standing and it seems likely that the suppression of prostitution did much to reinforce the divisions between ‘good’ and ‘bad’ women. Yet as had been the case since the Roman Empire, the purchasers of sex appear to have been unchallenged.

---

\(^{13}\) It was largely irrelevant whether the sexual impulse was satisfied through receiving payment for sexual services or for ‘free’, since promiscuity was the defining factor in prostitution rather the exchange of money. Women’s promiscuity was seen as undermining the fabric of society and it was this promiscuous excess that was primarily condemned and regulated (Karras, 1996; Ringdal, 2004).
Although demand continued to outstrip supply, women’s purported willingness to engage in commercial sex markets was represented for the first time in literature with the phenomenon of the novel. Naturally the pernicious elements of prostitutes continued to be portrayed in fiction and social historian commentaries, but by accepting working girl ‘choice’ and assumed rationality made it much easier to vilify the prostitute and maintain the ‘double standard’ paradigm. Ultimately, the belief remained that ‘prostitutes are a necessity. Without them, men would attack respectable women in the streets’ (Napoleon Bonaparte quoted in Butler, 2000:209). Perhaps the most unequivocal example of how prostitution burgeoned in this ‘age of debauchery’ came in the form of the infamous ‘Harris List of Covent Garden Ladies’ (Rubenhold, 2005), which promoted a range of sexual services offered by London’s prostitution ‘community’. As a precursor to the modern-day ‘Punternet’, the Harris List’s success is generally attributed to weak marriage bonds and the tradition of prostitution’s ‘necessarily evil’ exemplar.

Late Georgian values and the growth of Victorian morality: a challenge to the ‘Double Standard’ paradigm?

By the Seventeenth century, regulating sex was less to do with ‘religious fervour’ than secularisation driven by individual members of the middle classes (Bullough and Bullough, 1987). During this period, Stone (1977) observes that wives reluctantly accepted extra-marital sex as a primordial form of contraception; as a result illegitimacy soared. The disquiet amongst the middle classes led to Sir Fielding’s ‘public laundries’ providing ‘honest’ work for prostitutes (Roberts, 1992), with a subtext that ‘fallen women’ could somehow be reformed into ‘submissive and dutiful wives’.

The Victorian era continued this repositioning theme whereby ‘prostitutes’ were no longer seen as ‘the daughter of wretchedness nor the elegant penitent, but a recalcitrant sinner to be won to repentance with severity and discipline’ (Trugdill, 1976 in Self, 2003:23). This new moral climate, however, did nothing to confront the entrenched ‘double standard’ ideology. Far from challenging the belief that men’s predilections for paid sexual services were rooted in an innate inevitability, the new moralists increasingly turned to the scientific, medical and legal professions to justify moral admonishments of prostitutes and support for the need of men to satisfy their natural sexual urges.

In an effort to ring-fence the morals of ‘good’ women, medics including the gynaecologist William Acton (1857 in Finnegan, 1979:1) declared that the majority of women were not

---

14 For example, in John Cleland’s ‘Fanny Hill: The Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure’ (1748), prostitution is posited as a possible road to social advancement (Ringdal 2004: 205).

15 Prostitution (and the resultant social consequences) was also represented in art, most notably Hogarth’s (1697-1764) ‘The Harlot’s Progress’.

16 Such themes were taken up elsewhere; Dr William Dodd founded the first ‘Magdalene Home’ in 1758, with the aim of converting the ‘outcast poor into the virtuous Christian Poor’ (Henriques, 1963 in Roberts, 1992).
particularly troubled with sexual desire nor pleasure. Increasingly popular was the notion that some women were simply biologically predisposed towards criminality and prostitution. Lombroso’s (1885 cited in Brooks-Gordon, 2006) ‘The Female Offender’ made the ‘scientific’ claim that the prostitute and the criminal were physiologically and psychologically identical. Worse still, the authorities assumed that the ‘criminal’ prostitute was to blame for a rise in sexually transmitted infections (STI) amongst army/naval personnel (Mort, 1987). Eventually, this ‘medico-moral panic’ (ibid) led to a drive towards regulationism in Britain. Backed by the methodologically rigorous Parent-Duchatelet study of over 3,000 Parisian working girls, British authorities embarked on a programme of state hygiene culminating in the three Contagious Diseases Acts (CDA’s) of the 1860’s to treat - via physical examination (enforced if necessary) - prostitutes for STI’s. Once again, it appeared that the defamatory ‘Otherness’ (O’Connell Davidson, 1998) of the prostitute was being amplified, this time through overtly biased regulatory regimes.

Given the historical precedent towards the purchasing of sex, regulation continued to be unconcerned with reducing demand and the solicitation of women for sex remained legal. Regulation in this context was about ensuring that men’s health was protected through the CDA’s identification of ‘diseased’ prostitutes (Brooks-Gordon, 2006). As the twentieth century drew closer, the relative anonymity of the client appeared secure amidst the determination to preserve the sexual purity of virtuous and modest women and the ideological presuppositions of the ‘double standards’ status quo.

**A new abolitionist paradigm: removing punters’ ‘cloak of invisibility’**

Following the Industrial revolution and the women’s suffrage movement, British society began to transform (Brooks-Gordon, 2006). Pioneering the so-called ‘abolitionist movement’, Josephine Butler (1828-1906), was instrumental in the repeal of the CDA’s in 1886 (Bullough and Bullough, 1987). Butler’s oppositions to prostitution were based on the state’s iniquitous treatment of demand in relation to supply and a growing belief that immorality in society could be confronted with concepts of conjugal love (Brooks-Gordon, 2006). Challenging men’s right to use prostitutes clearly represented a considerable paradigm shift, but the political, social and moral climates seemed favourable to abolitionism and rapidly political alliances formed to propagate the idea that regulated prostitution was unacceptable. As the anti-regulation movement grew, regulation was disregarded in favour of abolitionism as the primary legislative protocol in Britain.

---

17 For a critique of Lombroso’s work in relation to prostitution, see Kaspersson (2005).
18 Published in ‘De la prostitution dans la ville de Paris’ (Parent-Duchatelet, 1836).
19 It is widely acknowledged that W.T. Stead’s shocking descriptions of child prostitution in his 1880’s Pall Mall Gazette newspaper articles (latterly collected into a book entitled ‘The Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon’) were hugely influential in demonising the purchasing of sex (Eckley, 2007).
Criminalising demand in the twentieth century

Prostitution was now framed by an abolitinist stance. Certainly the ‘necessary evil’ of prostitution lost its wide-ranging legitimacy. Consequently, the number of men paying for sex during this period seems to have reduced, as does the number of women involved in prostitution (Briggs et al., 1996:185).

Nevertheless, even as the public’s disapproval towards consumers grew, punters were still remarkably absent from the legislative framework (Brooks-Gordon, 2006). Without widespread disapproval it would have been unlikely that legislators would have felt compelled to include men in the abolitionist model; eventually social condemnation led to legal censure. In the decades following the Second World War, punters have increasingly been drawn into the legislative framework (see Chapter 8). For the first time since the Roman Empire \(^\text{20}\) men’s legitimised right to purchase sexual services was challenged in all echelons of society (ibid).

Reducing demand to control supply: the importance of historical reflections on the ‘inevitability’ of prostitution

Ultimately contemporary attitudes towards prostitution – or more specifically the relationship between demand and supply - cannot be seen in isolation from historical, political, ideological and social contexts. Naturally, the prevalence of contradictions in the literature suggests it would be unwise to project the ‘history of prostitution’ as an un-contentious, universal, objective ‘truth’. Nevertheless, visible street-prostitution has almost certainly declined over the past 150 years or so \(^\text{21}\) and punters ostracization coincides with the attack on prostitution’s inherent ‘double standards’ \(^\text{22}\).

Historical analyses seems to vacillate between the positions of both pro and anti-prostitution advocates; either the narration of prostitution is such that its permanence in historical accounts is a symbol of its inevitability or its fluctuating fortunes denote unequal social and economic structures and a distorted historical and social construction of human sexuality (O’Neill, 1997). In this sense, heterosexual prostitution is seen in absolute terms, with no shades of grey

\(^{20}\) With the exception of the (Counter) Reformation ‘blip’.

\(^{21}\) This decline is explored in a number of studies including Kinsey et al., (1948), Winick and Kinsie (1971), Monto (2000) and Wellings et al., (1994) (in Brooks-Gordon, 2006). It should also be noted, however, that there is some evidence that more recently the number of men paying for sex had started to rise again (Ward et al., 2005). The prevalence of ‘punting’ is discussed in more detail in Chapter 6.

\(^{22}\) With the sexual commodification of women and women’s bodies in recent decades (particularly through ‘traditional’ media, commercial and Internet outputs), it could, however, be argued that we are entering a new twenty-first century ‘double standard’ (see Phoenix and Oerton, 2005) whereby some sexual activities (for example street-level prostitution) are outlawed and expatriated, whilst others (such as lap-dancing) are vindicated and actually encouraged as ‘harmless boys’ fun’. This is particularly relevant when considering ‘clients’ entry dynamics and is discussed further in Chapter 6.
between, as either completely about the pursuit of sex to fulfil basic biological (male) needs or very little to do with biology at all and all about the socialised subjugation of women.

‘Inevitability’ plays an important function in determining how governments deal with prostitution. Notions of inevitability/normalisation shape philosophies underpinning the divergent ‘sex-as-work’ discourse versus prostitution as a symbol of victimisation, coercion and abuse. In turn, the language one uses has important implications for the representation of theoretical standpoints in the pro or anti prostitution debate. This is the subject of the next chapter.
Chapter 3 - Is the Language of Prostitution Merely a Question of Semantics?

Debates surrounding the language of prostitution research have been dismissed by some as mere political correctness (May et al., 1999:2). However, this standpoint arguably misses the point. To ignore the evolution of the language of prostitution is akin to ignoring the key debates that surround prostitution itself. For this reason, this thesis adopts a number of terminologies that are sensitive to these debates. As the previous chapter demonstrates, one of the key debates centres on the acceptance or denial of the inevitability of prostitution through a historical lens and, as with many areas of the social sciences, a number of contrasting theoretical standpoints exist. The outcome of the multiplicity of views is that a divergence of opinion survives as to what language is most appropriate when describing the activities and the individuals engaged in street-level prostitution and what these descriptions mean. Clearly this debate is more important to some than for others, but it remains that definitional issues not only reside in the peripheries. Even policy-centric Home Office research papers (2004:12) acknowledge the importance of definitional sensitivity.

The heterogeneity of terminology means that it is unlikely that conceptual definitions contained within this thesis will satisfy everyone. Although not intentional, the definitional decisions taken may prove contentious for a variety of reasons. For example, in early discussions with ‘professionals’ in the field of sex research, one respondent confided that her approach focused on using language appropriate to the audience. Unfortunately, this method tends not to be a luxury that can be afforded in an academically accessible thesis, since the audience’s experiences and theoretical standpoints will inevitably be varied. Moreover, to vacillate between terms may simply serve to mask one’s own definitional preferences and theoretical position.

Having said that - and in contrast to the all too often polarised debates surrounding street-level prostitution - my own standpoint does in fact fluctuate on the key issue of agency, since like many things in life, choice in street-level prostitution is probably more nuanced than a straightforward dichotomy between ‘having choice’ or ‘not having choice’. In other words, life circumstances may constrain and indeed mask the scope of choice that we all have, but even where systematic physical and sexual abuse and/or problem drug usage (see Chapter 5) leads to extreme cases of ‘choice funnelling’ (Phoenix, 1999), individuals still arguably retain some residual choices. Therefore, the concept of choice and the academic arguments that surround it are perhaps best served if the concept of choice is seen less as an unmoveable, socially-constructed absolute and more as a fluid socially-influenced concept changing across people, time and space. One could contend that denying working girls agency in this way is synonymous with the removal of ‘free will’ and taken to it’s logical conclusion, this line of reasoning would suggest that working girls would never leave prostitution because the ‘choice’

---

23 As Rosell (2006) points out, the ‘right’ are opposed to ‘political correctness’ since they view it as ‘a form of tyranny that forces people to believe in certain social values and to conform to specific politically motivated behaviors or face social or legal sanctions’.

24 The language of prostitution is primarily concerned with the acts and actors associated with any sexual activity that involves payment (including money and/or other material benefits).
to do so is seen to be socially constructed and therefore externally determined. Those individuals and agencies concerned with supporting working girls may (rightly) find this position untenable.

Importantly, all definitions adopted in this thesis are grounded in a critical evaluation of the available literature and are specifically designed to ‘serve the functions of communication, sensitivity to and organisation of experience, generalisation and theory construction’ (Frankfort-Nachtman and Nachmias, 1996:28). Nevertheless, whilst aspiring - as the author of this thesis - to academic rigour and a high level of objectivity, it would be naïve to claim one’s own values do not enter into the research process to some degree. Such values can be challenged by evaluating the evidence available in the literature and by disputing the permanence of theoretical and ideological standpoints, but there remains an awareness that one's own subjectivity – including assumptions about the appropriateness of language - will inevitably play a part in the entire research process, from a synthesis of the existing literature right through to the completion of the fieldwork.

**What is prostitution?**

The focus of the contentiousness of words in this domain is framed around two key factors. First, there is a determination to ensure that any definitions articulated are free from depreciatory connotations. The second relates to a broader attempt to ‘redefine commercial sex as an income-generating activity or form of employment for women and men’ (Bindman, 1997), rather than an insidious act of coercion and oppression (as claimed by a number of feminist commentators, for example, Barry, 1995 and Jeffreys, 1997). In other words, the utilisation of one expression rather than another is seen to indicate one’s own theoretical standpoint: accordingly sex is either work or a manifestation of coercion and oppression.

O’Connell Davidson (1998:8) argues that prostitution has historically been defined by academics and lay persons as ‘the exchange of sexual services, for cash and/or other material benefits. In the UK, a female ‘prostitute’ is any woman, ‘who is devoted, or (usually) who offers her body to indiscriminate sexual intercourse, esp. for hire; a common harlot’ (Oxford English Dictionary Online 2006).

As a description, the historical definition of the act of prostitution outlined above avoids some of the more subjective and overtly politicised aspects of what we mean by prostitution and is certainly consistent with the vast majority of literature covered within this thesis. Nevertheless, it is important to recognise that ‘workable definitions’ can be problematic ‘...since different

---

25 Whether it is possible to achieve ‘true’ objectivity in the social sciences is debatable (Bryman, 2005). Nevertheless, it has generally been expected of social scientists that they at least attempt research that minimises the impact of their own subjectivity. Breuer and Roth (2003) argue this may be unrealistic and that ‘a more minimal assumption is that research products are in fact a function of research processes and researchers’; this position does not seem unattractive. Methodological presuppositions are discussed in more detail in Chapter 7.
societies have different standards’ and ‘it is the social evaluation and legal determination of a society that gives prostitution a special status’ (Bullough and Bullough, 1987:25). Interestingly, O’Connell Davidson (1998) rejects the notion of sexual services exchanged for money or other material gains as a sufficient conceptualisation of prostitution on the basis that this conventional ‘material exchange’ definition ignores the subtle reality that labour cannot be separated from the individual who is selling the labour. As Braverman (1974:54 in O’Connell Davidson, 1998:9) observes, workers sell ‘not an agreed amount of labour, but the power to labour over an agreed period of time’. To illustrate this point, O’Connell Davidson (ibid) points out that ‘we cannot purchase ten kilowatts of plumber’s labour at a DIY superstore and then take it home to fix our leaking sink’. Applied to the domain of prostitution, this theoretical distinction opens up the debate. O’Connell Davidson (ibid) believes it is therefore better to view prostitution as:

‘…an institution which allows certain powers of command over one person’s body to be exercised by another. The client parts with money and/or other material benefits in order to secure powers over the prostitute’s person which he (or more rarely she) could not otherwise exercise’.

For some involved in prostitution this may resonate as a perfectly reasonable articulation of the power dynamics that take place. O’Connell Davidson’s commitment to a Marxist definitional approach evidently addresses head-on the structural and social agendas that underpin the reality of prostitution and is patently another manifestation of the wider ‘sex-as-work’/’sex-as-oppression’ debate. Nevertheless, dismissing overly descriptive definitions on the basis that they miss the broader structural picture seems unnecessarily to complicate the issue. Prostitution demonstrably involves ‘the exchange of sexual services, for cash and/or other material benefits’ and it does not seem unreasonable to take this as our starting point. Best of all, an adherence to ‘plain English’ is less likely to alienate lay readers and arguably provides the foundation for more complex theoretical conversations about ‘prostitution, power and freedom’ to develop at a later point.

It is acknowledged that for some, the term ‘prostitution’ implies an emphasis on women ‘selling themselves’ in much the same way as the Victorians regarded prostitutes as immoral creatures preying on moral gentlemen (Brooks-Gordon, 2006) and that demand is somehow fuelled by the women’s behaviour. This is a criticism that is considered, but ultimately rejected here on the basis that: (i) personal experiences in the field (see Chapters 7 and 10) suggest that ‘prostitution’ was not a term deemed to be offensive to any of the research participants (and therefore the idea of using alternative terminology possibly politicises a term that does not need politicising for the group it is intended to ‘protect’) and; (ii) it is a term that is widely associated specifically with street-based sex (Sanders, 2004), rather than the more generic label of ‘sex work’. In other words, because ‘prostitution’ as a term is widely understood and used by working

---

26 See also Chapter 5. The purpose here is to introduce these issues in relation to the rationale for adopting particular language constructs.
27 And if viewed as employment is it ‘self-employment’ or, is there an ‘employer’?
girls and punters and since it appears largely free of pejorative connotations for working girls, the act of selling sexual services at street-level shall be referred to as (street-level) ‘prostitution’.

**Issues of agency**

However, to argue that the term ‘prostitute’ is not value-laden appears more problematic. On pejorative grounds, for many commentators (academic or otherwise), the term ‘prostitute’ is unacceptable (Savino, 2005). Consequently, a number of ‘sex worker’ rights organisations argue that, due to its historical permanence, prostitution should be normalised in mainstream culture as a job just like any other. Accordingly, any negative connotations associated with prostitution should be removed, beginning with a redefinition of prostitution as ‘sex work’ as part of an (inter)national agenda (for example, the ‘UK Network of Sex Work Projects’). Such redefinition led some working girls and working girl organisations to disregard concepts such as ‘prostitute’ and ‘prostitution’ to replace them for the first time with ‘sex worker’ and ‘sex work’ (Gangoli, 2001).

**Issues of exploitation: ‘sex workers’ or ‘prostituted women’?**

The onset of HIV/AIDS in the 1980’s cast a serious blow to the legitimacy of the ‘sex-as-work’ discourse (Hillaire-Marcel et al, 1996; Mort, 1987) However, whilst women involved in prostitution (along with homosexuals) were blamed by many as being key to the spread of the disease, there also persisted a growing determination that they be seen as the innocent ‘victims’ of men (and society in general). Probably as a consequence of the erosion of the ‘double standard’ (Chapter 2), the real villains became the punters responsible now for the spread of HIV/AIDS between the ‘prostitute’ and ‘non-prostitute’ communities. Nevertheless, HIV/AIDS was not the primary vehicle for resistance in all of these groups.

For ‘radical feminists’, the real danger of defining prostitution as ‘work’ is that it normalises prostitution at the expense of the harsh realities of street-level sex markets; namely that prostitution is often not the consequence of a life ‘choice’. To talk of entry into the ‘profession’, implies choice, but conveniently negates the fact that women are all too often ‘lured, coerced, bribed, intimidated, threatened and abducted into prostitution’ (Farley, 2001).

Advocates of ‘sex-as-work’ do not deny that there exist many examples of abuse and coercion within street-level prostitution that should not be tolerated (Kinnell, 2008). Equally, however, ‘sex worker’ rights advocates contend the need to distinguish between entry-level ‘abuse’

---

28 Naturally, there may well be those that would react equally negatively to being labelled a ‘working girl’
29 ‘Sex work(er)’ and is a term that arguably has evolved to encompass both solicited penetrative and non-penetrative (oral and ‘hand relief’ for example) sex (that is, prostitution) and non-solicited, non-penetrative sexual services (including strippers, ‘porn stars’ and phone-sex operators).
30 The arrival of HIV/AIDS was a massive conduit to the expansion of ‘prostitution research’ generally (Scambler and Scambler, 1997)
(against those entering involuntarily) and ‘work’ (for those entering voluntarily). Anti-prostitution feminists, fundamentally reject this, arguing instead that such a distinction ignores the broader ‘power politics that govern social intercourse between men and women’ (Bromberg 1998:296). Ultimately:

‘Prostitution is [...] a powerful means of creating, reinforcing, and perpetuating the objectification of women through sexuality’ (Weisberg, 1996:242).

Nevertheless ‘sex work’ and ‘sex worker’ are terms that are still widely used in academic circles and elsewhere and the ‘sex-as-work’ discourse has survived to such an extent that in 2002 the International Union of Sex Workers (IUSW) became an official branch of the GMB Union, a major general workers’ union in the UK (Lopes, 2006). Of course, the debate continues. Like Jeffreys (1997), my primary objection to defining street-level prostitution as ‘sex work’ is that the normalisation process ignores the acute problems that numerous street-level working girls face. Other writers have adopted the term ‘prostituted women’ on the basis that it ‘brings the perpetrator into the picture: somebody must be doing something to the woman for her to be prostituted’ (Jeffreys, 1997: 26). Nevertheless, this definition implies that all those engaged in street-level prostitution lack any agency and this generalisation does not seem to be especially sensitive to the idea that agency might be better represented on a continuum, rather than diametrically opposed ‘realities’.

Rejecting ‘prostitute’ and ‘prostituted women’ labels while referring to street-level prostitution, led me to adopt a definition that best represented the views of the prostitution-involved women interviewed as part of research for this thesis. To ensure academic credibility, the only caveat attached to this approach was that any terminology used to describe the women themselves should avoid overtly pejorative connotations, whilst simultaneously creating a space for both ‘victimised prostituted women’, ‘non-victimised sex workers’ and those somewhere else on the agency continuum. For this reason, the term ‘working girl(s)’ as used by the women themselves has been adopted in this thesis. Working girls’ rejection of the label ‘prostitute’ is perhaps not surprising if one considers the potential stigmatising impact that this word contains (see Roget’s New Millennium Thesaurus, 2007). Hence this thesis refers to working girls rather than prostitutes working in street-level prostitution markets.

Working girl does not immediately appear to contradict the pejorative caveat mentioned above and although this term may appear to favour only the voluntary non-coerced aspects of street-prostitution, closer inspection reveals implicit assumptions of coercion. Adult females utilising the linguistically loaded word ‘girl(s)’ seems to imply a vulnerability that counteracts the ‘working’ prefix of this self-determined label. There is also a sense of irony and empowerment implicit in this ‘label’. Therefore, linguistically, working girls incorporates voluntarism, vulnerability and coercive assumptions and would appear to be the least value-laden option that creates the space for the debate to be opened out. There will of course be those who disagree with the
decision to base language on the experiences of working girls themselves (particularly if it was thought that these working girls are suffering from ‘false consciousness’ – see Chapter 5), but having never worked in prostitution, it seems unmerited to impose an academic view of the world on those living this life every day.

**Pimps**

A similar degree of complexity arises when considering which labels and definitions to assign to ‘pimps’ and those who pay for street-level sexual services. As the Home Office recognise, defining a ‘pimp’ is not straightforward. May *et al* (2000) point out that the term ‘pimp’ should be considered by exploring the control that boyfriends often exert over their partner’s prostitution. On a continuum, some partners may reluctantly ‘live off the immoral earnings’ derived from sexual service activities; other partners may engage more proactively, often ‘running’ more than one girl at a time. Some men may ‘differ only from ‘classic pimps’ in that they control only one sex worker – their partner’ (May *et al* 2000:2). Whatever part of the continuum a pimp is placed on, the control element is a key factor in defining the role of the pimp. Control may manifest itself in one or a combination of physical, psychological, financial or drug-dependency mechanisms. Overall, and considering all the evidence, there appears to be no real justification for creating an alternative term for ‘pimp(s)’ or ‘coercive boyfriends’ and these will be the *de facto* standard definitions used throughout the thesis. Having said that, it is worth stressing that the entry dynamics into ‘pimping’ are likely to be as complex and diverse as they are for working girls. More work is certainly needed on issues of agency, abuse, exploitation of the daily dynamics of ‘pimps’, work that is beyond the scope of this thesis.

**Men that pay for sex**

The final question in the lexicon of prostitution relates to the terminology used to describe those who pay for street-level sex with female working girls. Advocates of ‘sex-as-work’ have been inclined to champion ‘clients’ or ‘customers’ since this tends to emphasise the economic nature of prostitution. Anti-prostitution feminists and academics (Mackinnon, 1989; Harding, 1991; Jeffreys, 1997) have argued these terms are insufficient, since they normalise activities that should not be normalised and ultimately fail to achieve the preferred level of denunciation of men who pay women for sex. Frequently used in the USA is the term ‘John’, particularly favoured by some writers and policy practitioners since it simultaneously portrays a sense that men who pay for sex are indistinguishable from one another, is a slang term for a toilet and as a label is ‘nicely contemptuous’ (Jeffreys, 1997). The *de facto* standard adopted in the UK over

31 It is also worth noting that the Oxford English Dictionary defines a pimp (the noun, rather than the verb) as: ‘One who provides means and opportunities for unlawful sexual intercourse; a pander, procurer’. It is also worth considering that particularly in the USA, ‘pimp’ has been adopted in street-culture to define ‘a person of considerable status in the street hierarchy’ (OED Online, 2006).

32 It is thought that the etymology of ‘pimp’ lies in the 16th century French verb ‘pimper’ which indicates ‘allurance or seduction in outward appearance or dress’ (OED Online, 2006).

33 For example, in North America a ‘sex client’ education programme is labelled and ‘marketed’ as the ‘John school’ (Monto, 2000).
recent years has tended to be the descriptive word ‘kerb-crawler’ (particularly prevalent within the mass media and the Home Office). Those that pay for street-level sex have predominantly, although by no means exclusively, tended to drive around the red-light area slowly – hence ‘crawling’ - in motor vehicles, close to the kerb.

Because accessibility is one component of research/fieldwork, attempting to achieve a universality of language is important. Consequently, the term ‘John’ will not be employed on the basis that it tends to be colloquial and/or a denunciatory term specific to the USA. ‘Client’ and ‘customer’ will be avoided due to their overtly sex-as-work connotations. Although ‘kerb-crawler(s)’ and the terms ‘punter(s)’ are arguably equally colloquial - and perhaps due to its ‘crawling’ symbolism the former is regarded by some as denunciatory - they are widely used in more formal academic and UK Government circles and also by several men and working girls in my own research.

What is vital, however, is that through labels we are not condemning behaviour entirely at the cost of understanding behaviour. As O’Connell Davidson (2001:35) observes:

‘Unless we are willing to face the fact that the people who use prostitutes, are not monstrous ‘others’ but are actually members of our society, produced by us, we are in danger of formulating policies that, at best, do nothing meaningful to address the problem, and at worst, intensify the vulnerability of those already most vulnerable within prostitution’.

On this basis, ‘punter’ (and to a lesser extent ‘kerb-crawler’) is a term that is arguably the least value-laden when weighed against the complex debates on discourse articulated above. However, because evidence exists indicating that the solicitation of street-level sex is not restricted to men in motor vehicles (see Appendix R), the term ‘punter’ - rather than ‘kerb-crawler’ - will be adopted as the de facto standard throughout this thesis.

**Implications for discourse analysis**

Evidently, the language used in discussions relating to prostitution is much more than mere semantics; underpinning these debates are sociological and historical assumptions about prostitution and those involved in it. Chapter 4 explores how these linguistic contestations have heavily influenced the governments of different countries in their stance on the control and regulation of street-level prostitution.

---

34 Someone driving slowly along the kerb seeking sex from prostitutes or other women (Free Dictionary, 2006).
35 However, it should be noted that self-labelling was extremely rare amongst punters. Typically these men would refer to the ‘prostitute’ and ‘prostitution’ rather than their role in the ‘transaction’.
36 Working girls would also occasionally talk of ‘clients’ and ‘tricks’.
Chapter 4 - International Policy Comparisons: Exploring Abolitionist, Legalisation, and Decriminalisation Stances

The language of prostitution is evidently more than just semantics; how prostitution is perceived ideologically underpins much of what goes on the statute books. Decisions about prostitution in England and Wales do not happen in an ideological vacuum; as Pawson and Tilley (1997) observe in relation to general crime reduction initiatives, ‘programmes are theories incarnate’. Prostitution is a worldwide phenomenon and, often in an attempt to influence policy-makers, those that argue for ‘sex-as-work’ vie with others who see ‘sex-as-abuse’ on the international stage and there is sufficient evidence that government’s worldwide are influenced in both legislation and crime reduction programme initiatives by such ideological debates.

Social problems and infrastructures, combined with cultural sensibilities, clearly influence specific interventions at the national level. Such pragmatism is often allied with a search for dogmatic commonalities with other nation states (for example, the ‘Politics of Prostitution’ workshops of the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR) in 2000). Nevertheless, placing an ideological stake in the ground publicly can be a risky business. After all, an adherence to one specific philosophical standpoint will limit what public policy interventions can realistically be employed; if sex is perceived as work, then managing this will inevitably be more important than any reduction or elimination strategies. Interestingly, in a climate of ‘Evidence Based Policy (EBP)’, prostitution is one of the areas of public policy where it is seen to be acceptable to make ideological aspersions. However, when the policies adopted appear not to be working, any volte face is much more difficult to pull off.

Whilst there are a number of locally managed prostitution strategies around the globe, it would be impossible for this thesis to analyse each and every one. What is possible, however, is the comparison of state interventions in three basic models of control: 1) abolitionism through the criminalisation of the demand for and/or supply of sexual services as implemented in Sweden; 2) legalisation as advocated in the Netherlands; and 3) decriminalisation as recently adopted in New Zealand (see O’Connell Davidson, 1998 and Jordan, 2005). The reasons for including these three ‘Western democracy’ models, rather that alternative prostitution strategies in ‘developing countries’ is due to a number of factors, including:

---

37 It would be disingenuous to locate the argument in purely dichotomous terms; the ‘continuum of coercion’ means that for some, the distinction between ‘sex as work’ and ‘sex as abuse’ is unclear, since the presence of coercion cannot always be realistically determined (for example Sullivan 1997).
38 And sometimes regionally, particularly where there is a large degree of autonomy at the local government level.
40 See also Chapter 2 of this thesis.
(i) Limited research initiatives and literature outside of the dominant trafficking paradigm within developing nations;

(ii) An appreciation that Westminster is more likely to evidence the success and failures of interventions in countries with comparable ‘Western’ social structures and cultural identities.

Ultimately, for the purpose of contextualising prostitution interventions in England and Wales, inter-country comparisons have been chosen with these comparable social and cultural characteristics in mind.

**Sweden - criminalizing demand**

Delighting anti-prostitution feminist commentators and seemingly the majority of the Swedish population, in 1999 the Swedish government announced ‘groundbreaking’ legislation that legally recognized working girls as victims of male violence, coercion and oppression. The quintessence of the policy was a decriminalisation of the selling of sex, whilst simultaneously criminalizing the procurement, or attempted procurement, of sexual services (SoS-Rapport, 2004). This position is perhaps best summarised by the Swedish Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communications (2003:1), which formally recognised prostitution as:

‘…a form of exploitation of women and children and constitutes a significant social problem, which is harmful not only to the individual prostituted person but also to society at large[…]. Gender equality will remain unattainable so long as men buy, sell and exploit women and children by prostituting them. […]. It is important to motivate persons in prostitution to attempt to exit without risk of punishment. By adopting the legislation Sweden has given notice to the world that it regards prostitution as a serious form of oppression of women and children and that efforts must be made to combat it’.

The broad consensus amongst female politicians in Sweden, large swathes of the Swedish population and anti-prostitution feminists worldwide was that ‘young men growing up in a culture where prostitution is acceptable will often form detrimental views of women and sexual

---

41 Nevertheless, there should also be a general recognition that Western democracies can still differ widely in their social structures and that the concept of ‘Western democracy’ is in itself a disputed term (see Bassiouni and Reznik 2005).


43 This constituted part of a more comprehensive omnibus violence-against-women package passed through the Swedish legislature (Ekberg, 2003).

44 One of the factors that may have contributed to the implementation of the 1999 prostitution legislation specifically and pro-gender equality issues generally is the high proportion of women at all levels of government in Sweden; about 50% of all Swedish MPs were women when the original legislation was passed (Ekberg, 2005).
relationships’ (Winberg, 2003). Against this background, the logic of the demand-led legislation was intended to eliminate prostitution rather than merely manage its consequences.

Since the law’s inception in 1999, it is claimed that this broad level of support has enabled the reduction of street-level working girls in Stockholm and other major Swedish cities, to reduce by between one and two-thirds and kerb-crawlers by around 80 per cent (Pettersson and Sjogren, 2000; SoS-Rapport, 2004). The legislation also appears to have had implications for the numbers of women trafficked to Sweden for the purposes of sex, with the Swedish government estimating the annual number of women sex trafficked into Sweden as low as 200-400, while at the time of this claim, there were an estimated 15,000-17,000 trafficked women into neighbouring Finland (De Santis, 2005).

With a maximum sentence of six months incarceration for those convicted of purchasing (or attempting to purchase) sexual services, the Swedish model appears hugely successful in reducing both the demand (for) and supply (of) street-level prostitution. Significantly, Kaspersson (2009) argues that the legal changes have deterred ‘respectable’ buyers. Proponents of the model claim its success lies in its holistic two pronged approach. Punitive elements are restricted to undermining the legitimacy of demand rather than criminalizing those engaged in supply-side activities. Simultaneously, rehabilitative exiting strategies for ‘victims’ of prostitution are comprehensive, varied and well funded (Bindel and Kelly, 2003). Månsson and Hedin (1999) describe this approach as a typical reflection of the social welfare model for which Sweden is famous, and that the legislation (and subsequent 2002 amendments) are ‘a compassionate, social interventionist legal response to the cruelty of prostitution’.

Ultimately laws relating to prostitution evolve from the fact that ideology is at the heart of policy-making in this area. Compromise borne out of pragmatism, it appears, cannot be intellectually or morally justified. The Swedish abolitionist stance is intended to be effective both in the short-term to set normative standards as to what is deemed to be acceptable behaviour (and purchasing sex is unacceptable set in the framework of violence, oppression and coercion against women), increasing resources to enable women to exit prostitution and re-educating the public about the realities of prostitution; and in the long-term to eradicate prostitution nationally and internationally (Bindel and Kelly, 2003).

For those instrumental in implementing and supporting Sweden’s new prostitution laws, challenging the normalisation of prostitution is a far better indicator of the legislative efficacy than is the short-term measure of CJS punter convictions.

---

45 See Regeringskansliet (2004)
46 914 men were reported under the law between January 1999-March 2005 and 234 males were convicted of purchasing sexual services or pleaded guilty during the first five years. The rate of conviction has risen year on year; approximately two-thirds of charges now result in a conviction (Ekberg, 2005).
Supporters of Sweden’s prostitution laws claim that they are well on the way to achieving a de-normalisation of prostitution within Swedish society. In addition to public support, the national and local media are often less sensationalised, the police and prosecutors strongly support the scheme and the number of street-level working girls keen to ‘normalise’ their behaviour is evidenced in the frequency in which women appear to be exiting prostitution.  

**Criminalising demand: a consensus?**

Despite this widespread support, there are nevertheless a number of dissenting voices, with opposition principally grounded in: i) ideological resistance and; ii) a disputation of the ‘facts’ widely quoted in official publications and the media.

**Ideological contestations**

Ideological opposition to Swedish legislation, focuses on the key debate concerning whether or not prostitution should ever be considered work and the degree of agency that working girls actually have (see Chapter 3). To re-iterate, the dominant paradigm operating within Sweden stresses that prostitution should not be considered legitimate employment and the existence of prostitution is evidence of the gender inequality still permeating much of Swedish society.

Critics, however, are deeply opposed to the idea that working girls always lack agency, with the academic Skjervheim noting that ‘the first thing you have to choose is to make the choice yourself’ (quoted in Jessen 2003). In essence, opponents of the legislation argue that ascribing a homogeneous social victim-object label to the working girl simply reduces the individual to a non-person without choice or identity. Although the majority of working girls have been subject to childhood abuse and/or chaotic, traumatic lifestyles, even then, working girls want their voices to be heard and for society to move away from the stigmatised label that they are all ‘weak, dirty, mentally ill, addicted to drugs and alcohol and viewed as a victim’ (Östergren 2004:1).

Problematically, since ‘prostitution rights’ organisations are effectively outlawed in Sweden (ibid), the chances that pro-prostitution voices will be heard amongst the dominant anti-prostitution rhetoric are considerably reduced.

**Disputing the facts**

Aside from these socio-philosophical disagreements, are fundamental concerns that the legislation fails to deliver what it set out to achieve. Criticism is primarily centred on two

---

47 A Stockholm-based social service unit, ‘Pros-Centrum’, estimates 60% of street-prostitutes have exited the ‘industry’ (in Bindel and Kelly, 2003).
48 This also frames the debate as to how and why governments decide to legislate against prostitution.
49 A more detailed discussion relating to reasons for entry into street-level prostitution are provided in Chapter 5.
fundamental flaws identified in the (predominantly) quantitative data presented by academics and governmental departments. Firstly, it is claimed that prostitution has not declined, but suffers from reduced visibility. In other words the ‘problem’ has been driven underground (The Local, 2008). Secondly, the detrimental impact of criminalizing demand on working girls has largely been ignored (Östergren, 2004).

The Problem of displacement

Because working girls can be a hard-to-reach group, assessments of Swedish working girls lives have tended to be limited to a number of social work organisations, making the claim from Pros-Centrum (see Footnote 47) that up to 60 per cent have exited the sex industry difficult to validate. Nevertheless, that street-level prostitution was less visible in Sweden’s major cities was generally uncontested in the early years of implementation (SoS-Rapport, 2004). More recently, however, it has been argued that the number of street-level working girls is returning to pre-legislation levels (The Local, 2008; Randers-Pehrson, 2005; Stridbeck, 2004; SANS, 2009).

Critics of the legislation argue also that any initial observed reductions in street-level prostitution were probably due to ‘workers and customers [choosing] less visible ways of making contact, so that the policy has led to a re-organisation of the sex industry’ (Kilvington et al, 2001:83). Indeed, the 2004 SoS-Rapport acknowledges that it is extremely difficult to assess whether the reduction on the streets reflects increasing levels of exiting or is actually a reflection of prostitution’s ability to incorporate new technologies (mobile phones/Internet) and the spatial displacement of punters in which the demand for prostitution remains in tact, but the location and venue changes to negate any CJS crackdown. Stridbeck (2004) argues that any on-street ‘success’ may not have been replicated in off-street locations, primarily because indoor markets tend to be more covert by nature and are visited by agencies of the CJS less frequently since ‘…it [undercover policing] is a very resource-intensive job, with uncertain results’ (SoS-Rapport, 2004:25).

Interestingly, anecdotal evidence suggests that the impact of the legislation in reducing demand may also have been overstated. By way of illustration, the number of men attending the ‘Köp Av Sexuella Tjänster’ (KAST) projects in Stockholm and Gothenberg, has remained more or less unchanged since the legislation was introduced. Simultaneously KAST personnel are seeing more men below the age of 30 who define their behaviour as sexually compulsive, rather than the more typical pre-1999 ‘classic sex buyer’ (SoS-Rapport, 2004:57). This may indicate that

50 However, in their first report, the National Council for Crime Prevention (Brottsforebyggande Radet (BRÅ)) suggest that the number of women involved in street-level prostitution in Stockholm is difficult to gauge because the ‘problem’ has moved to other streets and a larger area (BRÅ, 2000).
51 KAST is a project that offers support and counselling to the purchasers of sexual services (see Hedlund, 2000).
52 These typical pre-1999 legislation ‘classic’ motives include purchasing sex to satisfy particular desires, because sexual relations with their life partners were not satisfactory, difficulty making contact with the opposite sex, and seeking excitement and variation (SoS-Rapport, 2004:57; see also Chapter 6).
the underlying causes of men paying for sexual services remains fundamentally unchallenged, ensuring that prostitution continues to be important for a minority of men.

**Displacement implications**

The potential for legislation to drive prostitution underground has a number of implications. Firstly, it is widely recognised that it is more difficult to deliver outreach services (including mental and physical health support) and for working girls to access benefits, pensions and the payment of rent, when organisations are unable to locate those most in need of these service provisions. Although there have been a number of outreach initiatives contacting those street-level working girls ‘displaced’ to off-street locations (such as internet-based introductory ‘postcards’), these measures are time consuming and difficult to accurately target and so their success is limited (Kilvington et al., 2001:84). Failure to deliver outreach services can have a number of negative consequences. Not only is there evidence that women leaving the streets to work indoors on their own are more likely to attract undesirable ‘criminal’ elements associated with trafficking and ‘pimping’ (Eriksson, 2005), significantly, where the police had previously relied on information from clients to help tackle the problem of traffickers and pimps, legislative changes led this information source to almost dry up, since clients are afraid of being prosecuted (ibid).

There is also evidence that the legislation has affected both the ‘quality’ and ‘quantity’ of men purchasing sexual services. In interviews with working girls (Östergren, 2004; Eriksson, 2005), the majority of women complain that – the fear of - arrest, and a switch to Internet-based sexual services, has meant the ‘nice and kind’ clients have all but disappeared, leaving perverted and dangerous customers who are less concerned with the implications of the new legislation, possibly because of existing criminal records, or because they are familiar with loopholes necessary to avoid arrest. In the legislation’s first year, almost half of cases relating to procurement of sexual services were dropped - either because no offence had been committed or because of lack of evidence (BRÅ, 2000)). Whilst there has been a tightening up of these loopholes, they still exist and many of the cases still do not result in a conviction.

Evidence exists that ‘perverted’ clients tend to ‘have more peculiar demands (for instance rough or violent sex) or are prepared to pay for unprotected sex’ (SoS-Rapport in Stridbeck, 2004:12). Ironically, because there now appear to be exponentially fewer street-level clients, there is tougher competition and a harder existence for the weakest in the street-prostitution community (Östergren (2004), hence “…prostitutes lower their prices, are prepared to take more clients [and to work longer hours] and are prepared to give the service without protection’ (Malmö-report, 2003:27 in SoS-rapport, 2004).

---

53 For a detailed analysis of these practical problems see Östergren, 2004.
Compounding this, a reduction in working girls means they are less able to look out for one another. Working girls assess clients more rapidly and because of demand reductions, are less likely to be able to afford to say ‘no’ (Östergren, 2004). These quick-fire decisions suggest ‘the likelihood of ending up with a dangerous client is [therefore] far greater’ (ibid). Increasingly, working girls are far more reticent to report problem clients to the police since it makes no sense to further reduce revenue streams in an already diminishing market.

The law is also seen by some working girls as illogical and paradoxical (Östergren, 2004):

‘Sex workers have fallen into a difficult, constructed, in-between position regarding the new law. The female sex worker sells sex, but this is not a criminal act. However, because purchasing sexual services is now a crime, the sex worker can be made to appear as a witness in the trial process. She therefore has neither the rights of the accused nor the victim’.

The UKNSWP (2009) point to similar developments in Scotland as evidence about how legislative changes can have detrimental effects. Research from Edinburgh, for example, has shown that in line with the experiences from Sweden (Östergren, 2004; Schwartz, 2008), ‘prostitution is being pushed further underground. Women are having to work longer hours and changing the times they work’ (SCOT-PEP, 2008 cited in McKewan, 2008; see also Owens and Chevalier, 2009). Furthermore, the UKNSWP (2009:20) state that the intensive, targeted policing required to implement this policy results in: i) spatial displacement due to pressure from punters to work away from traditional ‘red light’ areas; ii) short-term demand reductions, which leads to less visible (and therefore more dangerous) working practices for ‘sex workers; iii) a reduction in the solicitation negotiation process as a means of avoiding the attention of the police, thus negating the safety strategies promoted by the Home Office; iv) working girls engaging in greater risk-taking with regards to sexual practices in order to maximise revenue streams in a potentially declining market and; iv) greater difficult in accessing support services.

**Criminalising the demand for sex in Sweden: some reflections**

Feminists and Government advisors, such as Ekberg54 (2005), dismiss out of hand the claim that prostitution is a matter of ‘choice and agency’ and it could be argued that recent legislative changes have had some success in propagating this de-normalisation and re-inforced the ‘public nuisance’55 discourse. Evidently the Swedish government have been willing to financially back-up this commitment to working girl ‘victims’ (and to a lesser extent, punters) with education, training, drug rehabilitation and counselling all increasing since 1999. Undoubtedly the 1999 legislation has been directly responsible for facilitating ‘exiting’ from on-street prostitution for a number of often vulnerable and coerced working girls and should be welcomed.

54 Ekberg is a special advisor to prostitution and trafficking issues for the Swedish Government.
Less clear, however, are the displacement effects and the impact on those that remain in street-prostitution. Unfortunately some women are unable or unwilling to exit prostitution; those that are left are driven underground and therefore ‘feel discriminated against, endangered by the very laws that seek to protect them, and they feel under severe emotional stress as a result of the laws’ (Östergren, 2004:1).

The Netherlands – the regulation model

Whereas the Swedish model is clearly dedicated to ‘abolitionism’ and a demarcation of prostitution from work, - until recently - the Dutch embraced the view that prostitution cannot be eliminated, but the social problems associated with it can be. Accordingly, the role of the state is to regulate prostitution as legitimate employment, rather than the adoption of policies to eradicate it (Outshoorn, 2004). In the Dutch model, the primary concern is to ensure women who enter prostitution voluntarily are protected from harm and exploitation (sexual, physical and psychological) and enjoy the same employment rights of other Dutch workers operating in more ‘traditional’ sectors of the economy. Regarded by many as pragmatism, this approach is underpinned by an acceptance that prostitution can be legitimate employment.

Post-1980s there has been a movement in the Netherlands towards normalising and regulating the procurement of sexual services, clearly in direct contrast to the Swedish legislation. Although eliminating prostitution is not necessarily undesirable it is nevertheless perceived in this model to be unrealistic (Prostitution Information Centre (PIC), 2000).

In principle, a ‘sex as work’ approach allows the Dutch authorities to distinguish and legislate between ‘good’ prostitution (voluntary) and ‘bad’ prostitution (forced); a dichotomy clearly alien to the Swedish model. For the Dutch it is essential that those who ‘choose’ to work in the sex industry be allowed to do so safely and in reasonable working conditions. Where minors or trafficked women are involved, prostitution is treated as an illegal, criminal and immoral activity requiring elimination. In instances of forced prostitution, the Dutch CJS adopts a strictly punitive - rather than regulatory - approach.

In relation to non-nuisance prostitution operations, however, the Dutch government took ‘controlling action so as to guide developments in a particular direction by various measures’ (Norwegian Ministry of Justice and Police Affairs, 2004:26). In this regard the Dutch authorities legalised brothels from the 1st October 2000 and, from the 1980’s, a number of Dutch municipalities implemented ‘toleration zones’ (or ‘tippelzones’) for outdoor sex markets. The move from ‘passive’ to ‘active’ toleration meant authorities focused their attention on human trafficking (Article 250a) and the procurement of underage sexual activities (Articles 244/245).

56 The subject of forced versus voluntary prostitution is discussed elsewhere in the thesis.
Even though there are increasingly more punitive sanctions against human traffickers, it is important to stress that Article 250a does not criminalise the purchaser of sexual services with trafficked women; purchasing sex in the Netherlands is a criminal act only where the working girl is between the ages of 12-18 and this is irrespective of whether or not trafficking is present.

Ultimately, Articles 244/245/250a were implemented with the intention of:

- Controlling and regulating the employment of prostitutes through a municipal licensing system;
- Protecting people from being coerced into prostitution;
- The protection of minors from sexual abuse;
- Protecting the position of prostitutes;
- Severing the links between prostitution and crime;
- Reducing prostitution by foreign nationals residing illegally in the Netherlands (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2005:2).

Given the focus of this thesis on street-level prostitution, the detail (or implications) of legislation in relation to Dutch brothels is not covered here (see Bindel and Kelly, 2003). Because the dominant perception remains that on-street working girls tend to have more pronounced social problems (particularly with regards to problematic drug addictions), the ‘sex as work’ discourse is generally of less concern (within and outside of parliament) in street-level sex markets (Outshoorn, 2004). Like many other Western countries, the on-street prostitution discourse in the Netherlands is dominated by the ‘public nuisance’ agenda. Consequently many local authorities have simply outlawed street-level prostitution in an attempt to prevent or reduce the criminality and public nuisance associated with street-level sex-markets. In these cases indoor markets are considerably more favourable than outdoor sex markets; an undeclared objective seems to be to move prostitution from the street to indoor locations (see Day, 2008). Importantly, there does not appear to be the same appetite for ‘active tolerance’ of street-level prostitution as there is for off-street prostitution, which seems massively at odds with the belief that Dutch public policy should be directed to regulation and not eradication.

That said, a number of Dutch municipal authorities including Utrecht and The Hague have experimented with ‘pragmatic’ solutions, most notably the ‘designation of official zones where streetwalkers may solicit at specified times’ (Ministry of Justice, 2005:4). These ‘toleration zones’ (or ‘tippelzones’) evolved to allow working girls to operate without interference from the law. To minimise disruption to local communities, ‘tippelzones’ have typically been located in non-residential areas incorporating a ‘package solution’ of facilities that include a drop-in centre.

---

57 Maximum penalties currently stand at six years in prison.
58 See Chapter 5.
a lounge for showering and resting and counselling/sexual health facilities (Norwegian Ministry of Justice and Social Affairs, 2004). Advocates of ‘tippelzones’ argue that they work because they tackle simultaneously issues of public nuisance and criminality associated with street-level prostitution, as well as the welfare of those working girls remaining in the ‘industry’.

The regional interpretations associated with the regulation of prostitution, demonstrates the difficulties in uniformly evaluating and implementing legislative interventions within countries. Importantly, even within similar ‘Western’ social infrastructures, inter-country comparisons are highly problematic and it is extremely rare that the size and scope of the prostitution ‘problem’ will have evolved evenly. For example, it is estimated that there are about ten times more working girls in the Netherlands than Sweden. In large part this is attributable to the diversity of sex markets in operation in the Netherlands; it is estimated that only 5 per cent of working girls in the Netherlands are ‘streetwalkers’ (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2005). There is further evidence that the interdependence between the sex and drug markets is far more pronounced in the Netherlands than in Sweden.

**Policy impacts upon street-level prostitution and trafficking**

The Dutch authorities have deliberately employed policies aimed at improving the lives of working girls and local residents affected by the sex industry. Where women are operating legally and voluntarily there have been a number of positive benefits. Many of those who choose to work within the system (almost exclusively within indoor markets) now find that they are free from reliance upon pimps, violence has decreased and is more likely to be reported. Overall, the sexual health and ‘work life’ of the working girls has generally improved (Daalder, 2007).

Regrettably, there is mixed evidence that the benefits of legalisation found in licensed brothels have filtered into street-level sex markets. Arguably, the prostitution model operating in the Netherlands has created a two-tiered system in which street-level prostitution has ‘seen a sharp increase in the number of illegal women, mostly from Eastern Europe’ (Wagenaar, 2006:226 drawing on evidence from Dijk, 2002). The upshot of this being (Wagenaar *ibid*):

‘…the exploitation of women and juveniles […]has shifted from the clubs and windows to the street walking zones, and possibly, […] illegal brothels’.

Wagenaar’s (2006) commentary appears to suggest that the problem of ‘displacement’ is as much a possibility in partially legalized and regulated markets as it is in demand abolitionist regimes such as Sweden. With over 50 per cent of working girls in the Netherlands estimated to

---

59 ‘Displacement’ occurs here where the criminal, health, coercion, violence and trafficking issues associated with prostitution are transferred geographically (that is from one area to another) and/or within sectors (indoor versus outdoor or regulated versus illegal for example) of the prostitution market.
be non-Dutch nationals\textsuperscript{60} (Daalder, 2007), it would appear that a significant proportion of individuals involved in Dutch prostitution operate at the boundaries and by default find themselves excluded from the regulatory model. Moreover, many of these working girls operate illegally or at best, in the ‘grey’ market; due to the absence of work or residence permits for non-EU ‘working girls’, involvement in prostitution will often involve a large degree of coercion. This may partially explain why the number of licensed brothels in operation has declined significantly post-legislation (De Rode Draad\textsuperscript{61}, 2009). Irrespective of legal changes, it remains that working girls still face societal stigmatization in so-called liberal democracies such as the Netherlands (De Rode Draad, 2009). Because legalisation removes the veil of anonymity - but not exposure to stigmatization – it appears then that those remaining in prostitution often do so illegally and underground (Daley, 2001).

Moreover, the street-level ‘tippelzone’ experiment created problems that policy reform was designed to reduce. With the number of foreign nationals coerced into prostitution still significant\textsuperscript{62} and continued endemic linkages between street-level sex markets and organized crime, Mayor Cohen took the decision to close Amsterdam’s toleration zone in October 2003 seeing the zone as a ‘devil’s dilemma’ because ‘it appeared impossible to create a safe and controllable zone for women that was not open to abuse by organized crime’ (Het Parool, 2003 in Bindel and Kelly, 2003:14)\textsuperscript{63}. Advocates countered by stating the problem was of poor implementation rather than practical and ideological flaws. Because on-street working girls still need to procure drugs, it has been found that the most successful ‘tippelzones’ are those that operate closely to the Central Business District (CBD). Irrespective of the validity of this argument, the Amsterdam administration generally felt that ‘unmanageable’ street-level prostitution and associated criminal activities were likely to spread to other areas of the city.

Evidence from the literature is inconclusive about whether the Dutch legalisation model has been effective in reducing the number of under-age prostituted girls (Van Den Borne and Kloosterboer, 2005; Daalder, 2007) and the escalation of ‘abuse’ and ‘coercion’ (even utilising the narrowest definition of ‘coercion’). According to Bindel and Kelly (2003:14), the inherent problem with the Netherlands regime is that ‘only one sector is legalized, and as it expands, so does the illegal: both illegal brothels and street prostitution. Thus, legalisation of prostitution does not remove the street market, or the dangers associated with it’. Whilst public and political support for the legalisation model has been challenged by these criticisms, organizations such as Red Thread (CEDAW, 2001 in Bindel and Kelly, 2003) have urged patience, claiming that the worth of the legislation will only become apparent over time. Whilst subsequent reports have indicated improvements following the ‘bedding down’ period (Daalder, 2007), in October 2007, Mayor Cohen followed the ‘tippelzone’ closure with a proposal to transform a third of

\textsuperscript{60} Represented by 44 different nationalities (Norwegian Ministry of Justice and Police Affairs, 2004).
\textsuperscript{61} The Red Thread.
\textsuperscript{62} The IOM (1995 in Bindel and Kelly, 2003) argue (and evidence) that legalisation is a significant ‘pull factor’ for traffickers.
\textsuperscript{63} For a full discussion of other ‘tippelzones’ developments see Korf et al, 2005 and Daalder, 2007.
Amsterdam’s ‘window brothels’ into retail and housing developments. The rationale was analogous to the shutdown of the ‘tippelzone’; namely that ‘window brothels’ have an undeniable link to human trafficking and other forms of criminality (Amsterdam Red Light District, 2007; BBC, 2007b). Mayor Cohen stopped short of calling for an ideological shift away from the legalisation model, but the clear message was that there was too much prostitution in the city and the phenomenon needed scaling back.

Responding to the announcement that 51 ‘window brothels’ were to be closed, ‘Red Thread’ took up the arguments of two-tierism, stressing that the closure of ‘window brothels’ accentuate the differences between the legal/illegal prostitution markets and that fewer windows:

‘…means more exploitation of women. If the windows close down, women who are being exploited will be hidden somewhere else where union representatives and health workers can’t make contact with them’ (Amsterdam Red Light District, 2007).

Whereas the Swedes have been able to side-step the need for this distinction by claiming all prostitution is oppression and all working girls lack agency and ‘choice’ in decisions relating to prostitution, the Dutch have opted to clearly demarcate between ‘good’ and ‘bad’ prostitution and legislate accordingly. But, if the scaling back of state-sanctioned prostitution activities in Amsterdam is anything to go by, it would appear that these boundaries and the worst social and criminal excesses are become increasingly difficult to manage.

**New Zealand – the decriminalisation model**

The experiences of Sweden and the Netherlands, indicate that contemporary approaches to prostitution within Western democracies vacillate between abolitionism and legalisation.

Although potentially more politically hazardous, in June 2003 the New Zealand Parliament passed the Prostitution Reform Act (PRA) that effectively ‘repealed existing prostitution-related legislation and created a new legal environment for the sex industry’ (Jordan, 2005:5). Previously, prostitution policy in New Zealand was characterised by the application of criminal sanctions, principally against female sex workers. Like Sweden, one of the key criticisms of the pre-2003 legislation, was that working girls were exposed to criminal sanctions whilst punters remained strangely inconspicuous. In light of this, it was almost universally accepted that the policies that preceded the PRA were not working. Although the debate to amend the law lasted more than fifteen years, it was acknowledged that a radical change of direction was required.

---

64 The model of prostitution control in New Zealand prior to 2003 was not dissimilar to that operating in England and Wales (Chapter 8).
Yet implementing the PRA was not a paradigm shift in a moral sense, more a political and sociological shift. The stated purpose of the Prostitution Reform Bill was to decriminalise prostitution whilst ‘not endorsing or morally sanctioning prostitution or its use’ (PRA, Part 1 clause 3). As Jordan (2005:20) points out, ‘…the principal reasons for changing the existing laws emerged from the inherent difficulties of enforcing those very laws, and the double standards they perpetuated’ (see Chapter 2).

Instead of morally sanctioning prostitution, the PRA was legitimised ideologically to minimise harm and protect not punish working girls and punters. Its principle aims focus on (ibid):

- Safeguarding human rights of sex workers;
- Protecting sex workers from exploitation;
- Promoting welfare and occupational safety and health of sex workers;
- Creating an environment conducive to public health;
- Protecting children from exploitation.

What is interesting about these stated aims is how little official attention is paid to the ‘public nuisance’ discourse so prevalent in other models of prostitution regulation. In spite of New Zealand’s historical imperative towards prostitution, the ‘sex as work’ discourse was seen to be the driving force for change, with three of the above aims associated with ‘sex workers’ ‘rights’ (‘human rights’, ‘protection’ and ‘welfare’).

Although the Dutch and New Zealand models share a ‘harm minimisation’ agenda, one of the fundamental distinctions between the two approaches is that New Zealand’s decriminalisation rejects the notion that the state should pick which elements of prostitution should be regulated or ‘outlawed’. Because of this supporters of decriminalisation argue that it is not exposed to the criticism of ‘two-tierism’ levelled at the Dutch legalisation model.

Naturally, there will always be regulation in decriminalised markets; a decriminalised market does not equate to an unregulated one. For example, it would be unacceptable in the context of child abuse to accept that prostitution be tolerated with underage girls. Rather than being governed by additional pieces of legislation, ‘prostitution becomes subject to the same kinds of controls and regulations which govern the operation of other businesses’ (Pickles, 1992 in Jordan, 2005:79).

**Decriminalisation: evidence of success?**

Since the law was changed in New Zealand as recently as 2003, it is probably too soon for any side to declare victory. Nevertheless the infancy of the policy reform has not prevented pro- and anti-PRA advocates vehemently defending their respective ideological and practical standpoints, in an attempt to influence public (and political) opinion.
There are currently two key Government sponsored research analyses that explore New Zealand’s prostitution situation up to the decriminalisation watershed. The Prostitution Law Review Committee’s (PLRC)\(^{65}\) (2005) benchmarking assessment provides evidence from both the police and the New Zealand Prostitutes Collective (NZPC).

The PLRC (2005) paper cites Police surveys which suggest that of the estimated 5,932 ‘sex workers’ in New Zealand, 11 per cent were engaged as street workers. Of the approximate 650 street-level ‘sex workers’, it was estimated that about a third (120) were under the age of 18 and another third transgender or transsexual. Underage figures are significantly higher than for all other modes of prostitution. These findings are broadly in line with the audit undertaken by the NZPC. The main point of departure between the police and NZPC research is in the area of street work and organised crime; the NZPC argue that the police overstate links between sex markets and organised crime\(^{66}\).

Complimenting the PLRC paper, the Ministry of Justice commissioned Jordan (2005) to produce a sociological and historical benchmark of the situation pre-PRA legislation. Effective benchmarking was seen as a vital component in realistically evaluating the impact of the new Act. Like the PLRC, Jordan (2005) found a problem with prostitution in New Zealand, which legislation was doing very little to reduce. Levels of prostitution remained unaffected by abolitionist strategies and more importantly ‘law and health interests clashed’ (Jordan 2005:20). As a result, even those working girls that wanted to exit the ‘profession’ were finding it difficult to do so.

**Media and public support**

Initially the media were supportive of the new legislation, arguably key to vindicating the policy switch in the public’s mind (Jordan 2005:26). Nevertheless, as the PRA began to settle in, the media have become more vociferous in their criticisms of the PRA legislation (ibid). Furthermore, one of the most enthusiastic pro-family opponents of the decriminalisation agenda, the Maxim Institute (2007), has consistently advocated that New Zealand ditch its previous policies in favour of the ‘Swedish model’ of criminalizing demand. This stance has been adopted by Maxim primarily on the basis that decriminalisation is seen to normalise and institutionalise the abuse of women and is ultimately detrimental to the traditional family unit. According to critics, the message that the PRA conveys is that when prostitution becomes a legitimate occupation, the corollary to this ‘legitimacy’ is that the sex industry will expand, which in turn will inevitably lead to other social consequences, including a greater involvement of

---

\(^{65}\) The PLRC was instigated as part of the PRA to monitor and assess the efficacy of the Act and to make future recommendations and/or potential amendments of supplementary laws.

\(^{66}\) The original publication provides more detail on the scale of the problem. There is also a detailed discussion of the methodological limitations of the research.
gangs organised crime and an increase in the health problems associated with prostitution (ibid).

The PLRC-report (2008): a vindication of Maxim’s concerns?

In 2008, the PLRC published their first full audit of the operation of the PRA (PLRC, 2008). In relation to street-prostitution, the report cites a number of benefits to ‘sex workers’ from the implementation of the PRA. Most notably: i) 62 per cent of respondents said it was now easier to refuse to ‘do’ a client; ii) there was a widespread belief that the role of the police had changed from prosecutor to protector, especially after the Christchurch working girl murders in 2005 (New Zealand Herald, 2005); iii) on-street ‘sex workers’ more often worked in daylight hours, which contributed to a greater sense of safety and; iv) evidence of greater engagement with social workers, mental health practitioners and counsellors.

However, the PLRC report simultaneously identified problems persisting in street-level sex markets, resulting in recent widespread support to outlaw street-level prostitution (Tapaleao, 2009). Despite the improved role of the police, on-street sex workers are still subject to high levels of rape, violence and robbery. The view from the PLRC is that this can partially be explained by fundamental differences in the motivations of on-street and off-street-clients (see Chapter 6). Problematic drug and alcohol abuse are still prevalent within on-street working girl communities. What the report also clearly demonstrates is how the ‘public nuisance’ discourse is entering back into the debate. Although the PLRC are cognisant of these persistent problems, they nevertheless avoid recommending that street-level prostitution should be tackled through legislation. In the short-term, on-street ‘sex workers’ should be supported to work safely and with consideration to local communities through practical solutions such as closer co-operation with NGO organisations. This same ‘practical solution’ approach should also frame the long-term strategy of encouraging women to ‘exit’ street-level prostitution (but not necessarily prostitution altogether).

In terms of the impact of the PRA on working girl numbers, the PLRC-report claims that these have remained broadly static since decriminalisation. However, there is also a recognition that these findings are contentious and as such have been widely disputed in the research literature (see Abel et al, 2009). Whilst the evidence-base is clearly building, it remains to be seen whether the contested increases in working girl numbers (and affiliated ‘public nuisances’) will coalesce with the continued abuses faced by street-level working girls to herald the end of the decriminalisation experiment or whether the view of decriminalisation as an effective tool for engendering voluntarism in sex markets to further empower working girls will prevail.
The implications of international prostitution policy model evaluations on English and Welsh prostitution public policy

The importance of understanding the influence that Dutch, New Zealand, and Swedish examples of prostitution polices have played in the evolution of recent English and Welsh prostitution control mechanisms, cannot be underestimated. Importantly, the one reliable conclusion emanating from this inter-country (and intra-country) overview seems to be that the problem of prostitution is far from homogeneous; factors such as social infrastructures, the scale and scope of the problem, as well as linkages with drug markets will all impinge on the efficacy of prostitution policies. Chapter 8 builds on this analysis, by demonstrating the way in which Westminster has adopted or rejected evidence from international discourse and evaluation, with ideological and micro-political undertones that the adoption of certain policies is simply not the ‘right’ thing to do.\(^\text{67}\)

As we shall see – and demonstrating clear parallels with the ‘Swedish model’ - English and Welsh policymakers are increasingly focusing on the punter as a means of tackling street-level prostitution. However, in contrast to the Swedish model, paying for sex is yet to be criminalised. Moreover, the primary objectives behind this demand-led paradigm shift are driven less by feminism’s attempt to engender equality between women and men in society generally, but arguably has more to do with the practicalities of ensuring that the pillars of New Labour’s ‘progressive governance’ agenda (Scoular and O'Neill, 2007) are not displaced by the supposed damaging effects that street-level prostitution can play in reducing community cohesion and preventing social capital. As discussed previously, this is not to say that ‘sex as abuse’ is not on the agenda, just that it is unlikely to be the driving force behind policy change, particularly where respectable, professional communities are affected. In this sense the ‘public nuisance’ discourse has far more resonance in Westminster, and in ‘red-light’ areas where prostitution is perceived to severely reduce the resident’s ‘quality of life’. However, before discussing any changes in English and Welsh prostitution policy interventions, it is necessary to discuss these changes against the backdrop of changing – and polarised - perceptions of agency and coercion amongst working girls and punters. This entrenched polemic – and the associated antecedents to entry - frames the discussion in the following two chapters.

\(^{67}\) See Footnote 5. This has clear parallels with what was being said by anti-prostitution politicians in the Swedish parliament at the end of the 20th century. This synergy will be discussed further in Chapter 8.

‘Coercion cannot but result in chaos in the end’ (Mahatma Gandhi in Fischer, 1997)

‘I’m a 100 per cent supporter of the portions of feminism that are empowering to women and a 100 per cent opponent of the portions that hone victimhood as a fine art’ (Farrell, 1994)

In 2006, the British government publicly declared that, in response to a recent consultative review of UK ‘sex work’ that it would seek to:

‘...significantly reduce the numbers involved in street prostitution. The focus of enforcement will be on kerb crawling to respond to community concern’ (Home Office, 2006:9).

This suggests that the British government is more eager to align itself with the Swedish demand-led abolitionist stance, than it is with Netherlands’ legalisation or New Zealand’s decriminalisation model. For the Home Office, the role of government in all matters relating to prostitution should be to protect communities, legislate against demand and help support innocent ‘victims’ to produce personalised exiting strategies (Home Office 2006:23).

The importance of this latter point may not be immediately transparent. However, ascribing a ‘victim’ identity to all working girls inevitably shapes any interpretation of what it means to sell sex, and the logic of this argument suggests that devising effective exiting and prevention strategies is possible only when those responsible for policy interventions understand - and take account of - the coercive and abusive elements that characterise entry into prostitution. And in the context of working within any relevant theoretical framework, there is also an obligation to understand the contexts and mechanisms (Tilley, 2000) underpinning these coercive, violent and oppressive elements.

Unlike the Dutch and New Zealand models of control, ‘voluntarism’ is clearly not on the British agenda of reform (Weaver, 2006). Moreover, even when street-level working girls claim their ‘sex working’ to be a voluntary rational response to poverty and/or - in rare circumstances – a sexually rewarding job (Marlowe, 1997; Nagel, 1997 cited in O’Connell Davidson, 1998; Zatz, 1997), this is rejected by a number of feminists on the grounds of ‘false consciousness’ (MacKinnon, 1989:149).

Along with a more general exploration of British prostitution legislation, the ‘Paying the Price’ (PTP) consultation will be discussed in Chapter 8.
Partly in response to this claim (and building on discussions from Chapter 3), this chapter scrutinizes the core belief that street-level prostitution in England and Wales should always be determined by a persistent and universal ‘victimisation’ agenda and that street-level working girls can never act as rational (economic) agents. As we shall see, the realist position may be that ‘...issues of control and consent in prostitution are rather more complex than either the radical feminist or the liberal ‘sex work’ model suggest’ (O’Connell Davidson 1995:1).

**Revisiting ‘coercion’ and ‘oppression’**

Chapter 3 briefly outlined how and why working girl ‘victimhood’ is a powerful and pervasive concept. The OED (2006) describes a victim as ‘someone who is reduced or destined to suffer under some oppressive or destructive agency’. Whilst this definition has some value in attaching meaning to experience, it is arguably less useful in explaining the subjectivity of attachment that different individuals place on broadly similar events. Externally imposing a universal notion of ‘victimhood’ on others does not seem particularly empowering for those being researched. Equally, the suggestion of ‘false consciousness’ (Mackinnon, 1989; Harding, 1991) is an imposition that is difficult to justify if subscribing to the view that research should always attempt to ‘see through the eyes of the people being studied’ (Bryman, 2005). At some point there needs to be a realistic assessment of the validity of subjective meanings individuals allocate to their own experiences; the danger otherwise is that research participants dictate the boundaries for sociological analysis rather than the researcher (Katz, 2000). Evaluating how working girls end up in prostitution creates the opportunity to explore in more detail the logic behind the claim of ‘false consciousness’. To further synthesise the ‘entry dynamics’ literature, issues of subjective meaning will be revisited throughout this chapter.

That said, coercion and oppression are not always obvious to the outsider (Scoular, 2004); such abuses can be subtle or overt. The counter-claim from sex radicals (see Delacoste and Alexander, 1987) that the *majority* of non-trafficked adult working girls are reacting ‘voluntarily’ to a series of economic realities and/or purely ‘out of satisfaction with the control it gives them over their sexual interactions’ (Zatz, 1997:291), seems as questionably polemic as the radical feminists claims to ‘false consciousness’.

Fully appreciating this bifurcated ‘free choice/victimisation’ dispute, requires an exploration of the antecedents that are perceived to underpin often violent, coercive biographies of working girls. For example, ‘victimhood’ amongst street-level working girls needs to be examined against the backdrop of compelling evidence that involvement in street-level prostitution frequently begins in adolescence, and is all too often predicated with an exposure to childhood abuse, a disrupted family life, socio-economic deprivation and illicit drug markets.
Addictions to Class A Drugs: the ‘new pimp’?

In Britain, the co-existence of problem drug use and street sex work is well documented (May and Hunter, 2006:173; Ward et al, 2000; Home Office, 2004). Amongst the many explanations for the interdependence between drug and street sex markets, two of the most popular explanations are that drugs help to temporarily mitigate the psychological damage intrinsic to the ‘job’ and that once addicted, ‘sex work’ is financially lucrative enough to enable illegal drugs to be bought on a regular basis (Hester and Westmarland, 2004).

A number of studies suggest young girls and women initially take drugs as a mechanism to cope with the insidious elements of prostitution (and their lives in general), rather than as an economic necessity to fund pre-existing addictions (Dalla, 2002; Inciardi et al., 1991; May et al, 1999; Cusick et al, 2004). Due to the close geographical and social proximity of sex and drug markets, drugs are often readily available, as are those individuals who willing to sell them to often-vulnerable individuals.

Other research studies indicate that many women are compelled to enter street level prostitution as a means to fund pre-existing chronic illegal drug addictions (Hester and Westmarland, 2004; Pearce et al, 2003; Church et al, 2001; Melrose et al, 1999; Gossop et al, 1995; James, 1977; Potterat et al, 1998). Compounding this situation, it is typical for many working girls to fund their own habits and those of an addicted partner (Cusick 1998; Stewart, 2000; Hester and Westmarland, 2004). This can place coercive pressure on a working girl to continue working in a commercial sex market. Based on the OED (2006) definition of coercion there is enough evidence in the literature to suggest that Class A drugs are often integral facilitators in the mechanism of coercion into prostitution.

However, due to the fact that ‘drug use and prostitution may simply be simultaneously occurring elements in a ‘deviant’ environment’ (Cusick, 2002:238), to talk in terms of either sex work or drug use preceding one another may be an artificial distinction. The gap in exposure to drugs and sex work is frequently simultaneous or if not concurrent, then very short indeed (Adler, 1975; Bean, 2008). Irrespective of causal direction, May and Hunter (2006) have argued that drugs have replaced violence as the key coercive element that prevents women from exiting...
sex work and for many, ‘crack has become the new pimp’ (Thompson, 2003). Accordingly, addiction-motivated working girls are more likely to offer the direct exchange of sex (with ‘punters’) for crack-cocaine (Green et al., 2000; Sterk and Elifson, 1990). Maher (1996:144) argues that crack-cocaine has altered the culture and context of street-level prostitution, such that ‘the tricks have become cheaper, the violence more pronounced and street-workers increasingly viewed as morally contaminated’. Much of this violence is said to be perpetrated by pimps/coercive boyfriend’s and the shifting nature of the drug market (Home Office, 2004). This evidence casts some doubt on May and Hunter’s (2006) assertion that drugs have replaced violence as the major coercive element for working girls continued involvement in prostitution. Rather it would appear that ‘crack has co-joined with violence as a key coercive tool for pimps to control street-level working girls’ (ibid).

Moreover, causality should not mask the fact that those involved in sex and drug markets share a number of interconnected entry commonalities including: disrupted family lives, multi-generational drug dependencies, sexual, physical and verbal abuse in childhood, poverty, familiarity with local authority care and the resulting low self-esteem, confidence and life-skills that accompany these ‘social exclusions’ (Faugier and Cranfield, 1994; O’Neill, 1997; Cusick et al., 2004; Hester and Westmarland, 2004; May and Hunter, 2006).

**Lost bonds, uncertain boundaries: social structural breakdown as a precursor to street-level prostitution**

Evidentially, a chronic addiction to Class A drugs functions as a major catalyst for working girls’ involvement in prostitution and - significantly for multi-agency partnerships – consistently proves to be a major barrier to achieving long-lasting ‘exiting’ success (Home Office, 2004). Yet, as suggested above, it is doubtful that the aetiology of prostitution can be reduced simply to a symbiotic relationship between the drug and sex markets. Seddon (2000) notes that researchers (and government’s) often mistake correlation for causation. Rather than simply accepting the ‘commonsense’ view of drug addiction fuelling acquisitive crime and ‘deviancy’,

---

73 Exit strategies, within the current Government policy framework, will be discussed in Chapter 7.

74 Philosophical and sociological underpinnings of ‘deviance’ are detailed and complex. Nevertheless, in order to fully appreciate the opposition to the labelling of working girls as ‘deviants’ (O’Neill, 1997:11) it is necessary to recognise objections to representing deviancy as an ‘activity that is outside the norms of the accepted standards of society’. For critics, there is a danger of neglecting the ‘full range of internal contradictions’ (Sumner, 1994:5). In this post-modern Foucauldian world, one of the principle foundations for rejecting deviancy is that ‘society has been dramatically changed by shifts in values, social relations and political debates’ (Henderschott, 2002). Applied to working girls, opponents argue that the ‘elite’s’ fascination with labelling ‘nuts, sluts and perverts’ (Liazos, 1972) as ‘deviant’ is symptomatic of gendered judgements of deviance becoming the vehicle for enforcing patriarchal moral values on dissenters. One of the tangible negative impacts of this supposed ‘working girl-deviant’ obsession is said to be the psychological distress caused by overt social stigmatisation (see the labelling theories of Lemert, 1951). A self-acceptance of this label is assumed to lead to greater risk-taking behaviours and serious personal dysfunctions (Boyer and James, 1983; Dalla, 2002; Plummer et al., 1996). Stigmatisation also makes it extremely difficult for working girls to return to more ‘legitimate’ lifestyles (Weiner, 1996:100). More insidiously, it has been argued that labelling working girls as ‘deviant’ creates stigma-related attitudes amongst ‘punters’ (and also the general population and media) including the unrapeability of working girls (or that they somehow deserve to be raped), that no harm is done to working girls, and/or all prostitutes are the same (Miller and Schwartz, 1995).
there is a requirement to better understand the temporal sequence of events and a
determination to ‘extend the chains of causality further back’ (Potterat et al., 1998:339). In the
context of working girls, this means extending the chain of causality back to a ‘multi-problem’
home environment during childhood. Generally, this is consistent with widespread ‘familial
breakdown’ and other situational factors that result in the undermining of ‘social bonding and the
development of social control’ (Brannigan and Van Brunschot, 1997:348).

Before exploring the reasons why ‘imperfections in the raising of children’ (Cusick 2002:234) are
deemed to be important precursors to involvement in prostitution, it is worth stressing that the
complexity of sampling and other methodological considerations regularly results in ‘sex work’
researchers arriving at different conclusions (Currie, 2003). As Cusick (2002:234) points out,
‘issues of causality are particularly hotly debated around the apparent correlation between child
abuse and prostitution’ to the extent that these causal links have been shown to be both ‘direct’
or ‘indirect’ or indeed, not relevant at all.

Regardless of causal disputes, the majority of research still indicates that, given the right
cultural settings\(^{75}\), negative childhood experiences play a key role in working girls’ initial and
continued involvement in street-level prostitution (Cusick, 2002). Of particular concern is sexual
abuse. Based on principles originating from ‘social learning’ theory (Akers, 1998), the logic of
this causation states that familial childhood sexual victimisation teaches the individual ‘to view
herself as sexually degraded – as “loose”, “dirty” and/or “damaged goods”’ (Brannigan and Van
Brunschot 1997:338). In these circumstances, individuals ‘are more likely to believe that
strangers can use and abuse them’ (Schissel and Fedec, 1999:36) which ultimately ‘may lead
them to expect that their self worth will only be acknowledged when they grant sexual access’
(Boyer and James, 1982:101). Based on a psychodynamic association between granting sexual
access and taking control of one’s life in an otherwise emotionally chaotic existence, prostitution
is deemed to be obvious ‘work’ for individuals to drift into. Ultimately, this psychopathological
model of coercion/abuse allows for an emotional distancing during sexual activity, so that ‘the
girl who finally tries prostitution is one who is already degraded and demoralised, in a state of
psychological bondage, with grossly diminished self-confidence’ (Bagley and Young, 1987:23).

A number of studies have provided strong evidence for direct causal links between sex abuse
and prostitution (Newton-Ruddy and Handelsman, 1986; Silbert and Pines, 1981; James and
Meyerdinger, 1977; Finkelhor and Browne, 1985). Notions of ‘psychological paralysis’ (Silbert and
Pines, 1982:131) – or ‘learned helplessness’ - are also indicated in the research literature
(Bagley, 1999; Cunningham et al., 1994; Jesson, 1993; McClanahan et al., 1999; Miller, 1986;
Russell, 1995; Schissel and Fedec, 1999 and Swann, 1998). For anti-prostitution feminists,
evidence for a direct causation further validates their claim that prostitution can only ever be

\(^{75}\) See section on the ‘Feminisation of Poverty’ later in this chapter.
seen as abuse and oppression; as Giobbe’s (1991) suggests, the same emotional distancing is required to survive both prostitution and familial sexual assault.

Easy though it is to focus on a narrow maltreatment as the defining factor in prostitution entry, Brannigan and Van Brunschot (1997) argue against the spotlight of analysis falling on a singular mistreatment. Instead analysis should be posited within a cluster of wider social and situational factors that negatively impact on ‘social bonds and boundaries’. In other words, entry into prostitution is likely to be the result of an accumulation of multiple interdependent factors, ‘none of which exist in the same form or to the same degree for all women involved in the ‘sex industry’’ (Dalla, 2000:345). Ultimately, ‘when all is said and done, no single factor stands out as causal in a woman becoming a prostitute’ (Bullough and Bullough, 1998: 171).

Anomalous to descriptions of a direct causal link between childhood sexual abuse and prostitution, is that ‘specific forms of maltreatment are not especially predictive of any offence type’ (Zingraff et al 1993: 173). For Van Brunschot and Brannigan (2002) any causal link is, at best, predictive of a ‘heterotypic continuity’; victims of sexual abuse in childhood are no more liable to be working girls in later life than they are shoplifters or ‘white collar’ criminals (Bennett et al., 2000; Brown et al., 1998). Furthermore, critics argue that the evidence presented for a direct link between prostitution and sexual abuse is frequently methodologically flawed76 (Nadon et al., 1998; Van Brunschot and Brannigan, 2002), as well as ‘contradictory and inconsistent’ (Vanwesenbeeck, 2001:252). A crude indicator of this inconsistency is the massive discrepancy in the estimation of childhood abuse amongst street-level working girls (Seng, 1989), ranging from 10-20 per cent (Russell, 1988; Csapo, 1986) up to 95 per cent and above (Newton-Ruddy and Handelsman, 1986). Of course, highlighting these discrepancies is not intended to undermine the well-documented psychological trauma that sexual abuse can induce77, but as Kruttschnitt et al (1987) contend, psychological reactions to abuse tend not to be homogeneous, owing in large part to the incidence of other ‘protective factors’ such as the presence of one nurturing adult, parental arrest history and the number of other stressful life events occurring concurrently. Dalla (2002) builds on Kruttschnitt et al’s (1987) observations, by suggesting the adoption of Bronfenbrenner’s (1989), ‘Ecological Systems Theory’ (EST). EST proposes that present circumstances cannot be understood without an appreciation of the ‘ecological context’ within which any individual is embedded. Furthermore, in order to better understand the social matrices that underpin ‘problem solving pathways’ (Warren, 1980), it is important to uncover the social relationships and environmental factors that define working girls’ social world, past and present (Dalla, 2002).

---

76 Amongst the methodological criticisms are: (i) inappropriate/absent control groups; (ii) an over-reliance on convenience samples that are biased towards support agencies, prisons and psychiatric services and; (iii) a lack of clarity and consistency in definitional outcomes (involvement in prostitution) and predictors (abuse) (Brannigan and Van Brunschot, 1997).

77 Incidences of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) as a result of sexual abuse have been reported by, for example, Ackerman et al, (1998); Farley et al., (1998); McLeer et al., (1988); and Perry and Azad, (2000).
Any analysis that overly-focuses on the direct causality of a single maltreatment, does so at the expense of data that indicates routes into prostitution are varied (O’Neill, 1997) and almost impossible to disentangle (Hester and Westmarland, 2004). Ultimately, an important question remains: how do - what might be termed, ‘mono-direct-causal-advocates’ - explain the many victims of childhood sexual abuse who never become involved in prostitution (Vanwesenbeeck, 2001:253)?

Runaway behaviour as a precursor to prostitution

A seemingly more nuanced explanation is provided by those who argue that sexual abuse may actually represent an indirect - rather than direct – and multi-faceted causal link (see Matthews, 2008 ‘pathways into prostitution’ model). For Cusick (2002:235) this ‘indirect causation’ model, is dependent upon ‘intervening connections such as running away, living in local authority care, or indulgence in risky or adventurous activity […] having an associating role’ (Cusick, 2002: 235).

Running away from home and experiences of living in local authority care are especially strong causal factors (Benson and Matthews, 1995; Boyle, 1994; Kirby, 1995; O’Neill, 1997; Shaw and Butler, 1998; Simons and Whitbeck, 1991; Yates et al., 1991), particularly if one considers the early age at which many working girls enter prostitution. Runaway behaviour occurs as a means to escape abuse (Chesney-Lind and Sheldon, 1998), but once ‘on the street’ individuals become exposed to the dangers of this new world that they inhabit; in these circumstances street-life provides opportunities for learning alternative means of survival, of which an involvement in prostitution – possibly via an attachment to Class A drugs - is one notable example. For children who have experienced living in local authority care, the susceptibility to prostitution seems even more pronounced. Kirby (1995 in Cusick, 2002) observes that feelings of marginalisation and ‘otherness’ can be common emotions for children growing up in such environments and allied with an exposure to ‘peers who can introduce them to and advise them on the local prostitution scene’ (Cusick, 2002:237), the chances of ending up in prostitution are not insignificant. Tragically, leaving the care system has ‘the effect of putting onto the street ill-prepared, poorly educated and emotionally fragile young people, many of whom had been received into care in the first place because of abuse, neglect, self-harm, or their violent or aggressive behaviour’ (Pitts, 1997:147 commenting on the Kirby (1995) study).

On first inspection, the evidence for runaway behaviour - instigated by sexual abuse – as a major precursor to involvement in street-level sex markets seems compelling. However, as with the direct ‘sex abuse’ causal model, counterexamples exist that casts some doubt on this supposition. Widom and Ames (1994), for example, found abuse and runaway behaviour to be
correlated, but little supporting evidence for becoming a runaway and becoming a ‘prostitute’. Kufeldt and Nimmo (1987) found high levels of sexual abuse amongst their sample, but this was not deemed to be the primary motivation for running away when compared to other forms of conflict and neglect. Arguably, the best conclusion we can reach from the existing research data is that ‘sexual abuse’ or ‘sexual abuse leading to runaway behaviour’ may be symptomatic of ‘multiple, co-occurring problems’ (Van Brunschot and Brannigan, 2002:230). What appears to be significant is that there are a number of conditions that lead to running away from home that are not limited to incest/sexual abuse. Moreover, the heterogeneity of any socialisation process is more complex than either of these direct/indirect models allow for.

Prostitution research – a meeting of disciplines?

Part of the problem in understanding why so much contradictory and unpredictable evidence in ‘supply-side’ entry dynamics exists, is that prostitution has attracted the attention of a diverse range of social scientific disciplines, including criminology, psychology and sociology (Brannigan and Van Brunschot, 1997).

Whilst there has been an obvious paradigm shift in recent years away from individualised psychological ‘pathologies’ (see James, 1976), there remains a significant divergence about which social and situational factors are most important for advancing our understanding of the prostitution ‘problem’ (and by implication, how social policy can be used to reduce or eliminate street-level sex markets).

Cusick (2002) provides a list of the more common situational factors underpinning motivations to ‘prostitute’, including: parental promiscuity (Benjamin and Masters, 1964), dysfunctional families, early sexual precocity (Udry, 1988), absence, truancy or problems at school (Home Office, 2004) and lack of vocational skills (Scottish Executive, 2004). Although ‘quasi-psychological’ rationalizations are affiliated to these motivations, unlike ‘innate’ pathologies, psychological dysfunction is explained as being caused by social trauma. Equally well documented is evidence that once an individual becomes involved in prostitution, psychological morbidity can set in, characterised by an increased tendency for suicidal thoughts (Seng, 1989\(^78\)). Potterat et al (1998:340) suggest that ‘while social factors may set the stage for prostitution, the script to become a prostitute may be written by psychological factors’. Completing the cycle, psychological abuse leads to substance abuse, ‘which is itself antecedent to prostitution’ (ibid).

\(^78\) Although well documented, this view is far from universal. Other psychologists stress that there is no evidence that prostitution and an increased psychiatric morbidity are interdependent (for example, Romans et al., 2001)
However, a distinct causal presupposition has yet to be consistently proven across the multitude of theorised (and interdependent) psychological, situational and social motivations. Furthermore, it is not safe to presume that these psychological constructs are antecedents of, rather than sequelae to prostitution; a mental illness/personality disorder ‘could just as easily be the outcome of a hazardous and stigmatised activity, which is subject to routine police suppression and violent control by dates and pimps, and which is often conducted under the influence of drugs and alcohol’ (Brannigan and Van Brunshot, 1997:348). Besides, an over reliance on ‘psychological paralysis’ (Silbert and Pines, 1982), appears to come at the expense of broader socio-criminological explanations of prostitution and the Barnado’s model of coercion (Swann, 1998)\textsuperscript{79}, suggests that prostitution is a unique, unfamiliar behaviour that is somehow exempt from broader socio-criminological traditions. For Cusick (2002), to ignore these traditions is a mistake; whether it be failing to account for Gottfredson and Hirschi’s (1990) ‘general theory of crime’, Cloward and Ohlin’s (1960) differential opportunity structure, Matza’s (1964) explanation of deviancy through ‘drift’, or Adler’s (1975) theory of female delinquency and emancipation, academic and policy research should strive to ‘uncover a fuller typology of entry models’ (Cusick, 2002:236).

The underlying message here is that policy practitioners should not rely on a policy ‘golden bullet’ to disrupt entry into street-level prostitution. It would be naïve, for example, to assume that prostitution could be reduced simply by tackling, or taking account of, childhood sexual abuse and/or runaway behaviour. Similarly, in understanding which social policies are promising, there needs to be a subtle appreciation that decisions to enter prostitution are not just dependent on the type of maltreatment, but also on their seriousness, extent and the presence or absence of other ‘protective factors’. Naturally, there are a number of commonalities in working girls biographies, but the erosion of social bonds and social control is inevitably more complex and multi-layered than many writers in this field suggest.

**The ‘feminisation of poverty’**

One obvious omission from the discussion thus far is the notion that the decision to enter street-level prostitution can be seen as a (rational) response to poverty. As O’Connell Davidson (1998:3) points out, ‘wealthy, powerful individuals do not typically elect to prostitute themselves’. This is especially true of street-level sex markets.

In line with the discussion above, however, poverty on its own is not a sufficient condition for prostitution introgression, but it is almost certainly a necessary condition. For Vanwesenbeeck

\textsuperscript{79} See Swann (1998) for a fuller description of the Barnado’s coercion model that incorporates aspects of ‘ensnaring’, ‘creating dependency’, taking control by ‘using violence’ and ‘introducing drug use’ to achieve ‘total dominance’ of the girl. In this end phase the appropriate conditions are deemed to be fulfilled for prostitution to begin.
(2001:255), there is some evidence to suggest that in ‘developing’ countries at least - the most common reason for entry into prostitution is ‘economic necessity and not early abuse’ (see McCaghy and Hou, 1994 and Manopaiboon et al, 2003 in Vanwesenbeeck, 2001). Whilst it would be reckless to suggest that the examples from developing countries are in any way representative of street-level prostitution in the ‘West’, it seems reasonable to suggest that economic motives may be important in Western street-level markets in a number of ways.

Certainly the limitations of economic opportunities in a predominantly patriarchal society have ensured that until fairly recently prostitution remained one of the few opportunities for paid ‘work’ available to women across all social classes (see Chapter 2). Of course the ‘absolute’ poverty of previous centuries arguably no longer exists in Western democracies, but women arguably still find themselves entrenched in a patriarchy that underscores their ‘relative’ poverty (Matte, 2005). Whilst there has been an improvement in women’s economic standing and a narrowing of gendered pay differentials since the 1980s (ONS, 2006), other economic indicators (European Union, 2006) suggest there is still some way to go before women’s economic standing is rebalanced with men’s.

For Marxist commentators (see Weisberg, 1996), the ‘sole, or at least major, cause of prostitution is, […] the general social condition of women under capitalist production, particularly their economic deprivation and exploitation’ (Eriksson, 1980:358). Accordingly, get rid of capitalism (and by implication, ‘relative poverty’) and you get rid of prostitution. However, according to Eriksson (ibid: 358) ‘the exclusive reference to economic factors is grossly inadequate as an explanation of so complex a phenomenon as prostitution’. And Marxists need to explain both heterosexual and homosexual male prostitution (ibid). Economic factors almost certainly play a role in converting maltreatments into opportunities for prostitution, but any cursory examination of history demonstrates that prostitution flourishes equally well in ‘feudal as well as socialist’ (ibid: 346) societies. In short, ‘prostitution is often a response to poverty, financial hardship and need’ (O’Neill, 1997:12), but rarely exclusively so for street-level working girls. On its own, it is almost inconceivable that a reduction in welfare payments could compel an individual to enter prostitution, without other sexual, physical, mental or verbal pre-conditional maltreatments being present.

Nevertheless it is not an exaggeration to suggest that for many women in the developing world, prostitution can mean the difference between survival and destitution (Vanwesenbeeck, 2001). Of course, it is rare for working girls in the developed world to be exposed to this level of

---

80 This assertion assumes non-trafficked prostitution which, by its very nature, suggests abuse and coercion. There is, however, little distinction made in Vanwesenbeeck’s (2001) commentary between on and off-street sex markets and as a result this comparative data should be treated with caution.
absolute poverty prior to entering prostitution\textsuperscript{81}, but having been psychologically primed through
the erosion of social bonds in childhood, prostitution remains a well-paid –albeit dangerous\textsuperscript{82} – ‘opportunity’ to (i) escape ‘relative’ poverty and/or; (ii) fund chronic addictions to Class A drugs.
The unfortunate reality is that once addicted to drugs, rather than leading to an escape from
relative poverty, involvement in ‘well paid’ prostitution can lead to a slippage into absolute
poverty as the cumulative debilitative effects of chronic drug addiction takes hold. As Phoenix
(1999) argues, one of the contradictions of prostitution is that it appears in women’s lives as
both a cause and way out of poverty.

Revisiting the rhetoric of victimisation: ‘lost bonds’, ‘economic necessity’, drugs and
coercive violence as maintainers of prostitution involvement

With overwhelming evidence supporting the claim that entry into street-level prostitution is
characterised by poverty and a combination of sexual, physical, verbal and mental
maltreatments (even if the exact causal mechanisms are disputed), it is not surprising that anti-
prostitution campaigners have actively promoted an alignment between prostitution and notions
of victimisation (Mackinnon, 1989; Harding, 1991; Jeffreys, 1997). Tragically many abuses
continue for those involved in street-level prostitution and the risks associated with street-level
prostitution are well documented. The death of working girls in the course of their ‘work’ is not
uncommon (O’Neill, 1997; Moss and King, 2001; Dickson, 2003; Romero-Daza et al, 2003;
Sanders, 2004; Rodgers, 2006) and a significant proportion of women are habitually exposed to
highly unpredictable yet premeditated physical abuse by punters and/or pimps/coercive
boyfriends (Church et al., 2001; May et al., 2000; O’Neill, 1997; Sanders, 2001; McKeganey and
Barnard, 1996; Kinnell, 2008; Scambler and Scambler, 1997; Dalla, 2000, 2002) or
premeditated rape/sexual abuse within prostitution (Kinnell, 2008; Haigard and Finstad, 1992;
Globbe, 1991; Green et al., 1993; Miller and Schwartz, 1995; Williamson and Folaron, 2003;
Taylor-Browne, 2002). Add to this the testimonies of enforcing poverty, a history of childhood
maltreatment, and the coercive effects of the use of drugs/alcohol and it is understandable why
‘voluntarism’ should be such a misnomer for opponents of prostitution.

Radical feminist perspectives on ‘victimhood’

Evidently, there are few issues in the field of sex research as divisive to feminists as the rhetoric
of victimhood (O’Connell Davidson, 1995)\textsuperscript{83}. However, there needs also to be some recognition

\textsuperscript{81} Although in the 1990s it was claimed that the withdrawal of benefits to 16 and 17 year olds resulted in
around 80,000 young people with no income (Scambler and Scambler, 1997:98) and between 1989-1993,
3300 children under eighteen were cautioned/convicted for prostitution offences (Morris, 1996).
\textsuperscript{82} See Chapters 5 and 6.
\textsuperscript{83} Other feminists contest the view of radical feminists (for example, MacKinnon, 1984) that all
heterosexual intercourse is an expression of patriarchal power with prostitution at the apex (O’Connell
always by force…it is a violation of human rights and an outrage to the dignity of women’.
that the meaning working girls attach to their ‘sex working’ is far from consistent. Detecting a strain of neo-Victorianism’ (Abraham and McNaught, 1997), Overall (1992:713) argues, ‘women who engage in activities that I personally find bizarre or repugnant cannot merely be dismissed as having ‘false consciousness’. I am not willing to assume a more privileged view of their circumstances and motivation, not to claim that they are all deluded’. The result is that these contradictory accounts get subsumed by confirmatory data from ‘victimised’ working girls, thus preventing a more sophisticated understanding of a ‘continuum of coercion’. Furthermore, the over reliance on qualitative, individualised accounts to establish patterns of typicality amongst working girls – of which this thesis could also be accused of relying on (see Chapter 7) - helps cement one’s own ideological standpoint. In light of this, I would argue that there is some value in supplementing qualitative data quantitatively, possibly through the funding from the Home Office of a comprehensive ‘British Prostitution Survey’.

It is also arguably a mistaken belief that all working girls have an unswerving and tangible understanding of their own ‘voluntarism’, a ‘confusion’ exemplified by one respondent in Millett’s (1971) research:

‘I like to believe that I have some kind of free choice […].Yet then I realise how much was determined in the way I got into prostitution, how determined my life had been, how fucked over I was to have no confidence in myself’ (Millett, 1971:124-5 in Overall 1992:712).

This illustrates how difficult it is to determine (and avoid) the concept of victimisation altogether when discussing female sex work (Campbell and O’Neill, 2006). Phoenix and Oerton (2005) are especially critical of this unidimensional approach on the basis of: (i) the reification of victimhood to a level of explanation in which ‘individuals become involved and stay in prostitution because they are ‘victims’ and; (ii) an insufficiently nuanced understanding of ‘consent’, ‘voluntarism’, and ‘coercion’. The point for Phoenix and Oerton (ibid) is that social and material conditions tend to funnel choices rather than eliminating them altogether. Consequently, it is argued that the ‘working girl-as-victim’ model effectively strips women of any agency and the notion of ‘voluntarism’ gets turned on its head; ‘voluntarism’ becomes the capacity to ‘make a different choice – in other words, to choose not to be involved in prostitution’ (ibid). Moreover, reminiscent of the whore/Madonna divisions used to control the sexual behaviour of all women, this insistence on ‘victimhood’ probably ‘reinforces rather than challenges stereotypical views of female sexuality’ (Doezema, 1998: 45). Individuals who refute victim identities are met with ‘disdain and loathing’ (Shaver, 1994) and a CJS that is progressively punitive towards working girls that fail to take up the support intended ‘to change their behaviour’ (Home Office 2004: 67). In other words such women are deemed to be complicit in their offending behaviour;

84 For a detailed discussion on legislation’s role in reducing demand and controlling supply, see Chapter 8.
despite the fact that it is probable that the ‘good victim’ is equally as likely as the ‘bad offender’ to have experienced childhood maltreatment. Conceivably the denial or acceptance of a ‘victimisation’ label allied with a ‘risk and responsibilisation’ agenda (Scoular and O’Neill, 2007) can affect the support and treatment that working girls get through CJS and, to a lesser extent, other agencies.

**Sex radical perspectives on ‘victimhood’**

‘Sex radical’ feminists, (for example, Califia, 1994 and Bell, 1994) argue that even where evidence exists of previous maltreatments, prostitution should be presumed to be part of an emancipatory, rehabilitative process in which working girls are seen to be taking a degree of control of their lives (Abraham and McNaught, 1997). Considering the often-tragic coercive biographies of many working girls, this seems a difficult position to justify for many women involved in street-level prostitution. Nevertheless, as the direct antithesis to the radical feminist position, this discourse does create the opportunity to explore the middle ground between these ideological dichotomies, particularly as working girls enter prostitution with a multitude of personal biographies; this motivational variation seems at odds with the insistence that all working girls should, in all circumstances be labelled victims.

Equally, the claim from sex radicals that involvement in non-trafficked adult prostitution should always be seen as a voluntary, emancipatory process seems to deny working girls the opportunity to self-certify themselves as victims of abuse and maltreatment. Nor should we stereotype about ‘types’ of prostitution. As Chapki (1997) points out, ‘I have interviewed street prostitutes who feel powerful and in control, and I met many high-class call girls who hate their jobs’. Ultimately perhaps the job of social scientists is to accept that ‘some sex workers (perhaps most) appear to have little or no choice about their work; but some do have some alternatives, are explicitly conscious of them, and deliberately choose prostitution’ (Overall, 1992: 713).

**Street-level prostitution and the erosion of agency: some conclusions**

In considering the plethora of evidence indicating working girls exposure to maltreatments in childhood, much of the discourse surrounding prostitution (particularly street-level) in Western democracies understandably centres on notions of victimhood. The role of drugs, violence and abusive partners is well documented. Nevertheless, the dominant discourse has not stifled debate completely, with the ensuing bifurcated dialogue centring on working girls: i) lack of agency or; ii) tendency to demonstrate a level of voluntarism responsive to economic necessity. If the first of these bifurcated positions holds true, then the policymaker’s role is considerably simplified. In effect all debate pertaining to legalisation and decriminalisation becomes
redundant owing to the coercive trajectories associated with prostitution; the eradication of prostitution will be a naturally occurring process if one is able to eliminate those maltreatments that ‘compel’ women to enter into – and remain in - the sex industry in the first place. As suggested by the Home Office stance, those that fail to take up the support on offer to tackle abuse and coercion may be representative of ‘residual deviant, criminally-minded and morally corrupt’ individuals who choose to engage in ‘bizarre or repugnant sexual acts’.

Whilst the presence of drugs, childhood abuse and coercive individuals play a significant role in how choices are made, this does not mean that choices are never made. Denying all agency and pursuing a policy of abolitionism is a dangerous path to tread, as this inevitably leads to an unhelpful bifurcation between the ‘good’ and ‘bad’ working girl. Arguably, rather than seeking to abolish prostitution, we should look to reform working conditions so that exploitation is minimised. For Delacoste and Alexander (1987:200), prostitution actually requires careful regulation rather than abolition, since there is a good argument that ‘forced prostitution cannot be addressed until voluntary prostitution is legitimised’ or at least clearly demarcated. Undoubtedly increased violence on the streets and the widespread introduction of drugs has clouded the issue of ‘voluntarism’, but understanding and tackling violence, problematic drug use and the social and economic contexts in which choice is funnelled (Phoenix and Oerton, 2005) seems to me more favourable than universally denying or accepting notions of ‘victimhood’.

But prostitution could not exist at all if there was no demand for the ‘services’ of working girls. What is interesting here is that men that pay for female sexual services have gradually been stripped of the right to claim ‘victimhood’ (Chapter 2). By denying punter ‘victimisation’, the assumption is that social and material conditions are deemed less important for those that pay for street-level sexual ‘services’. In this newly created oppositional climate, punters are increasingly seen to be responsible for facilitating working girls continued involvement in drugs, crime and street-level prostitution (Brooks-Gordon, 2006). As we shall see in the next chapter, this homogenisation of punters has meant that until recently very little attempt has been made to understand the possible heterogeneities of this group or the multitude of motivations that may underpin decisions to pay for street-level sex. The reluctance and difficulties in understand men’s motivations for paying for street-level sex has meant that the employment of social policies to tackle demand have generally been sacrificed for a more widespread application of penal policies through the CJS.
Chapter 6 - The Demonisation of Punters: Exploring Socio-demographic and Motivational Heterogeneities Amongst Working Girls’ ‘Clients’

‘In contrast to many of the women and girls’ experience of prostitution [or trafficking], for men, purchasing a sex act is a choice and voluntary behaviour’ (Hughes et al, 2004:9)

Judging by the debates that persist in relation to working girls continued involvement in street-prostitution, claims to a consensus of ‘voluntarism’ appear misguided. Nevertheless, what Hughes et al’s (2004) quote above demonstrates is that for those commentators opposed to prostitution, the capacity for punters and working girls to ‘choose’ to be involved in prostitution is delineated. Accordingly, anti-prostitution adherents employ working girls victimisations as a mechanism for transferring responsibility and accountability for involvement in ‘prostitution’ away from working girls to society at large. In the transformation from seduced victims to aggressors, punters are now perceived by policymakers to be making the wrong (rather than ‘lack of’) choices.

Although counter-evidence does exist, the broad consensus is that unlike working girls, punters are no more likely to be exposed to childhood maltreatments than the general male population (Monto and McRee, 2005:526) and a non-abusive childhood is generally assumed. Consequently the decisions punters make are seen to be just that; rational choices that serve to propagate the daily abuses experienced by working girls.

Questionably, demarcating demand from supply in this way denies the opportunity for punters prostitution decisions to be seen in their full situational psychological, sociological and criminological contexts. Moreover, the moral and political climate in which punters are readily demonised (Kinnell, 2006; Prieur and Taksdal, 1993) affects the willingness of policy makers to apply non-punitive social policies as a means to reduce demand and, indirectly, supply (Prince, 2007). Clearly influenced by the ‘Swedish model’, the suggestion amongst English and Welsh policy-makers is that the CJS is the best instrument to achieve behavioural change (Home Office, 2006 and 2008). Sadly, the rationale behind the victim/aggressor polemic is all too often based on sketchy evidence; considerably less is known about punters lives, motivations and socio-economic profiles than is known about working girls (Perkins, 1991 in Brooks-Gordon, 2006; Ward et al, 2005:467). We seem also to have a limited understanding of the precise dynamics that underpin the purchasing of street-based commercial sexual services.

85 Although this is not to deny that the remnants of the ‘double standard’ associated with prostitution (see Chapter 2) do not persist in the decision-making process.
86 Atchison et al’s (1998) research, for example, indicates that punters are three times more likely to have experienced sexual abuse in childhood than non-punters. Kulick (2005:217-218) also provides commentary from a two-part series run in Sweden’s largest daily newspaper (Dagens Nyheter) in which a social worker involved with a ‘social services organisation devoted to reforming men who buy sex’ frames punters as victims on the basis that ‘many of these men suffer from prolonged angst and depression because they were not treated as they should have been as children’. These two examples are a rarity in the research literature.
87 Largely beyond the scope of this thesis.
With the number of men willing to pay for sexual services in England and Wales seemingly on the rise (Wellings et al., 1994; Wellings, 2000; Ward et al., 2005; Groom and Nandwani, 2006), for the purposes of furthering social science knowledge, good policy-making and simple equity, we should focus attention equally on the reasons why certain men feel compelled to ‘choose’ to purchase sexual services, who these men actually are, the social dynamics of their behaviour and to explore desistance factors. Here we need to recognise that to better appreciate the intersection between demand and supply, we need to better understand punter motives and routine activities (Felson, 2002). This chapter will examine what evidence exists in an attempt to understand who pays for street-level sex, how ‘transactions’ are scripted and what are the motivations driving punters decisions to pay for sex.

Understanding the scale of the ‘problem’

Integral to our understanding of the demand for street-level prostitution is an appreciation of ‘why’ and ‘how’ men pay for sex. But equally fundamental (and interlinked) is a comprehension of ‘who’ these men are and the size of the punter population under consideration. When studying prostitution, identifying who pays for sex (and how) should be a central component. Realist evaluation (Paswon and Tilley, 1997), for example, usefully asks ‘who does what/with whom and what works for/with whom, where, when, why, in what way and with what effect’ (see for example, Sutton et al., 2007). Any misunderstanding about the heterogeneity (or not) of the ‘whom’ has the potential to imbalance the logic of evaluative enquiry.

Notwithstanding the paucity of contemporary demand-centric research, what the available evidence demonstrates is the folly of assuming the demand for prostitution is limited to a small number of men ‘with abnormal desires and predilections for violence’ (Kinnell, 2006b: 213). Even conservative estimates put the number of British men who have paid for sex at least once in their lifetime at one in 12 (Wellings et al., 1994). Furthermore, there appears to have been a steady decline in the numbers of British men willing to pay for sex during the twentieth century88, but the numbers are once again on the rise (Wellings, 2000; Johnson et al., 200189; Groom and Nandwani, 2006, Ward et al., 2005). It is of course inherently difficult to validate whether these data are an over or under representation of the scale of the problem. As Månsson (2003) points out, the act of prostitution is considered a violation of norms in a number of cultures and under-representation may occur when men attempt to conceal their prostitution behaviours. Moreover, admitting the ‘need’ to pay for sex could be seen as counterintuitive to a strong sexual self-identity. Conversely and, unlikely though it may seem, over-representation may arise when shame is subordinated to the masculine ‘norm’ of aspiring to a large number of

89 Copas et al (2002) argue that some of this change can be attributed to an improved accuracy in reporting sensitive sexual behaviours between the first National Sexual Attitudes and Lifestyle survey in 1990 and the second in 2000.
sexual experiences/partners (Månsson, 2003). However, even accounting for possible over-representation in the data, it seems unlikely that the number of men in the UK who have paid for sex at least once is less than one million individuals.\textsuperscript{90}

When considering numbers as large as this, the likelihood of socio-economic homogeneity is clearly remote. Neither should we assume that paying for sex is a problem restricted to Britain, or indeed, the West. In fact, in comparison with a number of studies worldwide, the UK is placed near the bottom of the punters ‘league table’. The proportion of men who have paid for sex at some time in their lives ranges from 13 per cent in Finland (Haavio-Mannila and Rotkirch, 2000) and Sweden (Lewin, 1998)\textsuperscript{91}, through to 38 per cent in Spain (Leridon \textit{et al}, 1998)\textsuperscript{92}. Punter prevalence in several Asian nations is even more pronounced with research undertaken by Anderson and O’Connell Davidson (2003) indicating that as many as 73 per cent of Thai men have paid for sex with a ‘prostitute’ in their lifetime (see also Nopkesorn \textit{et al}, 1993). This is perhaps unsurprising given the 700,000 Thai women that are estimated to be involved in prostitution at any one time (Taywaditep \textit{et al}, 1997)\textsuperscript{93}.

One of the principle drivers for much of the contemporary research on client numbers in different regions of the world – particularly developing nations - is the attempt to understand the role of prostitution in facilitating the spread of HIV/AIDS, and in particular an examination of the ‘proportion of the male population who have unprotected sex with female sex workers’ (Caraël \textit{et al}, 2006:26; UNAIDS, 2006; WHO/UNAIDS/FHI, 2003). Understandably, in these circumstances more immediate public health concerns based on limited financial resources have more obviously transcended strict ideological discussions of ‘sex as work’ or ‘sex as choice’.

The data presented above are far from exhaustive\textsuperscript{94}, but the over-riding message emanating

\textsuperscript{90} The last UK Census (2001) puts the number of men between the ages of 15 to 79 at 20,393,129. Taking Wellings \textit{et al’s} (1994) study, which demonstrates one of the lowest percentage estimates of men paying for sex (7 per cent), then this would equate to nearly 1.5 million men who have paid for ‘prostitute’ contact at least once in their lives. Only if this figure were a 2 per cent over-representation of the prevalence for demand, would the figure fall below the one million mark. In other words, any study that estimates more than 5 per cent of the sample have paid for sex, translates to over 1 million men in the general population.

\textsuperscript{91} Although it is claimed that the figure in Sweden has substantially declined since 1999 as a result of the legal changes articulated in Chapter 4 (Pettersson and Sjogren, 2000, SoS-Rapport, 2004).

\textsuperscript{92} These statistics should be treated with the usual degree of caution; sample bases vary and there are marked differences in the methods of data collection (particularly related to sampling). For a full description of methodological variations, please refer to the original studies.

\textsuperscript{93} Of course this statistic tells us nothing about the complex relationship between demand and supply. Are these high numbers of working girls a product of high demand or vice versa? This question is something that will be revisited over the course of the thesis.

\textsuperscript{94} In addition to randomised national and local surveys, other methods used to estimate punter populations have been derived from the number of clients reported by female sex workers (May \textit{et al}, 1999, 2000; McLeod, 1982; O’Neill and Campbell, 2001) and the average number of ‘working girl’ contacts for each client (Elliott \textit{et al}, 2002; Brooks-Gordon and Gelthorpe, 2003; Faugier and Cranfield, 1995). However, because these other measures tend to require other information (for example, if using the ‘number of clients reported by female sex workers’ measure, we can only estimate the number of punters if we know the number of working girls – in essence this is a ‘double estimate’) and because the sample size is often small, punter estimation has primarily focused on large-scale national and local surveys.
from research is that paying for sex is a prevalent worldwide phenomenon. Those subscribing to the notion that prostitution is inevitable and should be scrutinised only from a libertarian, ‘free choice’ perspective, point to the vast numbers of men paying for sex globally as yet another validation of the permanency of prostitution. Ironically, the huge variations in punter numbers across countries, cultures and historical eras, is also seen by those pushing for the eradication of prostitution as evidence of its temporal nature. Accordingly, cultural variations in the demand for prostitution merely serve to highlight the ‘specific cultural and historical circumstances surrounding men’s sexuality’ (Månsson, 2003). Since this latter viewpoint effectively disassociates demand from a biological - or even ‘man as a ‘social animal’’- determination of his sexual desires, one view is that significant punter reductions can be achieved by changing the prevailing cultural and social conditions. This reconfiguration towards socio-cultural determinants and demand reduction policies is intended to emphasise and reinforce men’s responsibilities in prostitution and their role as ‘victimisers’ and is, evidently, in direct contrast to perceptions of female victimisation being embedded in a number of personalised abuses.

**The growth of sex markets**

The ways in which sex can be purchased have diversified tremendously over the past decade or so, particularly with the emergence and growth of mass sex tourism, escort agencies, the Internet and sex clubs (Sanders, 2008). Accordingly, opportunities for the sale and purchase of sex are no longer restricted to the confines of street-prostitution and indoor brothels. In spite of these conspicuous changes in prostitution markets, contemporaneous research appears to have made only modest attempts to understand the impact of what might be termed the ‘Travel and Communications Sexual Revolution’, on the demand within more ‘traditional’ prostitution markets - particularly that of street-level prostitution (national sexual behaviour studies are especially guilty of this - see Wellings et al, 1994:449-50 and Wellings, 2000). To this extent, whilst it is conceivable that the number of men paying for sex on the street has declined as a result of prostitution diversification\(^5\), without more scientifically rigorous data to validate this claim, answers to the question of ‘punter prevalence’ within street-level prostitution are speculative. Moreover, the lack of street-level baseline data has the potential to undermine any claims to ‘evidence-based policy’. If the only evidence that we have for prostitution usage is generic, then the obvious question is how can we evaluate policy interventions aimed at reducing demand for street-level prostitution?

**Research on the punters**

Fortunately ‘within-punter’ population evidence does exist. Campbell’s (1998) small-scale study in Liverpool, for example, found a degree of crossover in the locations where punters purchase

\(^5\) And recent developments concerned with the criminalization of demand for street-level sex.
sex, most notably the 18 per cent of men combining street contact with visits to saunas. The common claim that a significant minority of punters buy sexual services in different locations is also validated in several North American studies (Atchison et al, 1998:198; Wortley and Fischer, 2002). However, evidence indicating that punters do not restrict themselves to one particular sex market contradicts the more widely held belief that men rarely go to both street and indoor markets\footnote{Equally, there is a wealth of evidence to suggest that working girls either work on the street or work indoors; they very rarely vacillate between the two ‘markets’ (Vanwesenbeeck, 2001; Weitzer, 2000; Scambler and Scambler, 1997; Sanders, 2004).} (Sanders, 2006 and 2008; Groom and Nandwani, 2006). Benson and Matthews (1995) research suggests that the majority of ‘indoors’ punters restrict themselves to that market because, unlike street-markets, saunas and brothels are conducive to relaxation, clean (location and the ‘girls’), and welcoming. Furthermore, the discreet, semi-legitimate nature of the purchasing environment gave them a sense of personal safety away from the prying eyes of the police and on-lookers. Testimonies from the Benson and Matthews (1995) study seem to imply that for each type of prostitution ‘service’, there will be different types of men driven by diverse and complex motivations. Although much of this is still unexplored territory, demand-led research has become progressively more attuned to socio-economic categorisation, therefore allowing us to indirectly build a case for challenging or accepting the myths associated with punter typologies within each prostitution market.

**Who pays for sex? Challenging the ‘dirty mac brigade’ paradigm**

There is of course a danger that crude socio-demographic analysis reduces and reinforces complex issues into convenient ‘black and white’ typecasts that miss the inevitable shades of grey. The Home Office (2004:17), for example, states that the profile of a ‘prostitute user’ is ‘a man of around 30 years of age, married, in full time employment, and with no criminal convictions’. Taken as median values from a couple of well-chosen studies, this data may well be representative of a ‘typical’ client. But the question is: what use is this to social scientists trying to fully understand the nuanced demand for paid sex? Because the Home Office (2004) lacks full, national, offending census data or any cognisance of motivational complexities, such bold and sweeping claims are pretty much meaningless and therefore largely useless. There seems little point in attempting to design policy to drive out any stereotyped punter from paying for sex if we don’t understand why they do so. Theoretically at least, the informed intention should be to tailor policies to account for specific socio-economic and/or motivational groups in particular places and particular times, rather than to pursue generic ‘one size fits all’ policies, regardless of any weak homogenised national crime survey evidence (see Sutton, 2008) for socio-economic typical offenders (Pawson and Tilley, 1997).

Before exploring the psycho-social and cultural factors that are perceived to feed into motivational determinants, it is worth a brief socio-economic diversion to examine the claim that in the UK the typical ‘kerb crawler’ is ‘employed and in his 30s’ and a non-violent, married, white
‘everyman’ (Brooks-Gordon’s, 2006:98 interpretation of British studies including Benson and Matthews, 1995 and Sharpe, 1998). In order to appreciate what the research literature has to say about punter socio-economic heterogeneity, baseline data from the 2001 Census has been provided (see Appendix A). However, this Census data should be treated with a degree of caution since direct comparisons with punter research findings will be affected by: (i) the scale of the research data timeline (covering the period 1989-2006); (ii) inconsistency in socio-economic groupings across research data; (iii) not all punter samples being obviously and uniquely involved in street-level prostitution; and (iv) differentiated methods of data collection, sample bases and sampling protocols used.

**Socio-economic heterogeneity? Evidence from the research literature**

What is immediately apparent from the research data in the UK and elsewhere is that there is a degree of punter profile heterogeneity across the literature base (see Appendix A for an overview of the research studies – including sample sizes - and the key results from these studies).

**i) Age**

Evidently men of all ages pay for sex (Appendix A, Tables 1a-1c), a spread that is far less apparent amongst working girls (Home Office, 2006; Church et al, 2001). That said, it appears that age outliers for punter activity (15-19 and 60+) are significantly underrepresented when compared to 2001 Census data (see Brooks-Gordon, 2006; Shell et al, 2001; Benson and Matthews, 1995; Radford, 2007; Kinnell, 1989 in Appendix A, Tables 1a-c), particularly at the upper ends of the age scale.

Whilst punters are seemingly underrepresented at the extremes of age bands, they appear to be notably over-represented between the ages of 30 and 49, both in national data (Wellings et al, 1994) and locally (Radford, 2007; Brooks-Gordon, 2006; Shell, 2001; Kinnell, 1989; Benson and Matthews 1995 in Appendix A, Tables 1a-c). There are, however, discrepancies in this trend; Ward et al (2005) found that 31 per cent 97 of punters were aged 35-44, similar to the 36 per cent in the 2001 Census (collapsed data) (see also Boyle, 1994).

Away from ‘age bracket’ analysis, research findings from Faugier and Cranfield (1995) and McKeeganey and Barnard (1996) indicate a mean age for punters of 39 and 36.8 years respectively, which broadly corresponds with the mean age of British men in the 2001 Census (38.7 years).

---

97 All percentages in this section are rounded up or down.
ii) Ethnicity

Ethnicity amongst punters, like age, does not seem restricted to any one group. In line with 2001 Census data, the vast majority of punters are classified as ‘white British’. National studies (Ward et al, 2005) indicate that the percentage of white British punters broadly corresponds with the proportion of White British males in the 2001 Census data (Appendix A, Table 2a). Similarities between white British punters proportions and 2001 Census data is also reflected in a number of local research studies including Shell et al (2001) and Campbell (1998) (Appendix A, Table 2b). However, local studies also reveal some noticeable discrepancies (Brooks-Gordon, 2006; Radford, 2007 in Appendix A, Table 2b). Depending on which research project one looks at, white British punters are either equally or under represented when compared with 2001 Census data. Faugier and Cranfield (1995) blur these boundaries even further, by suggesting that (in Liverpool at least), white British punters are actually over-represented by more than 10 per cent when compared with 2001 Census data for Liverpool (Appendix A, Table 2b). Clearly, any bold claims to a link between ethnicity and being a punter are undermined by this conflicting evidence.

iii) Married and Co-habiting punters

From the available research data it is not possible to say with any degree of confidence that punters are any more or less likely to be married than the general population. Of the nine studies cited in Appendix A, Table 3a, four (Ward et al, 2005; Faugier and Cranfield, 1995; McKeeganey and Barnard, 1996; and WYPA, 1998/9) indicate that punters are less likely to be married or co-habiting than 2001 Census data, three (Wellings et al, 1994; Campbell, 1998; and Benson and Matthews, 1995) suggest that punters are more likely to be married or cohabiting, whilst two (Shell et al, 2001; Mcleod, 1982) were equitable with 2001 Census data. What we can say, however, is that, with the exception of the Ward et al (2005) study, the majority (over 50 per cent) of punters are married or co-habiting.

iv) Employment status/economic activity

The existing research data strongly indicates that punters are more likely to be unemployed than the general population\textsuperscript{99}. In 2001, 4 per cent of the male population in England and Wales were unemployed\textsuperscript{100}, which varies considerably from the unemployment rates amongst punter

\textsuperscript{98} More than most the McLeod (1982) data should be treated with scepticism when compared to 2001 Census data. Much has changed socio-economically in the intervening 20 years.

\textsuperscript{99} Of course unemployment rates are not static, ranging from about 9.5 per cent in the late 80s to about 5.5 per cent in 2007.

\textsuperscript{100} Standard Government Classification.
populations in research undertaken by Benson and Matthews, (1995) (9 per cent) McKeganey and Barnard, (1996) (11 per cent), Shell et al (2001) (12 per cent), Campbell, (1998) (18 per cent), and Radford, (2007) (21 per cent) – see Appendix A, Table 4a. However, punters are also more likely to be employed (full and part time) or self-employed than males in the general population (67 per cent in the 2001 Census), as indicated by Shell et al (2001) (82 per cent), Campbell (1998) (71 per cent), Radford (2007) (71 per cent) and Benson and Matthews (1995) (90 per cent). Appendix A, Tables 4a-4b, clearly demonstrates that the over-representation in economically active roles is compensated by an under-representation in economically inactive roles such as being retired or registered sick. Speculating, this could be a product of poverty and/or the simple practicalities of getting to the red-light (particularly if disabled or sick). To move away from speculation, more research is clearly required in this area.

**Demystifying punter typologies**

Owing to the breadth of punters’ socio-economic profiles, identifying in advance those men most inclined to pay for sex based only on socio-demographic profiles seems an improbable – and perhaps pointless – task. Perhaps the only genuine conclusion that we can draw from this analysis is that it is ‘very difficult to identify clients as a distinct group – the behaviour occurs across ages, social classes and ethnic groups, and is increasing’ (Ward et al, 2005:470). In other words, because so many men pay for sex, even statistically under-represented socio-economic groups are numerous enough to pose a problem for those committed to tackling street-level prostitution. Certainly more methodologically consistent and rigorous research needs to be carried out in the UK to clarify the situation. This might include the use of advanced, weighted\(^\text{101}\) statistical techniques to test for significance, correlation and regression\(^\text{102}\). However, regardless of any increased research activity in the area of socio-economic profiling, given the scale of the problem, public policy practitioners are unlikely to be able to precisely target the most prolific users of street-level working girls armed with this information alone.

Clearly, to expect British CJS agencies to control the culturally and sociologically determined prostitution behaviours of at least one million socio-economically heterogeneous men, overlooks the obvious limitations of only using the CJS to control illegal sexual behaviours (Kinnell, 2006:232). Of course, many men will be deterred or rehabilitated by the threat and imposition of criminal sanctions, especially occasional buyers\(^\text{103}\) and those who feel they have too much to lose economically and socially. But history demonstrates that, even amongst those with seemingly the most to lose, the lure of prostitution is strong; after all, Directors of Public

\(^{101}\) Weighted against Census data.


\(^{103}\) Described by Månsson (2003) as ‘men who buy sex on a few occasions during their whole life course’ (2003:12)
Prosecutions, Hollywood film stars and Ministers of Parliament can and do lose their jobs or suffer adversely over sexual ‘indiscretions’ with working girls (see for example, Coates, 2001). Furthermore, it may be that narrow CJS solutions ‘not only mask but inevitably reproduce the structures that determine the strictures of contemporary sexwork’ (McDonald, 2004:207). Notwithstanding the fact that it would be almost impossible to physically police the sexual activities of one million men, it seems erroneous to assume that these desires will simply go away because there are more police patrolling the streets for ‘kerb-crawlers’. Moreover, without confronting and understanding the reasons supporting punter motivations, it is difficult to predict how (or if) these behaviours will be prevented, reduced, or at best, re-channelled.

**Biological determinants versus social constructivism: shaping the debate on punters motives**

One of the factors said to be inhibiting any large-scale, demand-led analysis, is the Government’s clamour to ‘divide the world into victims and victimizers’ (Bernstein, 2001:389). This has resulted in ‘clients’ motives being ‘pathologised rather than explained in relation to their historical specificity and to the social and economic institutions that themselves structure the relations of gender domination’ (McDonald, 2004:206). Fortunately the need to research punters’ motivations has been embraced by a variety of scientific fields, yet it is the multidisciplinary sphere of sexology, together with psychology and sociology, which have in recent years had the most to say about the complex motives underpinning men’s prostitution behaviours (*ibid*). And contrary to popular belief, paying for sex is indeed complex; rarely (if at all) is demand just about satisfying an innate biological sexual urge.

However, for centuries, the ‘myth’ of the ‘double standard’ (see Chapter 2) was legitimised by a functionalist view (Järvinen, 1993) of prostitution being the most effective way of channelling men’s innate cravings for sexual variety and for ‘relationship free’ intercourse (Davis 1937:753). According to Ericsson (1980:355), ‘we must liberate ourselves from the mental fossils which prevent us from looking upon sex and sexuality with the same naturalness as upon our cravings for food and drink’. Yet these innate cravings were only said to be applicable to men, which led the sexual psychologist Ellis (1927), to dubiously conclude that men were sexual beings and women were not. By focusing purely on the biological, men seemingly avoid any accountability for their prostitution behaviours.

By the 1960s, the primacy of this biologically led motivational framework was challenged by increasingly influential feminist and social constructionist ideologies. First and foremost, the notion that women lacked sexual needs was scrutinised and disputed. As Herschberger (1970:32) observed, ‘it’s quite a feat of nature to grant the small clitoris the same number of nerves as the penis’. Rather than dismissing the idea of an innate sex drive, feminists and social constructionist’s acknowledged its existence, but argued that assumptions of ‘sex drive’
exclusivity amongst men (or ‘deviant’ women) to be a complete misnomer. On its own, however, this ‘sex drive’ equalisation failed to provide a suitable explanation as to why more women didn’t pay for sex with men and why fewer women than men seek to pay for casual sex encounters.

The answer for feminists and social constructionists, was not to be found in a gendered differentiation of inherent sex drives, but through the expression of sexual urges being dependent upon patriarchal gender roles (Järvinen, 2004), culture and life experiences (McIntosh, 1978 in Smart and Smart, 1978). Interactionists do not claim that prostitution is never about innate sexual urges, but they do believe that this position has been simplified and overplayed at the expense of understanding the role of the social. Following her biological observations, Herschberger (1970:33) writes ‘...it was an even more incredible feat that society should actually have convinced the possessors of this organ [the clitoris] that it was sexually inferior to the penis!’ By challenging the veil of biological innateness, feminists managed to reframe the demand for prostitution was progressively seen as a social construction with contents and meanings varying across time and space (Järvinen, 2004). Consequently it was felt the best way to tackle the demand for commercial sex was by addressing its social and cultural causes.

That man’s motives became re-contextualised as socially and culturally determined, was in part validated by the sexual revolution that began in the 1960s (Scambler and Scambler, 1997). Unavoidably working girls faced enormous ‘competition from amateurs’ (McIntosh, 1978) and the logic of the biological model would seem to indicate that the only punters who would remain would be a ‘hardcore’ of ‘diseased, abnormal, adolescents and soldiers’ (Mort, 1987). But as the statistics at the start of this chapter suggest, more and more men are paying for sex in the conspicuously commodified ‘sex as entertainment’ culture of the twenty-first century (Reichert and Lambaise, 2005; Hawkes, 1996; Illouz, 1997) and there is little evidence to suggest that sexually isolated men are especially prevalent amongst prostitution users; punters seem just as likely to be married than non-married and/or have ‘a habit of sexual relations with a large number of partners’ (Monto and McRee, 2005:508). For feminists and constructionists, it is the social and cultural that creates the (pre-determined?) psychological conditions for prostitution use to flourish. And transposing Phoenix and Oerton’s (2005) arguments in relation to working girls (see Chapter 5), it may well be that the prevailing social and cultural conditions actually funnel the choices to pay for sex.

104 It is probably more than a coincidence that as the cultural barriers to female sexuality have been eroded, so there has been a corresponding increase in women using sexual imagery (and other aspects of commoditised sex associated with ‘sexual urges’ – for example, ‘sex toys’). There has also arguably been a paradigm shift, whereby women are now expected to be ‘satisfied in bed’.
Empirical studies: the death of ‘biological constructionism’?

Clearly something other than just biologically driven ‘sex’ is going on here; as McLeod (1982) points out, punters tend to limit their prostitution activities to certain times of day, in certain locations and in certain situations, indicating this is ‘hardly an uncontrollable urge at work’ (McLeod, 1982:66). Although entrenched claims of ‘biological determinism’ still persist, more common is a positing of psychological explanations within their appropriate sociological and cultural context(s). For opponents of ‘biological determinism’, positing ‘punting’ merely as a response to promiscuity (Ringdal, 2004) fails to adequately answer a number of key questions, including: what are the conditions that stop more men paying for sex? Do men who don’t pay for sexual contact, all lack libido? Why does demand appear to fluctuate spatially and temporally? And why do men (often wealthy, good-looking and successful) in stable relationships feel the need to pay for street-level sex in particular? Evidently most men do not pay for sex, which suggests that any innate sex drive needs a catalyst to translate these tendencies into prostitution type behaviours. For many commentators this mechanism is only triggered in some (rather than all) individuals because ‘sexual behaviour is socially scripted behaviour and not the masked or rationalised expression of some primordial drive’ (Simon and Gagnon, 1969:736; see Shrage, 1989).

Much of the conjecture about causality remains theoretical in nature, with a noticeable avoidance of any commitment to primary research with ‘hard to reach’ punter populations. Even studies that are grounded in primary research with punter populations are frequently very small in scale, methodologically questionable and disjointed as a cumulative body of knowledge. Therefore, any study purporting to definitively uncover a causal relationship between demand fluctuations (the dependent variable) and socio-cultural structural changes (the independent variables), should be treated with a degree of scepticism (see Chapter 5).

Provisos aside, achieving a thorough understanding of post-industrial contradictions in culture and sexuality inexorably requires a paradigm shift away from individualised (and pathologised) motives and sexual ethics (McDonald, 2004:206), towards an acceptance that modern demand fluctuations are partially a result of a wider and ‘unbridled ethic of sexual consumption’ evidenced by ‘soaring demand for pornography, strip clubs, lap-dancing, escorts, telephone sex [in developed nations] and ‘sex tours’ in developing countries’ (Bernstein, 2001:389). Nevertheless, in much the same way that not all young girls who are sexually abused go on to become working girls, not all British men who are exposed to this ‘unbridled ethic of sexual consumption’ go on to become punters. Equally, not all men paid for sex in the pre-Victorian era, but when they did, the double standard ‘safety net’ was there to justify their conduct and to remove the possibility that they should be accountable for their actions.
Manipulating Brannigan and Van Brunschot’s (1997) assertion that the spotlight of supply-side analysis should not fall on a singular mistreatment, it could be argued that demand-led analysis should also be posited within a cluster of wider sociological and cultural factors that extend beyond explanations grounded only in a sexualised and gendered culture. Moreover, only in the absence of ‘protective factors’ (Kruttschnitt et al., 1987) might this ‘sexual consumerist’ and patriarchal culture prove relevant to a man’s ‘decision’ to pay for sex. Unfortunately little data exists about what these ‘protective factors’ are – if indeed they exist at all - and we can only speculate about their constitution. In one of the few studies exploring the role of ‘protective factors’ (albeit implicitly), Sullivan and Simon (1998) found little evidence that ‘broken homes’, political affiliations or an absence of religious boundaries to have any significant bearing on the incidence of men visiting ‘prostitutes’. McIntosh (1979) also speculated on the role of the family, but in contrast to Sullivan and Simon (1998), she suggests that a mother and father can contribute to male siblings being punters in later life.

The role that parenting plays in ‘protecting’ (or not) men from becoming punters was taken up by Sandell et al. (1996 cited in Kulick, 2005), who observe five discrete punter typologies, all with identifiable and distinct childhood characterisations. By way of illustration, the ‘omnivorous consumer’ appears well adjusted and happy, with a childhood characterised by love and affection. On the surface it is difficult to see how such a childhood could be perceived as anything but a ‘protective factor’. However, ‘the parents of these men did not set enough limits, and they raised them to be egotistical’ (Kulick, 2005:217) and as adults these men escape the constraints of a conventional relationship through the use of prostitutes. In contrast, the ‘relationship avoider’, buys sex to avoid close long-term relationships, rather than to escape them (Sandell et al., 1996:153 cited in Kulick, 2005:216). For these men, childhood is characterised by ‘disturbed relations with their mother and other women’ resulting in a ‘fear of dependency and closeness’. Sandell et al (1996 in Kulick, 2005) suggests the final three typologies of punters in this model are reluctant consumers; the ‘supplement buyer’ has a childhood that does not appear to have been important in the process of ‘punting’; the ‘relationship seeker’ with a childhood characterised by a disturbed relationship with his mother (which in part explains the difficulty in establishing relationships and the need to pay for sex in between these infrequent relationships); and ‘the refused’ who has ‘no self-confidence, few friends; desperately wants a relationship with a woman but feels unworthy and ugly’ (Sandell et al, 1996: 153 cited in Kulick, 2005:216), resulting in their only female relationships being with working girls. Accurately identifying these background upbringings is important for Sandell et al (1996), since it allows for these behaviours to be ‘cured’ via therapy programmes tailored to each typology. This can range from ‘omnivorous consumers’ being ‘trained in maleness’ to understand that ‘real men are not just hard, but also sensitive and soft’\(^{105}\) (Sandell et al., 1996:267 cited in Kulick, 2005:216), through to ‘men’s support groups’ for the ‘relationship seeker’ ‘to provide him with the opportunity to acquire a clearer role as a man’ (ibid). Many of

\(^{105}\) There may be some value in exploring the way in which notions of ‘masculinity’ are framed at both the individual and societal level.
these issues will be explored later in this chapter, but evidently more research is needed to understand the ways in which the family (and education and other stressful life events) might mitigate or exacerbate the impact of socio-cultural, protective factors in influencing demand. What - to take an extreme example - becomes of the child whose mother is (or was) a working girl?

As valuable as these accounts are, it is debatable whether causality between the individualised psychological constituents identified by Sandell *et al* (for example) and wider societal factors can ever be scientifically demonstrated. For Månsson (2003) it is the socio-cultural context that is integral to our understanding of punters motives. In particular Månsson (*ibid*) emphasises: (a) the increased commercialisation of sex; (b) entrenched patriarchal social structures and; (c) a gendered stratification of sexuality. However, in much of the earlier research with punters these socio-cultural elements were palpably missing and as a non-psychologist, it is beyond the scope of this thesis for me to dwell on psychological accounts (see Winick, 1962; Gibbens and Silberman, 1960; Masters and Johnson, 1970; Stoller, 1976, 1979 in O'Connell Davidson, 1998). What is worth mentioning, however, is that themes of hostility as well as ‘control, triumph, rage, revenge, fear and risk in sexual fantasy’ (Brooks-Gordon, 2006:90) abound within psychological explanations of punter behaviour and this broad analytical framework is taken up by the sociologist, O'Connell Davidson (1998) to contextualise her work with mainly international ‘clients’. Applying this to street-prostitution in particular, a central theme emerges whereby the image of working girls is synonymous with the sexual arousal associated with the ‘dirty whore’ fantasy (O'Connell Davidson, 1998:141) and in extreme circumstances degraded, vulnerable and *ever-more* powerless women, including visibly bruised, drug addicted and pregnant working girls (O'Connell Davidson, 1998:144). There are also possible homoerotic aspects to this notion of working girls being ‘dirty whores’, in which:

‘...the image of the objectified ‘cunt’ becomes all the more arousing when constructed and visualised in relation to other men’s ‘cocks’, perhaps because these imaginings endorse a fetished view of human sexuality [...] and so help to normalise the desire to harm others by reducing them to nothing but their sex’ (O'Connell Davidson, 1998:141).

At first, it may not be apparent how psychological aberrations, such as an ‘erotic form of hatred’, correlate to social and cultural explanations of demand fluctuation. Closer inspection of Stoller’s (1976) work and other forms of psychoanalysis reveals, however, that in response to post-industrial social and economic changes, the sexual act becomes a way of emphasising or re-claiming man’s intellectual, physical and biological supremacy over women (Stoller, 1979). Kimmel (2005) argues that as women advance socially, economically and sexually, for some men the only way of coping is by mentally pushing women into the realm of fantasy (Kimmel, 2005 in Månsson, 2006). If true, then using working girls in this way can be viewed broadly as a form of ‘hate crime’ (Perry, 2001). In other words, punters have sex with working girls not for
who they are, but for what they are and what they represent.

**Another kind of sex**

A number of common themes have emerged from the research carried out directly with punters. In addition to the ‘dirty whore’ fantasy (Månsson, 2006), individualised and social motivational explanations appear to fall into a number of distinct - but often-interconnected - categories. The first of these describes the demand for prostitution as a representation of ‘another kind of sex’ and - for those already in a relationship - a reaction to sexual dissatisfaction (Månsson, 2006; Kinnell, 1989; Spurrell, 2006; McKeganey and Barnard, 1996; Monto, 1999 and 2000; Jordan, 1997; Holzman and Pines, 1982).

The literature repeatedly finds that a significant minority of men are looking for sexual experiences – often fellatio - that they cannot get from non-paid sex partners (McKeganey and Barnard, 1996). But justifying ‘oral sex’ with working girls as simply a reaction to frustrated sexual desires, can mask more insidious motivational undercurrents. As one respondent in Campbell’s (1998) research acknowledges: working girls are ‘different from women you can meet in clubs...they’re happy to do whatever you want’ and they ‘are no more than the sex they sold’ (Campbell, 1998:169). Consequently, the idea that prostitution is seen as ‘another kind of sex’ may have more in common with O’Connell Davidson’s (1998) notions of the dehumanised and objectified working girls than is immediately apparent.

**Another kind of woman**

Superficially, notions of desiring ‘another kind of sex’ and the ‘whore’ fantasy appear closely affiliated with other widespread punter motivations, involving fantasies of ‘another kind of woman’ (Månsson, 2006; Kinnell, 1989; McKeganey and Barnard, 1996) and an aspiration to escape the conventional male heterosexual role (McLeod, 1982; Segal, 1997; Jordan, 1997). Invariably such dispositions are connected with socialised images of gender roles and men’s loss of power to women and ‘…an attempt to reclaim images of what is deemed to be ‘natural’ femininity - and masculinity’ (Månsson, 2006:89).

For reasons associated with passivity, assumed sexual prowess and ethnic objectification (O’Connell Davidson, 1998), punters can also demonstrate sexual-racist and paedophilic overtones. Psychologically these ‘choices’ may also act as a mechanism to attempt to regain the perceptions of power lost to women in post-industrial Western society (Elias *et al*, 1998; Månsson, 2001), or simply through ageing. Notions of ‘shopping’ for sex based on specific attributes, encompass not only ethnic and age delineations, but also extend to being able to ‘select’ a working girl based on particular physical characteristics such as ‘big breasts and an
attractive figure’ (Campbell, 1998:165). Images of sex as a consumer product are repeatedly expressed by punters in discussions with researchers (Månsson, 2006; McKeganey and Barnard, 1996; Monto, 2000; Coy et al, 2007; Macleod et al, 2008), leading Blanchard (1994 in Monto, 2000) to argue that the way sex is bought is akin to the way fast food is sold and marketed in the high street. This notion of ‘McSex’ (ibid) is inextricably bound up in the way women and sexuality are portrayed in late capitalism particularly through the medium of pornography, ‘lads mags’ and more subtlety in corporate advertising and other media outputs (Monto, 1999; Foucault, 1988; Fausto-Sterling, 1996; Morris, 1997; Lacqueur, 1990; Kipnis, 1999; Adams and Savran, 2002). By separating intimacy from sexuality (Seidler, 1989) through the process of commodification, punters are once again seen to be attempting to retain emotional control and reduce the possibility of sexual humiliation and rejection (Prieur and Tåksdal, 1989,1993).

Set against the background of the saturation of the sexual image in advertising and other aspects of cultural production (Egan et al, 2006; Bernstein, 2001), it is perhaps not surprising that the erotic has not only been normalised, but that the right to pursue these desires has been simultaneously legitimised even in an increasingly feminised and more equal society. Wolf observes that in the end: ‘consumer culture is best supported by markets made up of sexual clones, men who want objects and women who want to be objects and the object desired ever-changing, disposable, and dictated by the market’ (1990:144 in Jordan 1997:66). Set against this context of objectification and dehumanised sex that Jeffries (2008) understandably proposes, ‘just as same-sex love and gay marriages have become anathema to no one, so sex with robots will become socially acceptable […] and lose its taboo’.

**Emotional detachment and ‘intimacy avoidance’**

Within the research literature, what is striking is the prevalent role that ‘emotional detachment’ plays in punters own understanding of their prostitution activities (Kinnell, 1989; Spurrell, 2006; Jordan, 1997; McKeganey and Barnard, 1996; Monto, 2000; Brooks-Gordon, 2006). Married men in particular are keen to stress that paying for sex is a means by which they can satisfy their innate sexual urges whilst protecting a long-term relationship (Shell et al, 2001). In essence, visiting working girls is seen as a preferable way to manage lust when compared to having an affair or ‘exploiting’ women through one-night stands.

Notably, paying for sex as a means of avoiding intimacy is not limited to married men or those involved in long-term relationships (McKeganey and Barnard, 1996:52). Once punters allow...

---

106 The monthly magazine FHM is one such case in point. Randomly taking the most recent edition (September 2007 at the time of writing), cover stories include: ‘Our hot new calendar girl Danni Wells’, ‘FHM Championship of women’, ‘The girls of FHM’ and ‘the FHM global sex survey’. This is accompanied on the front cover with a number of women being photographed in varying states of undress.
themselves to humanise working girls as mothers, sisters and daughters – ‘ordinary women’ - then the process of objectifying working girls as ‘no more than the sex they sell’, becomes very difficult to achieve. Yet there is a glaring contradiction in this commodification process. On the one hand, clients will talk-up the advantages of treating sex as a commodity, but will then complain when working girls come across as too impersonal and unfriendly (Campbell, 1998). Høigård and Finstad (1992) reported that the majority of punters participating in their Oslo-based research project, wanted ‘sex without strings’, but simultaneously desired ‘warm girls, increased intimacy and understanding’ (1992:95). Like any other service industry, punters expect good ‘customer service’, but in order to justify their prostitution behaviours - and to maintain the pretence of working girls being a ‘sexual and social Other’ - these men convince themselves that this can only be achieved through the separation of emotion from the paid sexual act.

**Working girls as ‘kind hearted healers’**

Whilst some punters demonstrate contradictory attitudes towards their negation of emotional involvement, others openly accept that they are seeking sexual solutions for the emotional problems they have with non-prostitute women (Brooks-Gordon, 2006:91). Such men tend to be single, with a self-perception that their inability to meet women is due to loneliness, shyness, looks or mental or physical disabilities (Månsson, 2006; Holzman and Pines, 1982; Jordan, 1997; Kinnell, 1989; Campbell, 1998; Shell et al, 2001). One in three of punters interviewed by Campbell (1998) stated that it was their inability to form sexual relationships that substantiated their motivation for paying for sex. What’s more, for these punters penetration is often seen as less important than ‘mothering’, sucking breasts, holding and being stroked (from a ‘clients’ narrative in O’Connell Davidson, 1998:152); what O’Connell Davidson (1998:152) calls a ‘kind hearted healer’. There is evidence, however, that street-level working girls tend to view the punters that fall into this typology as an inconvenience, since these ‘nurturing’ predilections visibly conflicts with working girls motivation to earn the most amount of money in as short a period as possible and with as little fuss as possible (Vaswesenbeeck et al, 1993; Brewis and Linstead, 2000).

In this sense, prostitution appears to act as the best way for punters to avoid women’s expectations and ‘confrontations with their own inadequacies or failures’ (Høigård and Finstad, 1992:31). Yet again, prostitution appears to ‘work’ by stripping women of their post-industrial authority and autonomy that some men find so threatening. In this way the working girl on the street today is viewed by modern punters in the same way as Victorian working girls were viewed by all men in their time. Nothing has changed due to a desire to ‘turn back the clock’.

---

107 These findings are replicated elsewhere; Monto (2000:80) found that forty-two per cent of his punter sample paid for sex because they claimed to be ‘shy and awkward’, with a further twenty-three per cent because of their physical unattractiveness.
The uniqueness of the street

Many of the reasons given by men for their ‘punting’ are arguably applicable to both on-street and off-street sex markets. Yet when it comes to notions of ‘risk,’ it is claimed that the ‘street’ is uniquely placed to satisfy this distinctive impulsion (McKeganey and Barnard, 1996; O’Connell Davidson, 1998; Campbell, 1998; Holgård and Finstad, 1992; Holzman and Pines, 1982, Monto, 2000; Kinnell, 1989; Shell et al, 2001). This is not to say that there is never an element of ‘risk’ in paying for sex ‘behind closed doors’, but that the ‘risk’ achieved in this environment is unlikely to match the ‘danger’ associated with kerb crawling. As Stoller (1979) puts it, the sexual act involves maintaining ‘a sense of risk in the story – the delicious shudder – while at the same time minimising true risk’ (1979:19). The street is a draw for so many because it combines the generic thrill of the ‘unknown quality of what actually happens’ on the street with the associated possibility of ‘a knife at your throat’ (Holzman and Pines, 1982:109). Shell et al (2001) argue that it is the excitement and potential danger associated with the street that helps to explain why men from professional backgrounds - who could clearly afford more ‘upmarket’ prostitution services – pay for street-level sexual services. For such men, ‘kerb crawling’ allows them ‘to experience excitement and a subsequent sense of triumph and mastery’ (O’Connell Davidson, 1998:155). But this risk has to be surmountable; if the perceived probability of being ‘knifed’, robbed or caught by the police is too high for a particular location at a particular time, then this will almost certainly act as a significant – albeit temporary - deterrent.

Drink, drugs and violence

Unsurprisingly, the motivations described above are not exhaustive. Some men claim their ‘punting’ to be a result of the ‘sexual excitement’ brought on by drink or drugs (Sanders, 2008) often in the sexually ritualised atmosphere of a stag weekend or sports trip (Boyle, 1994). But it is unlikely that this one-dimensional explanation tells the whole story. Mixed up in these accounts are the very same socio-cultural issues associated with a commodification and objectification of working girls and the erosion of male supremacy. The same complexity is also almost always true of those who claim that their prostitution behaviours are merely a product of ‘convenience’.

Fortunately, for most men, purchasing sex is a non-violent experience. However, the danger that some punters pose to working girls is well documented (see Chapter 5). Although not entirely within the scope of this thesis to speculate why a significant minority of punters turn physically and sexually violent towards working girls, it would seem likely that most, if not all, of this may partially explain the reduction in punter numbers during periodic police crackdowns or excessive media interest. The role of the CJS and the intersection between demand and supply will be discussed in further detail in the following chapter.

---

108 This may partially explain the reduction in punter numbers during periodic police crackdowns or excessive media interest. The role of the CJS and the intersection between demand and supply will be discussed in further detail in the following chapter.
the explanations outlined above have a role to play in facilitating this violence amongst already seriously psychologically disturbed men\textsuperscript{109}. This is likely to be especially true of the way in which social and cultural factors frame working girls as sexual and social others. Again, the absence of protective factors may be more pronounced in the lives of these individuals and warrants further investigation.

**Understanding ‘crime scripts’: exploring how street-sex is purchased**

It seems likely that we do not yet fully understand what policy interventions will work for whom and in what circumstances principally because we do not understand the interplay between diverse motivational explanations and different social and geographic environments. This is compounded by the focus on the ‘why’ and ‘who’, rather than the ‘how’ of sex purchasing. However, understanding the minutiae of ‘crime scripts’ (Cornish, 1994) is a vital aspect of addressing ‘root causes’, routine activities and conducting ‘realist evaluation’ of crime reduction programmes.

Although some researchers have used street ethnography and police records to write about how sex is negotiated on the street (Cohen, 1980; McKeganey and Barnard, 1996: 31-35; Matthews, 1993), these observational or second-hand accounts focus mainly on the transactional negotiation end product, which tends to be just one aspect of the ‘crime script’ process (Cornish, 1994). Inevitably, questions relating to who solicits who, how far men travel to pay for sex, where the negotiation and sexual act takes place, how men know where to find working girls, whether the punter is on foot or driving, the prevalence of condom use, whether the punter solicits on his own or in a group, aspects of monetary arbitration and length of negotiation are all *necessary* elements of the enquiry into ‘how’ sex is bought. But because these accounts emphasise the ‘situational’ aspects of ‘punting’, the ‘psychological build-up’ and seduction of crime in this area has tended to be overlooked. As a result it could be argued that our understanding of the ‘how’ is not yet sufficiently nuanced. This goes beyond Felson’s less sophisticated ‘Routine Activities’ approach to tackling ‘red-light’ areas (Felson, 2002 and 2006).

Holzman and Pines (1982) were amongst the first to recognise the importance of a psychological build-up in the process of becoming a punter, claiming that ‘the experience of paying for sex begins long before the actual encounter occurs’ (Holzman and Pines, 1982:102). They identified four stages to the phenomenology of being a ‘client’, a process that begins with the ‘conception of intent’. In this stage, punters form a ‘subjective interpretation of what the behaviors, individuals, and situations associated with prostitution mean’ (*ibid*). Generally,

\textsuperscript{109} For a detailed discussion on the links between sexual violence and the way that women are culturally and socially defined in relation to men, see Kinnell, (2008); Miller and Schwartz, (1995); Dobash and Dobash, (1979); Frohmann, (1991) and Sanday, (1986).
respondents generally have high expectations about the encounter in which ‘a sexual fantasy tinged with elements of fear and adventure is created and nurtured’ (Holzman and Pines, 1982:111). Once intent has been established, the would-be punter then moves onto the ‘pursuit’ phase, which may take place immediately or over a period of weeks after the ‘conception of intent’. This phase is often characterised by feelings of nervousness, fear and excitement (ibid). The third phase is the ‘encounter’ itself, including the initial verbal approach and negotiation, together with the engagement of the agreed sex act. Up to this point punters are still able to maintain the psychological pretence of what the encounter should and will be like. But it is not until the final ‘aftermath’ stage is realised that punters are in a position to be able to correlate experience with expectations. According to Holzman and Pines, ‘it was not unusual for the men in this study to experience feelings of disappointment’ (1982:113) or guilt after the ‘encounter’ had taken place.

Explicitly missing from the Holzman and Pines ‘slow build up thesis’, however, is any recognition that there are men who will actualise some but not all phases of the model. Evidence from the police (Radford, 2007b) and elsewhere (Brooks-Gordon, 2006; Høigård and Finstad, 1992) suggests that some men are able to fulfil their sexual fantasies within the ‘pursuit of the encounter’ phase. These voyeurs are unlikely to feel compelled to experience the ‘encounter’ phase, although ‘voyeurism’ may have a psychological ‘aftermath’ not dissimilar to that expressed by punters who go on to pay for a sexual ‘encounter’. Prieur and Taksdal (1989) identified three categories of ‘voyeurs’ (or ‘peepers’) in Oslo street-markets: i) those that drove around whilst they ‘jerked off’110 (Høigård and Finstad, 1992:88); ii) those that felt so powerless that they dare not approach the working girl and; iii) those that felt powerful just knowing that they could have sex if they wanted to. There also existed a group of ‘negotiators’ who made contact with working girls but then withdrew without ever agreeing a price, act or location. Persistent ‘peepers’ or ‘cruisers’ (McKeganey and Barnard, 1996) have been shown to account for up to one-fifth of all men stopped by the police in red-light areas (Brooks-Gordon, 2006:115). The presence of ‘peepers’ in street-markets, raises questions about: (i) whether such men should be labelled as punters or just exhibiting ‘punter-like tendencies’ (legally or otherwise); (ii) what stops these men going on to become punters111 and; (iii) how to align the voyeuristic motivation of achieving erotic arousal/orgasm through the ‘risk of being discovered’ (Money 1996:273 in Brooks-Gordon, 2006:143) with the motivations of more ‘traditional’ punters. And what of the men – and non-‘working girl’ women for that matter – who live, work or have to travel through ‘red light’ districts on a regular basis? How do they differ and do some have shared emotional experiences with those who cruise the area by choice? As is stands, the empirical knowledge base is simply insufficiently comprehensive to allow us to answer these

---

110 The American Psychiatric Association (1980) found that some voyeurs masturbate whilst watching street-level working girls (as described by Prieur and Taksdal (1986) above), whilst others masturbate later whilst remembering the events.

111 In addition to the explanations Prieur and Taksdal (1992) provide in relation to power, Mann et al (2008) claim that voyeurism is an attractive option for some men because it is free and requires even less emotional involvement than is necessary in ‘normal punting’. They also claim that the police are less interested in ‘voyeurs’, although Brooks-Gordon (2006) study would seem to contradict this claim.
questions with any degree of certainty. But learning the answers will better inform ‘harm reduction’ policies.

For those men that do go on to purchase sex, the ‘encounter’ phase (based on police and research evidence) is far from homogeneous. Some men are solicited, others do the soliciting; most men drive to working girls’ locations, but significant numbers walk or even cycle into the red light district; some men who are paying for sex for the first time appear to know the ‘market’ cost for each sexual service on offer, whilst others ‘expect to get oral sex for a fiver’ (Radford, 2007b) and will on occasion have to go to an ATM to get the necessary funds; the majority of punters solicit alone, but men also attempt to pay for sex in the company of one or more men; most punters tend to live within ten miles of the ‘red light’ area which they were frequenting, but a significant minority live over ten miles away (often connected to the phenomenon of working away from home); the majority of sex appears to take place in a car (for car drivers) or in an outside location such as an alleyway (for ‘walkers’), but it will also very occasionally be carried out in a hotel or other indoor location; condom use is widespread, but a minority of punters attempt to negotiate unprotected sex for a premium; some men haggle over price, whilst others are keen to simply ‘get the job done’; and most punters are non-violent, but tragically there are those who are not (Monte, 1999; Brooks-Gordon, 2006; McKeganey and Barnard, 1996; Radford, 2007b; Shell et al, 2001; Matthews, 1986; Kinnell, 1989; Vanwesenbeeck et al, 1993; Lowman, 1989; Boyle, 1994). Once again, it is vital that these transactional variations are taken into account when designing operations intended to design out the practical elements of ‘punting’, particularly when attempting to spot any diversity in ‘how’ abusive men purchase, or attempt to purchase, street-level sex.

The demand for street-level sex: towards a policy of understanding?

On the basis that there is little visible evidence punters purchase sex coercively, Hughes et al’s (2004) declaration at the beginning of this chapter that a client’s behaviour to buy a sex act is an act of voluntarism rather than coercion, would seem reasonable. However, the growing evidence base indicates the demand for sex is somewhat more complex than the notion of bifurcated choice implies. Rather than men’s punting behaviours being seen in a social and cultural vacuum, more useful is to focus on the ways in which socio-cultural factors and other unidentified ‘protective factors’, are likely to funnel decisions (Phoenix, 1999).

Regrettably some policymakers appear to have discounted the idea that men’s decisions to pay for sex are in many ways as complex as working girls involvement in prostitution. Yet the logic of only using the agencies of the CJS to control demand (and indirectly supply) seems as misguided and paradoxical as trying to control the supply of working girls simply through the use of ASBOs, fines and imprisonment (see Chapter 8). Politically it is more difficult to justify a
holistic approach to paying for sex, as punters are not immediately recognisable as victims of the same abuses that working girls are. Moreover, the frequent physical and sexual violence directed towards working girls make it a difficult crime to politically – or morally - treat outside of the CJS. Intentionally or not, the motivational causes underpinning punters prostitution choices remain more or less invisible in the public and policy making domain. It is also worth remembering that the demand for street-level prostitution is an unusual crime in so far that there are no obvious linkages to poverty, childhood abuse, ethnicity or a wealth of other socio-economic variables.

However, there are a number of paradoxes within this CJS focused approach. If we assume that punters motivations are mainly biological then it is difficult to see how the threat of being caught by the police would be effective in channelling innate sexual impulses. Are we to assume that these ‘innate’ sexual urges would dissipate simply because there are more police patrolling the red-light districts of our towns and cities? Likewise, if the decision to pay for sex is largely a product of social and cultural imperfections then it is equally difficult to see how the police could adequately confront these deep-seated fissures on their own. This is not to say that the police don’t have a major role to play, but that this role should be seen as complimentary, rather than exclusionary, to a broader holistic approach. As McDonald (2004) argues, ‘state efforts to address material inequalities may provide a more useful model to emulate than the all too familiar headlong rush towards narrow criminal solutions’ (McDonald, 2004: 207). What is interesting here is that Sweden, with arguably one of the lowest rates of prostitution usage in Europe (Gould, 2001), should be at the forefront of demand-led interventions. This is especially important when considering that the Swedish demand-led model is an approach that the UK seems particularly keen to emulate (Home Office, 2006).

**Paying for sex: some conclusions**

With a clear sense of irony, Kulick (2005:206) asks ‘will researchers someday claim to have discovered a “client gene?”’ The evidence base, would suggest that the answer to Kulick’s ironic question above is ‘no’; paying for sex is far more than satisfying uncontrollable, biologically determined sexual urges. And yet, punters are increasingly seen to be ‘a species’ (*ibid*), the activities of which are seen to be best solved exclusively via punitive CJS interventions.

Motivational and socio-economic heterogeneity clearly poses a challenge for those tasked with ‘controlling’ the problem of demand. The complex news for policymakers is that demand appears not only to be multifaceted, but is also inevitably shaped by wider socio-cultural constructions of male sexuality (McDonald, 2004; Gould, 2001). If policymakers are serious about solving the ‘problem’ of street-level prostitution, then long-term generational social and penal policies have to be designed that challenge the socio-cultural imperfections that influence punters. Campbell (1998:169) rightly points out that punter behaviour needs to be ‘understood
as extensions of components of male sexual identity' present in many non-commercial sexual encounters, but it is important to guard against viewing male sexual identity as a monolithic entity. If paying for sex is more than biological determinism, then there must be some validity to the claim that the amount of prostitution going on should not be viewed as inevitable and permanent. As Månsson (2003) argues, because social and cultural ‘circumstances are liable to change, so is men’s sexuality and their demand for prostitutes’ (2003:8).

Policymakers and commentators should also be aware that the street is patently different from indoor prostitution markets and whilst a number of motivations inevitably overlap, the uniqueness of the street should not be underestimated. Although it would be wrong to claim that we – in any significant way - understand the mechanisms by which multifarious motivations intersect, the elevated role that risk appears to play in consolidating men’s sexual identity seems to be relevant to street-level punters in a way not replicated for off-street punters. More research is clearly required in this area. Likewise, the lack of motivational and socio-demographic analysis in UK prostitution studies needs redressing as a matter of some urgency.

‘How’ sex is bought and ‘who’ buys are important aspects of demand. But social scientists should be looking to better align the ‘how’ and ‘who’ to the ‘why’. Unfortunately, the current literature is far from satisfactory in relation to pulling the ‘who’, ‘how’ and ‘why’ elements together and it is rather difficult to see why policymakers have implemented demand-led interventions with – at best - a patchy evidence base at their disposal. With the obvious limitation about what we know about punters, it seems strange that British policymakers should have opted to primarily tackle demand to seek to reduce supply. Inevitably notions of ‘victimhood’ - and punters perceived lack of it – have played a key role in this shift in policy emphasis. Exactly how this paradigm shift has enshrined itself in legislation is the subject of Chapter 8. However, before critically assessing these policy changes and their associated impact on ‘reducing demand and controlling supply’ (in other words, the aim(s) of this thesis; see Chapters 9-10), the following chapter sets out the methodology that was employed to facilitate these research findings.
Chapter 7 - Methodological Design and the ‘Search for Truth’: Reflections and Strategies

The principle methods by which this research sought to understand the impact of local policy initiatives (see Chapter 1) was: i) through the analysis of third party statistical data and internal reports; ii) interviews with twenty-two working girls, ten punters and ten agency professionals (formally and informally); iii) involvement with fourteen Change Programmes over a 17 month period, and; iv) designing, collecting and analysing 208 self-completed questionnaires from men who have been caught paying for sex. The research design could be said to fit into the ‘testing theory’ approach to research, in so far that a key aim involved exploring the hypothesis that demand and supply in street-level sex markets are inextricably linked.

Disappointingly, prostitution research has all too often failed to abide by the need for methodological transparency, leading Weitzer (2005:934) to argue that ‘in no area of the social sciences has ideology contaminated knowledge more pervasively than in writings on the sex industry’. Partly as a response to this criticism this chapter will elucidate not only what was done ‘on the ground’ in terms of the collection, analysis and interpretation of data for this research, but also how this correlates with the core research questions and with the broader theoretical and philosophical framework that guided this research.

Theoretical orientation

Before detailing the research methods, it is important to engage in a brief philosophical discussion to contextualise my own standpoint. Unifying philosophy and social research is, as Hughes (1990:11) points out, necessary because ‘every research tool or procedure is inextricably embedded in commitments to particular versions of the world and to knowing that world’.

Whilst appreciative of the logic behind the need for methodological transparency, I am less comfortable with the presumed positivist alignment between a ‘good research design’ and the uncovering of some over-optimisitic ‘universal truth’ and direct causality within social research. Although a logical, structured and consistent approach is necessary for the research data to at least claim validity, as an advocate of Popperian notions of ‘falsification’ and ‘verisimilitude’ (Popper, 1986), I would contend that even methodologically sound research can only ever allege to produce findings that at best ‘remain conjecture, open to refutation’ (Popper, 1986 in

---

112 Briefly, positivism is a branch of philosophy in the social sciences concerned with ‘the natural scientific approach’ with a ‘strong emphasis on observations, a neutral and dispassionate approach on the part of the scientist, and an assumption that causal laws of behaviour can be discovered’ (Bottoms, 2000:26).
113 ‘Falsification’ is a subject that will be revisited throughout this chapter. For the sake of expediency, ‘falsification’ is a method of negating the problem of induction. Rather than striving for the impossible ultimate answers, what we should be doing as scientists is getting closer to truth, through the ‘weeding out’ of bad theories. In other words, the emphasis of scientific inquiry should not be to search for confirmatory examples, but to search for those examples that challenge our most cherished ideas.
Therefore, regardless of the perceived validity and reliability of my methodological approach, I am happy to concede that the findings and recommendations articulated in subsequent chapters – particularly in relation to the relationship between demand and supply - will be partial, temporary and spatially distinctive to Nottingham, rather than be inferential to all street-level prostitution markets, for all people all of the time. However, this is not the same as saying that the findings and recommendations within the thesis are not, at least at some level, transferable to street-prostitution markets elsewhere; but if they are only under circumstances where each local prostitution market and the local population within which it operates, has been considered in order to determine the suitability for local policy implementation.

Ultimately it is contended that the social world can only be understood through an empathic identification of the inner meanings, motives and intentions underpinning human action, or what Weber called *verstehen* (Hollis, 2003:147). In this interpretivist view, the methods required for understanding do not readily lend themselves to the positivist tradition of ‘enumeration, tabulation and statistical analysis’ (O’Connell Davidson and Layder, 1994:32). Because the focus of the social researcher is on ‘seeing the world through the eyes’ of individual social actors, the most appropriate methods are deemed to be those from the qualitative tradition.

However, it is also important to recognise that rejecting outright a positivistic approach in favour of exclusive ‘interpretivist/constructivist’ accounts, can lead to a slippage into the worst kind of ‘relativism’ (Bottoms, 2000). After all, if it is not possible to claim a reality outside of the ‘interpretations that social actors bring to their observations of the natural and social world’ (*ibid*: 17), then how can we determine - in the area of concern of this thesis - which accounts give a ‘truer’ picture of how sex is bought and sold and the impact of those policies that are intended to reduce or eliminate the trade? In the end, as Williams and May (1996:35) point out, if relativism is right, then ‘any claim that science is superior to, say, astrology, witchcraft or voodoo, collapses’. Assuming one explanation is as good as any other is clearly problematic for the social scientist criminologist concerned with engaging scientific enquiry as a tool to help our understanding of identified social problems and to implement polices that are intended to promote the ‘good life’ (*et al*, 1998). In essence, I would concur with O’Connell Davidson and Layder’s (1994:28) view that ‘research that is rigorous and reflexive produces knowledge that is more objective than research which is sloppy and uncritical’. This pragmatic and multi-dimensional approach underpins the chosen methodologies outlined in the rest of this chapter.

**Setting realistic expectations: boundaries and limitations of the thesis**

There are major methodological challenges in undertaking research with punters, working girls and affiliated social agencies that cut across one’s own philosophical standpoint; for example, both positivists and interpretivists would recognize the inherent difficulties in accessing the
hidden populations of punters and working girls. Therefore whilst epistemology and ontology are integral to any research design, having set out this broad philosophical position, my primary concern is that the methodological account below fulfils the criteria of transparency and reflexivity. Without this, the research is prone to some of the non-transparent and unreflective methodological weaknesses that Weitzer (2005) quite rightly attributes to other sex research studies.

**Non-random sampling and negotiating access as a continuous process**

**Finding punters and working girls: some preliminary observations**

Researchers have used pre-existing secondary data such as retrospective case notes (see Groom and Nandwani, 2006) or stratified probability sampling frames to understand the prevalence of prostitution activities amongst a randomised adult male population (Ward et al, 2005; Sullivan and Simon, 1998). Whilst this approach may be effective for establishing prevalence estimates, such approaches may be less useful when trying to understand the meanings that individuals place on their own involvement in prostitution.

When working with discreet populations, the social researcher regularly has at his or her disposal access to organisations and/or databases from which a random sample can be generated. Unfortunately this is rarely, if ever, the case when carrying out research amongst specific ‘offender’ populations (although generating random samples has been attempted – see Kanouse et al., 1999). Because of this, social researchers have tended to employ other techniques associated with convenience and non-random sampling when recruiting working girls and/or punters to participate in their research.

Firstly, researchers may simply ‘hang out’ on the streets of the ‘red light’ districts of the geographical area(s) they are interested in (for working girl research see Bindel and Atkins, 2007; Sharpe, 1998 and 2000; McKeeganey and Barnard, 1996; O’Neill, 1991; Leonard, 1990; Kinnell, 1989; for punter research, see McKeeganey and Barnard, 1996; Freund et al, 1991). This ‘hanging out’ can consist of either i) observation only or; ii) observation and approaching those individuals identified as working girls and/or punters. This latter method can be a risky strategy; correctly identifying on-street working girls and punters is never an exact science and liable to unhelpful stereotyping. Researchers are also exposed to the possibility of approaching individuals unconnected to street-based prostitution activities. This is unlikely to go down well with the local community. Furthermore, where male researchers have failed to inform the appropriate CJS agencies of their research activities, they run the very real risk of being apprehended by the police for soliciting offences. And of course, one should not overlook the very real safety issues associated with the ‘street’; working girls (and to a lesser extent, punters) regularly experience sexual/physical violence and robbery. Researchers should not assume that
they are immune from these risks.

Any individual involved in any form of ‘deviant’ behaviour and illegal economic activity is likely to want to conceal these activities and will be particularly resistant to unwanted attention (Campbell, 1998:157). Consequently there may be a degree of antipathy from working girls (and pimps/coercive boyfriends) who perceive academic researchers as, at best, nothing more than a major barrier to their earning potential\(^\text{114}\), and at worst as potential police informers.

Alternatively, researchers have looked to initially recruit their participants through advertisements in the local/national media or via the internet (for punter research see Grenz, 2005; Campbell, 1998; McKeganey, 1994; Macleod et al, 2008; Faugier and Cranfield, 1995; Jordan, 1997; Coy et al, 2007; O’Connell Davidson, 1998; Atchison et al, 1998; Sanders, 2008; Earle and Sharpe, 2007). This approach is often favoured by researchers whose primary question is *why do men pay for sex?* Because these methods can generate quick interest, using the media as a recruitment tool is favoured in circumstances where the research project is operating with short timescales, and/or when large numbers of participants are required. Inevitably, this gain has to be balanced with some of the methodological limitations of such an approach. As Campbell (1998:158) acknowledges of her own research ‘the respondents were a clearly self-selected sample’ and consequently ‘our research cannot claim to have examined a […] representative sample of male clients of prostitutes nor can its results be generalised to the larger ‘hidden’ populations of male clients’ (Campbell, 1998:158).

Grenz’s (2005) reflections of her own research further demonstrate the problems that this self-selection sampling poses. Specifically, Grenz (*ibid*) describes a number of ‘inappropriate’ telephone responses to her request for volunteers from the punter community in the local paper, whereby it was clear that ‘sexual expectations had surfaced’ (Grenz, 2005:2095). This is not to discount recruitment through the media, but to recognise that relying on the media (electronic or otherwise), one arguably loses a significant degree of control over the sampling process and therefore it becomes difficult, if not impossible, to filter out respondents with ulterior motives, or to include those who are not exposed to the chosen media output.

Occasionally the researcher will have pre-existing relationships with punters and/or working girls as workers in prostitution support agencies (Coy, 2006), through previous research projects (Sanders, 2004) or as ex-working girls/punters’ themselves. Kinnell (2006) has used working girls to keep diary accounts. Faugier and Cranfield (1995) asked working girls to conduct questionnaires with their ‘clients’. Besides the fundamental criticism that these approaches inevitably fail to factor in the ‘problematic orientation of the researchers (given their own experiences)’ (Weitzer, 2005:938), the main problem with this approach in relation to my own

\(^{114}\) The subject of ‘ethics’ is discussed later in the chapter.
research, is that it is an unrealistic sampling strategy for street-level prostitution settings.

In an attempt to break from these standardised approaches, O’Neill and Campbell (2001:46) have used a collaborative ‘Participatory Action Research’ (PAR) methodology to ‘provide as clear a picture as possible of prostitution’. In essence, the use of PAR operationalizes a ‘mixed methods’ approach and, amongst other things, O’Neill and Campbell’s (2001) research included: i) social agency interviews; ii) focus groups and community meetings with local residents; iii) ethnographic field research, interviews and questionnaire survey’s with ‘sex workers’ accessed ‘via outreach with sex worker projects’. Whilst advocates of PAR see this as a glimpse into the methodological future, others have argued that it lacks ‘scientific rigour’ (Kemmis and McTaggart, 2001) since its collaborative nature can make it difficult to determine who is in charge of the research project (Avison et al., 2001). There is not the space here to fully explore the arguments and counterarguments associated with PAR, but suffice to say that not everyone perceives it to be the methodological panacea of prostitution research.

With the exception of the PAR study, all the approaches above have sought to recruit volunteers through direct means. What the O’Neill and Campbell study demonstrates, however, is that increasingly there is a tendency for access to be initially negotiated indirectly through an intermediary medical, social or criminal justice agencies or through criminal justice rehabilitation programmes and arrest operations (for working girls research see Pitcher et al., 2006; Potter et al., 1999; Dalla et al., 2003; Potterat et al., 1998; for punter research see Wortley et al., 2002; Sawyer et al., 2002; Sharpe, 2000; Monto and McRee, 2005; Busch et al., 2002; Brooks-Gordon, 2006). This strategy appears to be a commonly used sampling method in prostitution research, most likely because it offers the greatest opportunity to confront the problems associated with recruiting independently of ‘gatekeepers’. That said, Weitzer (2005) is especially critical of using social agencies to sample working girl populations, arguing that the ‘most frequently or seriously victimised, may be especially likely to contact service providers’ (2005:938; see also Shaver, 2005: 296). For Weitzer (2005) this research methodology is open to the worst excesses of selection bias in the sampling process. Because it is not possible to carry out randomised sampling amongst working girls and punters, Weitzer (ibid) implicitly suggests that the key job of the researcher is to produce a sampling frame that uses non-random techniques in the most innovative and diverse way (whilst recognising the limitations of generalisability within convenience and ‘snowball’ sampling). Weitzer (ibid) cites the Silbert and Pines (1982) study discussed in Chapter 6 as one of the most glaring examples of the inherent problems of a poor sampling approach. The interviewers used in the Silbert and Pines (1982) study were all former street-‘prostitutes’ drawn from the same city, the same treatment facility and all of whom had ‘been the victims of various assaults’ whilst involved in the sex ‘industry’ (Silbert and Pines, 1982:127). Because the research was concerned with uncovering systemic violence amongst the ‘prostitute community’, Weitzer (2005) argues the theoretical orientation intrinsic to the methodological design was flawed from the start. Interestingly, however, Weitzer fails to offer any realistic improvements without suggestions as to how researchers might hope to implement
‘innovative’ non-random sampling designs independently of ‘service providers’, existing contacts or any of the other means highlighted above. In light of Weitzer’s (2005) criticisms, I should point out that for my own research, a selection of opportunistic samples were used.

Whichever methodology one adopts, it is often the case that prostitution researchers rely on some form of ‘snowballing’\textsuperscript{115} strategy to open up their convenience sampling frames. According to Atkinson and Flint (2001), snowball strategies provide ‘a means of accessing vulnerable and more impenetrable social groupings’. Whilst the convenience of ‘snowballing’ can often produce results within difficult areas of criminological research (Jupp \textit{et al}, 2000), there is an inherent problem that ‘snowballing’ can simply lead to ‘more of the same’, with isolates ignored (Atkinson and Flint, 2001). In other words, there may be a tendency for respondents to recommend those of a similar view of the world. A further risk is that control of the sampling process may be lost to an unrecognised third party, and that if ‘more of the same’ is being produced then this has obvious implications for reliability and validity. Because of these obvious limitations, I made the decision that my own use of ‘snowballing’ would be a method of last resort; one that I was largely able to resist drawing on.

Before considering how best to negotiate access, it was imperative that the chosen sampling frame was suitably aligned with the aims and objectives of this thesis. Most obvious to the sampling process was the necessity to involve working girls and punters. However, given the recent focus on multi-agency strategies (see Chapter 8), the number of agencies responsible for rehabilitation and/or ‘administering criminal sanctions’ to working girls and punters is substantial. Even at the local level, in a city the size of Nottingham the number of agencies concerned with the rehabilitation and punishment of punters and working girls is well established and reasonably extensive. Conceivably, the research could have incorporated research with residents/tenant associations, Nottinghamshire Constabularies’ On-Street Prostitution Team (OSPT), Registered Social Landlords, City Council Housing Officers, Anti-social behaviour officers/Tenancy Enforcement Officers, Community Wardens, Drug Action Teams, Social services departments, prostitution outreach services (including POW! and the Jericho Road Project), the Criminal Justice Intervention Team (CJIT) and drug treatment workers.

Patently, capturing the multiple structural and sociological explanations of prostitution and positing them in the appropriate demand and supply contexts required throwing the sampling net as far and wide as possible. Initially, this involved important decisions about which agencies/gatekeepers would bring the most value to the thesis and also about how to justify my sampling decisions in relation to the core objective of assessing if and how prostitution policies

\textsuperscript{115} In its simplest form ‘snowball’ sampling is ‘a technique for finding research subjects, whereby one subject gives the researcher the name of another subject, who in turn provides the name of a third and so on’; the sample gathers subjects like a rolling snowball gathers fallen snow (Vogt, 1999).
reduce demand and supply in Nottingham’s street-level sex markets. And - as is demonstrated throughout the research literature (and to a degree in this thesis) - even where appropriate sampling units had been established, the process of negotiating and maintaining access could be unpredictable, time-consuming and at times highly politicised. However, before exploring the specificity behind the sampling and access of punters, working girls and other social/criminal justice agencies, it is worth re-emphasising that as with many other areas of ‘crime prevention’, the implementation and delivery of prostitution policy is today increasingly subject to a ‘partnership approach’ (‘multi-agency’ policing within prostitution is briefly discussed in Chapter 8; see also Matthews, (1993, 2005 and 2008)).

Research implications of the partnership perspective

With agencies now encouraged to work together\(^\text{116}\), the potential for prostitution researchers to gain access to a broader range of agencies may, in some conditions, be improved. By virtue of the way agencies are now expected to co-operate with one another, the social researcher’s sampling frame could, in theory, reflect the inter-agency relationships of a ‘key contact’ within a core agency. In this model, identifying and harnessing relationships with those individuals who have the connections and credibility with other gatekeepers and decision-makers throughout the multi-agency partnership, is key to maximising the scope of the sampling frame within and between agencies.

Equally, however, a close co-operation between agencies may have negative access implications in those circumstances where a key relationship between the researcher and the research participant becomes compromised or politicised (for example, about how best to control street-level prostitution). Rather than be recommended, the researcher may find themselves ‘blacklisted’ from liaising with key contacts across the ‘partnership’. Furthermore, personality clashes, distrust and administrative conflicts can and do occur across multi-agency partnerships regardless of how well the key relationship has been cultivated. Nevertheless, targeting the individual(s) with the greatest sphere of influence with punters, working girls and agencies in the Nottingham multi-agency partnership was a strategy I felt likely to have a positive outcome.

Working girls: initial reflections on a supply-led sampling frame

What is evident from previous research projects (Chapter 5) is that interpreting the specificity behind each working girls route into - and continued involvement in - street-level prostitution is a

\(^{116}\) Although there is some evidence that agencies are less ‘joined-up’ than is sometimes claimed (see Hamilton, 2005 and Chapter 8).
prerequisite to any social policy implementation intended to facilitate a long-term, permanent ‘exiting’ strategy. Designing a research strategy to investigate this, I would argue, partially necessitates talking directly with working girls about their life experiences inside and outside of any involvement in street-level prostitution markets. Consequently part of the research material collected for the thesis involved a series of semi-structured interviews with twenty-two working girls between 19th October 2006 and 4th July 2008.

As with almost all research involving ‘hard to reach’ groups and sensitive topics (Lee, 1999), getting to this interviewing stage requires deciding how best to gain access to individuals who typically prefer to remain anonymous. Noaks and Wincup (2004:56) maintain that negotiating and maintaining access is one of the most consistently demanding processes in the field of criminological research. It is perhaps unsurprising therefore that, at the start of the project, my biggest fear for the thesis’s viability and credibility centred on the willingness of critical ‘gatekeepers’117 to ‘buy in’: (i) to the aims and objectives of the project itself and; (ii) to me as an individual. Nevertheless - despite my limited exposure to networked contacts in this field of enquiry - Sharpe’s (2000:366) observation that at the start of her fieldwork amongst street-level working girls, she was ‘armed with only a very vague strategy’, gave me the confidence to suppose that my preliminary research design was both realistic and achievable.

**Working girls: sampling strategy**

Whilst I would make no claims that there is ‘such a thing as a representative sample of women selling sex’ (McKeganey and Barnard, 1996:2), taking on-board the widespread evidence of physical and sexual abuse, together with the well-documented links between street-sex and drugs markets (Chapter 5), it seems realistic to assume that working girls who are in contact with service providers are in fact typical – not atypical - of the street-level ‘working girl community’ in Nottingham. Consequently the decision made was to use ‘gatekeepers’ affiliated to social agencies, service providers and the CJS as the primary method of recruiting working girl respondents.

Naturally, the terms ‘service provider’ or ‘social agency’ are broad concepts, and the range of services in Nottingham fulfilling this role is correspondingly diverse. Understanding these delineations was an important consideration when deciding which agencies are the most suitable to engage with, particularly in light of Welitzer’s (2005) criticisms that prostitution research focuses on only the most desperate.

---

117 Hughes (2000:239) defines ‘gatekeepers’ as ‘...those individuals in an organisation or another social situation who have the power to grant or withhold access to people or situations for the purposes of research’.
Choosing to work with a third party organisation is not without risks. The benefits afforded to researchers using gatekeepers (or ‘professional informants’, Lee, 1999) are essentially that gatekeeper’s bring opportunities for accessing groups not normally available to ‘outsiders’ (Lee, 1999; Becker, 1970). However, these benefits have to be counterbalanced with the implications of handing over the sampling process to third parties, possibly with their own agendas. As Arksey and Knight (1999:64) point out, gatekeepers are often agreeable to access, ‘more than likely because they believe taking part will serve some interest of theirs’. More so, gatekeepers can ‘segregate people out rather than in’ or ‘not enforce procedures set up to put the researcher in contact with eligible respondents’ (ibid) to propagate these interests. In light of this I wanted to be sure of the answers to a number of key questions about any ‘service provider’s’ role in the research before deciding if, or how much of, the sampling process I wanted to hand over. Namely: why does this organisation want to help? What are their motivations? What are their expectations, particularly in terms of written outputs? Are they expecting to have any censorship of the findings? Who will (or won’t) be approached to take part in the research?

Interestingly, as O’Connell Davidson and Layder (1994:222) point out, the role of good fortune is often overlooked in the research process and it was the chance meeting of a fellow student (whom I shall refer to as ‘Catharine’) at Nottingham Trent University (NTU), who in her capacity as ‘research co-ordinator’ at a Nottingham-based Housing Association (‘HA1’), mentioned she might be able to help with sampling suitable ‘service users’ who were/had been involved in street-level prostitution.

Much of the ensuing discussion with Catharine and the manager of HA1’s principal supporting housing project (to whom I shall refer as ‘Julie’) focused on the strategies I would employ to protect the anonymity, confidentiality and emotional well-being of often vulnerable individuals, as well as strategies I would employ to protect my own psychological well-being. Importantly this meeting played a key role in ameliorating any preconceived concerns that I had in respect of a third party organisation taking control of the research agenda. Julie confirmed that providing the research was contemporary, relevant, ethical and that the appropriate (human) resources were available, HA1 were happy to engage with any sensitive and well-designed research project that had the potential to improve the lives of their ‘service users’. Research instruments would only be censored if they were felt to be insufficiently sensitive to the needs of ‘service users’. This ethical approach greatly appealed; consulting and negotiating on the interview schedule and other research instruments is good practice anyway and combined with access to their ‘service users’ and the intellectual freedom to write-up unfettered by third party agenda’s, this seemed like an appropriate solution to the notorious problem of recruiting a working girls sample.

As Noaks and Wincup (2004) observe, negotiating access is a continual process and not long

118 As articulated on their website, HA1 is ‘Nottinghamshire’s leading provider of housing, support, training, care and resettlement services to homeless and vulnerable people’.
119 Given the pseudonym ‘Central’ throughout this research.
after our initial meeting, Julie went on maternity leave. Fortunately, dialogue with her successor (to whom I shall refer as ‘Carl’) resulted in the authorisation to move on to the next phase of project approval. Importantly all dialogue with HA1 management was electronically minuted so as to: i) minimise any misunderstandings that can result from verbal communication and; ii) to compliment my research diary as a useful ‘aide memoir’ to events, discussions and feelings as the project progressed.

**Checks on researcher’s history**

The ESRC advise in their ‘research ethics framework’ that a Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) check offers ‘organizations a means to check the background of researchers to ensure that they do not have a history that would make them unsuitable for work involving children and vulnerable adults’ (ESRC, 2005:19). Rather than go through this process again, HA1 were happy to base my suitability to work with their vulnerable client group on CRB clearance obtained earlier in the year following research carried out with Nottingham’s On-Street Prostitution Team (OSPT; see below).

**‘Persuading the professionals’**

Martin (2000:222) notes in her research in a prison setting that ‘a high level of management co-operation does not always filter down to the wings’ and because the onus and practicalities of sampling ultimately lay not with managers but with HA1’s key workers, I took the opportunity of ‘selling’ my plans with key workers at the next Central team meeting. In essence this provided an opportunity to ‘persuade the professionals that I was not a liability’ (Sanders, 2006b) and to ‘sell’ the research’s long-term projected outputs in the context of a well-designed and ethical piece of research with a clear commitment to protecting often-vulnerable individuals. Having secured key worker buy-in, it was agreed that they would approach those ‘service users’ they knew to be (or have been) involved in street-level prostitution, explain the research to them and ask them if they would like to be involved. And in circumstances where the recruitment was not progressing as anticipated, Carl would involve Central’s resettlement co-ordinator to act in a co-ordinating capacity.

**From sampling to interviewing at Central: methodological checks, safety concerns and other ethical considerations**

With hindsight, the high degree of transience and unpredictability in working girls lives meant that to talk of plans and schedules in a precise, professional sense is generally not attuned to these social circumstances. As a result of this transience, there arose a number of situations where scheduled interviews were cancelled at short notice. Typically, I would get email
communication from Carl, along the lines of the October 2006 email example below:

‘Just to check that you are still able to do the interviews on Friday? We have had to change things slightly as we evicted one person you were going to see. However not all is lost and we have replaced them with two others!’

Neither was it uncommon for interviews to be cancelled on the day itself for non-eviction reasons, including: i) feeling unwell; ii) having second thoughts; iii) having to ‘score’ or; iv) simply not being around (unspecified). Fortunately my research schedule allowed me a degree of flexibility in reacting to unexpected changes.

The use of financial incentives

Thompson (1996) argues that the use of incentives in social research can be desirable when working with less powerful groups. In these circumstances ‘payment can be one way of recognizing and beginning to equalize such power relations’ (Thompson, 1996). Conversely, other researchers have frowned upon the use of financial reimbursement for reasons associated with bias and contamination of data. Financial incentives, it is also argued, ‘introduce commercial norms into research’ (Wilkinson and Moore, 1999:114). Furthermore, such worries may be compounded in circumstances where the group under consideration has well documented severe and prolonged drug or alcohol problems. As McKeganey (2001) notes:

‘We ought not to entertain the notion that the money [incentives] is being used to buy a ticket to the ballet or for a hearty meal. In most cases the money will be spent on the drugs to which the individual is addicted.’ (2001:1237).

Nor should one overlook the inherent ethical problems that might ensue from lone male researchers giving female working girls money for participating in ‘sex research’. Whilst several respondents in McKeganey and Barnard’s (1996) research refused the offer of financial compensation on the basis they had agreed to be interviewed to ‘make a difference’ rather than for monetary gain, the decision I eventually took in this contentious area was to offer non-monetary incentives 121 for any working girl willing to take part in the research. Although this was in part a reaction to the problem of response rates, the primacy of my decision was that it was simply the right thing to do (McKeganey (2001:1238). Of course, these vouchers could have quite easily been sold to pay for Class A drugs (or exchanged for alcohol in Tesco and Asda), raising the question, ‘was I funding a potential drugs overdose’? The view from HA1 staff was that in most instances working girls would probably use the vouchers to treat themselves to

120 To get drugs.
121 I also reluctantly asked all research participants to sign a ‘payment’ receipt (Appendix N). Although this provides a valuable audit trail, morally and professionally I didn’t want HA1 ‘service users’ to feel that I didn’t trust them even before the research had begun.
‘smellies’ or other cosmetic indulgencies; this was my hope.

Confidentiality and anonymity amongst HA1 respondents

When working with hard to reach and ‘deviant’ groups the ethical challenge of ensuring confidentiality and anonymity is arguably even more pronounced. Guidance in these matters was largely dictated by my commitment to the code of ethics as laid down by NTU, my funding body (the ESRC), the British Society of Criminology (BSC) and the Social Research Association (SRA) (Appendices P-Q and http://www.the-sra.org.uk/documents/pdfs/ethics03.pdf). For obvious reasons, most individuals engaged in ‘criminal’ activity are unlikely to speak with social/criminological researchers unless the cloak of confidentiality and anonymity is ensured.

The ESRC (2005:25) clearly state that they expect ‘researchers take steps to ensure that research data and its sources remain confidential unless participants have consented to their disclosure, and ensure that plans have been made for their storage and access to them’. In relation to this latter requirement, all raw data (including electronic and hard-copy data) was stored safely behind a locked drawer in a steel cabinet within a locked office and/or backed-up to a password protected PC and password protected data stick.

However, as King (2000:307) acknowledges ‘…protecting the vulnerable is one thing but I have never taken the view that confidentiality can be absolute’. Of course one of the key techniques that researchers use to elicit openness is the assurance that ‘whatever you say, it will not be possible to identify you’. But as King’s assertion demonstrates, confidentiality has boundaries and the following qualification was placed at the end of the ‘Informed consent’ document (Appendix C):

‘Please note [...] that if you were to disclose any information that gives us cause for concern for you or another, we will need to pass this on and will tell you why’.

The danger of course is that the inherent vagueness in the above condition, gives considerable discretion in deciding what is a ‘cause for concern’, which may in turn exacerbate the unequal power dynamics in the research process. Attempts were made to overcome this by detailing specific examples where confidentiality would be compromised, but I fully accept that this method is no guarantee of candour from research participants.

Although researchers have a duty to report the findings of their research, it is important to recognise that this can be achieved by not disclosing ‘identifiable information about participants’ (such as occupation, place names and so forth) (Wiles et al, 2006). I was also careful to remove all identifying features from references, paraphrasing and/or quotations. In other words, ‘anonymity is a vehicle by which confidentiality is operationalised’ (ibid). Nevertheless to make
claims of complete anonymity would be a misnomer; all the ethical researcher can promise is that (s)he will do their best to ensure that the respondent cannot be identified. All research respondents were made aware of this potential limitation.

Defining confidentiality and anonymity is of course only one aspect of informed consent. Appendix C provided all participants with: i) a description of the study; ii) what was required to take part in the project; iii) details of key contacts; iv) an audit trail 'check list'. However, even seemingly straightforward informed consent protocols are not without controversy, with Homan (1991) arguing that there is an instinctive 'tension between the participant's right to refuse and the motivation of the researcher to achieve a high response rate' (cited in Wiles et al, 2005:6).

Groups engaged in criminal activity in particular can view written consent forms with some trepidation on the basis that 'the information they provide traceable to them, which may make them vulnerable to potential investigation by the criminal justice system' (Coomber, 2002 cited in Wiles et al, 2005:7).

The politics of research and the problem of gender

Although issues such as informed consent are vital components of any research project, without a full appreciation of the wider milieu in which such ethical issues exist, it could be argued that such issues serve no purpose other than to tick the relevant boxes for academic ethics committees embedded in academic institutions and funding bodies.

Historically the ‘methodological demands’ (Sanders, 2006b: 451) of transparency (Weitzer, 2005) and reflection (Sanders, 2006b) have all too often been missing in discussions surrounding prostitution research. In particular, insightful and reflective accounts from male researchers tend to be thin on the ground. Of course, gender alone does not privilege one to be a good researcher, but it would be equally naïve to suppose that one’s gender does not have some bearing on the research process. Unfortunately, because prostitution research is often plagued by theoretical entrenchment (Chapter 3), issues of gender are not just methodological considerations; prostitution research is a highly politicised endeavour. Whilst my maleness has its challenges, it also presented a number of opportunities. Demonstrating clear parallels with Finch’s (1984) observations with research participants who expressed a view that ‘it’s great to have someone to talk to’, one member of the OSPT noted, ‘working girls often relish the opportunity to talk openly with the police, as this is the only time they get to speak with men who aren’t after something’.

In considering the challenges associated with gender, all interviews took place in the presence of an independent female third party (to whom I shall refer as ‘Naomi’). Naturally putting a vulnerable individual in a room with not one, but two strangers, had the potential to be unsettling
and counterproductive to the aims of the research. Fortunately all working girl volunteers had been recruited from people they knew and trusted and the background to the research had been articulated to them in some detail before; this was likely to be less confrontational and gave the research and researcher(s) some initial legitimacy. Secondly, all interviews took place in the recognisable surroundings of Central. Furthermore, Naomi was familiar with the HA1 organisation and its ‘service users’, having worked in Central and other projects in a support capacity over a number of years. Finally, full and detailed ‘informed consent’ documentation allowed informants to ‘appreciate where the discussions might eventually lead, and [...] what they might reveal’ (Arksey and Knight, 1999:113).

Whilst I am happy to accept O’Connell Davidson and Layder’s assertion that ‘there are parts of the social world which are invisible to men simply because they are men’ (1994: 220), this did not seem to me to be the case in the research setting of Central. Moreover, as the analysis in Chapter 10 demonstrates, working girls were more than happy to talk to me as a male researcher disparagingly, unflinchingly and often brutally about punters and their sexual and social imperfections. Consequently, I would both tentatively and subjectively reject the speculative argument that ‘…it is easier […] as a woman, to establish a rapport [with working girls]’ (ibid).

Whilst not denying that gender ‘influences all aspects of our being, of our relationships and of the society and culture around us’ (Järveluoma et al, 2003: 1), I tentatively argue that, seen in isolation, my own gender had only a marginal effect on working girls self-expression during the interview process. As Morgan (1986:46) argues, there is a need to examine the ‘interaction between gender and other social variables’ […] as a corrective against a catch-all use of gender as a source of analysis’. Strongly aligned with Websdale’s (2001) reflections on his research with rural battered women, working girl support workers assured me that ‘these women wanted to tell their stories, regardless of the sex of the interviewer, because hitherto they had been silenced, both in their interpersonal relationships and, at times, by the Criminal Justice System’ (Websdale, 2001:55). Overall, I would strongly contend that generating rapport was predicated not on socio-demographical homogeneity between the researcher and person being researched, but on: i) commonalities other than gender (or any other personal characteristic); ii) being a good listener, ‘receptive to their stories’; iii) being interested in them as people ‘rather than as shelter residents […] or cogs in a system’ (ibid: 53-54) and; iv) wanting to tell their story from their point of view.

122 This assertion is, however, extremely relevant to other HA1 projects which, for reasons associated with physical and emotional protection, have a strict ‘no men’ admittance policy. Methodological issues associated with these projects is discussed in later sections.
The working girl interview schedule

Adhering to sound ethical processes alone does not give social researchers their data. Inescapably, getting quality data has to be predicated on a well designed, logical and clear interview schedule whereby ‘what is asked’ is closely aligned with the techniques of how these questions are delivered and answers are received. As mentioned previously, interviews were semi-structured in nature, in so far that specific themes were probed for comparative purposes (May, 2001). Because I was keen to simultaneously test and construct theory, these interviews were informed by a non-prescriptive and flexible topic guide (see Appendix D).

Much of this schedule focused on exploring the heterogeneity of working girls’ life experiences (marked by where they perceived themselves to be socially situated), since it was felt that these experiences had a significant bearing on how working girls gave meaning to their lives and the wider social world. Arguably exploring this heterogeneity of experience would allow for a greater understanding of which – if any - current policies are most likely to work, for whom and in what circumstances they are most likely to be effective, although again it is worth stressing that due to the sample size and qualitative design it would be wrong to suppose that any findings are inferential to the wider ‘population’ of working girls.

Inevitably, much of the interview schedule was formulated from a review of the literature, but also discussions with friends, family and academic colleagues. The final ratified version of the topic guide included in Appendix D, was formulated only after drafting and re-drafting and by continuous interaction at both supervisory and ‘gatekeeper’ level, particularly drawing on Catharine’s own experiences of interviewing HA1 clients.

A proportion of the interview schedule included questions relating to the circumstances that led to working girls’ involvement in prostitution and the factors that continued to propagate this attachment. The logic behind these questions is that one cannot understand ‘exiting’ until one understands the dynamics of ‘entry’. Because one of the key research questions underpinning the thesis regards the supposed interrelationship between demand and supply, the interview schedule looked also to explore whether or not working girls had experienced a noticeable drop in punter demand and if they had, what had been the impact on their lives. These are just a couple of examples of the presumed logic of the alignment between interview design and the core research questions/hypotheses.

Importantly, by adopting a broad and diverse topic guide, I also felt that there was space for tangential discussions and theory-construction to be generated during the fieldwork itself. Consequently, on reflection, large chunks of interview data might seem unconnected to the semi-structured interview topic guide. In truth, I saw these unstructured exchanges widening the conversation. Moreover, actively pursuing unfamiliar territory forced me to very early on re-challenge any residual perceptions about the uni-dimensionality of working girls and their lives,
and these nebulous interactions were integral to creating a multidimensional and heterogeneous account of working girls' lives both inside and, just as importantly, outside of prostitution. These often overlooked minutiae are integral to challenging the dehumanised caricature of on-street working girls only as figures of tragedy and victimisation so prevalent in the research literature.

**The pilot interview: from ‘designing’ to ‘doing’**

Before going ‘into the field’ for real, the interview schedule required piloting. As Bryman (2005:159) points out, piloting is desirable as it helps to identify possible problems with the interview and how these can be addressed, particularly with ‘questions that seem not to be understood or questions that are often not answered’. In short, a pilot study ‘might give advance warning about where the project may fail’ (Van Teijlingen and Hundley, 2001).

For reasons associated with anonymity and under the terms of the informed consent agreement signed with this piloted individual (whom I shall refer to as ‘Alice’), I am restricted in the information that I can provide about the pilot interview here. What is worth mentioning however, is that Alice was highly articulate and communicative and there was little doubt from Alice’s reactions and interactions, that both the pre-interview instructions and interview questions themselves had been understood as intended123. Consequently, I felt the pilot interview posed few unanticipated challenges, which in turn gave me some confidence that the design of the topic guide was ‘fit for purpose’ and certainly helped to consolidate my thoughts about topics requiring the greatest focus and emphasis. Perhaps just as importantly, Alice’s frequently disturbing biography gave me an insight to the high degree of emotional distress that recounting such stories can have for interviewer and interviewee alike.

**Reflections on interviewing at Central**

**(i) Emotional stress and anxiety**

The emotional impact associated with the fieldwork was not limited to the interviewing process. For example, reflecting on my first meeting at Central, I note in my research diary:

‘Overall, I felt very intimidated by the [Central] project…not really been exposed to a place like this before. Not as street-wise as I thought!’

---

123 Although philosophically I acknowledge that this may be a point of contention; researchers cannot be sure that their interpretation of meaning is ever same as intended by the research respondent.
Other more mundane aspects that I thought I had given prior consideration to compounded a sense of being an outsider:

‘Although I had made the decision not to wear a suit, it was still obvious that I was an outsider; I looked and felt like an outsider. My dress and my language was visibly different from the residents’.

In general these feelings were most acutely felt in public areas of the project, but even in securely sectioned staff areas, I was provided with a panic alarm and two-way radio. In reality, these safety measures at Central were probably more to do with ‘fulfilling my obligation to abide by risk assessment safety protocols’ (Sanders, 2008:22; Sanders, 2006b: 451-453) than about being exposed to a statistically significant risk of bodily harm. Important as this was, my primary concern centred on the emotional challenges of the research for working girl respondents; very evident from these working girl interviews were the different ways in which the interview process impacted on each respondent emotionally, particularly when recalling childhood experiences (Napoli et al., 2001). As Birch and Miller (2000:189) point out, ‘during the process of inviting individuals to engage in a reflexive project the researcher may become the catalyst for revisiting very private and/or unhappy experiences’. Unlike Birch and Miller (2000:190), I was less convinced that reflexivity could be used constructively to ‘reorder and give new meaning to past difficult experiences’ and in light of these concerns, practical post interview support was offered to all respondents in the form of the external Mental Health Support Team (MHST).124

Although not comparable, the research process can also impact emotionally on the researcher. Maybe because of the social sciences’ ‘unrequited crush on the natural sciences’ (Sparks, 1997), whereby the ideal researcher is seen to be an objective, ‘value-free’ and detached truth finder (Campbell, 2001), few researchers appear able to openly admit that their research affects them emotionally (Blakely, 2007). This is somewhat surprising, given the ways in which this research affected me. Speculating, exposure to ‘the emotionally shocking images of horror and suffering that are the characteristic of serious trauma’ (McCann and Pearlman, 1990:134) most likely led to my own low-level of personal ‘vicarious traumatization’ (Schauben and Frazier, 1995; Cunningningham, 2003). Fortunately the finite exposure to these narratives, allied with the adoption of a ‘number of strategies to address the emotional costs to the researcher of emotionally charged subjects’ (Blakely, 2007:4; see also Rager, 2005) - including maintaining the balance between work and home life and ‘journal writing during the research process, peer or colleague debriefing and even personal counselling’ (ibid) - I was able to overcome any emotional trauma relatively quickly. This is sadly not a luxury afforded to clinicians125 or more importantly to working girls living with their own tragic memories and fears on a daily basis.

124 To my knowledge, this facility was never used as a direct result of my research.
125 For a discussion on secondary traumatic stress disorder (STSD) see Figley, 1995.
ii) Other reflections

For all the negativity associated with interviewing working girls, it would be wrong to neglect the more positive exchanges. Even in adversity, many working girls demonstrated frequent examples of humour, humanity and caring. There was a distinct lack of ‘self-pity’ or a culture of blame; working girls appeared more than happy to own/choose their actions, even if others would make claims to ‘false consciousness’ (Chapter 2). Equally, however, I certainly don’t want to romanticise and patronise working girls as upbeat, plucky survivors; nor I suspect would working girls themselves.

Conducting research in other HA1 projects

In addition to the thirteen interviews carried out at Central (plus the original ‘pilot’), a strategy of multiple data source triangulation was employed (Denzin, 1978) whereby interviews were carried out at other HA1 projects. Whilst disputing the ‘atypicality’ of Central working girls, interviewing respondents from other projects was important when considering Weitzer’s (2005) critique that researchers tend to ‘sample only the most desperate’. To protect the anonymity of respondents in these often small-scale women-only projects, I have refrained from naming the projects involved as other service users may conceivably read this report and make false accusations against fellow service users. Access to these alternative HA1 projects necessitated getting clearance from both the ‘Women’s Service Manager’ (‘Trudie’) and from project managers on a case-by-case basis. The process subsequently agreed was not dissimilar to that operating at Central; all managers would identify willing participants and then contact me to arrange a mutually convenient time and date. Informed consent, the offer of voucher incentives and the electronic tape recording of all interviews remained as per Central. The exception to this consistency of approach, was that the four non-Central interviews (over four projects) were carried out in the presence of the individual’s case worker, rather than involving Natalie in this process.

Supply-side triangulation

Although the sampling net had been cast across the entire HA1 organisation in Nottinghamshire, Weitzer’s (2005) criticism that sampling through agencies is biased and skewed towards the most ‘desperate’ was still concerning me. To clarify that service provider respondents were not symbolic of an atypical ‘underclass’ of working girls, agency-generated interviews were triangulated with access negotiated via the shadowing of two patrols of a Police Community Support Officer (PCSO) (‘Jerry’) attached to the OSPT. Once again this produced several distinct methodological challenges.

126 November 2007.
Upon ratification of the interview schedule/process with Jerry, sampling consisted of driving round Nottingham’s red-light districts to see ‘who was out working’. Once a working girl was spotted - using the premise of a voucher as compensation for ‘earnings lost’ – working girls were asked if they wanted to take part in the research. Those that agreed to participate were subsequently interviewed in the police patrol vehicle\textsuperscript{127}. In total, five interviews were completed ‘on patrol’. Whilst the process of ‘informed consent’ was strictly adhered to, inevitably some may query the voluntary nature of this interaction; after all, Jerry as an officer of the law is in a position of power and some working girls may have felt they had no choice but to take part. For all the reasons identified earlier in the chapter, there also must be some concern about interviewing these respondents without a – female - third party present. Whilst the interactions felt no different in content and context to any other interview, I am equally conscious not to undermine the plausible criticisms of these methods.

\textbf{Stakeholder interviews}

In order to qualitatively assess and gauge the attitudes towards policy interventions from the perspectives of professional groups responsible for implementing or overseeing such policies, a number of formal\textsuperscript{128} and informal stakeholder interviews were conducted with key informants. Because a number of support agencies are underrepresented – particularly ‘prostitute’ support groups - it is important to stress that these interviews are far from representative.

Unlike working girl fieldwork, no payment was offered for participation, but for the purposes of methodological consistency, the same rules of engagement applied to ‘stakeholders’; namely the interview was set up at a mutually convenient time, date and location; detailed information was given about the aims and objectives of the project and data, and informed consent processes were fully articulated. Based on this criteria, formal interviews were carried out with: i) two members of the OSPT; ii) a member of Nottingham City Council with responsibility for implementing the ‘Respect’ agenda (see NCC, 2009); iii) a HA1 employee; iv) a drugs worker employed by the Crime and Disorder Partnership and; vi) a working girl outreach support group employee. Informal interviews were carried out with members of the OSPT, two managers from HA1 and the Home Office ‘Prostitution Strategic Review Team’.

Primarily the aim of these semi-structured qualitative exchanges was one of data triangulation. In essence, some stakeholders had knowledge and experience of both supply and demand, others supply only, but ultimately ‘key informants were asked only those core questions to which they had some knowledge or expertise’ (Wortley and Fischer, 2002:96). Topic areas included the scale and scope of the problem, the effects of the problem, legal considerations and any recent or planned changes in their implementation and any perceived weaknesses in the

\textsuperscript{127} Jerry was not present for these interviews.

\textsuperscript{128} Formality is defined by whether or not interviews were tape-recorded or short-hand notes taken.
various programmes (Appendix E). The intention was then to triangulate this data with the experiences of punters and working girls.

**Researching with punters: background**

Justifying why we should attempt to understand, rather than merely condemn, punters motivations (Chapter 6) may be viewed in some circles with suspicion. As someone who broaches the subject of prostitution in a non-condemnatory way, Kulick (2005:225) provides an interesting insight into the way his ‘agenda’ has been challenged:

‘The mere fact that I had examined Swedish prostitution discourse in a critical light seemed to imply that I was anti-feminist, morally dubious, and somehow ‘for’ prostitution, whatever that might mean’

For the record, my ‘agenda’ in researching punters (and working girls) extends beyond just having criminological and sociological interest in the subject matter. In fact my route into this field came about more by chance than by strategy, having originally approached my host university (NTU) back in 2003 to carry out research in the field of Anti Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs). During the course of these initial discussions, my Director of Supervision (DoS) commented that ASBOs were being imposed on street-level working girls in Nottingham and it was following this informal observation that the project evolved. Like Kulick (2005), I have developed a deep interest in prostitution research (criminological, political, sociological and psychological), but as is often the case in the social sciences, this interest has evolved and become more tightly framed from seemingly unconnected wider research questions and agendas. Providing that the appropriate and transparent methodological checks and balances have been established, I would question how ethical it is to work on the default premise that all male sex researchers have dubious motivations. Sometimes we research that which we find most objectionable in order to make sense of it and in the hope that our research and recommendations might help to change things for the better.

**Researching punters: negotiating access**

In many ways, the problem of negotiating access with punters has equivalence with the methodological dilemmas connected with accessing working girl populations. As a hard-to-reach group, recruiting punters invariably exploits non-random techniques, which necessitates either approaching individuals directly or via intermediary ‘gatekeepers’. For much the same methodological reasons used to justify the sampling approach with working girl populations, ‘gatekeepers’ were used as a liaison between myself and identified punter populations. However, in contrast to the situation pertaining to working girls, punters are denied ‘victimhood’
and there are subsequently very few – if any – social agencies that cater for supporting those involved in the demand for commercial sex. Regrettably, the lack of a ‘Punter Outreach Worker’ organisation meant that my ‘gatekeeper’ options were more or less limited to contacting agencies of the CJS. In Nottingham, the principal ‘gatekeeper’ agency is the On-Street Prostitution Team (OSPT).

**Nottingham’s On Street Prostitution Team (OSPT): structural overview**

Set up on 1st June 2004, the OSPT has a remit to: 1) reduce the numbers of individuals buying and selling street-level sex in Nottingham and; 2) tackle associated criminality and anti-social behaviours affiliated to working girls and punter behaviours. Importantly it is the OSPT who have responsibility for implementing the re-educative programme for men caught paying for street-level sex in Nottingham: the Change Programme (see Chapter 8 for a full overview of the Change Programme process and content).

Prior to the involvement of the OSPT, policing street-level prostitution in Nottingham became characterised by the occasional ‘clampdown’ managed by local beat managers, a policy widely recognised at being ineffective at best, counterproductive at worst (Hester and Westmarland, 2004:31). By 2002, the view was that the problem was ‘getting out of hand’, with an estimated 200 to 250 women involved in street prostitution at any one time (OSPT, unpublished). Once the scale of the problem became apparent, the police and city council formed a ‘strategic group’ to tackle the growing problem.

Out of this review evolved the OSPT which currently consists of a police sergeant managing two constables, predominantly in ‘plain clothes’ to improve the working girl-police relationship. Two community support officers (PCSO’s) and two council employed community protection officers (CPOs)\(^1\) are also attached to the team. The unit also has its own ‘community drugs officer’ (CDO) who is line managed through Nottingham’s Criminal Justice Intervention Team (CJIT) and funded by the Crime and Disorder Partnership (CDP) (Hughes, 2002). The CDO essentially works with working girls to help them engage in the street prostitution exiting process. The team leader (police sergeant) is managed by a police inspector, funded by the council in ‘community protection’ (CP). CP is a department within the city council that handles community protection, relevant housing issues and enforcement undertaken by CPO’s. Ordinarily CPOs are geographically based and assigned to the police in that geographical area, so that the Local Area Commander (LAC) will have line management of his beat officers, PCSO’s and the CPO’s. However, ‘central’ operations such as the OSPT and the city’s Anti Social Behaviour teams are deemed to be more effectively line managed centrally by CP under the jurisdiction of one inspector.

---

\(^1\) Previously known as neighbourhood wardens.
Accessing Punters: a flawed methodology?

Limiting my options in this way has obvious methodological implications, not least that this already finite and hidden population is further restricted to those individuals who have been ‘subject to a policing crackdown’ (Sanders, 2008). However, as alluded to above, the permanence of the OSPT generally ensures that the policing of street-level prostitution in Nottingham is characterised by consistent and regular policing rather than by ‘periodic crackdowns’130. By standardising the policing of street-prostitution spatially and temporarily, Change Programme punters are likely to be reasonably representative of Nottingham’s on-street punter population. Equally, others have warned of the dangers associated with relying on arrests and prosecutions as being representative of ‘hidden’ populations (Hubbard, 1999). Conceivably, prostitution ‘veterans’ (Chapter 9) may be more familiar with the system than less experienced punters and therefore more adroit at avoiding the attention of the police. The same is arguably true of those punters with a predilection for physical and sexual violence. Such groups would inevitably be underrepresented in CJS data and rehabilitation programmes. Furthermore, the Change Programme’s eligibility criteria may stratify in a way that is not representative of Nottingham’s punter population.

As flawed as this non-random sampling design may be, the reality is that it is virtually impossible for any method of accessing punters to claim immunity from sampling bias. If, for example, I had advertised for respondent participation then it would have been imperative that the media bases were comprehensive enough to avoid selection bias. Financially and practically this would have proved highly problematic. Even then, subsequent analysis may be prone to the ‘inherent biases in self-selected samples’ (Brooks-Gordon, 2006:104). Alternatively I could have utilised one of many punter forums available on-line, but as Sanders (2008) acknowledges, most of the larger and ‘professionally’ designed sites tend to be focused towards off-street behaviours (for example, ‘Punternet’) and is likely to exclude those punters not on-line due to financial or technical constraints. Alternatively, I could have taken a direct approach and simply contacted punters on the street. Notwithstanding the immense tactical difficulty of such an approach and the physical, ethical and legal dangers of such a strategy, the reality is that to get a truly representative sample would require me to spend an unrealistic amount of time ‘in the field’; some men may ‘punt’ in cars, others on cycles, some on foot, some in winter, others during the summer, some at night, some in the day and so forth. In short there are a number of compromises and limitations with whichever sampling strategy one decides to employ.

Moreover, it seemed prudent to build on the relationships I had established with the OSPT during my MSc project exploring the use of multi-agency partnerships in dealing with ‘crack houses’ (Hamilton, 2005). In line with the sampling process undertaken with HA1 gatekeeper(s) it was important to ensure that my principle senior contact within the unit (‘Martin’) was not 130 See previous chapter for a detailed overview of the structure and remit of the OSPT.
taking part to serve the organisations own interests (Arksey and Knight, 1999:64). Thankfully, like the HA1 organisation, the OSPT appeared unconcerned with a wholesale censuring of the research instruments.

Much has been written of the future of the police and the peculiar methodological challenges that researchers face when researching (directly or indirectly) with the police and the associated ‘cop culture’ (Leishman et al, 1996; Jones and Newburn, 1997; Weatheritt, 1989; Young, 1993). Although police studies have tended to focus on specific aspects of policing rather than reflecting on the difficulties of using the police to ‘gatekeep’ hidden populations, there are nevertheless a number of overlapping considerations. Critical to any study is the need for the researcher to have the trust of the police, which amongst other things, entails spending ‘extensive periods in the field as a means of becoming accepted’ (Reiner, 2000:219). I would make no claims to ‘going native’ (Babbie, 2005: 299), but to facilitate this relationship there were times during both the MSc and the thesis when I would just ‘hang out’ (Patton, 2002), especially when carrying out Change Programme fieldwork.

Further to ratification from senior members of the police hierarchy\textsuperscript{131}, the OSPT granted full and largely unencumbered access to Change Programme attendees (as well the go-ahead to shadow a number of daily patrols). All of this is somewhat unexpected when considering my inability to fulfil Reiner’s (2000:222) assertion that ‘outside outsiders’\textsuperscript{132} (Brown, 1996) generally require ‘a track record as an established researcher (or the backing of one)’. I would also argue that in reflecting on Burgess’s (1984) five different phases of field roles, the ‘newcomer’/’provisional acceptance’ roles were relatively short-lived and it didn’t take long to reach ‘categorical’ and to a degree, ‘personal’, acceptance\textsuperscript{133}. Speculating, the OSPT’s willingness to participate openly and largely without provisos was in part: i) a reflection of the confidence that the team placed in the inherent logic and efficacy of their approach to controlling street-level prostitution; ii) a confidence in my legitimacy as a researcher (based on previous experience); iii) a ‘positive presentation of self’ (Reiner, 2000:224) and; iv) that the evaluation would effectively have a zero-cost application. Nor were the OSPT necessarily averse to publicity, having recently completed two well-received and high profile regional television series for Central TV\textsuperscript{134}. This is in direct contrast to the Sergeant in Brooks-Gordon’s (2006:217) study whose reticence towards research was grounded in him being previously ‘stitched up’ by a TV documentary team\textsuperscript{135}.

\textsuperscript{131} And Change Programme authors and facilitators.
\textsuperscript{132} ‘Outside outsider’ studies are generally defined as ‘work conducted by academics and others who are not employed or commissioned by the police or other governmental bodies with responsibility for policing’ (Reiner, 2000:222).
\textsuperscript{133} For example, another officer from the OSPT would regularly engage in ‘banter’ with me about my appearance/accent and would also send me non-research related texts or invites to various social events.
\textsuperscript{134} ‘Crimefighters: The Vice’.
\textsuperscript{135} Further evidence for this openness can be found in the numerous interviews the OSPT have done with the local media (especially the Nottingham Evening Post) and the national media. This culminated in two Times journalists being given full access to the Nottingham Change Programme in February 2007, a review of which was subsequently published nationally two weeks later (Rumbelow and Miles, 2007).
The Change Programme: further methodological considerations

Despite the widespread criticisms of KCRPs (Campbell and Storr, 2001; Brooks-Gordon, 2006; Sanders, 2009; Chapter 8 in this thesis), on balance, none of these UK studies have been carried out independently and directly with the rehabilitation programmes’ target audience – the punters themselves.

Putting aside issues of access, research design and other technical considerations for one moment, it is worth reiterating the research questions that this phase of the fieldwork was predicated on. Firstly, I wanted to establish whether or not the claim held up that the Change Programme was effective at preventing prostitution recidivism. More specifically, was there any evidence that this programme was any more effective than non-rehabilitative measures such as traditional criminal sanctions, or indeed ‘soft’ social policies such as educational poster programmes? At its heart, this question requires an understanding of why and how men pay for sex and who these men are. Assuming that the programme has some positive impact on re-offending rates, I was keen also to establish who the Change Programme was effective for, why it was effective, in what circumstances and how demand relates to supply. Ultimately the way in which these core research questions were operationalised determines the legitimacy of the research methods used.

Whilst the original intention was to interview Change Programme punters after their engagement with the Change Programme, this proved to be an unrealistic strategy due to the requirement of the OSPT writing to these men to release their personal details. Instead of contacting punters post hoc, the research strategy evolved so that my involvement began at the point of delivery via the delivery of a carefully designed quantitative research instrument. Importantly accessing these men through the Change Programme gave me ample scope to devise strategies for subsequent follow-up interviews.

A note on ‘direct observational’ research

Having negotiated access, it was agreed for me to directly observe two KCRP sessions, providing I did not take notes or interact with punters. Adler and Adler (1994:378 in Cohen et al., 2007:397) point out that such ‘direct observational methods’ (as differentiated from ‘participant observation’; Wardhaugh, 2000:320) are informed by the principles of: (i) ‘not seeking to manipulate the situation or subjects […]’, nor; (ii) deliberately creating ‘new provocations’.

136 In May 2008 the Home Office instigated their ‘walk in a punter, walk out a rapist’ campaign (see Home Office, 2008). An independent evaluation of this campaign has yet to take place.
137 Although Martin drafted a letter inviting punters to share their details with a ‘researcher from Nottingham Trent University’ (Appendix F), this sampling strategy was never actualised on the basis that it would almost certainly result in a low response rate.
138 The Change Programme invitation letter was duly amended to factor in the earlier start and end times (Appendix B) needed to undertake the research. However, punters were not specifically informed about the research project in advance of their attendance.
view from Change facilitators was that eroding the un-naturalistic setting of the Change Programme was difficult enough and anything other than an unobtrusive presence from myself had the potential to create an additional layer of disruptive ‘provocations’, therefore potentially undermining the mechanisms in place to tackle the ‘artificial’ environment of the Change Programme. However, as Reiner (2000:224) rightly points out, in such circumstances there is a reliance on memory, which necessitates ‘frequent visits to the toilet to jot down very brief reminders for subsequent report writing’. Even then, given the sheer volume of outputs, I’m certain that key interactions were missed.

Despite these limitations, on balance, the insights gleaned from these sessions unquestionably outweighed the frustrations and limitations of undertaking non-participatory direct observation. ‘Direct observation’ has a long lineage in the social sciences, particularly in relation to ‘(re)education research’, and is seen to offer the social scientist a number of distinct opportunities for ‘knowledge creation’. Bernard (2006:413), for example, contends that: ‘interviewing is a great way to learn about attitudes and values, [but] when you want to know what people actually do […] there is no substitute for watching them’.

In itself, allowing observations of the sessions in this way reflected the confidence that all stakeholders had in the efficacy of the programme. Furthermore, seeing first hand the way in which punters interacted and responding with the Programme curriculum, significantly challenged my own preconceptions about what it means to be a ‘street-punter’. It also significantly challenged my prejudice about the ‘hyper-masculinity’ (Francis and Skelton, 2005) that I had presumed took place when a group of men sit around talking about sex. I certainly had not expected some men to be moved to tears by re-living the emotional impact of their ‘punting’ activities. In the words of Rawlinson (2000:354), ‘being there’ helped me to understand the inherent preconceptions and prejudices that I brought with me. Moreover, these unique perspectives on the inner workings of the programme were far more valuable than any externally derived evaluation of the existing literature and arguably seeing the programme ‘first hand’ in this way enabled me to fully contextualise subsequent qualitative and quantitative findings.

Questionnaire design

Particularly amongst feminist researchers, there is a degree of resistance to the ‘quantitative research process’ (Jayaratne, 1999:110). Whilst I would argue that this research fulfils the criteria of transparency and methodological rigour, I would concur that even ‘the most sophisticated quantitative research report cannot impart the same ‘in-depth’ understanding’ (ibid: 117) as qualitative data. I would also reject the claim that quantitative research somehow represents ‘objectivity’ or indeed a ‘universal truth’. Because of this, I continue to be committed to triangulation, qualitative data and to viewing methodology on a continuum. Other criticisms

139 The minutiae of the Change Programme curriculum are discussed in more detail in Chapter 8.
are no less valid, particularly in relation to the methodological fault-lines inherent to a ‘one group before-after’ design (Hagan, 2006).

Questionnaires were given to respondents immediately before and after the Change Programme with the intention of measuring changes in attitude, motivation and knowledge. At first glance this approach seems a long way from ‘realistic evaluation’ (Pawson and Tilley, 1997). As Tilley (2000:98) notes, ‘interventions to change behaviour generally work in less direct ways’ and understanding the ways in which behaviour changes, requires the researcher not only to find out what ‘outcomes’ are produced from the intervention, but also to describe the ‘mechanism’ by which the intervention produces the outcome and the ‘context’ for the ‘mechanism’ to be triggered. A fundamental question for Tilley (2000) therefore is ‘what works for whom and in what circumstances’? Measuring attitudinal and behavioural change by way of a ‘before-after’ design might arguably be said to ‘steamroll over variation in context, mechanism and outcome’ (Tilley, 2000:100). This is symptomatic of the criticisms that ‘realistic evaluation’ levels at all quasi-experimental design. Even on the subject of ‘traditional’ research designs, my research evidently does not fulfil the criteria of an experimental design in so much that I did not have the luxury of direct access to a suitable control group (that is, a sample of punters not exposed to treatment). As Wortley and Fischer (2002:26) point out, the absence of a control group means that ‘no conclusions can be drawn with regards to the relevant comparative effectiveness of the [KCRP] versus conventional court proceedings’. In other words, in order to evaluate the Change Programme in a ‘properly controlled manner’, the attitudes, behaviours and recidivism rates of a sample of Change attendees would have to be compared with offender cases dealt with in court. Unfortunately, as Wortley and Fischer (ibid) go on to point out, even a ‘retrospective’ design could not produce such an analysis since the vast majority of those eligible for the Change Programme (those with no previous convictions) have been diverted to the Change Programme. Consequently, ‘the small number of individuals in the control group (that is, offenders processed through traditional court proceedings) would preclude any reliable data analysis’ (ibid). And looking for a control group in another city would have been counter to Pawson and Tilley’s (1997) compelling arguments that locating such a ‘matched’ control group is not in reality possible outside of a laboratory setting.

Thinking more philosophically - as an advocate of Popperian verisimilitude - it is also difficult to reconcile the claim that the hypothetico-deductive approach (usually associated with quantitative research designs) ‘unduly restricts subsequent empirical work to verificatory processes’ (Bottoms, 2000:43). It is unlikely that even the best designed questionnaires operating in this crude ‘before-after’ environment can ever be completely sensitive to ‘mechanism’ and ‘context’ considerations or for data to be exposed to the processes of ‘falsification’.

Nevertheless, whilst recognising these limitations, it is equally important to acknowledge that the delivery of quantitative research be seen in its holistic milieu. To reiterate a point, my intention was never to be constricted by either a quantitative or qualitative approach. Layder’s
(1998) synthesis of hypothetico-deductive theory and grounded theory (or what Layder terms ‘adaptive theory’) holds considerable appeal - not least because this approach rejects a reified distinction between qualitative and quantitative approaches in favour of ‘creatively cojoining’ both disciplines (Bottoms, 2000:48). Nor should it be assumed that this aspect of the demand-led research design is simply concerned with measuring comparative outcomes. The triangulated design is such that I believe that there is considerable scope to ascertain not only if the Change Programme works, but to suggest why it might work and for whom and in what circumstances - so that I am not left with an ‘unconfirmed set of speculations’ (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) – and so that this research might make useful recommendations for future research, policy and practice.

Translating this theoretical discussion into practice at the quantitative stage of analysis meant measuring the outcomes of attitudinal and motivational change and ‘before-after’ improvements in knowledge about prostitution and working girls (street-level in particular). It was also necessary to design the questionnaire(s) so that it was possible to identify (or at least, suggest) the mechanism in the Change Programme that actualised any cognitive changes. The context underpinning these mechanisms related to the Programme curriculum and who the punters on the Change Programme are at a particular date and point in time. Or, turning this latter point on its head, to ascertain which men were excluded from the programme and how these exclusions might be relevant to the findings. By including socio-demographic variables and a ‘prevalence of prostitution usage’ indicator, it was hoped that this stage of the research would be suggestive of ‘who the Change Programme could be effective for and in what circumstances’. In essence, the suggestive nature of the pre- and post-programme questionnaires paved the way for triangulated (or ‘adaptive’), qualitative inductive research to follow (see ‘qualitative’ section below).

In summary, positing the survey design in the appropriate conceptual framework, helped considerably in sharpening the focus on what should and could be included in the final version of the questionnaire.

The influence of ‘John school’ research

In answering the research objective – ‘what is the effect of the Change Programme on individual punters’? – ideas were drawn from a range of sources, including the burgeoning research literature base and non-participant observations of the Change Programme. I was particularly influenced by North American ‘John School’ evaluations (Wortley and Fischer, 2002; Kennedy et al, 2004; Abt, 2008), primarily because: i) these evaluations have tended to follow the same ‘before-after’ structure that I intended to implement and; ii) there are certain similarities with the programme content both sides of the Atlantic.

In April 2006, contact was made with a Massachusetts-based consultancy, Abt Associates (Abt), who were part-way through an evaluation of the San Francisco ‘First Offender Prostitution
Program’ (FOPP)) on behalf of the National Institute of Justice (NIJ). Further to electronic communications with the Senior Associate\textsuperscript{140} leading this evaluation followed, agreement was reached for me to replicate those FOPP questionnaire variables that I felt to be aligned with the aims and objectives of my own research\textsuperscript{141}. This was very much in line with Abt’s ethos that their research should share ‘benchmarks for other research programmes to utilise’ (Abt, 2006:1).

Pulling all these data sources together culminated in the formulation of a ‘Before Session’ survey (Appendix G) and ‘After Session’ survey (Appendix H), first used at the October 2006 Change Programme. As mentioned previously there were a number of ‘outcome’ variables (or ‘dependent’ variables (DV)) that I wanted to measure pre- and post- intervention, including punters knowledge of prostitution (for example, Q.13 Appendix G), attitudes towards prostitution (for example, Q.25 Appendix G) and motivational/behavioural change (for example, Q.27 Appendix G). The independent (or ‘predictor’) variables (IV) that the questionnaires factored in to help contextualise these outcome variables, included socio-demographic characteristics (see Questions 1-7 Appendix G), the prevalence of street-prostitution usage and the reasons for paying for sex in the first place (all Appendix G). Despite the presence of ‘IV’s’ and ‘DV’s’, I would contend that these questionnaires were just as much about the exploratory generation of theories and concepts as they were about a strategy of hypothesis testing. As Davis, (1964:232 in Bryman, 2005:444) points out, ‘there are so […] many ways in which the findings can be organised […] that a thousand different studies could come out of the same data’.

Whilst there is not the space to discuss the rationale for inclusion and design of each and every research question, it would be remiss of me not to mention the controversy of including Likert items (May, 2001) as a psychometric response in this questionnaire design. Even advocates of quantitative data, point out that when using three and five point scales, social scientists should be aware that Likert items can fall foul of ‘central tendency bias’ (the reticence for respondents to use extreme response categories such as ‘strongly (dis)agree’; Yu et al, 2003), a ‘social desirability bias’ (where respondents try to portray themselves more favourably; Shulruf et al, 2008) or ‘acquiescence bias’ (simply agreeing with statements as presented; Toner, 1987). Designing a scale with an equal number of positive and negative statements (see Q.11 Appendix H) was used to design out the problem of acquiescence biases, whilst it was hoped that the assured anonymity of taking part in the research would negate the problem of ‘social desirability bias’ to be an undue problem. ‘Central tendency’ bias, however, was not so easy to design out and therefore I have to accept that this remains problematic and is therefore an obvious limitation to the findings.

\textsuperscript{140} Dr. Michael Shively. Given the lack of interview (or sensitive) data, Abt and it’s employee’s have not been anonymised.
\textsuperscript{141} Which in turn operationalised much of Sawyer et al’s (1998) ‘Attitudes Toward Prostitution Scale’ (ATPS).
Data limitations: statistical significance

It is widely recognised that KCRP evaluations are rare. Where they do exist, there has been a tendency to apply a number of statistical techniques (usually t-tests) to measure levels of significance (Kennedy et al., 2004; Wortley and Fischer, 2002; Abt, 2008). This research rejects the use of such statistical measures on the basis that: i) the sample was not randomly generated and; ii) unlike some of the North American studies, the population is not sufficiently large to warrant such statistical interrogation (particularly when re-analysing the data by the independent variables). Instead, where statistical techniques have been applied in this thesis they are limited to simple percentage change values. Of course, the lack of t-tests or any other relevant tests of significance is an inherent limitation of the research. Certainly the findings are exposed to accumulating Type I errors across the analyses; the absence of statistically validated data means that any pre-post test differences observed may be the result of chance. Critics would no doubt argue that the findings from the survey data are likely to suffer from an error of ‘excessive credulity’ (Sarantakos, 2004).

On the basis that the findings outlined in Chapter 9 are evidently not statistically significant, I have to accept these limitations. Nevertheless, there is enough methodological transparency in the research design to support internal consistency and reliability and my belief is that the research is as well designed as any other KCRP evaluation; one should not forget that even statistically valid punter research using broadly similar measurement scales has thrown up inconsistent findings across different research studies. Furthermore, this quantitative data has been re-analysed in the context of follow-up in-depth face-to-face interviewing, something that is often missing in North American evaluations. As Weitzer (2005) points out, if the research is not well designed and executed in the first place, then these statistical values are questionable anyway. Despite these limitations, by executing a well-designed research approach, I believe that the findings of this research still contribute to our knowledge base, irrespective of whether or not they conform to statistical tests of significance. They certainly provide the foundation for future statistically significant research in the UK to evolve.

Ethics revisited

Demonstrating methodological consistency, punters were afforded the same ethical standards as working girls, which meant devising an informed consent strategy consistent with that drafted for working girls (Appendix I). To maximise response rate, it would have been easy to ‘sell’ the research as an integral and compulsory part of the Change Programme. However, not only would this contravene the ethical codes I signed up to, but this dishonesty would undoubtedly have been counter-productive to the quality of output generated; having to complete a piece of research out of obligation is prone to provoking the problem of ‘social desirability’ bias as described above. For the research to have any value, respondents needed to ‘buy-in’ to the fundamental ethos, aims and objectives of the research and to make explicit my independence from the police and the course facilitators (for details of the opening script, see Appendix J).
Unlike the working girl fieldwork, the practicalities of the research design and execution meant that punters on the Change Programme were not offered financial incentives to take part in the quantitative research.\footnote{142}

**Actively ‘researching’: reflections on the Change Programme**

Like punters, initially I had no idea what to expect from the Change Programme. What transpired was a mixture of intrigue, methodological challenge and a great deal of ‘learning on the job’. Initial exchanges with punters were undoubtedly awkward; the uniqueness of the situation manifested itself in my identity being neither an ‘insider’ nor an ‘outsider’. What was imperative, however, was that I attempted to distance myself from the OSPT and Programme facilitators. In addition to using my opening introductory gambit to emphasise my independence, my autonomy from the police was consolidated by ensuring that I never sat in on the Change Programme as an observer once the research fieldwork had begun.\footnote{143} Furthermore, when carrying out the research, no police or Programme facilitators were ever present. Judging by the apparent ease in which respondents would provide honest verbal and written commentary on the Change Programme post-session (see Chapter 9), it may be that this approach had some value.

**Administering the questionnaire: practical considerations**

In order to facilitate socio-demographic analysis, respondents got the same numbered questionnaire pre- and post-programme.\footnote{144} Further to explaining the IC protocols, a number of respondents expressed scepticism about the motives for asking for names and signatures on the IC form. In fact, all IC forms were collected separately from the completed questionnaires, with completed questionnaires sealed and placed randomly into an unmarked box elsewhere in the room. Once this process had been clarified together with assurances that my interest was only in aggregated data this fear tended to dissipate. This whole scenario perhaps most perceptibly demonstrates the high degree of scepticism towards the research felt by many respondents pre-session and the difficulty in administering IC forms in a group environment; this was in direct comparison to the openness displayed as the day progressed.

It should also be noted that the questionnaire design presented in Appendices G and H is not the version first delivered at the Change Programme (September 2006). Regrettably, the original questionnaires – administered for September 2006 only – did not engage men as

\footnote{142} Financial incentives in the form of a £20 store voucher were, however, offered in follow-up qualitative research (see below).

\footnote{143} What I would get, however, were informal commentaries from the course facilitators during breaks – ‘such and such is misbehaving’ and so on.

\footnote{144} Although I never got to know any names, with a maximum of 12 attendees per session it was fairly easy to visualise who sat where. Only twice did I have to ask men to move seats; whether or not these men got their post-session seat allocation wrong by accident or on purpose is not entirely clear.
anticipated, primarily on the basis that the pre-session survey was simply too long. Even worse, only two men completed the post-session survey. The problem here was indisputably one of process compounding questionnaire design flaws; upon completing the programme, all men were formally cautioned by the OSPT and asked to sign an ‘Acceptable Behaviour Contract’ regarding their future conduct. Once these documents had been signed, these men were effectively free to leave, which is exactly what happened. After a long day (8.30am-5.15pm) it was unrealistic to expect these men to stay for a further 20-25 minutes of their own volition, regardless of much they had ‘bought-into’ the concepts of the research. Owing to the fundamental flaws of this first session, these disjointed results were not included in the final data analysis. Instead the experiences from these (now) ‘pilot’ surveys were used to re-design the questionnaire content. Moreover, Martin kindly agreed for the cautioning process to take place after the post-session survey.

Response rates

Re-designing the questionnaires undoubtedly helped with response rates. Of the 120 men passing through the programme between October 2006-January 2008, 87 per cent (104) men completed both before and after session surveys. For comparative purposes, only data from those men completing both questionnaires have been included for data analysis (although in line with the IC agreement, some questions were not completed). Six men completed the ‘before session’ survey only (or parts of), two of whom contested the police allegation against them on the day itself and were therefore not eligible to complete the Change Programme (for a critique ‘due process’ see Chapter 9). A further nine men refused to give consent to take part in the research.

Change Programme attendee’s: observations

The vast majority of men appeared rather ordinary; an observation matched elsewhere in the literature (Brooks-Gordon, 2006:247). Pre-session, some men appeared to accept the punishment for what it was, whilst others would attempt to get me to be complicit in their alleged innocence. Prior to engaging in the programme, the atmosphere was generally characterised by compliance and a lack of interactivity; fortunately this rarely manifested itself in a reticence to engage with the research. Post-programme, attendees were relaxed, chatty and keen (perhaps too keen given the need for confidentiality) to tell me their experiences from the programme. Rightly or wrongly, I took respondents willingness to share this information with me as confirmation that I had been accepted as a trusted outsider. Since many of these men had no intention of telling friends or family about their attendance, I believe that my presence also gave punters an opportunity to divest themselves of certain residual feelings and emotions.

145 Amazingly one attendee insisted on completing the after session survey, even though he was advised that the data would not be included in any final outputs due to the fact that he had not done the ‘before session’ survey.
Given the brevity and superficial nature of these interactions, I did not get the same sense of engagement and emotional empathy as I had done when interviewing working girls. But equally this should not to taken as a sign that these men don’t suffer from a range of emotions associated with their ‘punting’ activities, just that a quantitative research design does not readily allow for these reflections to surface.

**Theoretical triangulation/’adaptive’ theory**

Complimenting the survey data, medium to long-term recidivism data for Change and non-Change punters were provided by the OSPT in the form of written outputs from the police PNC database concerning who had been re-arrested for a prostitution offence. I was also privy to the OSPT’s annual internal punter report (Appendix R) and a number of other confidential internal documents, which the OSPT gave me permission to disclose in the thesis write-up (subject to pre-agreed confidentiality/anonymity protocols). Naturally, it would be unwise to accept these corroboratory police documents uncritically; criticisms about the validity of police data and official statistics are not unique to this project (Coleman and Moynihan, 2002). As such, report data should be used cautiously and only when fully contextualised and triangulated with other data sources. Nevertheless, I should qualify this statement, by pointing stating that at no point in the research period were there any signs of dishonest or inappropriate police practice or systematic errors or substantiated data manipulations.

Of course OSPT data provides an official version of who has (or has not) desisted from ‘paying for sex’, but it does not tell us why. More importantly, even if we suspect that the Change Programme has been effective at manipulating behaviours and attitudes, in the absence of longitudinal data, all that the Change Programme evaluation can claim is, at best, a short-term impact. It may also be that by focusing on the immediate, the long-term unintended consequences are overlooked; hence the reason for Pawson and Tilley (1997) stressing the need for a Context-Mechanism-Outcome Configuration. To help further understand measured outcomes from the Change Programme ‘at a deeper level’ (Hoffman, 2007 in Sanders, 2008:31), a policy of ‘theoretical triangulation’ (Hoyle, 2000:397) was pursued. Essentially this meant undertaking in-depth follow-up interviews with punters who had passed through the Change Programme. Because access could not be negotiated retrospectively, the Change Programme was used as the population frame from which a sample was generated. The reality was that the vast majority of Change Programme punters (92 per cent) decided not to volunteer to a follow-up qualitative interview. This non-participatory percentage would arguably have been even higher had I not changed the follow-up methodology towards the end of the research period. Initially, my intention was to undertake six-monthly follow-up interviews (Appendix S) on the basis that this would give attendees the time to reflect on the Change Programme and their ‘punting’ behaviour. I was also keen to establish whether or not any changes in knowledge
about prostitution had been maintained at a ‘deep’ rather than ‘surface’ level of learning (Kolb, 1984).

In total, twelve men (over eleven sessions) volunteered to six-month follow-up interviews, equating to just over one per session, which I deemed to be a reasonable return rate in the circumstances. Unfortunately, converting this provisional intent into ‘data’ proved more problematic, with only four of these twelve men turning up for interview. Of the remaining eight, two contacted me to withdraw before the six months was up, three simply did not respond to emails/telephone calls, with the remainder stating that - in the words of one punter - they had changed their minds and wanted ‘to put the issue to bed and move on’. Because of this limited interest, the six-month follow-ups were dropped in the October 2007-January 2008 Change sessions, in favour of a more time-sensitive follow-up strategy (Appendix K). This resulted in a further six men volunteering and completing these qualitative elements of the research. Although demonstrating methodological compromise, out of necessity I had been forced to forfeit long-term data with a need to maximise data sources. In total then, ten men were interviewed in-depth after completing the Change Programme.

Weitzer’s (2005) criticism that working girl research often engages only with the most desperate has been dealt with elsewhere in this chapter, but arguably the underlying question about motivation still holds true when looking to understand punter (non)involvement in follow-up interviews. Sanders (2008) devotes several pages to a discussion about why ‘people tell their confidential, deeply personal sexual stories to researchers’ (Plummer, 1995:13) and comes to the conclusion that her research respondents were either motivated by a desire to challenge negative punter and sex ‘industry’ stereotypes, or - for fewer men - an interest in legal reform and policy. Both reasons are equally applicable to my own research, but I would also add that there was a strong cultural aspect to volunteering. Although socio-demographic data was not collated during the qualitative research process, it was reasonably clear from observation alone that 50 per cent (n=5) of interviewees were of South Asian (Indian, Pakistani or Bangladeshi) origin, as compared to only 18 per cent of survey research respondents overall (n=18). Although this figure is not statistically significant (due to the small sample size) it would be surprising if this were simply a statistical anomaly.

Regardless of interviewee motivations for taking part in the research, in much the same way that I was sceptical about using ‘snowball’ sampling, I would concede that this group is biased ‘towards the more cooperative participants’ (Shaver, 2005:296). At a push the available dataset arguably allows me ‘to explain the patterns that exist’, but certainly not have reached anything like ‘theoretical saturation’ (Strauss and Corbin, 1998). The point here is that this unrepresentative group of ten men may, for example, only include those punters most in need of ‘catharsis’ (Coy et al, 2007:6) and may therefore exclude the attitudes, motivations and knowledge of those residing at the more ambivalent or violent ends of the spectrum.

146 See Chapter 9.
Interviewing punters: notes and observations

Sanders (2008:21) provides some astute commentary on the impact that the physical context can have on the interview process, generally favouring to interview punters in her own office on the basis that it bolstered a ‘formal context and provided a professional atmosphere which somewhat protected me from any potential ambiguities’. In terms of process for this research, all but one of the initial interviews was carried out in a private room inside the Boots Library on NTU’s City campus. Approaching the research from a broadly ‘pro-feminist’ agenda (Cowburn, 2005), I was reluctant to engage in ‘sexualised banter to cement a male bond’ (Cowburn, 2007: 283; see Hearn, 1998) simply to get good data. By choosing the setting of the University I hoped that I could partially mitigate some of these presumed negative gendered perspectives, but when/if they did arise, my strategy was one ‘not colluding with sexist attitudes’ (Cowburn, 2007: 283; see also Colton and Vanstone, 1996:5).

Choosing to carry out research in the environment of NTU had other advantages, not least the fact that it symbolised an extended commitment to the academic research project (or as Sanders, 2008: 22 puts it, ‘a belief in this topic as a serious academic subject that deserved inquiry’) and meant operating in a safe environment. Nevertheless, the location was clearly not neutral and did little to reduce the obvious power dynamics between researcher and interviewee. Unfamiliarity of the environment may have also exacerbated feelings of unease about participating, or even undermined a sense of anonymity and confidentiality and there is a chance that this may have influenced the extent to which respondents felt comfortable ‘opening up’.

Judging by the candid responses elicited from research respondents (Chapter 9), however, I would feel confident in asserting that these men trusted me enough to open up to both themselves and to me as an interviewer. Perhaps this is reflective of the sampling process and the fact that I was interviewing only ‘the most co-operative respondents’. This emotional openness and propensity to trust the researcher with ‘confidential, deeply personal sexual stories’ (Plummer, 1995:13) was most graphically illustrated through a professional rapport cultivated with one interviewee in particular (to whom I shall refer to as ‘Deepak’). Two days after being interviewed, Deepak made email contact with me, requesting we meet to talk through some ideas that had been provoked from our initial discussion, including the

---

147 The one notable exception to the aforementioned research locale, relates to an interview undertaken in a respondents home. This was agreed after close consultation with the OSPT.

148 Again, it is worth reemphasising that the principles of confidentiality and anonymity (and ethical considerations generally) remained constant for both working girl, punters and agency staff alike. In other words, all demand-side respondents were advised that data would be safely stored and but that their confidentiality could never be absolute in circumstances where a serious risk was discovered.

149 Part of me felt at odds with shifting the boundaries of the research. Subconsciously, I experienced a sense that it was unethical to engage with punters in this way; that I was somehow ‘normalising’ and vindicating their behaviour. It was only upon intellectualising these reactionary feelings that I realised such thoughts clearly conflicted with my determination to better understand punters behaviours and not to stigmatise ‘men as monsters’ or unduly moralise their prostitution activities.
possibility for him to be involved in ‘educating’ other men about the emotional and legal implications of paying for sex. As a Muslim of Asian heritage, Deepak was most interested in working with the local Asian community. At the time of writing, Deepak has been unable to convert this preliminary interest into something more concrete, a) because the opportunities for potential or actualised ‘punter (re)education’ simply don’t exist in the UK and; b) due to Deepak’s reticence to lose his anonymity. In many ways this example fits in with the ‘therapeutic’ element to interviewing that other demand-led sex researchers have talked about (Coy et al, 2007; Sanders, 2008); set against an increasingly punitive background, punters have very few official ‘therapeutic’ outlets and once again more research is required in this area.

As can be seen from Appendix L, the interview schedule was lengthy, but was intended to be an aide memoir, rather than a prescriptive set of questions to be asked at all costs. The schedule was derived from a disparate range of sources, including the research literature and my experiences as a researcher on the Change Programme and was aligned with the aims and objectives of the research project.

Data analysis

‘Supply-side’ data analysis

Unlike quantitative methods, qualitative research does not typically lend itself to analysis through standardized statistical techniques. As has been discussed elsewhere, my own approach to research reflects the view that an understanding of the world can be achieved through an interpretive paradigm in which this understanding is ‘socially constructed through language’ (Sarantakos, 2004:344) achieved through interpreting experiences.

Having more than thirty-four hours of working girl transcriptions, it was vital that a systematic approach be taken to the analytical process in order to make sense of what at first appeared to be a series of unconnected conversations. Analysis took place during and after the interview process and the approach that I found most useful involved manually coding the transcribed data against the aims and objectives of this aspect of the research study, as well as cross-referencing with the literature review and the demand-led research elements. Although high-quality IT-based packages do exist to assist with the coding of qualitative data (for example, NVivo 8 by QSR International), I personally prefer manually coding qualitative data. Accordingly, based on the core research questions of understanding how and why policy interventions might facilitate – or hinder - exiting strategies (and understanding ‘entry’ as a prerequisite to ‘exiting’) and how demand is interconnected with supply (Chapter 5), I ended up manually producing eleven broad categories: (a) drugs, victimisation and childhood maltreatment; (b) explaining the relationship between risk factors; (c) a multi-agency approach; (d) role of abusive partners and punters; (e) on-street versus off-street: explaining motivational variations; (f) regulars: facilitating
a continued involvement; (g) social and psychological barriers to exiting; (h) assessing risk in the transactional process; (i) tackling demand, tackling supply: challenging the ‘delusion of permanency’; (j) supply-side displacement and; (k) regulatory model suggestions. Each of these categories was colour coded and any supporting/contradictory transcript quotations were assigned one of these colour codes where applicable (any quotes not readily falling into any of these core categories, were coded according to a generic ‘other’ category in the final analysis and re-coded). As the coding of the data progressed, commonalities began to emerge from which it became possible to begin to formulate thematic datasets. I was conscious throughout the analytic process of how the interview data i) corresponded to, or conflicted with, the key supply-side research questions; ii) interconnected to the key demand-side research questions and; iii) produced new or emergent themes outside of the original scope of the main research aims and its objectives. A repetition of this process led to ‘typologies and eventually theory’ (Benini, 2000), corresponding closely with the main aim and it’s objectives articulated at the beginning of the project.

**Demand side and agency staff data categorisation**

The data analysis process in respect of punter and agency staff interviews broadly replicates the process of transcription, coding and thematic dataset production as articulated above. Accordingly for demand-led respondents the relevant categories that emerged from the triangulated data were: (a) socio-demographic profiles and discussion; (b) prostitution usage; (c) exploring the relationship between ‘attitude’ and ‘behaviour’; (d) anticipated future behaviour; (e) the spectre of displacement; (f) understanding intended behavioural changes; (g) understanding motivations; (h) perceptions of prostitution and working girls; (i) barriers to desistance; (j) the Change programme and future deterrence; (k) the Change Programme and issues of due process; (l) improving knowledge and; (m) crime scripts: how men pay for sex. For formalized interviews with agency staff, the categorization generally cut across demand and supply, and the purpose here was to primarily reconcile how and why these organisations perceived policy interventions to work.

**Demand side quantitative data analysis: process**

Because quantitative data tends to be aggregated, it lends itself readily to statistical analyses (see also ‘limitations of statistical analysis’ section above). Using SPSS version 15, a SPSS file was constructed in which each response was assigned a numerical value, variable label and the appropriate level of measurement (nominal, interval or scale). Where possible – and for comparative purposes – socio-demographic variables were coded as per the latest UK Census data. All questionnaires (and therefore respondents) were allocated a matched number from 1-104 for both pre- and post-session questionnaires. Once input, the SPSS file was visually

---

150 Missing data were also assigned numerical values.
checked for obvious inputting errors and to compliment this manual verification procedure, frequencies were electronically generated for all variables and any inconsistencies noted and rectified\textsuperscript{151}.

As a non-randomly selected sample, it is important to reiterate that the datasets did not lend themselves to inferential statistics. Accordingly, the data analysis here can by its very nature only be suggestive rather than statistically significant. Primarily, the data were analysed via descriptive statistics and correlation tables for two or three variables. Although Likert items are not strictly classifiable as ‘scale’ variables, for the sake of suggestive expediency they were treated as such in order that pre- and post- test mean scores could be run and mean aggregate changes measured.

\textit{Data analysis of documentary analysis}

Because documentary evidence was included primarily for corroboratory purposes in the context of triangulation, analysis was restricted to a basic descriptive analysis rather than full ‘content analysis’ (Sarantakos, 2005): summarising data within the research context, identifying trends and descriptive presentations.

\textbf{Data Limitations: validity and reliability}

One of the key scrutinies that any piece of research has to stand up to relates to the validity and reliability of the chosen methods. Although this has been covered informally throughout this chapter, it is perhaps worth explicitly identifying how the research has attempted to fulfil these criteria.

\textit{Validity}

At its heart validity is simply a ‘measure for precision, accuracy and relevance’ (Sarantakos, 2004:83). Validity can be further broken down into ‘internal validity’ and ‘external validity’. The former refers to the way in which the research design impacts upon the outcomes from the research – in other words, whether there are any other factors that could explain the findings (Jupp \textit{et al}, 2000:12). External validity is concerned more with the way in which specifics can be generalised to other contexts and cases (\textit{ibid}). Especially in relation to the qualitative components of the research, much of this chapter has in fact reflected on the difficulties in fulfilling both internal and external validity, especially if we consider the need to understand the ‘contexts’ in which ‘mechanisms’ can be triggered.

\textsuperscript{151} For a full breakdown of the SPSS coded variables, please see Appendix M.
Throughout this chapter I have attempted to bring clarity to what was done, how it was done and my role in interpreting and analyzing the data. In doing so, I believe that the lucidity of the methods allows for other authors to replicate/challenge my research as they see fit. Moreover, I have also used multiple data sources and techniques for data gathering (‘triangulation’) as an internal validity check wherever possible. As O’Connell Davidson and Layder (1994:55) point out, ‘…we cannot claim that people’s ‘local knowledge’ is necessarily a faithful and valid description of social reality. We need a way of checking the validity of various and competing ‘facts’ and interpretations. Triangulation is a means of doing so’. That said, given some of the limitations of my data, I am also wary not to misrepresent triangulated ‘correlation’ for universal and uni-dimensional causality.

Reliability

Sarantakos (2004:432) describes reliability as ‘the capacity of an instrument to produce consistent results by measuring with objectivity, precision, stability and consistency’. Epistemologically, it would make sense that both qualitative and quantitative research traditions should strive to achieve a degree of consistency (whether internal or external) were the research to be repeated.

Whilst I have attempted to rigorously conform to these criteria, the question remains: what about those voices that were simply not heard? I have justified sampling punters and working girls via ‘gatekeepers’ on the basis of pragmatism and by way of it being less methodologically limited than the alternatives. But I also have to accept that this sampling frame is prone to criticisms of simply reproducing ‘more of the same’. And in the case of ‘stakeholder’ interviews was it realistic to expect complete transparency when the research may have potentially drawn attention to politically sensitive data and working practices that reflect badly on the organisation and/or a specific policy implementation? In terms of validity impacts, these critiques may very well mean that the findings are in part the result of other factors; in this case, a restricted, non-random sampling frame and political and/or personal instincts to hide or neglect policy shortfalls.

Equally important to the credibility of the findings, was the nature of the main research aim itself. In essence, the research sought to identify not only how and why policy interventions might be effective in reducing demand and supply, but if and how demand and supply are interrelated. Especially when considering that some respondents may have felt the need to reinterpret their stories with a spin of ‘social desirability’, was it realistic to expect complete transparency from research respondents when self-criticism/reflection was a fundamental component of the research process? As discussed previously, I have attempted to negate these potential pitfalls by concentrating heavily on the challenges associated with establishing rapport. Glesne and Peshkin (1992:87 in O’Connell Davidson and Layder, 1994:123) summarise perfectly how and
why establishing rapport is so essential when researching with often vulnerable respondents: ‘When you […] make yourself appealing to talk to, not least, you communicate to your respondents, ‘I see you as a human being with interests, experience, and needs beyond those I tap for my own purposes’.

To compliment the need for empathy and rapport, issues of confidentiality and anonymity, briefing all respondents fully on the aims and objectives of the research and discussing the forums in which the results would be disseminated were also essential tools in the battle to achieve validity. My feelings from listening back to transcribed data are that punters and working girls were generally frank and open (for obvious reasons, this is less easy to discern in relation to survey data). Equally, however, it would be wrong to assume that the artificiality of the research setting has no bearing on the willingness of respondents to engage in a completely honest dialogue, free from ulterior motives. No matter how much reassurance is given, the research environment may have caused some respondents to be reticent in fully engaging in self-critical reflection or indulging in psychological spin.¹⁵²

Finally, the research methods literature is quite clear that both the questions you ask and the way in which you ask them can have a significant bearing on the data obtained and ultimately the reliability of what can be concluded from this data (Noaks and Wincup, 2004). In an interview scenario, the qualitative interviewer is able to use interactive dialogue as a means of double-checking that the respondent understands the question and that the interviewer understands the reply as ‘the only way to be sure of acquiring reliable, meaningful responses’ (O’Connell and Layder, 1994:123). However, because the luxuries of ‘double checking’, prompting and probing do not exist in self-completion survey research, it was imperative that the survey design was cognisant of the most effective ways of asking questions quantitatively. This began with a clean design layout and clear instructions about how to respond to each question. Bryman (2005:152-8), May (2001:106-7) and Hagan (2006:155-159) note that there are a number of general rules that should be adhered to when designing survey questions. Researchers should avoid ambiguous, overly long, double-barrelled, general and leading questions. They should also take care to avoid using double negatives and an excessive use of jargon or prejudicial language. When using closed questions, there is a requirement to ensure that the answers provided are balanced (in other words, not biased towards negative or positive responses). To counter the implications of a disproportionate selection of items appearing early in the list of response options (Mayhew, 2000), the question ordering within the questionnaires were changed from Programme to Programme (see Q.27 Appendix G). Closely affiliated is the need to measure the level of ‘internal consistency’ (Hagan, 2006:174), whereby the researcher builds in ‘interlocking items’ as a crude means of measuring respondents propensity to give.

¹⁵² On the basis that I have criticised other researchers for their imposition of ‘false consciousness’ on working girls, I should state that I believe ‘spin’ to be very different from this concept. Denial is not the issue here; what is at stake is a protection of the moral self and I would argue that this is a manipulation of consciousness rather than ‘false’ consciousness.
different answers to the same question phrased differently throughout the survey. The researcher is obviously limited to how many of these checks s/he builds into the survey, but these ‘internal consistency’ measures were included where appropriate (for example, Q.24F/G in the pre-survey questionnaire). Of course, even with these measures in place it is very difficult to determine what effects the questionnaire design has on response; the lack of interaction in self-completion quantitative research is clearly one of the major limitations of this approach.

**Methodological conclusions**

I would agree with Weitzer (2005) that too many prostitution research studies lack clarity in what they have done and why they have done it. If nothing else, the anticipation is that this chapter will have demonstrated my commitment to methodological transparency and the alignment between research design and the core research questions. This is not to say that the methods underpinning this thesis are not without their limitations, but as O’Connell Davidson and Layder (1994:223) point out, ‘there are better and worse ways of doing research, and if it is undertaken critically, reflectively and competently, a more accurate picture of social reality will be produced’. I believe that the methodology outlined here is better more often than it is worse and is therefore well-placed to counter any claims that the research findings lacks reliability and validity. These research findings are the subject of discussion in the next three chapters.
Chapter 8 - Exploring National Legislation and Local ‘Policing’: the Impact of Ideological Paradigm Shifts

Much of the preceding discussion in Chapters 1-6 explored how our selective understanding of the antecedents to supply and demand have framed the debate on ‘who is the victim’ and ultimately what should be done about the ‘problem’ of prostitution. Subscribing to a reorientation of the victimisation paradigm, allied to a challenge of seeing prostitution through the lens of inevitability (Home Office, 2006:1), has created the space for policymakers to affect legislative change as a means of reducing the scale and scope of prostitution. Inevitably this ‘new’ legislative approach assumes a degree of causal linearity with regards to the relationship between demand and supply in commercial sex markets.

This chapter tracks these legislative and social policy changes, positing them in both a (inter)national and local implementation framework, whilst concurrently assessing the impact of such measures on tackling demand and supply and the relationship between them.

The current position: regulatory control of prostitution in England and Wales

Although the current approach to prostitution in England and Wales is broadly classified as ‘abolitionist’, the exchange of money for sex between adults is in itself not illegal. As Phoenix (1999:20) points out, ‘the only way that prostitution can be practiced without committing a criminal offence is as a one-to-one arrangement between two consenting adults in private’. Reconciling this apparent contradiction requires examining the criminalisation of a number of offences associated with prostitution since the publication of the Wolfenden Report (1957). Covered in various Acts - principally the: i) Sexual Offences Act, 2003; ii) Criminal Justice and Police Act, 2001; iii) Sexual Offences Act, 1985; iv) Street Offences Act, 1959 and; v) Sexual Offences Act, 1956 - some of the key offences (as of May 2009) related to street-prostitution include (Broadbridge, 2009):

- Causing or inciting prostitution for gain (s52, Sexual Offences Act 2003)
- Controlling prostitution for gain (s52, Sexual Offences Act 2003)
- Loitering and soliciting by a common prostitute in a street or public place for the purpose of prostitution (section 1, Street Offences Act 1959 as amended).

In addition to the idea that women involved in prostitution should be seen as victims of abuse (Brooks-Gordon, 2006), there has simultaneously been a shift in the state’s perception of and response to anyone paying for sex with a child (Home Office, 1998, in Brooks-Gordon, 2006). Under section 47 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003, anyone convicted of knowing or believing that the individual is under 18 can face life imprisonment if the child is aged under 13 and

153 In other words, this is not a strict liability offence in which the requirement for a mens rea (‘guilty mind’) is waivered (Armstrong and McAra, 2006).
penetration is involved, fourteen years’ imprisonment if the child is under 13 and the sexual services are non-penetrative (or where the child is aged 13-15) and seven years’ imprisonment when the child is aged 16-17 (Home Office, 2004:88).

Framed as inherently ‘wrong’, damaging to community cohesion, perpetuating more serious crime and representative of deviant sexual morals (Sawyer et al, 1998; Sanders, 2008), momentum has gathered since the 1980s in which the ‘problem’ of prostitution is constructed around a dichotomy between ‘dirty and dangerous men’ and ‘vulnerable female victims’ (Sanders, 2008:138). The first piece of legislation to include the offence of ‘kerb-crawling’ came with the Sexual Offences Act 1985. Section 1 of this Act introduced Level 3 fines\(^{154}\) for any person soliciting another person\(^{155}\) ‘for the purposes of prostitution (a) from a motor vehicle’ or ‘(b) in a street or public place while in the immediate vicinity’ persistently...or in such manner that is likely to cause annoyance to the person...or to other persons in the neighbourhood’. The Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001 s.71 has since turned the offence of ‘kerb-crawling’ into an arrestable offence, with the additional sanction of disqualification from driving introduced (from 1 January 2004) via the Power of the Criminal Courts (Sentencing) Act 2000. Section 2 of the Sexual Offences Act 1985\(^{156}\) concerns itself with the persistent soliciting of another person for the purposes of prostitution. This offence carries a Level 3 fine only and unlike Section 1 is not currently an arrestable offence.

**Regulatory change: supply-side realignment**

Clearly there has been a gradual shift in recent years regarding the way in which policymakers view working girls (see Chapter 2). No longer are working girls seen as ‘morally corrupting’ innocent men, but are now widely regarded as being vulnerable to coercion, abuse and oppression, particularly during teenage years. In much the same way that the UK does not seek to punish the *victims* of crime, it is now seen as inappropriate to deal with ‘abused and coerced’ working girls with punitive-only CJS strategies. Accordingly the regulation of prostitution (supply-side) has increasingly moved from ‘enforcement’ (punishment) to ‘multi-agency’ (regulatory) responses designed to exit women from the sex trade (Scoular and O’Neill, 2007:764). This has widely been touted as a positive development, with the regime seemingly less concerned about criminalisation than it is an appropriate welfare-based response (Matthews, 2005).

A visible manifestation of this policy shift began with the ‘Setting the Boundaries’ review of sexual offences (Home Office, 2000), the precursor of the Paying the Price (Home Office, 2004) consultation paper and the associated policy responses to this via the Co-ordinated Strategy (the ‘Strategy’; Home Office, 2006) and Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA) (Home Office, 2006b) publications. Intended to address the key objectives of children abused in prostitution and the inevitability and prevalence of street-prostitution, two of the five strands of the ‘Co-
ordinated Strategy’ (Home Office, 2006) included ‘prevention’ and ‘developing routes out’ (via the provision of support and advocacy services). For those advocating a reduction in (street-level) prostitution, Paying the Price’s suggestion of a welfarist approach designed to divert and rehabilitate women from ‘sex work’ was generally well received (Matthews, 2005).

Despite the recognition of victim-led ideological shifts in policy recommendation documents, the changes that occurred on the statute book pre-Paying the Price tended to be largely symbolic. For example, the wording of the 1959 Street Offences Act in the Sexual Offences Act 2003 was amended to make it gender neutral (Pitcher, 2006). Whilst demonstrating legislative equity, critics have contested that any positive outcomes derived from legal revisions have been negated by working girls being simultaneously ‘symbolised as perpetrators of criminal acts/immoral subjects as well as victims’ (Scoular and O’Neill, 2008:25).

To illustrate this point, imprisonment as a punishment for women convicted of persistent soliciting was abolished in the Criminal Justice Act 1982 (although Level 2 and 3 fines remained in relation to loitering or soliciting for the purposes of prostitution - see ‘Revolving Door’ publication, Urban Justice Center, 2003), a move supported by many prostitution support workers (Sagar, 2007).

Simultaneously, working girls have been subject to alternative civil injunctions - most notably Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs) and criminally-related ASBOs (CRASBOs). Although intended to be used as a ‘last resort’ there is some evidence that (CR)ASBOs are increasingly given to working girls as a ‘quick fix’ (Matthews, 2005 and 2008) to complaints from local communities (Hubbard, 1997; Hester and Westmarland, 2004; Kantola and Squires, 2004).

Besides the potential inappropriateness of imposing punitive sanctions on individuals who are regarded as being vulnerable ‘victims’, the use of (CR)ASBOs may be counter-productive. Banning working girls from certain streets has the potential to encourage spatial displacement, with obvious safety implications (Pitcher and Aris, 2003). Furthermore, the conditions of orders are often ‘unrealistic and curfew women from important places, such as drug clinics and their own communities, leading to breaches which then turn to criminal offences’ (Sanders, 2008:166) and in certain circumstances, imprisonment. In light of these safety issues, it is somewhat surprising that Suffolk Police deemed it appropriate to give ASBOs to working girls in the same area that five women had been murdered, a move widely condemned by residents and support groups alike (The Independent, 2007). Moreover, (CR)ASBOs have very little to do with tackling entry ‘root causes’ or encouraging women to voluntarily access specialist client-centred support services. Because the burden of proof of these civil injunctions is arguably less onerous than that required of the punitive sanctions pre-Criminal Justice Act 1982, critics argue that the use of (CR)ASBOs represents a more punitive and retrograde step in the battle to ‘control’ prostitution (Pitcher, 2006; Sanders, 2008; Brooks-Gordon, 2006), with concerns of the community trumping those of working girls (Hubbard, 2006:15).
Criminalising street-level working girls in this way seems at odds with the victim paradigm and the concurrent development of multi-agency responses and specialist support agencies (Scoular and O’Neill, 2007:765). Rather than engaging in unfettered support and rehabilitative strategies as articulated in Paying the Price (and beyond), the imposition of (CR)ASBOs for working girls is more akin to an ‘enforcement plus support’ model (Matthews, 2008:127).

Representing a broader ‘social control’ agenda (Garland, 2001), a failure to self-improve and adopt ‘positive lifestyle choices’ is morally frowned upon (Brooks-Gordon, 2006) and is thus liable to criminal intervention. Scoular and O’Neill (2007) posit this within New Labour’s attempt to engender citizens with ‘responsibilisation’, supported by the reconfiguration of the state as a ‘facilitator and educator towards good risk choices: through education, training, health campaigns and moral re-vitalisation’ (Kenshall, 2002:43 in Scoular and O’Neill, 2007: 772). Sadly, rather than reducing the stigmatisation of prostitution, for those women unwilling to adopt government-supported ‘normal lifestyles’, reframing working girls as ‘anti-social’ is likely to exacerbate stigma’s and other problems.

To further illustrate how punishment and welfare might be seen as ‘different sides of the same coin’ (Phoenix, 2002:81), policy recommendations have progressively been concerned with compulsory exiting strategies driven by criminal justice intervention services (Melrose, 2006). Following the Paying the Price consultation process, the Coordinated Prostitution Strategy (Home Office, 2006), not only dropped positively regarded proposals from the original consultation document – most obviously ‘toleration zones’ for street work similar to those operating in the Netherlands – but it also set the scene for ‘Compulsory Rehabilitation Orders’ (CRO’s) to be introduced (see below). Central to the ‘prevention and support for women to exit prostitution’ in the ‘Strategy’ was a four-staged approach to ‘exiting’ (Home Office, 2006:38) beginning with informal referrals to outreach services and continuing along a continuum to include ‘Drug Intervention Programmes’ attached to ‘pre-charge diversions’, drug testing and treatment following charge and finally, prosecution through the CJS. Justifying this approach, the Home Office (2006:39) state that women:

‘...who respond to informal referrals and seek help from support services to leave prostitution […] may avoid further criminalisation. However, for those individuals who [...] continue to be involved in street prostitution, the criminal justice system will respond with [...] interventions to reduce re-offending and to protect local communities’.

Recent supply-side developments

Having framed working girls’ ‘victimisation’ within the boundaries of ‘risk and responsibilisation’ (Scoular and O’Neill, 2007) and notions of ‘community cohesion’, the government set about enshrining these ‘Strategy' recommendations in law. Originally included in the Criminal Justice and Immigration Bill 2007, provisions were made to: i) abandon the pejorative and discriminatory term ‘common prostitute’ in any legislation relating to ‘sex work’ (UKNSWP, 2009), together with; ii) the less popular proposal to replace Level 2 and 3 fines for ‘loitering and
soliciting’ with CRO’s. Although these recommendations were subsequently dropped from the *CJ and Immigration Act 2008* for political reasons (Travis, 2008), they were taken up again in the *Policing and Crime (P&C) Bill 2008*.\(^{157}\)

In conjunction to the removal of ‘common prostitute’, subsection 2 of the *P&C Bill 2008* also recommends re-defining ‘persistently’ (in other words, an offence is committed only if the working girl acts persistently), from ‘two or more occasions in one day’ to conduct that takes place on two or more occasions in any three-month period. Whilst the UKNSWP (2009:14) perceive this to be ‘mildly progressive’ in so much that it potentially decelerates the damaging process of criminalisation this amendment has been criticised by other commentators as intrinsically prone to ‘net widening’ (Scoular and O’Neill, 2008:18).

Clause 16 of the *P&C Bill 2008*, seeks to introduce a new penalty for loitering/soliciting for the purpose of prostitution, ‘allowing the court to make an order instead of imposing a fine’. In effect, the purpose of this order is to impose compulsory attendance at three meetings with a named and suitably qualified supervisor within six months of the date the order is made. The aim is to address ‘the causes of their involvement in prostitution and to find ways of ending that involvement’. Although the punishment of 72 hours detention for those failing to attend a session with a ‘supervisor’ has been dropped from the latest Bill, it is unclear what replacement sanctions will be used for those breaching their ‘supervised’ order. Arguably such an ‘order could lead to an escalation of punishment’ (UKNSWP, 2009:16), with (CR)ASBOs, Acceptable Behaviour Contracts (ABCs) or even custodial sentences being deployed.

It is also argued that the emphasis on ‘compulsion’ undermines the complex process of ‘exiting’. Prioritising the need to ‘end involvement’ also ignores client centred support requirements (UKNSWP, 2009; ECP, 2009). Therefore, more evidence is required regarding how such schemes should be funded and how they dovetail into comprehensive ‘exiting’ frameworks, including voluntary specialist support services operating outside of the CJS.

### Tackling working girl victimisation

Whilst CRO’s appear to ignore the notion of ‘victimisation’, the recent growth of multi-agency responses and specialist support agencies have been widely welcomed (Matthews, 2005:1). Allied with a recognition that the Government needs to ‘work with all relevant bodies […] to develop comprehensive guidance on enforcement and best-practice partnership work’ (recommendation 6, Home Office, 2008), the past 15 years or so has seen: i) a shift from police to policing, whereby the police are increasingly becoming more involved with service-providers (Aris and Pitcher, 2004); ii) multi-agency support; iii) programmes offering routes out of ‘prostitution’; and iv) ultimately a commitment to ‘regulationism’ (Hubbard, 2006:23).

---

\(^{157}\) Which at the time of writing is awaiting its second reading in the House of Lords.
Nevertheless it has been argued these consultations represent a missed opportunity. Brooks-Gordon (2006) argues that *Paying the Price* ignored much of the empirical research evidence-base and was based on a flawed legal theory that had ‘prohibition’ at its heart. Likewise, recent policy proposals (including in the *Coordinated Strategy* and *P&C Bill 2008*), routinely failed to account for different legislative models operating around the world or misread the success of ‘alternative’ abolitionist models, most notably the ‘Swedish model’ (see also Chapter 4). Brooks-Gordon (2006:50-54) is especially critical of the misalignment between a public concern for ‘victimised’ working girls and the failure to fully intellectually engage in the potential health and safety benefits of alternative regulatory systems.

Publicly there has been a noticeable rhetoric of being seen to reduce the ineffective burden of criminalisation, whilst simultaneously recognising the importance of safety. This has infrequently been matched in practice. Most obviously, as a counterpoint to suppressing street work, the ‘Strategy’ included a ‘sweetener’ (Day, 2008:58) of re-defining a brothel so that two ‘prostitutes’ could work together (Home Office, 2006:61). Mysteriously this ‘necessary harm-reduction measure’ (Weaver, 2006) was dropped from the RIA circulation to Ministers and has failed to reappear on the most recent *P&C Bill 2008*.

**Regulatory change: demand-side realignment**

The corollary to seeing working girls as victims (even if the ‘new punitiveness’ does not always correspond with this status) is that the shift of blame has increasingly fallen on those that continue to pay for sex. Over the past two decades the Government have attempted to ‘reposition the client’ (Sanders, 2008) as the ‘problem’ in order ‘to send a clear message to force men to think twice about paying for sex’ (Home Office, 2008). Conceivably the logic of this position assumes that the potential to disrupt the demand-supply nexus is reliant on ‘tackling demand’.

In line with the working girl ‘responsibilisation’ agenda (Scoular and O’Neill, 2007), social inclusion is offered to punters who desist from paying for sex and resume ‘normal’ sexual functioning. For those that don’t take the opportunity to stop their ‘deviant’ behaviour, then social exclusion and a stigmatised representation in law as ‘anti-social’, ‘abusive’ and ‘dangerous’ (Scoular and O’Neill, 2007:765) becomes pertinent. Although moral objections persist, antipathy from modern-day British authority appears focused on the need to tackle the ‘public nuisance’ associated with prostitution (Wolfenden, 1957); or as Phoenix (1999) describes it, the ‘negative regulationist’ discourse.

---

158 Despite the UK’s ‘glowing report’ of the Swedish experience, the Government have since acknowledged that the application of the Swedish model in the UK would be a ‘step too far’ at this time given the different sizes of the sex industries in the two countries (Home Office, 2008:13).
Reframing the punter: legislative implications

Although kerb-crawling only became an arrestable offence in 2001, since 1985 kerb-crawlers have been sporadically subject to verbal warnings, warning letters, summons to court and attendance at various ‘rehabilitation’ programmes (Hubbard, 2006; Sanders, 2008; Kinnell, 2006; Campbell and Storr, 2001). Having set the scene for demand-side regulation, the language used in the Paying the Price consultation paper was largely sympathetic to abolitionism (Munro and Della Giusta, 2008), especially ‘the re-education of prostitute users through kerb crawler schemes’ (Home Office, 2004:40).

Admittedly Paying the Price declined to officially align with any one regulatory model, but by 2004 the ‘Sweden model’ had been in operation for over five years, allowing politicians and policymakers to build on previous tentative demand-focused interventions. Importantly, for the British who have a less well-established feminist tradition than the Swedes (Gould, 2001), the Swedish model meant that there was no longer a need to only frame the demand-reduction argument around issues of legislative equity and violence against women. Having tangible evidence that reducing demand: a) facilitated exiting for working girls; b) cut crime; and c) made for more content Swedish communities, gave UK policymakers added impetus to pursue a ‘demand-abolition’ agenda here.

In spite of these political opportunities, both Paying the Price and the ‘Strategy’ were criticised for their lack of a ‘systematic review of the literature on clients’ (Brooks-Gordon, 2006:47), poor methodological transparency and a mismatch between the published responses in the two documents (Soothill and Sanders, 2004; Brooks-Gordon, 2006). Perhaps most significantly – and in light of the antecedents discussed in Chapter 6 – both Paying the Price and the ‘Strategy’ fail to engage in the ‘broader context of sexual behaviour in late modernity’ (Sanders, 2008: 142).

In terms of objectives, however, the ‘Strategy’ achieves significantly more coherence, contending that eliminating street-prostitution necessitates tackling kerb crawling at the heart of enforcement strategies (Home Office, 2006:33). With this in mind - and in the wider context of ‘administrative criminology’ (Cornish and Clarke, 2003; Felson, 2002) being favoured politically - came the view that demand could somehow be ‘designed out’ as a social problem. Whereas working girls with their complex and chaotic lives were seen to morally and pragmatically require a multi-agency ‘enforcement plus support’ approach (Phoenix and Pearce, 2008), punters - as representative of ‘ordinary men’ - were likely to be wholly responsive to arrest and a shift in the balance of risk to deter future demand (Brewer et al, 2006; Cameron and Collins, 2003). The ‘Strategy’ document seeks to justify this approach on the basis that ‘there is a great deal more free choice involved on the demand, rather than the supply side of

---

159 The term ‘administrative criminology’ has potential pejorative implications and as such will be referred to as ‘mainstream criminology’ throughout the rest of the thesis.
the street sex market’ (Home Office, 2006:35). Understanding demand was clearly not on the agenda. Condemning certainly was.

Although denied the same degree of multi-agency support as working girls, the ‘Strategy’ nevertheless suggests that kerb-crawling ‘offenders’ benefit from a ‘staggered’ approach (Home Office, 2006:34-35), ranging from ‘media messages’ (including warning signs in the locality), ‘environmental messages’ (such as road management interventions, improved lighting and foliage clearance in ‘red light’ areas), followed by informal warning letters to men spotted in red light areas. If still unsuccessful, then punters have one final ‘rehabilitative’ pre-prosecution option of attending a KCRP, providing of course that: i) such an option exists in that locality and; ii) that arrestees can meet a number of legibility pre-conditions. Anybody choosing to ignore these phased opportunities, however, will subsequently be liable for prosecution including financial penalties, disqualification from driving, ‘naming and shaming’ and even ASBOs and Acceptable Behaviour Contracts (ABC’s).

Besides the obvious paucity of evidence-based data used to justify these policy conclusions, in a climate where ‘opportunity reductions’ take precedence, such an approach would seem to ignore the need to understand and address the heterogeneous ‘root causes’ underpinning demand as outlined in Chapter 6.

**Recent demand-side developments**

Although appearing to partially distance itself from developments in Scandinavia (Home Office, 2006:7), recent proposals\(^{160}\) suggest that the Government’s planned approach towards demand is more obviously aligned with the Swedish model than these official policy documents portray, culminating in the ‘Tackling the Demand for Prostitution’ Home Office publication (the ‘demand review’). This coincided with a number of demand-led legislative proposals in the *Policing and Crime (P&C) Bill 2008*. Coming on the back of a concerted deterrence campaign in the media, the ‘demand review’ (Home Office, 2008) sought to reinforce - through legislation - the message to potential punters that ‘kerb crawling costs more than you think’ (Home Office, 2007) and the unacceptability of paying for sex in any circumstance.

Inevitably, aspects of the *P&C Bill* were driven by an augmented ‘trafficking anxiety’ (Sanders and Campbell, 2008:172) and the abolitionist overtones for tackling indoor prostitution are increasingly indistinguishable from interventions directed at its outdoor ‘cousin’ (Day, 2008). For example, in an attempt to protect ‘prostitute’ victims, Clause 13 of the *P&C Bill* inserts a new section 53a in the *Sexual Offences Act 2003*, creating a strict liability\(^{161}\) offence of ‘paying for sexual services of a prostitute subjected to force, deception or threats’, punishable by a Level 3

\(^{160}\) Together with public support of the Swedish model from a number of prominent Labour MPs For example, at the end of 2007 the Commons Leader, Harriet Harman publicly declared that she wanted to see the UK outlawing the payment of sex (BBC, 2007).

\(^{161}\) In other words, the requirement for a *mens rea* (‘guilty mind’) is waivered (Armstrong and McAra, 2006).
fine. Originally, Clause 13 talked of introducing a strict liability offence for paying a ‘prostitute who is controlled for gain by a third person’, but was amended following concerns from the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) that there would be considerable difficulty in getting enough evidence ‘to merit a suitable number of prosecutions to act as a deterrent’ (BBC, 2009). Others questioned why such a Clause was necessary when the infrequently used s.52 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003 already covers ‘controlling prostitution for gain’ (Brooks-Gordon, 2006), raising concerns that this Clause is merely a symbolical demonstration of how the Government was ‘getting tough’ on punters.

Despite concerns that the amended clause for ‘strict liability’ remains illogical and inconsistent (UKNSWP, 2009), organisations including the ‘Poppy Project’, point to the experiences of Finland as evidence for why ‘strict liability’ has to stay. Unlike British proposals, Finland decided not to make their Clause 13-type offence one of ‘strict liability’, leading senior Finnish police officers complain that: ‘If we can’t prove that the client knew that the woman was trafficked or pimped, then it is not a crime. The law should be judged on whether it practically helps sex workers, and I don’t think it does’ (Fouché, 2009).

The removal of ‘persistency’

Other Clauses in the P&C Bill focus on the specific message that the demand for street-based ‘sex markets’ will not be tolerated (Home Office, 2008:19). Accordingly, Clause 18 of the P&C Bill proposes amending the offences of kerb-crawling and soliciting so that the need for persistency is removed, making kerb-crawling or soliciting punishable on the first occasion (up to a Level 3 fine). In the case of kerb-crawling, the requirement for the soliciting to be shown to cause nuisance or annoyance to others is also removed.

Media campaigns

Ignoring these potential repercussions, the ‘demand review’ also makes recommendations to re-run ‘a national anti-kerb crawling campaign’ (Home Office, 2008: 20). Likely to replicate a pilot scheme run for six weeks in May/June 2007 across seven pilot cities, future measures will no doubt once again include: i) ‘poster’ campaigns in public houses (and elsewhere) articulating individual biographies of men who ‘had it all’ (job, wife, kids) and then subsequently ‘lost it all’ by way of their ‘unacceptable’ kerb-crawling activities (Home Office, 2007; see figure 7.1); ii) publicity bearing beer mats, warning that the ‘cost’ of picking up a ‘prostitute’ is ‘Your driving

162 Although supportive of ‘strict liability’, the Poppy Project are opposed to the recent modifications to the Clause on the basis that it ‘doesn’t cover the exploitation of vulnerability which commonly occurs in cases of grooming of women and girls into prostitution’ (BBC, 2009b). Working girl support groups, on the other hand, whilst dismissive of ‘strict liability’ welcome the re-wording because the original term was so wide-reaching that it had the potential to ‘criminalise women working independently and collectively, forcing women to work on their own, thus making them more vulnerable to attack’ (Broadbridge, 2009:19). Clearly the revisions and amendments to Clause 13 have resulted in draft legislation that is unpalatable to parties on both sides of the ideological divide.
licence. Your job. Your marriage. A £1,000 fine; iii) using the broadcast media, to ‘educate’
current or potential punters of the consequences of being caught kerb-crawling. In addition, it is
likely that these measures will coincide with localised ‘naming and shaming’ of punters in
regional newspapers (in the original pilot cities the examples of Middlesbrough (Home Office,
2008:19); Leeds (Dewsbury Reporter, 2007); Bristol (Bristol Evening Post, 2008) are testament
to this approach).

**Figure 7.1: Home Office (2007) anti-kerb crawler campaign poster**

In many ways this nationally piloted campaign can be seen as a subtle reincarnation and
extension of local poster campaigns that had run locally prior to 2007, a particularly caustic
element of which took place in Wolverhampton in February 2006 (see figure 7.2 overleaf). To
compliment this campaign, leaflets were distributed throughout the city and to registered
keepers of offending vehicles (see figure 7.3 overleaf), thus re-iterating the communities’
objections to kerb crawling (Sanders, 2008).

However, given the lack of evaluation of these local and nationally piloted campaigns, it seems
somewhat peculiar that the Government should be pushing for a ‘re-run’. As Sutton et al (2007)
point out, using media-driven awareness campaigns to facilitate changes in harmful beliefs,
motivations and behaviours is notoriously difficult and policymakers should be aware that such
campaigns can do more harm than good if not designed and evaluated ‘realistically’.
Regrettably no evidence is provided as to the context and mechanism by which such ‘anti kerb-
crawling’ messages may prove to be effective (Pawson and Tilley, 1997). In a climate where
evidence is rarely provided to justify the imposition of anti-punter media campaigns, we should
perhaps not be surprised that the chair of Wolverhampton’s ‘Prostitution Task Group was happy to declare that adverse publicity ‘will help build our city’s reputation for a tough and intolerant attitude towards kerb crawling – and contribute to the end of the street sex trade’ (Wolverhampton City Council, 2006).

**Figure 7.2:** *Wolverhampton anti-kerb crawling poster campaign (Wolverhampton City Council, 2006)*

‘Don't fool yourself. Kerb-crawling is a crime.

The victims are the people of Wolverhampton - every man, woman and child who lives in the city.

We've all got one thing in common. We hate kerb-crawling.

Like all crimes, kerb-crawling will be punished.

If you go kerb-crawling, you'll be caught. You'll spend a night behind bars. You could be fined and lose your driving licence. You might even get an ASBO.

And it's not just the law that'll hurt you.

Kerb-crawlers have lost their jobs, their status in the community – even their families. You could be one of them.

You could also go home with a little souvenir – like herpes, gonorrhoea, or syphilis.

You don't want those in your system. And if you're here to kerb-crawl, we don't want you in our city: Wolverhampton hates kerb-crawling. So get out and stay out!’
There is also concern that the use of such emotive language will stigmatise and ‘shame’ men in a way that fuels misogyny and men's attempt to re-assert their power over these ‘disgraced’ women (Kinnell, 2008; see also Chapter 6). Post-Ipswich this may be a dangerous development. Because of the potential to increase violence against working girls, the UKSWP (2009:11) suggest that any future marketing campaigns should instead be used as part of a wider educational outreach programme for punters that actively promotes the safety of women involved in prostitution (Sanders, 2008:158).

**ASBOs and punters**

Regarding the use of ASBOs to deter kerb-crawlers, there is evidence is that the use of ASBOs have, on the whole, been issued less rigorously for punters than they have for working girls (Gould, 2006; Keaveny, 2008). In large part this relates to the different ways punters and working girls use ‘red-light’ districts. This may of course all change, if the need to prove ‘persistence’ is removed from the legislature. However, as with the marketing campaign discussed above, implementing this form of criminalisation is noticeably devoid of contextually relevant evidence about how these reduction outcomes would be achieved, with the RIA even recognising that ‘there has been no formal review of their effectiveness’.

**Legislation at the national level: some observations for crime reduction**

Although the Home Office deny implementing the ‘Swedish model’, the plethora of national and localised policy initiatives (many of which are not covered here), clearly demonstrate that paying for street-sex is being progressively prohibited through the back door. Indirectly (for a breach of a kerb-crawling related ASBO) it is now theoretically possible to end up with a custodial sentence for kerb-crawling offences, something that was unfeasible even 10 years ago. If translated into law, the P&C Bill, will no doubt make these punitive sanctions more widespread.

At the same time that punters activities are becoming ever more criminalised, working girls have been subject to a ‘punishment plus support’ approach’ that arguably further criminalises – and fails - those women who unsuccessfully adopt ‘normal lifestyles’. The evidence-base for this approach: i) reducing the phenomenon long-term, without displacement and; ii) making prostitution safer for working girls, is patchy. There is even some tentative evidence to suggest that a recent 40 per cent rise in non-prostitution sex crimes in Sweden (Brå, 2009), is partially attributable to the prostitution law changes (Paterson, 2009).

In terms of crime reduction, what this demonstrates is the need to align legislation more carefully with an understanding of why men pay for sex, rather than implementing only situational crime prevention measures to ‘design it out’. Unfortunately, recent legislative changes are at best driven by poorly evidenced presuppositions, at worst, guilty of a systematic disregard for contradictory counter-evidence, particularly concerning the unintended
consequences of displacement. Remarkably the recent ‘demand review’ failed to cite or discuss evidence coming out of Edinburgh that the number of attacks on working girls had reportedly doubled since the implementation of the *Prostitution (Public Places) (Scotland) Act, 2007* (Fraser, 2008; McKewan, 2008).

If prostitution legislation continues to be implemented without evidence, then the outcomes of policy measures may prove to be both unpredictable and unpalatable. Unfortunately these demand and supply policy changes may simply serve to undermine the support programmes that have evolved in recent years at the local level. Using documentary evidence and interviews with OSPT, NCC and CDO personnel (see previous chapter), how these national legislative changes are assimilated locally in Nottingham is the subject of the final section of this chapter.

**Policing at the local level: the experiences of Nottingham**

**Background**

To complicate the contradictions inherent to British prostitution policy, there is also considerable scope for regional interpretations to regulate the behaviour of working girls and punters (Brooks-Gordon, 2006:28). With the ‘Policing Pledge’ (DirectGov, 2009) and a recent commitment towards ‘traditional’ community policing (Savage, 2007; Newburn, 2008b), crime reduction strategies have evolved to stimulate neighbourhoods to have a stronger voice in local public safety. Matthews (2005:878) argues that this return to ‘a more localised and community-based response’ helps explain the demise of the traditional ‘vice squad’ in England and Wales since the 1980s.

Unfortunately, the law in relation to street-level prostitution is somewhat fragmented and thus inconsistently enforced (Selje and Burke, 2001). According to Hubbard (2006:28) this variation serves to ‘create a series of difficulties for those working in the sex industry, who may find their activities tolerated in an area one week, yet be persistently arrested the next’ (Hubbard, 2006:28), leading Hubbard (ibid) to contend that ‘many sex workers fear and mistrust the police’. Given the demise of the local ‘vice squad’ (Matthews, 2005), it is understandable that there have been local variances in harnessing effective, long-term and mutually beneficial relationships between working girls and the police.

The demise of ‘traditional’ policing approaches to tackling street-level prostitution has, however, been replaced by a diverse strategy of policing that embraces a multitude of inter-agency forums, with a ‘wide range of agencies [taking] much of the responsibility for the regulation of prostitution’ (Matthews, 2005:879). The rhetoric behind the recent phenomenon of multi/inter-agency partnerships is premised on the assumption that ‘crime prevention and community safety lie beyond the competency of any one single agency’ (Crawford, 1998:170). Most importantly, the release of public funds for local crime prevention projects is increasingly reliant
on these partnerships being in place (Hughes, 1998; Gilling, 2005) and is a legal requirement - within Nottingham\(^{163}\) and elsewhere in England and Wales as a means to control street-level prostitution and other crimes. It is against this shift in policing, that Nottingham’s approach to policing (street-level) prostitution will be discussed.

**Nottingham’s multi-agency framework**

Although Nottingham is one of the few areas in England to retain a specialist team dedicated to controlling street-level prostitution (Matthews, 2005), in line with the trend towards ‘multi-agency’ policing, the OSPT actively work with a number of local agencies to promote a ‘holistic’ strategy towards tackling street-level prostitution (Hester and Westmarland, 2004). Accordingly three levels of multi-agency partnerships operate in Nottingham to deal with the problem of on-street prostitution.

The ‘prostitute support network’ (PSN) brings together a PC from the OSPT with other key/front line workers from each voluntary and statutory group\(^{164}\) to ‘case conference’ individual women and to tailor an ‘action plan’ for each individual based on what is it that is putting her on the streets, what will take her off the streets and an identification of who’s best to provide that support.

Above the PSN, the ‘manager’s group’ are primarily concerned with ensuring that data protection and policing protocols are properly adhered to and consists of the OSPT team leader and manager’s from the identified voluntary/statutory agencies. Above that, the prostitution ‘strategic group’ meets at chief inspector level and the chief officers from the various voluntary agencies and undertakes a more overarching and strategic overview.

Whilst not discussed in detail here, suffice to say that the challenge here is in reconciling the different agenda’s that each of the constituent agencies bring to the table. Putting to one side the latent - but ultimately managed - tensions inherent to any multi-agency policing strategy, it is notable that at no point do Nottingham’s tiers of support consider demand outside of the agreed parameters of implementing punitive action to ‘eliminate’ kerb crawling from the city.

**Explaining Nottingham’s focus on prostitution: the political context**

To appreciate the spatial/political nuances in which the street-level prostitution market in Nottingham operates, we need to appreciate several unique factors. Firstly, unlike many of the ‘red light’ areas in large British cities, evidence from the OSPT indicates that Nottingham’s on-street prostitution district encroaches on some of the more affluent areas of the city (see Figure

---

\(^{163}\) And also nationally through the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) – see Brain et al, 2004.

\(^{164}\) This includes the CDP, CJIT, Prostitute Outreach Workers (POW), Jericho Road, Nottingham City Council and the Nottingham Alcohol and Drug Team. Input is also garnered from various housing associations and other ‘social care’ organisations. It is unclear whether or not national working girl support agencies have been contacted for their input.
7.4 and Radford, 2007b). Whilst it is not my intention to provide a historical analysis of the evolution of the ‘red light area’ in Nottingham, it is worth pointing out that the building of Nottingham’s ‘Tram Network’ had the effect of displacing the locations from which working girls operated, exposing some of more affluent areas to street-level prostitution\textsuperscript{165}. Shifting the socio-economic profiles of residents affected by street-level prostitution, can have ‘public nuisance’ discourse implications (Kantola and Squires, 2004), especially considering that many of those responsible for delivering Nottingham’s prostitution policies live in some areas where street-level prostitution is now prevalent\textsuperscript{166}. Rather than relying on the usual feedback channels (Hubbard, 2006), it is likely that many decision makers have first-hand experience of the problems associated with street-level prostitution. It is not unfeasible to speculate that this exposure has given an added political impetus to devote additional/delineated resources to tackling the phenomenon.

\textbf{Figure 7.4: Nottingham’s ‘red light’ district (courtesy of OSPT)}

Since 2003 Nottingham has been committed to the ‘Respect for Nottingham’ (RFN) agenda (Nottingham City Council (NCC), 2009). Under the pretext of ‘tackling anti-social behaviour for a

\textsuperscript{165} This information was gathered through informal conversations with members of the City Council, Housing Associations and the OSPT.

\textsuperscript{166} Again this information was disclosed in informal conversations with City Council representatives and members of the OSPT. Interestingly there is now some evidence that street-prostitution has migrated back towards less affluent areas (see Appendix R). Whether this will result in long-term changes to policing is as yet unclear.
cleaner and safer Nottingham’ (*ibid*), the ‘Respect’ agenda has many strands, but its primary concern is to reframe ‘social problems’ – including street-level prostitution - as ‘anti-social behaviour’ that threatens the integrity of neighbourhoods (Scoular et al, 2007:11). Within this framework sits on-street prostitution.

Noticeably, the RFN’s approach to street-level prostitution clearly follows the ‘enforcement plus support’ ethos outlined earlier in this chapter (NCC, 2009). As defined in the RFN ‘mission statement’, the strategy in relation to working girls:

‘...implements support mechanisms to enable prostitutes to take steps forward and make a positive change to their lifestyle, leading to an exit from prostitution. We offer support to women to help them make these positive steps, but if they fail to take advantage of the support offered then they will be arrested’ (NCC, 2009: 9)

**Assessing OSPT targets: clarity and achievability**

Table 7.1, outlines the objectives and outcomes assigned by RFN to the OSPT in the years 2006-2008 (NCC, 2009: 11). Unfortunately, this table (and the associated commentary) tells us nothing about why these objectives were set, the rationale underpinning these measures, nor how these outcomes were subsequently measured.

**Table 7.1: 2006-2008 Respect for Nottingham: Objectives and Outcomes - Prostitution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Increasing number of high visibility patrols from 18 to 21 per month</td>
<td>Minimum of 37 individual patrols per month throughout 2007/8, exceeding the target by 76%</td>
<td>March 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Maintain media campaigns highlighting unacceptability of kerb crawling twice yearly</td>
<td>Media campaigns conducted in May, June, July, December and March 2007/8</td>
<td>March (and ongoing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. By engaging at least 60% of those arrested for Kerb Crawling in the ‘Change’ programme</td>
<td>66% or 118 individuals arrested for Kerb Crawling were successfully engaged with the Change course</td>
<td>March 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Consider publicity in all cases where a refusal to engage with the ‘Change’ Programme is followed by re-offending behaviour</td>
<td>Publicity was positively considered on three occasions throughout 2007/8 1 case was deemed inappropriate for publicity</td>
<td>March 2008  May 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To increase the number of ‘Change’ programmes from 6 to 10 per year</td>
<td>14 ‘Change’ programmes conducted throughout 2007/8 September’s course was run and designed for Polish speakers</td>
<td>November 2007  March 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To reduce the number of active street workers by 12%</td>
<td>Reduction of 32%</td>
<td>March 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To ensure that the application of an ASBO fits in with the ‘care plan’ and therefore reduce the number of arrests for breaches</td>
<td>All ASBO applications during 2007/8 have been made in line with a Care Plan</td>
<td>March 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To use a multi-agency ‘case conferencing’ approach to meet needs and enable women to exit prostitution</td>
<td>Prostitution Support Network has been formed, which met its target of helping 12 women exit the sex trade in 2007/8</td>
<td>March 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RFN and ‘demand’ objectives

Like the national media campaigns outlined earlier, RFN assert that the media is a useful tool for reducing demand (objective 2, Table 7.1). Yet Hester and Westmarland (2004:32) point out of a media campaign carried out in Nottingham in May 2001 that it ‘...was not possible to assess the impact of this initiative as no process was in place to monitor it’. Similar concerns are equally applicable to the objective of generating publicity for non-Change programme attendee’s (objective 4, Table 7.1). Moreover it is unclear what impact such measures have had for these three punters and their families. Such a measure may even be considered legally and morally dubious practice. Finally, there is a lack of clarity about where the seemingly arbitrary figure of 60 per cent of arrested ‘kerb crawlers’ attending the Change programme has been generated from (objective 3, Table 7.1). Does this represent the number of ‘offenders’ that will be eligible to attend? Why and how is the ‘Change’ programme deemed to be a ‘suitable’ intervention? Arguably, criticisms pertaining to what counts as evidence (and to what extent evidence is used) could be applied across the board nationally to other policy interventions (Hope, 2005; Young et al, 2002).

RFN and supply objectives

According to Table 7.1, the PSN has helped 12 women exit the ‘sex trade’. Yet, it is unclear how this compares with exiting data prior to the involvement of the PSN and why/how the PSN has managed to facilitate exiting. We also know that women move in and out of prostitution over extended periods (Pitcher, 2006), so this may simply be an organic response to the exiting process. Simultaneously, we learn that in the period 2006-2008 the number of active ‘street workers’ reduced by 32 per cent. Presumably ‘active’ involvement and ‘exiting’ require different measurement criteria, but the equivalence between ‘activity’ and ‘exiting’ lacks clarity. For example, what role does imprisonment, displacement, disease and death play in these ‘reduction’ figures? Regrettably this quantitative data tells us very little of the qualitative picture.

Again correlated with the ‘enforcement plus support’ approach towards working girls, the authorities claim to have successfully served ASBOs with attached ‘care plans’ as a means of reducing potential breaches. But the document fails to identify how successful these ‘care plans’ have been in reducing the number of breaches and there is no comparison with the previous imposition of ‘non-care plan’ ASBOs (see Hester and Westmarland, 2004). Moreover, why is there no discussion of ASBOs in relation to demand?

167 The OSPT (unpublished data) establish the concept of non-activity over a six month period; if neither the OSPT nor any of the various support agencies have seen a working girl during this time frame then she is considered to be inactive.
Policing on-street prostitution in Nottingham: March 2008 – March 2011

Surprisingly the three year plan for 2008-2011 retains the majority of these indistinct, often un-evidenced, objectives (see NCC, 2009: 12). In addition the RFN seeks to tackle on-street prostitution in Nottingham by:

- Pursuing those having breached civil orders through the courts;
- Referring all identified ‘prostitutes’ to a CDO for ‘assessment’;
- Redefining the geographical area within which the OSPT operates.

Understandably, these ‘new targets’ are to some extent aligned with planned changes at the national level. Hence, referring all ‘prostitutes’ to a CDO has obvious parallels with ‘supervised community orders’ mentioned in the P&C Bill. Once again, however, the lack of detail makes it difficult to interpret why these particular initiatives have been included and how their success will ultimately be measured.

**Beyond ‘traditional’ punishment? Rehabilitation, media propaganda and public shaming**

Evidently local objectives share with the ‘national policy model’ a paradigm shift in the perceptions of ‘victimhood’. Importantly, the underlying logic of this framework dictates that demand is seen to be a key driver of supply. Demonstrating clear equivalence with the ‘Co-ordinated Strategy’ (Home Office, 2006), the OSPT are committed to pursuing punitive measures against kerb-crawlers (ASBOs, driving disqualification, fines) - in a zero-tolerance framework (Dennis, 1998) - for those men that fail to take on board deterrent messages propagated in the (local) media and through Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) initiatives. Most men caught kerb-crawling in Nottingham will be offered one opportunity to rehabilitate themselves away from punting via the Change Programme, but those that fail to ‘reform’ post-‘Change’ will be dealt with punitively. Given their imposed ‘victim’ status, working girls are dealt with differently from punters, although still very much in line with a ‘support plus enforcement’ (Matthews, 2008) national approach. Accordingly, working girls have more opportunities to ‘reform’ and ‘exit’, before a more punitive approach is adopted. These local initiatives are the subject of the final discussion in this chapter.

**Tackling supply: referral and assessment process for ‘street prostitutes’**

Based on the known antecedents underpinning women’s involvement in street-level prostitution (see Chapter 5), and in interviews with the OSPT (including Radford, 2007b), Nottingham has opted to take a ‘holistic’ approach towards ‘tackling supply’ (Pitcher, 2006; Hester and Westmarland, 2004). This involves multi-agency operations ‘holistically’ examining many aspects of working girls lives, including drugs, housing, ‘lifestyle’, benefits, childcare, and
physical/sexual abuse, as well as encouraging working-girls to access a wide-range of user-focused support projects (Faugier and Cranfield, 1994). As the OSPT’s CDO pointed out during interview:

‘My role is purely involved with working with the women to help them exit, whereas everybody else [on the team] is concerned with the community side and also the kerb crawling side. […] Initially it’s just a question of meeting up with them to have an assessment and basically establish where they’re at now, with regards to their drug use, their prostitution, their housing, accommodation, lifestyle, because it’s very much based on a holistic approach. Rather than just going ok, lets stop you working as a prostitute and deal with your drug problem, it’s actually looking at every aspect of their lives’.

The majority of referrals come to the CDO via the OSPT, as well as local organisations such as Prostitute Outreach Workers (POW), Jericho Road, and John Storer (see Appendix O). Significantly this process model operates on the principle of voluntarism and a recognition that the needs of working girls fluctuate. Accordingly, the CDO assesses each woman’s circumstances and produces mutually agreed tailored, individualised, achievable and realistic ‘care plans’.

Against this background, achieving any successful assessment criteria implementation necessitates that key workers are aware of the need to co-ordinate multi-agency strategies. In particular, the CDO must ensure that working girls continue to engage with support agencies via the establishment of a sequencing process that makes sense for that individual (CDO interview, unpublished). For example, the temptation might be to begin working on women’s drug dependency straight away, as this is seen as the major barrier to ‘exiting’ (Williamson and Folaron, 2003). But without the stability of somewhere to live, the chances that being ‘scripted’ will have the desired outcomes is minimal. Furthermore, having a home is often a minimum requirement to access other services such as social security, education, drugs and GP services (UKNSWP, 2004). Without this core stability, the likelihood that working girls will engage with some of the more sophisticated outreach services (such as education) remains remote. To ensure continuous engagement, therefore the CDO works with the ‘client’ to ‘identify their lifestyle phase in order to target interventions’ (see also Williamson and Folaron, 2003).

Whilst this proactive, integrated approach is commendable, there are nevertheless a number of barriers and challenges to effective provision. For example, my own research in Nottingham (Hamilton (2005)) indicates that the politics of service provision has affected the degree of support integration achieved across the city (and county). There are also a number of other limitations over and above these procedural shortfalls. For example, looking at the process model flowchart (Appendix O), the co-ordinated provision of mental health services is notably absent, despite this being potentially one of the most important aspects of working girl

---

168 At the time of writing.
169 Being on a drugs programme to reduce consumption.
'rehabilitation' (Plummer et al, 1996). Furthermore in a tight budgetary climate, not only is the level of funding under scrutiny (and yet to be fully scoped in any of the official governmental publications), but in relation to: i) the changing national legislative environment and; ii) the competing priorities of the OSPT/City council and support agencies, is increasingly likely to result in changes to the conditions of provision. As Pitcher (2006:256) observes, ‘project delivery has to link in with the priorities or focus of funders, but this can present problems when national priorities and concerns change’.

No matter how well-intentioned the OSPT is in supporting working girls to exit street-level prostitution, they also have a duty of care to the local community, and a commitment to an ‘abolitionist’ ideology, arguably made easier by the continuation of the ‘Othering’ of working girls (O’Neill, 2007:47). This can create conflict with support agencies whose primary and predominant concern lies with working girls.

In circumstances where a woman’s drug taking and/or involvement in prostitution is pronounced, it is unlikely that she will voluntarily engage with support facilities. Based on the planned objectives and outputs from the RFN for 2008-11 (and the P&C Bill, 2008 proposals), this lack of voluntarism is likely to come increasingly under threat from compulsory engagement. Unfortunately, some women are simply not ready to engage with projects - or at least to work with them in the way that is expected - and as a result, non-compliance with CRO’s is likely to result in more, not less, punitive measures such as ASBOs being administered in the future. It is not inconceivable that ‘forced change’ rather than ‘voluntary engagement’ will drive women away from services rather than making them more accessible (Sanders, 2008b). Compounding this, the likelihood is that multi-agency work will be also disrupted by the cumulative effect of the control measures put in place to tackle demand and phase out Nottingham’s ‘red light’ district (Boynton and Cusick, 2006).

**Tackling demand: Nottingham’s anti-‘kerb crawler’ poster campaign**

In line with objective 2 of the RFN agenda (Table 7.1), policymakers in Nottingham have produced several ‘public message’ posters warning potential (or current) punters about the consequences of paying for sex (see Figure 7.5). Demonstrating parallels with the national commitment to poster campaigns (Home Office, 2008), one such poster was widely publicised170 around various locations throughout Nottingham in 2004.

---

170 This was printed in English and other ‘relevant’ languages such as Farsi.
Interestingly this poster talks of ‘guaranteed publicity’ for those caught ‘kerb-crawling’, despite Table 7.1 demonstrating that publicity is not always deemed an appropriate action. In fact, as acknowledged in interview, the OSPT are opposed to using ‘naming and shaming’ as a carte blanche policy on the basis that it affects whole families and not just the arrested punter. In light of this, the OSPT will only agree to adverse publicity campaigns following a rigorous ‘risk assessment’ process in which the potential familial fallout is fully determined. Because of this threat, negative publicity will only be considered in circumstances where there is a high degree of confidence that such a campaign will not cause any damage to innocent family members.

The poster also talks of the risk of imprisonment and ‘registration as a sex offender’. Again the tactics of such claims are highly questionable in the context of existing legislation. As with the Home Office campaign, the evidence-base for using posters to deliver anti-‘kerb crawler’ messages is never substantiated and as such the efficacy of this approach is highly debatable (Sutton et al., 2007). Honourable though the motivations behind such posters might be, moral certitude policymaking rarely, if ever, uses knowledge from psychology regarding what works in attitude change to tackle core psychological or social ‘root causes’ of particular criminal and deviant behaviours. The likelihood is that the posters are not primarily intended for punter ‘regulars’ (or ‘rationally calculating rapists’), but for ‘novices’ or the uninitiated. In other words, this poster campaign is more about uninformed, yet good intentions, aimed at prevention of
prospective punters and deterring recidivism amongst those who have only paid for sex a handful of times.

The poster campaign raises a number of other fundamental questions that are left unanswered, including: How did the RFN plan to evaluate the effectiveness of this poster? What was their baseline data? What can we learn from this campaign operating over such a short time? If core motives remain unchallenged, what might the implications be? Because of this, social scientists would be wise to retain a degree of scepticism about implementing un-evidenced pseudo-psychological initiatives of any kind. Yet in Nottingham and elsewhere they continue to do so regardless.

**Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED): The Nottingham experience**

Further proliferating this short-term media-based deterrent message, the OSPT and City Council - have erected permanent signs alerting potential (or existing) 'offenders' that their movements are being monitored and what the impact of this monitoring process has been (see figure 7.6). In many ways the logic of this approach is predicated on classic situational crime prevention (SCP) theory; two of Cornish and Clarke’s (2003) ‘25 techniques of crime prevention’ contend that crime can be ‘designed out’ by the ‘removal of excuses’ through: i) posting instructions and; ii) alerting the conscience’s of potential offenders. In many ways, this tackles head on the ‘techniques of neutralisation’ (Sykes and Matza, 1957), which considers how offenders' create rationalisations for their actions (Felson, 2002).

*Figure 7.6: Example of permanent anti-kerb crawler signage in Nottingham (courtesy of OSPT)*

Again it is unclear who these messages are aimed at. Moreover, running such publicity campaigns are, on their own, unlikely to have the desired demand reduction outcomes.
Consequently, the OSPT have sought to implement other measures working on the core SCP principles of offenders being rational actors who seek to gain quick pleasure and avoid imminent pain (Cornish and Clarke, 1986). There are also aspects of the Routine Activities Triangle (RAT) present here, whereby crime is seen to occur where there is a likely offender and suitable target which come together in time and place, without a capable guardian being present (Cohen and Felson, 1979). Therefore, included in this broad SCP canvas have been a number of discrete ‘Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)’ policies concerned with ‘increasing the risks’ to punters through the assistance of ‘natural surveillance’. Accordingly, environmental measures such as securing empty property (which can be used as ‘crack houses’ or informal brothels), trimming back overgrown foliage, improvements to lighting, clearing away needles and condoms have all been sporadically implemented by the OSPT since 2004.

In addition to making ‘punting’ risky and inexcusable, the OSPT have also implemented SCP-based measures to ‘increase the effort’ required to pay for sex. Because street-level working girls nearly always work on the junction of a through road, so that kerb crawlers can drive in one way and out the other (Hubbard, 2006), one technique of deflecting offenders away from the ‘red-light’ area is by intermittently closing off roads for through access (Felson, 2002: 132). To ‘make it difficult for kerb crawlers and cruisers to access street prostitutes’ (Renewal.net, 2008), in 2005/6 the OSPT ran two fortnightly Operations171 in which various junctions in the ‘red-light’ area were closed off172 to create a series of cul-de-sacs. Using pneumatic counters173 as a measure of ‘success’, the data that came back – together with anecdotal comments from the local community – indicated that the road closures had reduced the number of men ‘cruising’ that area. Although well received, the scheme lacked impetus (OSPT, unpublished) and the intervention has not been run since. Moreover, despite evidence that road closures affected ‘kerb-crawling’ patterns (Renewal.net, 2008; Matthews, 1993), the lack of a long-term implementation in Nottingham means that any potential displacement impact cannot be ruled out (Hubbard, 2006). Furthermore, due to issues of inconvenience, not all local residents are supportive of these interventions and implemented as a short-term measure there is a sense that road closures are perhaps best served to deliver short-term consequences.

**Punter rehabilitation: the Change Programme**

As discussed briefly in the previous chapter, the most high-profile manifestation of Nottingham’s commitment to ‘tackling demand’ is its implementation of a re-educative programme for men caught kerb crawling: the Change Programme174. Indirectly this programme might be seen to be

---

171 Operation Kerosene.
172 More specifically the junctions of Fowler Street/Gorsey Road were closed off from Woodborough Road and were chosen on the basis that they represented the best opportunity to prevent men ‘cruising’.
173 Consisting of one or two black rubber pipes laid across the road; every time a car crosses them, air is squeezed out and it is counted as one vehicle. These pneumatic counters were used for the duration of the fortnight Operation, as well as a week before and after the Operation (for comparative purposes).
174 For an overview of ‘Change Programme’ research methods, see Chapter 7.
addressing the final category of SCP techniques: making punting not just difficult, risky and inexcusable but also ‘unrewarding’ (Cornish and Clarke, 2003).

**Punter rehabilitation: theoretical considerations**

Over recent decades, doubts have begun to surface about the appropriateness of ‘traditional’ criminal justice institutions and policies in preventing recidivism (Vass, 1990), particularly in relation to ‘minor’ offences such as prostitution (Fischer et al, 2002) and ‘punting’. Concurrently there existed an ideological debate between those committed to the promotion of retributive, punitive, ‘tough on crime’ discourses and academic or local voices advocating ‘models of restorative justice’ and more conciliatory alternative measures’ (Fischer et al, 2002:386). When added to the reorientation of criminal justice towards the ‘victim’ as a means of challenging the prevailing paradigm of retributive punishment (Zedner, 2002), it is easy to see how the Change Programme, with its emphasis on restorative principles, came into focus as a means of dealing with street-level prostitution.

**The Change Programme: political considerations**

Approximately 601 men have passed through the Change Programme since its inception in Nottingham in 2002. Eligibility criteria dictates that prospective attendees admit to kerb-crawling (see Appendix B), have no previous convictions for sexual offences (or offences against women) and be prepared to pay a fee of £200. Until October 2007, it was also a requirement that anyone attending the Change Programme be able to speak English, but in response to an increasingly number of non-English speaking nationals being caught ‘punting’ and countering criticisms of a discriminate application of the re-educative model, the Change Programme has been run in Polish on several occasions since the end of 2007. Simultaneously the OSPT have run a number of non-English prostitution ‘awareness/poster campaigns’ to ‘remove excuses’ about different legislative models operating in the punters home nation (see above and; BBC, 2008b).

**Change Programme attendance: the process**

All men caught kerb crawling in Nottingham are arrested and taken to Nottingham’s Central police station where fingerprints, photographs and DNA are taken (OSPT, unpublished).

---

175 Up to May 2009. On average 9-13 punters attend the monthly ‘Change’ programme, equating to an average of approximately 103 punters per annum (see Chapter 9).
176 This fee level is set to cover administrative costs, as well as charitable community schemes operating within the area in which the offence took place (for an example of these charitable schemes see Woodford, 2005).
177 With the translation and presentation input of a postgraduate psychology researcher from Nottingham Trent University.
178 At the time of writing, there are also plans to run the course in Kurdish and Farsi, as this represents the most prevalent non-English speaking ethnic groups caught paying for on-street sex.
179 As with the poster campaigns in English, the efficacy of this intervention has not been measured.
180 For a discussion of the ethics of the National DNA database, see NDNAD Ethics Group, 2008.
Following this, each arrestee’s previous criminal history is examined in relation to domestic violence and sexual offences. The OSPT are generally less concerned with punter’s acquisitive crimes such as burglary and robbery on the assumption that these offences do not affect the impact of the Change Programme in the same way that sexual offences do (ibid). It is unclear what – if any – evidence base such assumptions are predicated on.

Those eligible men rejecting the ‘chance’ to attend the rehabilitation programme may be subject to CJS sanctions, including court attendance and, if found guilty, a fine, ASBO or driving disqualification. Any man with ‘previous’ forfeits the opportunity to attend the Change Programme and will be automatically processed through the usual mechanisms of the CJS. Post-arrest, men who agree to attend the Change Programme are sent a follow-up invitation letter to their home address (see Appendix B) outlining the terms of their attendance: i) agreeing to paying a fine; ii) agreeing to actively engage in the programme; iii) accept a caution for the offence and; iv) compliance with an Acceptable Behaviour Contract (ABC) regarding future behaviour (ibid).

**Change Programme delivery: background information**

The OSPT do not own or deliver the Change Programme. Instead the course is run as an independent enterprise and is operated by a senior probation officer (the lead facilitator) and a Chartered Forensic and Clinical Psychologist. Originally developed for Hampshire Constabulary in May 2000 (where the programme is still delivered), independent ownership of the Intellectual Property Rights has allowed the Change programme to be adopted in other police forces (Northamptonshire constabulary being one example). However, to ensure ‘programme integrity’ and minimise ‘programme drift’, all Change courses are run by experienced and fully trained staff adhering to the implementation of an accompanying manual (Shell et al, 2001:7; OSPT, unpublished)

The course itself is delivered as a one-off, full day programme from a training room in Nottingham’s Central Police Station. Held on a Saturday to minimise ‘disruption’ to attendees work and family obligations, delegates are expected to register by 8.30am and can expect to be present until approximately 4.30-5.00pm. Attendees are required to stay on police premises for the whole day. Cautions and ABC’s are given on completion of the rehabilitation session and anyone failing to complete the whole programme will usually be reprocessed through the court system.

---

181 Most of the detail about programme content and delivery was obtained from interviews with the OSPT and more importantly from my own observational research of two Change Programmes at the start of the research process (see Chapter 7).

182 At the front desk of Central Police station in North Church Street. Slightly different registration times were required during the research period to factor in the completion of the research instruments.
Change Programme: context and content

Heavily Influenced by the North American ‘John school’ model and the classic ‘Scared Straight’ programmes for young offenders (Finckenauer, 1982 in Wortley et al, 2002:373), the provision of KCRP courses in England can be traced back to a discontinued pilot project running in Leeds at the back end of the 1990’s (Campbell and Storr, 2001:95)

Whilst a number of content commonalities exist between the Change Programme and other re-educative schemes, there are also a number of departure points, rendering direct comparisons problematic. Primarily the Programme does not incorporate testaments from working girl victims or support agencies to ‘shame’ punters into behavioural change. The view from the OSPT (unpublished) is that the ‘John school’ model is more likely to engender a lack of self-respect amongst attendees. Compounding the possible negative recidivist consequences of such labelling (Becker, 1963), the local and national media feed into this stereotyping process through the production of headlines such as ‘kerb-crawlers are like alley rats’ (Curtis, 1999 in Campbell and Storr, 2001:98).

Another distinction is that monthly class sizes varies from 25 to 100 in ‘John schools’ (Wortley and Fischer, 2002; Abt Associates, 2008), whereas the Change Programme limits attendance to no more than 13 men. In months where significant numbers of punters have been arrested (especially when running ‘test purchase’ operations183), the view taken by the OSPT during interview is that it is better to run extra sessions than it is to compromise on the interactive atmosphere generated by this attendance policy (OSPT, unpublished). Comparisons with the San Francisco FOPP (Abt, 2008:35) ably demonstrate this different approach; ‘John school’ classes in San Francisco are held in an assembly suite where ‘a podium, an overhead projector, a television with media players and a slide projector are set up for each class’ (ibid). Most anomalously, the presentations in San Francisco are ‘almost exclusively of lecture format, and little interaction occurs between speaker and participants […] and most presenters stay behind the podium’ (ibid). In comparison, attendees on the Change Programme are taken to a training room where they are seated in a semi-circle arrangement directly opposite the (seated) facilitators. There is no podium, no microphone, no lectern, but there is lots of interaction.

To maximise the potential for attitudinal change, Change facilitators make attendees aware of their independence from the OSPT. Consequently, the OSPT play no role in delivering the programme and are largely anonymous throughout the day apart from registration, comfort breaks, lunch and post-session cautioning. This is in direct contrast to the Toronto ‘John school’ which is actually moderated by a police officer (Wortley and Fischer, 2002:17).

183 Prior to the involvement of the OSPT, these covert operations using decoy officers were known as Operation Ghana (targeting ‘kerb crawlers’), Operation Gower (women involved in prostitution) and Operation Gammon (targeting ‘cruisers’) (see Hester and Westmarland, 2004:33).
Whilst the delivery mechanisms may vary, what all KCRPs share is a concern with the harms, dangers and consequences of street-prostitution for: a) working girls; b) punters and their families; c) personal relationships and; d) the local community (Shell et al., 2001; Wortley and Fischer, 2002). In fact the Change Programme shares almost identical objectives to those identified by Sawyer et al (1998:115) with regards to the Minnesota ‘John school’. Namely:

- To get punters to acknowledge that it was their ‘choice’ to seek out working girls
- To provide accurate information about street-prostitution and to create the appropriate forum to be able to discuss their involvement
- An identification of the risks inherent to street-prostitution
- To recognise and talk about the emotional/relational consequences of punting

Critically these aims highlight the importance to distinguishing between ‘educating’ and ‘scaring-straight’ tactics, particularly in the context of attempting to engender ‘behavioural change’ (Lloyd, 1996). Like the discontinued West Yorkshire KCRP, it would appear that the Change Programme curriculum contains both ‘educative’ elements (for example, presenting statistical information on the scale and scope of street-level prostitution in the UK and the problems ‘sex work’ causes to working girls and communities), combined with ‘scaring-straight’ tactics (for example, stressing the negative consequences of continuing to pay for sex).

**Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (CBT)**

The Change Programme claims to be effective because it employs a ‘cognitive behavioural model’ of rehabilitation, not dissimilar to that found in prison-based ‘sex offender treatment programmes’ (SOTP’s) (Brown, 2005). Of course, direct comparisons between the Change Programme and SOTP’s are questionable on a number of levels. Recognising these limitations, programme facilitators argue that the programme can only ever use brief therapy techniques (Fisch et al, 1982) to signpost men to the use of ‘prostitutes’ as symptomatic of a dysfunctional attempt to resolve unrelated life problems (Schwartz and Masters, 1983), rather than simply being the result of a biologically-driven ‘desire for sex’. The assumption is that post-programme attendees will be emotionally engaged enough to continue employing the necessary cognitive behavioural actions post-course and where relevant, to seek further advice and support from external organisations to facilitate the implementation of these action plans (OSPT, unpublished; Shell et al., 2001).

Before the Change Programme begins in earnest, one of the first ‘icebreaker’ questions that all attendees are asked is whether or not they are in a relationship and was anyone aware of what they were doing that day. As Wortley and Fischer (2002:19) point out, this exercise ‘uncovers the fact that ‘family’, ‘spouses’ or ‘children’ are an integral part of many participants’ lives’.

---

\[184\] Data from the US suggests that cognitive behavioural treatments are promising interventions in reducing sexual recidivism (Bynum et al., 2001).
Significantly this part of the day also sets the boundaries for participation; anyone questioning the legitimacy of their arrest or offence is advised that if they are convinced of their innocence, then they should pursue this through the court system. During the research period, two attendees were asked to leave due to continuous objections to this core premise\textsuperscript{185}. Wortley and Fischer (2002:19) point out that this boundary-setting exercise is very important in terms of setting the tone of who are the ‘victims’ and who are the ‘offenders’. The implicit philosophy is that buying sex is ‘bad, harmful, risky to self and the social environment and thus must not be engaged in’ (ibid). Because of this, any attendees expressing pro-legalisation sentiments are strongly encouraged to retract these views.

In terms of detail, the Change Programme draws on the ‘Relapse Prevention’ (RP) model as its key cognitive driver (Laws, 1989). Widely critiqued in the research literature (Laws, 2003), the basic principle of RP is that sexual offences are the culmination of a chain of events. If ‘relapse’ (or ‘recidivism’) is to be avoided then offenders must first recognise and take accountability of these cumulative events (Nelson and Jackson, 1989:167). Only through an awareness of the antecedents to their punting behaviour, can offenders hope to plan and implement ‘adequate coping responses’ to ‘preclude the relapse process and sustain a position of abstinence’ (Nelson and Jackson, 1987:167).

By way of illustrating this ‘cycle of offending’, figure 7.7 (overleaf) represents a real example taken from a Change session. In much the same way that Holzman and Pines (1982) discuss a ‘psychological build up’ in the purchasing of sex (Chapter 6), Change attendees are encouraged to recognise that paying for sex is more than just a ‘spur of the moment’ decision. Through a process of interactive dialogue, any initial reticence to accept this premise is usually short-lived and the example below is fairly representative of the outputs produced by the majority of men during the research period observations. The key principles of RP are that the process of punting begins with ‘thinking/wanting’ (in this example, prompted by trouble at home and so on), moving on to a process of ‘legitimisation’ (‘it’s a victimless crime’), followed by tactics to ‘create the opportunity’ (for example, finding reasons to work late) and then finally to ‘maintain the cycle’ (including ‘getting away with it’, perpetuating the ‘victimless’ crime myth and expressions of enjoyment). Having recognised these chain of events, the intention is that attendees will be in a position to produce personalised ‘action plans’ for cognitive restructuring to take place (Brown, 2005:126). Incorporated into this process, the Change Programme seeks to confront any cognitive distortions about what it means to be a working girl ‘victim’, through group discussion, didactic input and role play (Perkins et al, 1998).

‘Street facts’

Morning sessions seek to challenge misconceptions about why working girls are ‘out there’ and what their lives are really like. Preceding more formal presentations, punters are asked first to

\textsuperscript{185} For a discussion of ‘due process’ and a full critique of the ‘Change’ programme see Chapter 9.
‘brain storm’ words that they associate with: i) ‘prostitutes’ and following that; ii) their closest female partner/relation. Using written outputs gathered from observations of the Feb 2007 Programme (Chapter 7) - and demonstrating parallels with the motivations outlined in the previous chapter – words that punters associated with ‘prostitutes’ included: no emotional commitment, drugs, robbery, to be with someone (guaranteed), convenience (sex), combat zone, a ‘buzz’, STD (‘risk’), illegal, loneliness, sex addict and dirty. Using the same written outputs from the February 2007 Programme, this stands in direct contrast to words associated with punters closest female partner/mother/sister/friend which included being: loving, dependable, caring, un-sexual, committed, manic and bossy.

**Figure 7.7: ‘Relapse prevention’ (example from Oct 2006 Change Programme)**
Producing this dichotomy early on is seen as essential to providing facilitators with an indication of the extent to which these men create a veil of ‘Otherness’ around working girls; as Høigård and Finstad (1992) argue, part of the process of puniting is to disassociate working girls from ‘ordinary’ women. In an attempt to shatter the ‘Pretty Woman’/‘happy hooker’ myth (Dalla, 2000), this part of the programme draws attention to the ‘facts’ of prostitution: that there are young children involved, the relationship with Class A drugs and violence, working girl mental and physical health issues, mortality rates, the scale and scope of the problem and what ‘street prostitutes want’ (see figures 7.8-7.14). Importantly these didactic aspects of educational sessions are delivered not by ex-working girls, but by Change facilitators themselves on the basis that the perceived neutrality of Change personnel is more likely to ‘get the message across’. Critics would no doubt argue that not including the voices of working girls in the programme design is in itself problematic (Harding and Hamilton, 2008), particularly if the label of ‘victim’ has been externally imposed.

**Figures 7.8-7.14:** ‘Educating’ the men: PowerPoint slides taken from Change Programme/OSPT presentation (courtesy of OSPT and Change facilitators)

**Figure 7.8:** Ages of street prostitutes

**Ages of Street Prostitutes**
- The average age for women to enter into prostitution is 12 1/2.
- One in eight prostitutes are under the age of 17.

**Figure 7.9:** What street prostitute’s want

**What do Street Prostitutes want**
- 88% want to leave prostitution.
- 78% want a home or safe place.
- 73% want education/training etc.
- 67% want drug or alcohol treatment.
- 58% want healthcare.

**Figure 7.10:** The life of a street prostitute

**The Life of a Street Prostitute**
- 97% have drug problems.
- 84% are homeless (or have been recently).
- 82% physically assaulted.
- 68% raped whilst working as a prostitute.
- 48% raped 5 or more times.

**Figure 7.11:** Street Prostitute’s health

**Health of Street Prostitutes**
- Between 6% and 19% of prostitutes are HIV positive.
- 5% are currently suicidal.
- 50% have physical health problems.
- 17% ought to be immediately admitted to hospital.
- Women in prostitution have a mortality rate 40 times higher than the national average.

186 Not original formatting.
Figure 7.12: street prostitute mortality

Street Mortality
- Since 2000, 13 street prostitutes have died in Nottingham
- The youngest was only 15 years old
- 5 were murdered
- 3 committed suicide
- 3 died from drug related issues
- 2 died from lifestyle related illnesses

Figure 7.13: hours worked

Hours Worked
- 15 year old girl, 11.00 – 07.00
- 14 year old girl, 12.00 – 03.00
- 10 hours a day
- 20 punters a day
- 7,000 punters per year
- £140k per year

Figure 7.14: Prostitution numbers

Prostitution Numbers
- Denmark – 5m people
- 6,000 prostitutes
- Britain – 60m population
- 80,000 prostitutes
- Sweden – 10m population
- 500 prostitutes

Despite directly observing this element of the Programme to be the most didactic of all sessions (see Chapter 7 for methodological reflections on my own ‘observational’ research), men are encouraged to actively engage in the process. Each man, for example, is asked to guess the average age of entry for women (girls) involved in prostitution. These guesses are then counterposed against the “facts” in an attempt to cognitively realign preconceptions and reality. A significant proportion of the morning session is spent highlighting the potential health implications (to punters) of paying for sex. Unprotected fellatio is singled out as being a particularly risky behaviour. Men are also ‘educated’ about the problem of many STDs being asymptomatic, with working girls singled out as being particularly prone to be carriers of disease. Because of this, men are strongly encouraged to undertake a check-up at recommended accredited sex clinic after completing the course.

Whilst the principle of providing these ‘hard facts’ has some educational value, the integrity of some of this data is highly questionable, a contention ignored by facilitators. For example, the majority of independent research studies do not support the finding that the average age of entry into UK prostitution is 12.5 (see Church et al, 2002). The OSPT themselves recognise that they have not seen a street prostitute under the age of 18 since March 2005 (OSPT, unpublished). The presentation also arguably hugely distorts data in a way that is intended to (implicitly) promote a certain ideological and regulatory message. Taking the slide concerned with national comparison prostitution numbers as evidence of this, Sweden implicitly appears more successful in protecting vulnerable working girl ‘victims’. Notwithstanding the difficulty of estimated hidden populations, the major flaw with this ‘fact’ is that the national data is not directly comparable. The figure of 80,000 ‘prostitutes’ in Britain relates to all prostitution
markets, whereas the figure for Sweden, corresponds to on-street prostitution only (The Local, 2008; SoS-Rapport, 2004). With regards to the health ‘facts’, there is also some evidence that working girls have lower rates of STDs than the general population (Pitcher, 2006; McKeeganey and Barnard, 1996; Ward et al, 2004). This is particularly pertinent if one considers the growth in asymptomatic STDs (such as Chlamydia) amongst the general population (Fenton, 2007). The danger of using un-evidenced and sometimes inaccurate statistical data in this way – over and above the obvious lack of rigour - is that it provides critics of the Change agenda the opportunity to question the legitimacy and integrity of the whole programme.

Whilst working girl ‘victim’ empathy is a strong theme throughout the day, it remains true that most of the focus of the programme is on the impact of paying for sex on men and their families (surprisingly less on the impact on the community). In addition to the health consequences outlined above, attention is drawn to the legislation concerned with paying for sex with minors (figure 7.15):

![Figure 7.15: ‘New’ street prostitution laws](image)

To compliment the ‘scare’ value of these legislative punishments, attendees are shown a number of media images of non-‘prostitute’ women/girls and asked to guess their ages. Generally most men mistake teenagers for older women. On the basis that men have already been advised that many working girls are under the age of 17, attendees are then reminded that being caught paying for sex with an underage ‘prostitute’ can lead to imprisonment (life in the case of under 13s). The accumulation of these messages is intended to ‘scare’ punters into accepting that paying for sex is an extremely risky endeavour (Petrosino et al, 2004).

**Exploring men’s motivations**

Having identified: i) the effect of prostitution on working girls; ii) numerous ‘street facts’ (Abt, 2008); iii) health education issues, and; iv) the law in relation to prostitution, the programme then moves on to explore men’s own motivations for travelling to the ‘red light’ area to pay for sex, primarily in the form of the ‘relapse model’ (see above). Building on this, facilitators attempt to raise men’s awareness of the impact of their behaviour on their wives/partners, mothers, sisters and/or children, through the imposition of a role-play exercise. During this exercise, all men are asked to adopt the role of the ‘most significant female’ to them; for those that are
married or in a long-term relationship this will be their wives/partners and for single men this may be a sister or their mother. To add realism, actual names are used throughout this exercise. Once the ground rules of non-abusive interaction have been identified, each man takes it in turn to answer questions from other members of the group and the lead facilitator about how ‘she’ feels about her husband/brother/son being caught paying for sex: How has it affected their relationship? What is the impact on the children? Does she think she can she stay with him? Why does she think he did it? How has his prostitution behaviour affected her life? Because most men tend to hide their prostitution behaviours from those closest to them (see Chapter 6), this exercise exists to give attendees the chance to engage in empathic interaction and to visualise the emotional (and potential health) consequences of their punting behaviour on others. For those able to fully immerse themselves in this intensive exercise, the emotional impact can be immense; on two occasions during the research period, the emotional breakdown of attendees was witnessed first hand during, or shortly after, the interactive role-play exercise.

Having created this emotional challenge, Change facilitators finish the day with techniques to facilitate positive outcomes as a means of filling the psychological void left by taking prostitution out of their lives. The logic of this final session is partly correlated with the notion of ‘risk’ (see Chapter 6). Accordingly, Change facilitators ask punters to think about ways that they can constructively factor in excitement into their lives. This may be through high-adrenalin sports or getting men to recognise the importance of being more emotionally open with those closest to them. Each man is asked to write down their ‘action plan’ and share it with the group in a supportive environment. Rather than leaving the Change Programme full of self-loathing, the hope is that attendees can ‘exit’ the programme without their self-esteem being unnecessarily damaged (Marshall and Eccles, 1998) and that - working in tandem with the RP techniques operationalised earlier in the day - most men will be able to resist paying for sex when placed in high risk situations or when exposed to considerable social pressure (Pithers et al, 1988). Of course such techniques are largely unproven in a one-day ‘rehabilitation’ context and without the appropriate long-term evidence for their efficacy (measured by more than the recidivism rate), then the rehabilitative impact of the Change Programme will remain speculative.

**Post-programme support**

Moreover, the lack of appropriate post-programme support (besides being provided with details for local STI clinics – see above) means there may be unintended consequences affiliated with this approach. This, of course, stands in direct contrast to the psychological support offered to men caught paying for sex in Sweden (see Chapter 6).

**Positing Nottingham’s approach in context of the national ‘Strategy’: conclusions**

At first, the social policy interventions discussed in this chapter may seem to represent a ‘new’ way of thinking about prostitution. Supporting the implementation of multi-agency partnerships, committed to a renewed ‘welfarism’ (Matthews, 2005), is clearly a positive move away from the
short-sighted approach of fining and imprisoning working girls (often for non-payment of fines) as the key policy tool used to control prostitution. Furthermore, in line with the recommendations emanating from the ‘Strategy’ it is clear that there has been a shift in emphasis from only seeing prostitution as a ‘problem’ of supply. Now, tackling demand is seen as integral to eliminating (street-level) prostitution.

However, no matter how it is re-packaged, the current British Government remains committed to abolitionism, zero tolerance policing, protecting communities and managing public space (O’Neill, 2007); ultimately the ‘prostitute’ still retains her ‘Other’ status in this new abolitionism. Furthermore, any changes appear to be constrained by the parameters of ‘risk and responsibilisation’ integral to ‘progressive governance’ (Scoular and O’Neill, 2007). Melrose (2006:3) contends that in this supposedly ‘new’ era, the Government ‘has missed an important opportunity to radically rethink its approach to prostitution’ and the streets may be no safer than before these changes were introduced. Worse still, there is some evidence that ‘making it a crime to pay for sex undermines initiatives to promote the safety of sex workers’ (Sanders and Campbell, 2008:175).

Perhaps a more pressing issue is that we still lack the evidence-base to judge the effectiveness of these interventions. Because the underlying relationship between demand and supply is assumed to be a \textit{fait accompli}, many of these interventions have been implemented without a true appreciation of the consequences that ‘tackling demand’ may have on working girls (and vice versa). Quite simply, stating that ‘without men’s demand for prostitute women, there would be no such women’ (Månsson, 2003) tells us very little and patently fails to capture the complexity of the demand-supply nexus. Chapters 9 and 10 attempt to begin the process of redressing this evidence-base imbalance by exploring the impact of the Change Programme on its attendees, in addition to understanding the experiences and attitudes of working girls in an era of ‘enforcement plus support’ and demand-led punitiveness.
Chapter 9 - ‘You’re so thirsty that you end up drinking muddy water’:
Understanding Men’s Narratives of Paying for Sex

Chapter 8 demonstrated how the British Government has migrated towards tackling the demand for prostitution ‘as an integral element’ of their ‘Co-ordinated Prostitution Strategy’ (Home Office, 2008b). Rather than re-hashing well-worn ‘disagreements over regulatory responses to prostitution’ (Munro and Della Giusta, 2008:5) this chapter assesses key policy initiatives in place to tackle the demand, primarily through an evaluation of the Change Programme. As Butler et al (2006) point out, attitudes and beliefs are known to influence general behaviour and against this background this chapter seeks to understand if (and how) the Nottingham Change Programme and to a lesser extent, other policy interventions, reform men’s attitudes and motivations towards ‘punting’, and ultimately how this may manifest itself in behavioural change and resistance from future (street-level) prostitution activities. There is also an attempt to use these findings to speculate what might be effective in deterring men within the general population, from entering the market in the first place. To determine the legitimacy of assumptions about punters motivational variations, this chapter simultaneously seeks to understand these motivations and the impact of anti-demand policy interventions at the socio-demographic level. The findings from this chapter are taken from an analysis of questionnaires distributed to Nottingham Change Programme attendees, punter recidivism data provided by the OSPT, together with follow-up interviews undertaken with Programme and agency volunteers.

The Change Programme evaluation: research context

Brooks-Gordon (2006) is particularly critical of the British Government’s augmented recognition and enthusiasm for re-education programmes (see Home Office, 2004 & 2008), especially in the absence of any formalised assessments. Similarly, Sanders (2008:155) argues there is ‘little evidence to support the effectiveness of re-education programmes’ in North America. However, what is needed are evaluations that are sensitive not only to the cultural and motivational specificity of paying for on-street sex, but, more importantly, attuned to the way in which the content and delivery of UK re-education programmes patently differs from ‘John schools’ overseas (Chapter 8). In short, whilst there are well-documented flaws with US-based ‘John schools’, we need to guard against automatically assuming that KCRP fault-lines are replicable both sides of the Atlantic; as Sawyer et al, (1998:124) advises, the generalisation of ‘customers in other cultures should be undertaken with extreme caution’.

Consequently, the importance of this locally-based evaluation as contributing to knowledge should not be underestimated. Equally, nor should it be overplayed; clearly these analyses do not represent anything close to ‘theoretical saturation’ and given the obvious methodological limitations (Chapter 7) it would be erroneous for any group or individual to use this thesis as conclusive evidence for the continuation - or elimination - of KCRP’s in the UK. Accordingly, the
findings from the Change Programme evaluation (seen in the context of men’s narratives articulated in a number of follow-up interviews) can only claim to be the starting point of a wider evaluative process and debate.

**Challenging the primacy of re-offending data**

Prior to this evaluation, the only way for the OSPT to gauge the ‘success’ of the Change Programme was: (i) by a direct comparison of the recidivism rates of attendees and non-attendees and/or; (ii) via positive (but anecdotal) comments made by attendees to the OSPT and/or Change Programme facilitators on the day of the course. Notwithstanding the evidence from the USA that any differences in re-offending rates between these two groups remains statistically insignificant (Brewer *et al.*, 2006; Monto and Garcia, 2001), measuring ‘success’ only on the basis of potentially flawed re-offending data, also inescapably lacks a detailed understanding of why and how men desist from paying for sex. This research sought to address these deficiencies by analysing the motivations, attitudes and pre-existing understandings of prostitution markets from a population of men passing through the Change Programme. Due to the perceived heterogeneity of punters (see Chapter 6), this analysis was also measured across socio-demographic characteristics and prostitution usage.

**Socio-economic profiles of punters engaging in Change Programme research between October 2006 and January 2008**

Acknowledging punter diversity, allows the researcher to analyse each subgroup’s ‘different profile, motivations and behaviours that are important to understand in order to design different therapeutic and criminal justice responses’ (Hughes *et al.*, 2004:17). Therefore, prior to outlining the ‘why’ and ‘how’ punters from this sample understand their decisions to pay for sex, it was important to clarify who the punters on the Change Programme are, where they came from and any previous experiences they had of procuring sex.

Before proceeding, however, it is vital to re-iterate the analytical limitations of this non-randomly selected sample. Primarily, that the datasets do not lend themselves to inferential statistics or modelling such as ‘logistic regression’ analysis for example and, because many of the socio-demographic sub-samples are small, a degree of caution needs to be exerted in interpreting this data (Chapter 7); all findings are indicative. In essence the inclusion of socio-demographic analysis is only intended to provide the foundation for future statistically robust research to be carried out.
(i) Age Profile

In line with other research (see Appendix A), Table 9.1 reveals that certain age profiles are divergent when measured against 2001 National Census data (ONS, 2008). For example, 44 per cent of attendee’s were aged 30-39, more than double the corresponding figure from the most recent ONS Census. Simultaneously, whilst the evidence from the literature indicates that older men are increasingly buying off-street sex (Santos-Oritz et al, 1998; Sanders, 2008) the above profile would seem to indicate that older men less-commonly pay for street-level sex.

These representations may seem to validate the Home Office’s (2004:17) fascination with the ‘typical prostitute user’ being ‘a man of around 30 years of age’, but the data also suggests that men pay for sex across all ages (Ward et al, 2005). On this evidence, paying for sex is more a series of peaks and troughs spread across the entire age range (although less evident at age ‘outliers’ or, as described by Sanders (2008:48), ‘bookends’). Importantly, ‘punting’ amongst this sample, clearly deviates from the typical age-crime curve (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990), which consistently shows that ‘generalist’ offending behaviour peaks in late teenage years and then ‘declines steeply at first (to the mid-20s) and thereafter more steadily’ (Farrington, 1992: 523). The implication is that the complex ‘root causes’ that drive men to pay for sex are not associated with age in the same way that other crimes appear to be. This, of course, is in contrast to the age profile of working girls, which very much appears to conform to the aforementioned ‘age-crime curve’ (Hester and Westmarland, 2004; Vanwesenbeeck, 2001).

Due to rounding conventions, percentages may be +/- 1% within 100% throughout this chapter.
(ii) Ethnicity

Table 9.2: Ethnic profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid Percent (Rounded) – ‘Change’ Programme</th>
<th>2001 Census Data Nottingham (Rounded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Other</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed White and Black Caribbean</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Bangladeshi</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>&lt;0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Pakistani</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Chinese</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>&lt;0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>97%</strong> (Excludes some categories)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 100

There is also a misalignment of punters (self-declared) ethnic profiles when compared with the 2001 Census data for Nottingham (see Table 9.2). The chief difference is that White British punters are under-represented and Asian Pakistani’s over-represented. Outside of these categories, the ethnic profiles for other punters engaging in the Change Programme is broadly in line with the 2001 Census data.

(iii) Marital Status

Table 9.3: Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid Percent (Rounded) – ‘Change’ Programme</th>
<th>2001 Census Data England and Wales (Rounded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married/living with long-term partner</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single (never married) living with parent/relative</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single (never married) living with friends</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single (never married) living alone</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=104

188 For the sake of expediency (working with samples at least 10 per cent of the sampling frame), analysis by ethnic profile is split into ‘White British/Irish’ and ‘South Asian’ (Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi). Whilst these assumptions serve to conceptualise broad geographical and cultural cohesion – and differences – amongst and between different ethnic groupings, it is important to recognise the limitations of homogenising distinct ethnic groups.

189 Similar findings are present in other research studies; Kennedy *et al* (2004), for example, found an overrepresentation of ‘Indo-Asian’ men in their sample of John School attendees.
In line with Ward et al’s (2005) national survey findings\textsuperscript{190}, Change Programme attendees are less likely to be married than men in the general population (Table 9.3). This is significant if one accepts Monto and McRee’s (2005) contention that low levels of marriage amongst punters is more meaningful to our understanding of prostitution behaviours than any other socio-demographic background information. Whilst this marital status pattern has not always been replicated elsewhere in the research literature (again, the Home Office (2004) research is a prime example), the discrepancy here is pronounced. Equally, it is important to recognise that married men (or those in a significant relationship) still make up over one in four of those passing through the Change Programme, indicating that a significant minority of men motivated to pay for sex are married. If these percentages were replicated at a national level then - based on Wellings et al’s (1994) conservative findings that 7 per cent of men have paid for sex at some point – at least 405,000 married men in the UK are likely to have paid for sex at some point in their adult lives\textsuperscript{191}.

\textit{(iv) Employment Status and Job Description}

Table 9.4: Employment Status

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
 & Valid Percent \hspace{1cm} 2001 Census \hspace{1cm} \hline
 & (Rounded) – ‘Change’ Programme & Data England \hspace{1cm} and Wales (Rounded) \hline
Valid & Employed f/t & 67\% & 51\% \hline
 & Employed p/t & 3\% & 3\% \hline
 & Self-employed & 7\% & 12\% \hline
 & Unemployed/laid off & 16\% & 4\% \hline
 & Studying full-time & 2\% & 2\% \hline
 & Not in labour force & 4\% & 19\% \hline
 & Other - part-time study & 1\% & 8\% \hline
Total & & 100\% & 100\% \hline
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

Compared with the latest 2001 Census, Change attendees are more likely to be in full-time employment and to be unemployed (see Table 9.4) than the general population, implying that ‘disposable income’ isn’t necessarily a (dis)incentive to demand-led prostitution behaviours.

Table 9.4 demonstrates how this over-representation is compensated by an under-representation in economically inactive roles such as being retired or registered sick, a pattern replicated elsewhere (see Shell et al, 2001; Wortley and Fischer, 2002; Benson and Matthews, 1995; Radford, 2007). The reasons for this under-representation may be multi-faceted; age-related waning sex drive (for the retired group; see footnote below regarding ‘proxy indicators’)

\textsuperscript{190} Although it is important to recognise that this study is not specific to on-street locations.

\textsuperscript{191} This has striking parallel’s with Kulick’s (2005) ‘Four hundred thousand Swedish perverts’.
may well be a key explanation, but equally it could be a product of the simple practicalities of getting to the red-light district (particularly if disabled, elderly or sick).  

Where attendees do work (Table 9.5), about a third of respondents describe their job as managerial or professional. We should perhaps not be surprised by this finding; as Finnegan (1979 in Sanders, 2008) points out, wealthy middle-class men have traditionally always paid for sex with poorer working-class women. However, the high proportion of punters from professional backgrounds in this sample contrasts with the findings from North American ‘John school’ evaluations (see Wortley et al., 2002: 378), which stress a distinct working-class bias amongst street-level clients. It also confirms Brooks-Gordon’s (2006:125) conclusion that there is no evidence that ‘men solicit women of a similar standing in the prostitution hierarchy’. The reason for this discrepancy in occupational stratification may be associated with the location of Nottingham’s red-light area being in a recognised middle-class area (together with the strategy of policing prostitution and differences in punters’ ‘crime scripts’; see Chapter 8). This could conceivably give some credence to Wortley et al’s (2002) suggestion that the social backgrounds of ‘punters’ on re-education programmes reflect the demographic of the neighbourhood. Certainly the way in which urban space is constructed and the context-specific geographies of prostitution in the ‘urban west’ (Hubbard, 1999b; Bertozzi, 2005) might be expected to affect who gets ‘picked up’ by the OSPT. Nevertheless, given what we know about the postcode prefixes of punters passing through the Change Programme (see Appendix R and ‘Place of Residence’ section below), this supposition in relation to Nottingham’s on-street

---

192 Although lacking large sums of disposable income, unemployed men may still have more access to cash that the long-term sick or retired and are less likely to suffer from problems of mobility.

193 Wortley et al’s (2002) research was undertaken with punters caught in Toronto’s ‘working-class’ red-light area.
sex market appears mistaken. Consequently the high percentage of men from professional backgrounds may be indicative of explanations unconnected to the ‘social class’ composition of the ‘red light’ area. Equally, it cannot be ruled out that middle class men residing outside the ‘red light’ postcode(s) are tempted by the perceived ‘safety’ of, and empathy with, a middle class ‘red light’ area; purchasing sex in a ‘working class’ area becomes a risk too far. Whatever the explanation, the high levels of (self declared) professional men passing through the Change Programme would seem to contradict the assertion of US-based evaluations that men from working-class backgrounds are more likely to be ‘targeted by ‘sting’ operations’ (Wortley et al, 2002: 378).

(v) Highest Educational Achievement (HEQ)

Table 9.6: Highest Educational Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>School leaver with no qualifications</th>
<th>Valid Percent (Rounded) – Change Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>CSE/O Level/GCSE</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NVQ/GNVQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A-Level</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate Degree</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postgraduate Degree</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other - professional qualification</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other - City and Guilds</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In line with other socio-demographic variables, there appears to be a broad spread across respondents’ ‘highest educational qualification’ (HEQ). The diversity of HEQ’s across the Change Programme sample is perhaps surprising given the influence that education is said to have in mitigating other criminal activities (Farrington et al, 2006). Previous research has had surprisingly little to say about the importance (or lack of) of educational background as a ‘protective’ (or risk) factor for those involved in purchasing sex, with the exception of Sullivan and Simon’s (1998) research, which concluded that qualifications do not appear to be a particularly reliable indicator of men’s future prostitution behaviours. With the lack of reliable data in this area, it is unclear how – or if – educational qualifications (as well as sex education) are correlated with street-level prostitution.

194 Or in the parlance of the OSPT, ‘test purchases’.
195 Please note, however, any data analysis stratified by HEQ should be viewed with caution; education may in fact be a proxy for age, class or indeed occupation.
(vi) Place of residence

Table 9.7: City/town respondents lived in at time Change Programme attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid Percent (Rounded) – ‘Change’ Programme</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent (Rounded) – ‘Change’ Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other East Midlands</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - UK</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 97

All respondents were asked where they lived at the time of arrest\(^{196}\) (Table 9.7). The data analysis clearly demonstrates that the vast majority of punters eligible for the Change Programme were local to the East Midlands region (89 per cent). As Brantingham and Brantingham (1995) point out, offenders often travel just enough distance not to be recognised. In other words, only one in ten of Change Programme punters had travelled any significant distance to pay for sex in Nottingham. Even then it is not entirely clear from the survey responses alone, whether these ‘long-distance’ punters had travelled to Nottingham with the pre-meditated intention of paying for sex, or whether sex was an afterthought, perhaps ‘driven by supply’.

Following informal discussions with punters from outside the East Midlands\(^{197}\), there is anecdotal evidence that ‘punting’ behaviour for these men was generally opportunistic rather than calculated\(^{198}\); these men were typically in Nottingham ‘on business’ or a ‘lads weekend away’. Building on Cameron and Collins’ (2003) findings that working away from home is responsible for a large increase in the volume of ‘sex trade’, Sanders (2008:190) argues that for these individuals, sexual behaviour can be seen as an adaptation of the ‘physical changes in men’s lifestyles’. Further research is clearly required to ascertain the validity of these anecdotal observations in relation to Nottingham’s street-level sex markets.

\(^{196}\) Originally, the ‘pilot’ questionnaire asked attendants where they lived at the time of Change programme attendance. On reflection, this was deemed to be an unsuitable measure for the aims and objectives of the evaluation and was subsequently changed to the home location at the point of arrest.

\(^{197}\) All formal follow-up interviewees resided in the East Midlands, hence the reliance on ‘informal discussions’.

\(^{198}\) This is not to deny any ‘psychological build-up’ (Holzman and Pines, 1982), but merely to acknowledge that this build-up is not specific to Nottingham. As one interviewee noted, ‘I had thought about going to pay for sex for probably about 12 months before I actually did anything’ (Deepak, 42, married, public sector manager). In this sense the location simply represents an opportunistic delivery system to actualise the previously contemplated fantasy of paying for sex.
vii) *Prostitution Usage*

**Table 9.8: Previous Prostitution Usage Profile**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>Valid Percent (Rounded)</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 times</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 times</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 times</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 times</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30 times</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never have</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.8 indicates that there are significant numbers of men passing through the Change Programme who will have paid for sex more than once prior to being arrested. Perhaps more accurately, Programme attendees should be seen as ‘first time arrestees’ rather than ‘first time offenders’. The importance of this distinction should not be overlooked; Monto (2000:9) argues that: ‘while intervention programs would be less likely to change established patterns of sexual behaviour, many of the men participating [in the FOPP ‘John school’] are first time or occasional users and may not have established a habit of prostitution’. In light of this, the questionnaire sought to identify the extent that prostitution usage preceded arrest by the OSPT.

Working within Wortley and Fischer’s (2002:49) ‘typology of John School participants’ framework, Table 9.8 demonstrates that three-fifths of Change Programme attendees declared themselves to be ‘first-timers’ or ‘novices’\(^{199}\). ‘Intermediates’\(^{200}\) accounted for 17 per cent of the sample, with ‘sex trade veterans’\(^{201}\), marginally less ubiquitous at 16 per cent\(^{202}\). A residual 9 per cent of Programme attendees privately claimed in the survey to be innocent of the charges laid against them and refuted that they had ever used working girls, although these men are publicly required to accept their guilt in order to be able to participate in the programme (see Chapter 8). This group of men were categorised as ‘deniers’. The phenomenon of ‘denial’ has tended to be more prevalent in other ‘John School’ evaluations; for example: (i) 35 per cent fell into this category in Wortley and Fischer’s (2002) research, (ii) 20 per cent in the Monto (2000) evaluation of the FOPP Programme and (iii) 21 per cent in the later Abt (2008) evaluation of the same FOPP Programme.

Like Wortley *et al* (2002:390) it is tempting to be sceptical about the scale of ‘first timers’. Kinnell (2006:216) argues that the scale of the sex industry could not be sustained with this level of

---

\(^{199}\) That is, not paid for sex more than five times in their lives.

\(^{200}\) Those that had paid for sex between 6-20 times.

\(^{201}\) Paying for street-level sex over 21 times in their lives.

\(^{202}\) As Wortley and Fischer (2002: 51) astutely point out the distinction between ‘novices’, ‘intermediates’ and ‘veterans’ is somewhat arbitrary; is there really a difference between those that have purchased sex five and six times? What this typology does allow for, however, is to differentiate between men who have used prostitutes on a few occasions and those with more ‘experience’.
first-timers and in circumstances where the punter is criminalised, there is evidence of dishonesty in answering questions about the frequency of engagement in commercial sex activities. However, on closer inspection the claim from 35 per cent of respondents that it was their first time does not seem implausible, especially if one considers that ‘first-timers’ (and novices) may be over-represented in large part due to their inability to spot ‘police sting’ operations (Wortley et al., 2002:399). Simultaneously, ‘repeat offenders’ may have been arrested previously, therefore making them ineligible for the Change Programme in any case. In these circumstances, the segregation of re-arrested punters would inevitably skew the data heavily towards ‘first-timers’. Moreover, a figure of about one in four may actually reflect the proportion of punters who pay for sex only once anyway; this figure was replicated in Lautrup’s (2008) large-scale research with Danish punters.

When compared with other research studies, Table 9.8 also indicates other differences in prostitution usage between Change punters and ‘John School’ attendees (see Kennedy et al., 2004:46; Monto and Mcree, 2005: 509; Abt, 2008; Freund et al, 1991; Campbell, 1998:161). Again, the reasons for these discrepancies may be a direct result of diverse policing strategies and a familiarity of these processes amongst ‘veterans’ (for an overview of changes in policing street-level sex markets in the UK, see Matthews, 2005 and Chapter 8). As Monto and Garcia (2001: 6), point out, ‘many of the men caught in sweeps are not regular users’.

On their own, however, Sanders (2008) argues these data arguably mask the nuanced way in which men engage in the sex industry over a lifetime. Rather than simply focusing on the length of involvement, Sanders adeptly produces a ‘typology of men’s involvement in buying sex’ (ibid: 48) that recognises involvement ‘can occur at a particular stage of the life-course’. Unfortunately - as Sanders alludes to - such categorisation does not readily lend itself to quantitative analysis. Consequently, although ‘life course’ categorisation is incorporated into my qualitative analyses, interim Change questionnaire evaluations are restricted to a modified version of Wortley and Fischer’s (2002) ‘novice/veteran’ modelling.

Important, ‘novice/veteran’ measurements retain a degree of interpretative value in the literature and it is claimed that a punter’s previous prostitution usage determines the efficacy of rehabilitation programmes on his attitudes, motivations and anticipated future behaviours (Wortley and Fischer, 2002: 62-67). The implication here is that where dynamic ‘risk factors’ (Laws and O’Donohue, 2008), such as ‘previous working girl contact’ are identified as being positively correlated with attitudinal, motivational or behavioural resistance, then we have a duty to re-assess the Change Programme’s inflexible and homogenised curriculum. The problem of aligning the programme outcomes and curriculum with this identified punter heterogeneity is a key debate that is re-visited throughout this chapter.

203 Operations using policewomen posing as working girls to catch punters.
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Punter’s socio-demographic heterogeneity and sexual commodification: a case for alignment?

Evidently the socio-demographic profiling outlined above, feeds into the increasing tendency for the lens of academic enquiry to examine who the men are that pay for sex, and why do they do so (Home Office, 2006). Although there are a number of important incongruencies, palpably, many men of all ages, occupations, ethnicities and educational backgrounds pay for (street-level) sex. Seemingly this heterogeneity is as surprising to punters as it is for the general public, with a reluctance to accept that ‘the men who buy sex are never our father, brother, husband or boyfriend’ (McKeganey and Barnard, 1996), one respondent noted that:

‘The initial first meeting of seeing everybody, really sticks out in my mind. Because you see some people and you think…’you don’t seem the type of person to be on this course’ (Ben, 29, single, structural engineer).

Even so, what is not known is whether the socio-demographic diversity of punters identified here, reflects the extent to which the ‘McDonaldisation’ (Ritzer, 1998; Hausbeck and Brents, 2002) of the sex industry and ‘striptease culture’ (McNair, 2002) of the West has saturated men’s psyche at every demographic level. As Sanders (2008:190) points out, ‘whether there have been significant shifts in the dominant sexual morality and how such shifts relate to actual behaviour is a sociological conundrum’. With policy becoming increasingly punitive towards punters (Chapter 8), policymakers will no doubt be grateful of any longitudinal research data that is suggestive of socio-demographic changes or more general demand reductions. Naturally attaining longitudinal data is well beyond the scope of this thesis, but the point is that the findings here might act as a springboard for future research.

Of course, establishing punter socio-demographic diversity is one thing, establishing an understanding of attitudes, motivations and behaviours is quite another. Again it is worth stressing the limitations of the resultant analysis, in particular the absence of a control group (Chapter 7). Limitations aside, rather than pathologise the motivations of Change Programme punters, this research was designed in such a way as to be sensitive to the socio-cultural specificity of puntling (see Chapter 6). Bernstein’s (2001:389) notion of an ‘unbridled ethic of sexual consumption’ and the ‘transformation of sexual cultures’ (Giddens, 1992) underpins much of the debate around the latest rise in the number of men paying for sex (Ward et al., 2005). Naturally, the role of society’s’ increased sexualisation in promoting demand (Sanders, 2008), was examined primarily through semi-structured interviews post-Programme.

Exploring the relationship between ‘attitude’ and ‘behaviour’: ideological, political and policy contexts

Brewer et al (2006:1) observe that ‘criminologists have long studied the effect that penalties for criminal behaviour have on the subsequent offending of those penalised’. Whilst a detailed
discussion of these controversies (see Hopkins-Burke, 2005; Maguire et al., 2002) is beyond the realms of this thesis, understanding the implied causal philosophy of how diversion schemes - including the Change Programme - are intended to change behaviour is, undoubtedly, a necessary pre-requisite for any evaluation of their process and effectiveness. In particular, one should instinctively seek to recognise whether or not long-term, permanent behavioural change is dependent on deep-seated ‘attitudinal’ (or cognitive) change. Moreover, can research expect to capture these often transient (see Chapter 7) ‘attitudes’?

The importance of this subtle distinction is best exemplified by Wortley et al’s (2002:393) observation of the Toronto ‘John school’ that ‘attitudinal changes did not seem to translate into significant changes in anticipated future behaviour’. Implicit to this declaration is that the relationship between punters ‘attitudes’ and ‘behaviour’ is not particularly well understood, either because: a) it is a false premise to seek a relationship between attitudinal change and intended future behaviours in the context of diversion programmes; b) that the wrong type of attitudes are being addressed in relation to future anticipated punting activities; c) that a superficial attitudinal change has taken place, or; d) that respondents have fallaciously recorded an attitudinal change to the research team. Evidently if no relationship exists, then the whole ethos, and therefore the Change mechanism, of the programme is liable to be called into question.

We can of course examine the extent to which any recidivistic reductions have been influenced by changes in the perception of street-level prostitution (and the various ‘actors’ associated with this discrete market). However, if we accept Brewer et al’s (2006) key finding that the process of arrest operates as the key variable in deterring future offending behaviour, then the whole rationale for implementing expensive and time-consuming rehabilitation programmes should come under scrutiny. The fact that the OSPT run a court diversion scheme as a key intervention to reduce the demand for street-level prostitution suggests a belief that only using the blunt instrument of the CJS to change behaviour may be ineffective (certainly in the long-term). This is not the same as an outright rejection of the importance of arrest or other punitive sanctions, but it does signify some acceptance of Wahab’s (2006) observation that diversion programmes typically aim to change people’s criminal behaviours through inculcating a permanent disposition not to offend.

This debate is arguably representative of a fundamental demarcation between two schools of criminological thought. ‘Structural’ criminologists stress the need to identify the causal explanations of crime, particularly socio-cultural/economic factors (O’Malley, 1992; Downes and Rock, 1988), whilst ‘mainstream’ criminologists’ principle preoccupation is with the control of crime through a manipulation of opportunity; of ‘situational crime prevention (SCP)’ (Clarke, 1995; Felson, 2002). The danger here is of falling into a polemical trap. ‘Mainstream’ criminologists, including Clarke, would reject the claim that advocating SCP measures, equates to a dismissal of the socio-cultural causes of crime. In fact, as long as more proximate
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interventions are implemented (in an ‘Evidence Based Policy’ framework; see Home Office, 2003), then tackling offender ‘dispositions’ through schemes such as the Change Programme is not inherently problematic for ‘mainstream’ criminologists. Simplifying, tackling the situational in the short to medium term creates the space for other well-designed ‘non-mainstream’ interventions to take place.

Understanding the relationship between ‘attitude’, and ‘behaviour’ and the ideological and theoretical context within which this is posited, is an important part of understanding how and why the Change Programme is seen by some as an opportunity to ‘provide more effective and constructive interventions [than ‘traditional’ punitive CJS interventions] in terms of addressing harms done and avoiding future deviance’ (Fischer et al, 2002:387). The following sections seek to evaluate how successfully the Change Programme has addressed these challenges.

**Anticipated future behaviour**

As important as it is for the research to capture punters multi-faceted attitudes and motivations, it should be recognised also that recidivism reduction remains a ‘key performance indicator’ (KPI) for the OSPT. Arguably, in an environment where results have potential funding implications (Nash, 1998), the police’s primary concern is that men don’t re-offend ‘on their patch’\(^{206}\). Consequently it was necessary that this somewhat perfunctory KPI measurement be captured in the research. The judgement made was that this was best achieved via a rudimentary ‘do you plan to go to a street-prostitute in the future’ variable in the two surveys\(^ {207}\).

Unlike other ‘John school’ evaluations (Wortley et al, 2002), Table 9.9 suggests that taken as a crude snapshot, the Change Programme has some identifiable attitudinal impact with respondents conspicuously more likely to state a belief that they would *never* again visit a street-prostitute having completed the programme. Despite this apparent success, a residual one in five punters still did not state that they would desist from paying for street-level sex in the future (post-programme); with the majority acknowledging that the motivations and temptations which characterised their past involvement, may result in future ‘slip-ups’\(^{208}\). Logically, one would assume that these punters are the men most liable to re-offend, particularly in the absence of any subsequent ongoing emotional and psychological support. Equally, without a greater understanding of men’s core motivations and the effect of arrest as a deterrent, we should not simply assume that all – or indeed any – of these men will actually pay for sex again.

\(^{206}\) Although by the very fact that the police are running the Change programme at all, it is clear that the Nottinghamshire Constabulary have some reservations about the efficacy and/or suitability of punitive CJS sanctions to moderate behaviour and challenge motivations. My point here is that the key aim is to reduce/eliminate demand, irrespective of long-term motivational elements.

\(^{207}\) Of course, ‘saying’ and ‘doing’ are entirely different, and in no way can this crude measurement be seen to be indicative of actual future recidivism rates.

\(^{208}\) When Abt Associates (2008) asked the same question, the percentage of punters stating that they would ‘never go to a prostitute again’, remained largely static over the two sessions (73 per cent pre-session, 70 per cent post-session), as did the percentage of punters asked in Wortley and Fischer’s (2002:60-61) research (87 per cent and 89 per cent respectively).
Table 9.9: Anticipated Future Use of Street-Level Working Girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you plan to go to a street-prostitute in the future?</th>
<th>Before Session</th>
<th>After Session</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I plan to pay street-prostitutes for sexual contact</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>(+100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, but I plan to do it less frequently</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>(-100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, but I am working on stopping</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>(-43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No plans to, but I might 'slip up' if tempted</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>(-36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I will never go to a street-prostitute again</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>(+27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never paid - not applicable</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>(-100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals                                                   | 100%           | 100%          |          |

N=100

Anticipated Future Behaviour: Socio-demographic Analysis

Although analysing the survey’s socio-demographic data can be of value, there is a danger that such analysis and its interpretation can ignore wider prevailing cultural and social conditions (Månsson, 2003). The challenge for Change facilitators - and policy makers more generally - is to combine standardised rehabilitation strategies germane to all punters, with more nuanced approaches that meet head-on any relevant socio-demographic peculiarities. Whether this can be achieved in a one-day ‘catch-all’ rehabilitation programme is an important foci of this analysis209.

Age and anticipated future behaviour

Table 9.10: Anticipated Future Use of Street-Level Working Girls: by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you plan to go to a street-prostitute in the future?</th>
<th>16-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-59</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, I will never go to a street-prostitute again</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>After</td>
<td>% Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>+26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>+44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>+58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

209 Unfortunately all follow-up interviewee’s expressed a commitment to desistance, so the socio-demographic findings and speculations cannot be triangulated with qualitative data.
Older punters\textsuperscript{210} appear noticeably more resistant to claims that their street-prostitution days are behind them (see Table 9.10). Unsurprisingly older punters have also paid for sex more often than younger punters (see Appendix T), indicating that as these prostitution behaviours get established and normalised over longer time periods, ‘rehabilitation’ becomes less effective at moderating anticipated future behaviours (Wellings \textit{et al}, 1994).

\textit{Prostitution usage and anticipated future behaviour}

Elsewhere, findings are suggestive of the limitations of the Change Programme in transforming more entrenched attitudes and behaviours. In particular, the data from this research inexorably indicates the more punters have paid for street-sex previously, the more likely it is that they say they will do so again. This supports similar findings from Wortley \textit{et al} (2002: 390) whereby anticipated future desistence declined markedly between ‘first-timers’ and ‘veterans’.

\textbf{Table 9.11: Anticipated Future Use of Street-Level Working Girls: by Prostitution Usage}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prostitution Usage</th>
<th>Novice (1-5)</th>
<th>Intermediate (6-20)</th>
<th>Veteran (21+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you plan to go to a street-prostitute in the future?</td>
<td>Before 77%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After 91%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>+18%</td>
<td>+86%</td>
<td>+213%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{Ethnicity and anticipated future behaviour}

For the white British/Irish group, the Change Programme appears to have had a suggestive impact upon behavioural change (Table 9.12). Disappointingly for programme facilitators, the Change Programme seems to have had unintended consequences for South Asians, with a 17 per cent \textit{reduction} in claims to future desistence. This clearly has some major programme design implications. Moreover, this rise demonstrates the need for qualitative research with South Asians to understand the potential unintended negative impact of rehabilitation programmes inappropriately designed for the target audience.

\textsuperscript{210} Due to the small sample size (four per cent), punters over the age of 60 have been excluded from this analysis.
Table 9.12: Anticipated Future Use of Street-Level Working Girls: by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you plan to go to a street-prostitute in the future?</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White British/Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I will never go to a street-prostitute again</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>+38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marital Status, ‘illicit’ sex as refuge and anticipated future behaviour

Regarding marital status, divorced and separated punters are most likely to express difficulties in resisting street-level sex in the future (Table 9.13). From this one might hypothesize that the process of divorce and separation leads to an inflated sense of victimhood, manifesting itself in an exaggerated and corrupted view of sex and women generally (see NetDoctor, 2007). As Brian acknowledged when asked if he thought that his divorce had affected his attitudes towards prostitution:

‘To be perfectly frank with you, my divorce was a bit messy….so yeh, I guess I had a bit of a downer on women after all that I’d been through. I wouldn’t call it revenge exactly, but you’re not gonna have a prostitute telling you what to do…with pro’s [working girls] it’s you calling the shots. Guaranteed sex without the nagging [laughs]’ (Brian, 50, divorced, copywriter).

This may in turn be correlated to Chen’s (2003:5 cited in Coy et al, 2007:22) conclusions that ‘physical sexual needs are not the first concern; instead it is how to have sex in masculine ways that makes seeking prostitutes desirable’. Consequently having ‘power’ in the commercial sex transaction may particularly appeal to divorced punters as this represents an anti-feminist ‘refuge’ and more so a re-assertion of male supremacy to counter-balance the perceived threat of the extension of gender equality and female ‘power’ in post-modern Western democracies (see Månsson’s (2003) discussion of ‘another kind of woman’; Smette, 2008).

Married punters may share with divorced and single punters a sense of perceived sexual dissatisfaction and seek their ‘fulfilling sex’ refuge in prostitution, but emotional accountability to a long-term partner may mitigate any bitter sense of sexual injustice. For divorced/separated punters, the lack of a long-term partner means that Change facilitators need to persuade these emotionally isolated men of the legitimacy of other ‘victim’ paradigms (such as the impact on other family members, the ‘community’ or working girls). This is especially important for ‘John schools’, which build on and ‘merge these victims’ discourses as its main rationale and legitimization’ (Fischer et al, 2002:394). Although the ‘anticipated future behaviour’ gap narrows over the two surveys, it remains that separated and divorced punters are more resistant to
future desistance than other marital categories, suggesting that more help is required to ‘signpost’ these men to the antecedents of their punting behaviours. The controversial hypothesis that for some men prostitution represents a form of ‘refuge’, is another promising area for future research.

Table 9.13: Anticipated Future Use of Street-Level Working Girls: by Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Separated</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Single 1*</th>
<th>Single 2**</th>
<th>Single 3***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you plan to go to a street-prostitute in the future?</td>
<td>No, I will never go to a street-prostitute again</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>+50%</td>
<td>+59%</td>
<td>+37%</td>
<td>+14%</td>
<td>+10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Living with parent/relative; ** Living with friends; *** Living alone

N=100

**Education and anticipated future behaviour**

Correlating ‘education’ with ‘prostitution usage’ has an illustrious background; as far back as the 1940s, Kinsey *et al* (1948:600) in the USA noted low-educated men were far more likely to have paid for sex than those with degrees (or equivalent). Going into the Change Programme, punters with lower qualifications are appreciably less likely to say that they will avoid paying for street-level sex in the future (Table 9.14).

Table 9.14 simultaneously demonstrates the turnaround in attitudes that the Change Programme appears to exert at lower levels of HEQ. Intriguingly, these findings are in direct contrast to the evidence from Wortley and Fischer’s (2002:2) evaluation which found ‘those with higher levels of educational attainment demonstrate more post-program change than others’ because they are better able to absorb and retain the programme ‘lessons’. Instead, the findings here indicate that those with the highest qualifications are more resistant to the Change Programme’s prohibitionist premise. Speculating, opposition might be the result of a scepticism encouraged and cultivated through higher-education processes. Further research is clearly required to explain these apparent contradictions and explore further the role that education in the UK more generally, plays in shaping attitudes towards prostitution.
Table 9.14: Anticipated Future Use of Street-Level Working Girls: by Highest Educational Qualification (HEQ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEQ</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>CSE/O Level/ GCSE</th>
<th>(G)NVQ</th>
<th>A-Level</th>
<th>Graduate (incl. PostGrad)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you plan to go to a street-prostitute in the future?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I will never go to a street-prostitute again</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>+102%</td>
<td>+54%</td>
<td>+16%</td>
<td>+9%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment and anticipated future behaviour

The above observations take on added significance when viewed in the context of unemployment. Given the well-documented relationship between education and employment (McKenna, 1996), the association between unemployment and low HEQ amongst this sample of punters is unsurprising (see Appendix U). ‘Re-educating’ unemployed (and therefore under-educated) punters may help explain why, post-session (Table 9.15), the number of unemployed punters stating that street-prostitution would not play a part in their future sexual activities nearly doubles between surveys.

Table 9.15: Anticipated Future Use of Street-Level Working Girls: by Employment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Employed f/t</th>
<th>Unemployed/laid off</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you plan to go to a street-prostitute in the future?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I will never go to a street-prostitute again</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>+19%</td>
<td>+98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The spectre of displacement: does the Change Programme challenge motivational ‘root causes’?

Despite the apparent success of the Change Programme in realigning men’s attitudes with regards to future street-level prostitution behaviours, one of the key arguments against the perceived efficacy of the traditional policing of street-level sex markets is the potential for displacement (Crawford, 1998). This can take the form of: i) temporal displacement, where levels of activity creep back up to their peaks over a period of time; ii) tactical (as has been suggested in Sweden (SoS-Rapport, 2004)) whereby punters still look to pay for sex, but make better use of new technologies, such as mobile phones and increasingly, the internet; or more frequently, iii) spatial displacement. On this latter point, it is argued that in areas where street-prostitution is continuously policed, the effect will be that street-prostitution migrates to another
location and/or street-prostitution will decline in popularity, with off-street prostitution filling the void (Weidner, 2001). One follow up interviewee noted that a fellow attendee on the Change Programme had admitted to him that: ‘now I’ve got caught in Nottingham, I’ll move somewhere else and have a look round that area’. This may of course be little more than punter bravado in the context of the Change group setting, but equally the problem of displacement is a very real concern and one that is acknowledged by the police themselves (see Bernstein, 2001:408). Away from ‘traditional’ policing, the spectre of displaced ‘unintended consequences’ remains. As Walgrave (1995) asks of court diversion programmes: ‘Diversion? It depends what we divert to’ and to the ‘diffusion of benefits’ (Clarke, 1997) effects that may be created.

Moreover, this assumes that stakeholders are clear about the Programme’s overall aims. Undoubtedly the Change Programme is about convincing offenders to stop engaging in ‘harmful’ street-level prostitution. Outside of this aim, however, the message is not so consistently applied and this lack of clarity has been widely criticised (Wortley and Fischer, 2002). Although there are glimpses of a more generalised abolitionist stance, the emphasis on eliminating the harms of street-level prostitution, means that stakeholders should not be surprised if the implicit message being transmitted is that off-street prostitution is the lesser of two evils, a position acknowledged by the Home Office (2004).

Whilst there is limited evidence for off-street punters migrating down the prostitution continuum to pay for street-level sex, the evidence for a movement from the street to behind ‘closed doors’ is better documented. One respondent in Sanders (2008:52) research discloses that his prostitution activities migrated from the street to off-street locations, because he felt the street to be: ‘too risky and it’s too quick and too uncomfortable’ and ‘I feel it’s exploitation’. How and why this respondent came to the conclusion that street-level prostitution represented ‘exploitation’ is not articulated, but as long as this rejoinder remains exclusive to the street, then the potential for displacement remains a possibility. It is the spectre of displacement and the impact of the Change Programme that this section of the research is concerned with.

**The case for displacement**

Intriguingly, punters claim to be only marginally more inclined to visit off-street prostitutes in the future than they are street-level working girls (Table 9.16). The implication of this finding (seen in isolation) is that the arguments against police crackdowns - or ‘re-education’ programmes that focus on street-level sex markets - on the basis that they are likely to lead to tactical, temporal and spatial displacement are perhaps overstated.
Table 9.16: Anticipated Future Use of Off-Street Working Girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When did participant complete survey</th>
<th>Before Session</th>
<th>After Session</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you plan to go to any other non-street prostitute in the future?</td>
<td>Yes, I plan to pay prostitutes for sexual contact</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, but I plan to do it less frequently</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, but I am working on stopping</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No plans to, but I might ‘slip up’ if tempted</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No, I will never go to a prostitute</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nevertheless, this assertion is seemingly contradicted elsewhere in the post-session survey, with only half of all punters disagreeing with the statement that ‘paying for sex in a brothel/massage parlour is more acceptable than paying for sex with a street-prostitute’. Of course this may indicate a subtle distinction between ‘attitudes’ and ‘behaviours’ – we should not assume that what punters say they think about prostitution would be directly replicable in what they do (Wortley et al., 2002). It is quite feasible that three-quarters of punters have opted against paying for off-street sex not because they see it as the ‘wrong thing to do’, but because the Change Programme (or indeed any other CJS response) implicitly challenges the misnomer that there are no implications of being caught paying for off-street sex. Further evidence of this assumption comes with responses to the section of the survey concerned with the factors most likely to prevent future punting activity – mainly ‘self preservation’ - and assumptions about the lack of police operations in off-street locations (see ‘Barriers to Desistance’ and ‘Improving Knowledge’ sections below).

Selected socio-demographic analysis

Ethnicity and off-street sex

Analysis of the survey data would suggest that the Change Programme has been moderately successful in closing the attitudinal gap between White British/Irish and South Asian punters in respect of paying for non-street sex (Table 9.17). The data also demonstrates that for White British/Irish punters, the ability to declare future desistance from off-street sex is more difficult than it is for street-level sex (Table 9.12).

Curiously, having been through the Change Programme, South Asians are more likely to ‘plan’ to pay for street-level sex than they are for off-street sex, perhaps because having already done
it, they know what to expect. As Deepak disclosed in a later interview, the off-street market is seen as far more risky as there is uncertainty about the degree of control over the transaction:

‘You don’t know what to expect behind closed doors. There’s always a chance that you could be robbed or see someone you know in a [massage] parlour’ (Deepak, 42, divorced, public sector manager).

Interestingly, these views were not limited to South Asian interviewees. One white respondent when questioned about his lack of off-street punting, explained that:

‘…probably because some of the brothels have got bad reputations…the way in which they get enrolled, getting a kitty off the minders. In the street you’ve got control, in a brothel they’ve got control. You don’t know who’s in there watching’ (Tony, 45, divorced, unemployed).

Culturally, it is conceivable that, the ‘McDonaldisation’ of sex (Blanchard 1994 in Monto, 2000) permeates White/British and Asian communities in quite different ways. Hypothesising, this resistance may represent a conflict between: a) the prevalence of sexualised messages and images in Western societies and; b) cultural and religious teachings in the home, whereby prostitution and sex out of wedlock carries with it a strong moral admonishment. What’s more, the opportunities to regulate this obvious conflict are exacerbated by a reluctance to discuss ‘all things sexual’ (Halstead and Reiss, 2003:102) in some South Asian communities. Mabud (1998:121) argues that one of the measures necessary for Muslim parents to ‘protect their children’ from secularisation and un-Islamic sexual traditions is to withdraw them from sex education lessons altogether211. As Fareed comments:

‘Sex was never talked about at home…or anywhere really […]. There was also a view that English girls were far more sexually active and available than Asian girls…at the same time our religion warns us that casual sex is a sin, so consensual ‘safe sex’ was never really on the agenda either’ (Fareed, 34, single, IT consultant).

Consequently, perhaps more of the White/British punters entering the Change Programme do so lacking equitable moral-religious obligations and guidelines? Valid though this question may be, one should probably guard against over-emphasising the primacy of religious and cultural peculiarities – at the expense of psychology and sociology - as explanatory tools for any one particular ethnic group (Kulick, 2005:222-3). More importantly, it is not possible to come to any firm conclusions from these speculative findings alone.

211 There are also potential implications for the operation of Change programme, due to the suggestion that Muslims could opt out of Sex Offender Treatment Programmes because any open discussion of sex crimes contravenes their religion (Ford, 2008).
Table 9.17: Anticipated Future Use of Off-Street Working Girls: by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you plan to go to any other non-street prostitute in the future?</th>
<th>White British/Irish</th>
<th>South Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>+32%</td>
<td>+10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prostitution usage and off-street sex

Only one in four ‘veterans’ claimed that they would not pay for off-street sex having completed the Change Programme (Table 9.18). This is considerably lower than the comparable figures for ‘intermediates’ and ‘novices’. Again this finding needs to be validated by future research, but as it stands would seem to give some credence to findings in the research literature that a major predictor of ‘sexual-offence’ recidivism relates to the total number of prior offences (Hanson, 2001).

Table 9.18: Anticipated Future Use of Off-Street Working Girls: by Prostitution ‘Usage’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you plan to go to any other non-street prostitute in the future?</th>
<th>Prostitution Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novice (1-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I will never go to a prostitute again</td>
<td>Before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Understanding intended behavioural changes: a concern for self or for others?

Of course, stating future behavioural intentions so soon after completing an intense ‘rehabilitation’ session is no guarantee of future behavioural changes. Moreover, even if representative of future behavioural modifications, on their own these ‘do you intend to pay for sex’ questions do not contribute to our understanding as to why these ‘before’ and ‘after’ changes take place.

One of the aims of the Change Programme is to challenge the illusion of inevitability associated with prostitution (Chapter 2) by tapping into the ‘misconceptions’ that many punters have in relation to street-prostitution and the lives of working girls. Based on the survey responses here, where behavioural change does occur, it is unlikely to be predicated on a belief that abolitionism is the most appropriate legislative model of control. To illustrate this point, Table 9.19 shows
that despite a substantial increase in the percentage of men who thought that it should not be legal for someone over the age of 18 to get paid for sex if they chose to do so, a small majority (51 per cent) of men post-programme still felt that it was acceptable for over-18’s to be involved in prostitution if they so choose. Purposively, this question did not distinguish between ‘on’ and ‘off’ street locations.

Table 9.19: Response to Prostitution Legalisation Question (post-18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should it be legal for over-18s to get paid for sex?</th>
<th>When did participant complete survey</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before Session</td>
<td>After Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=102

When asked the same question in relation to 16-17 year olds (Table 9.20), the percentage of men accepting the premise of supply legitimacy was far lower than demonstrated for over-18 prostitution activities. In the process of stressing the moral and legal ramifications of paying for sex with working girls from this age group (Chapter 8), course facilitators are arguably doing little more than re-emphasising a pre-existing resistance to the acceptability of this stance. On this basis, stressing the inherent risk of (in)advertently paying for sex with underage working girls, may have some ‘scare value’ if the resistance demonstrated in Table 9.20 is anything to go by.

Table 9.20: Response to Prostitution Legalisation Question (16-17 year olds)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should it be legal for 16-17 year olds to get paid for sex?</th>
<th>When did participant complete survey</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before Session</td>
<td>After Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 101

Interestingly whilst just over half of all punters still felt that it should be legal for over-18’s to get paid for sex (post-session), the corresponding figure in relation to those (strongly) agreeing with the statement that ‘prostitution will always be with us and the best thing we can do is to legalise

See for example, Finckenauser, 1982 in Wortley et al, 2002:373.
it’ was much lower at 33 per cent (see ‘Perceptions of Prostitution’ section). This may reflect some ambiguity in the question rather than an inherent inconsistency in attitudes. After all, the question of legalisation is not always best represented by a straightforward ‘yes’ or ‘no’ answer, especially if we consider the distinctions between 16-17 year olds and over-18’s, plus the various forms that prostitution takes.

**The choice to sell sex: selected socio-demographic breakdown**

As with other areas of analysis, the overall pattern in relation to the choice to sell sex masks some distinct variations at the socio-demographic level (see Appendix V). Generally, the younger a respondent is, the more likely he is to disagree with statements relating to the freedom of working girls to ‘choose’ to sell sex. Even though older age groups demonstrated attitudinal shifts towards legalisation over the two sessions, Change facilitators and the OSPT clearly have some way to go in addressing this base position for older punters.

Other selected socio-demographic variations (Appendix V) show that divorced punters are more likely to express working girl ‘choice’ sentiments after the Change Programme than before it. Although careful not to overstate the findings from this small sub-sample, propagating a strong anti-legalisation/choice message may actually invoke a pro-legalisation/choice reaction for divorced punters. Building on previous commentary, this is especially pertinent if one considers evidence from psychology, which suggests the process of divorce and separation can trigger misogynist attitudes, particularly if the separation was acrimonious (Jukes, 1993). It is not inconceivable that this inflated sense of misogyny manifests itself in a lack of empathy with the funnelled choices that working girls face.

Finally, Appendix V highlights that prostitution ‘veterans’ are more likely to express pro-choice views with three-quarters of ‘veterans’ agreeing that it should be legal for over-18s to sell sex (post-programme). This compares with half of men in the ‘novice’ group and a quarter of ‘intermediate’ participants.

**Understanding motivations**

**Introduction**

Whilst exploring participants’ attitudes towards prostitution in a broad legal sense is integral to a framework of understanding, this tells us little about how punters understand their motivations to pay for sex. Accordingly, both the survey data and the follow-up interviews sought to capture respondents’ interpretations of their ‘choice’ to pay for sex. However, it is important to guard against viewing motivations as inflexible, constant and uni-dimensional. In reality the psychological triggers for punting activity may fluctuate considerably with time, particularly for those men who have paid for sex over extended periods. Nor should we assume that men’s
own interpretations of their prostitution activities are constant or can be separated from
techniques of guilt neutralisation (Sykes and Matza, 1957) to justify engaging in ‘illicit’ activities.
As with many behaviours (criminal or otherwise), the motivations underpinning punting are often
multi-faceted and to talk of a singular causal explanation may be misguided (see Chapter 8 for
an outline of the ‘relapse model’). It is unlikely therefore, that this research can claim to have
captured anything more than a motivational snapshot. Equally, whilst analysis benefits from a
degree of categorisation, the production of full-scale typologies may be of limited value. Once
again, this would suggest the need to employ longitudinal and detailed biographical research
(beyond the scope of this thesis) as a means of building on the findings from this, and other,
research.

Risk, curiosity and excitement

Corresponding with Månsson’s (2003) ‘dirty whore fantasy’ theme (Chapter 6), a number of
‘John school’ studies indicate that a substantial proportion of punters are motivated by the illicit,
raunchy or risky elements associated with prostitution. Interestingly, Shell et al (2001) observe
that the ‘risk of the street’ is a key motivation for a number of men from professional
backgrounds; the street is said to represent a welcome diversion from the sanitised work and
home environment they inhabit.

Such themes were well represented amongst Change respondents, with 27 per cent of survey
respondents stating the primary reason for paying for sex related to excitement, risk, the
impulsive nature of the transaction, curiosity or the power to choose who to have sex with.
When asked as to why he (and men more generally) had paid for street-level sex, Stuart felt
that it was due to:

‘…novelty. And also because it’s a risk, for that quick adrenaline rush. Most guys that
have paid are after that kick…the fear of getting caught. Because you park up with a girl
and someone walks past…it’s that adrenalin rush […] But it’s like drugs or booze…I’ll
get a rush each time, but probably not as big a rush as the first time sort of thing’
(Stuart, 38, long-term partner, warehouse operative).

To get the same level of ‘adrenaline rush’ - and demonstrating noticeable parallels with the
voyeurism (and risk) inherent to the phenomenon of ‘dogging’ (Bell, 2006) - this interviewee
said:

‘…what happens is that you start to make yourself more visible to increase the risk of
getting caught. Then somebody will walk past and look into the car that will boost that
rush again’ (Stuart, 38, long-term partner, warehouse operative).

Intriguingly – and in line with Sullivan and Simon’s (1998) findings – four follow-up interviewee’s
were currently, or had previously been, in the armed forces. This is perhaps unsurprising given
the well-established links between the armed forces and prostitution usage (Ringdal, 2004;
Allred, 2006). On the basis that forces personnel are often away from home for long periods, explanations for this link have generally relied on a ‘biological needs’ perspective. More broadly, however, Change facilitators (unpublished Programme observations) claim a relationship exists between the armed forces and a high-adrenaline mindset, with evidence that retiring soldiers or personnel returning from deployment are keen to seek ‘this same high-octane adrenaline rush’ (Toland, 2008). Having been introduced to prostitution markets on overseas postings, prostitution is seen to be one such readily transferable replacement ‘high-risk’ ‘destructive’ behaviour. Corresponding with this perspective, for Tony (whose prostitution history preceded his involvement in the armed forces) the military represented the most obvious outlet to channel his ‘adrenaline-focused personality’. Consequently:

‘...you’ll find that blokes that do use street-girls are in jobs that gets their adrenaline pumping. And that’s the same for me, having been in the forces and all that…it just seemed like an exciting thing [to do]’ (Tony, 45, divorced, unemployed).

In relation to ‘control’, Ben derogatorily acknowledges:

‘I suppose that at some level choosing who to have sex with does have some appeal […]. When you’re looking for tricks [paid sex], then it’s down to you to take what you fancy at that time….‘tonight I’ll have the black bird, tomorrow blondie’ type thing. You don’t end up with the leftovers, because there are no leftovers’ (Ben, 29, single, structural engineer).

Contrasting this, Fareed (originally from the Middle East) argues that the idea of ‘power’ and a re-assertion of gendered hegemony can be overstated. ‘Control’ is clearly not a motivation for all men that pay for sex:

‘I do not recognise this feeling of ‘having control’ you talk about. Not every girl in Nottingham is on the streets – not the nice ones anyway – so I have very limited options’ (Fareed, 34, single, IT consultant).

‘Another kind of sex’

In wanting ‘another kind of sex’ (Månsson, 2003), working girls are seen to embody the ideal opportunity to engage in sexual activities that regular partners find unpleasant or unacceptable (Wortley and Fischer, 2002:49; McKeeganey and Barnard, 1996; Monto; 2000; Coy et al, 2007; SoS-Rapport, 2004; Smette, 2008). As discussed above, working girls are also seen to represent clients’ desire for access to women with certain characteristics, particularly associated with age, ethnicity and physique (O’Connell Davidson, 1998; McKeeganey and Barnard, 1996). The concept of ethnicity was especially pertinent for the five South Asian interviewees, best summarised by Iqbal:
‘I’ve always fantasised about sex with an English [white] woman, blonde in particular, but I never had the confidence – or the opportunity - to meet such women in everyday life. I always felt that prostitution was the only way to fulfil this…how to say it....’guilty fantasy’ (Iqbal, 24, single, research).

For Fareed it was the mismatch between an overwhelming desire to have sex with a ‘white woman’ and the lack of opportunity to meet such women that became the driving force for his prostitution activity in the UK:

‘I have found it difficult to make relationships with women outside my ethnicity, especially at work. Work is where most of these things happen. But the working environment over here is prohibitive for these things to work. Outside of work it’s even worse...when women hear that you were originally from the Middle East, they think you’re a terrorist or something’ (Fareed, 34, single, IT consultant).

Although ‘another kind of sex’ motivations are patently recognised by men in this research, the percentage response (6 per cent) amongst Change participants would suggest this is not a major facilitating factor in the Nottingham group sampled (a finding echoed in the Abt (2008) research). One respondent commented that the idea of street-level ‘prostitutes’ engaging in unconventional sexual acts is a complete misnomer anyway:

‘It is absolutely the opposite for me. I can do anything with my girlfriend…with women in massage parlours, at least they make you feel intimate...street-prostitutes they are usually not ready...they want to charge you for everything...if you want a different form of sex, they are usually aggressive and say pay me another 100 pounds. Some of them just say….‘no I don’t do anal’ or something like that' (Iqbal, 24, single, research).

Of even more significance, the majority of interviewees said they found the working girls they had sex with physically unattractive:

‘It was all a bit of a let down really. I was expecting someone to be dressed in you know a short skirt or something like that, high heels and plenty of flesh showing. The one I went with was just wearing jeans and a coat. I wasn’t at all attracted to this woman; to be brutally honest she was disgusting and looked ill’ (Stuart, 38, long-term partner, warehouse operative).

What the above example seemingly demonstrates is the importance that many men (especially first-time punters) place on expectation (the fantasy ‘build up’ as described by Holzman and

---

213 The respondent made it clear that he only ever paid for sex when single.
214 A number of working girls purposively avoided wearing the stereotypical working girl ‘uniform’, either because they were keen to avoid the attention of the OSPT or as a symbolic means of re-claiming their identity.
Pines, 1982). This is no doubt partly driven by the popular stereotypes of working girls in the media\textsuperscript{215}. One might reasonably assume that the mismatch between ‘expectation’ and ‘reality’ would act as a check to future recidivism. And yet, the evidence from this fieldwork (and elsewhere) indicates otherwise; ‘intermediate’ and ‘veteran’ interviewee’s continued to pay for street-level sex despite being just as likely to express dissatisfaction with the physical appearance of street-level working girls and the experience itself. Manifestly other motivational factors are at play here.

**Biological urges**

A number of men simplified their desire to pay for sex with ‘unattractive’ working girls to biological urges and entitlement; whether their partners are not interested or they simply don’t have the time (or ‘ability’) for conventional relationships, men feel they have a right and need to sexual access (Coy et al, 2007; Hollway, 1984; Kennedy et al, 2004). As one respondent in Smette’s (2008:30) research contends: ‘Why a man never declines an opportunity to have sex? Because of primordial instincts and hormones’. In this context, justifying punt on the basis of biological differences between men and women may once again be seen to directly challenge the gender equality discourse; accordingly ‘sex drive’ differentials provide immunity from changing gender roles within society. Furthermore for men in a relationship, justifying prostitution use on the basis of a partner’s perceived lack of interest in sex means that these men don’t suffer from a ‘sense of [their own] betrayal’ (Jordan, 1997: 58).

As evidence of this need/right to have sex as soon as aroused – a recreational view of sex (Bernstein, 2001) – 17 per cent of men in this research said the main reason they engaged in prostitution activities was because they were ‘horny’ or not getting enough sex. Aligned with this biological imperative Adam felt strongly that:

‘I need sex at least once a day. Again, to make an example…some people need to eat more, I need sex more’ (Adam, 22, single, plumber).

Moreover this biological ‘urge’ is so intense, that for some men it seems to transcend the need to be physically attracted to the working girl, even when in a ‘stable’ relationship:

‘I didn’t have sex for such a long time, I had to have...it was an act of desperation, and not out of choice or enjoyment. Sometimes you need more than your right hand [laughs]’ (Stuart, 38, long-term partner, warehouse operative).

\textsuperscript{215}As discussed elsewhere, media discourses related to prostitution are complex and contradictory. Prostitution (in the broadest sense) appears to be glamourised (usually off-street) and loathed (usually on-street) in equal measure (for example Saner, 2007 and Dalla, 2000 versus Hallgrimsdottir et al, 2006). The question is, are men able to recognise these subtle distinctions? Evidence from this research would suggest that the ‘Pretty Woman’ myth is still pervasive.
This theme was widely replicated in conversations with other men. In line with the ‘hydraulic’ view of sex (Chapter 2), Fareed rationalised his prostitution activities on the basis of it being:

‘...a physical pressure. It’s not something that I enjoy [paying for sex]. I hate it actually. But when you don’t have sex for 3-4 months…it’s purely a sexual thing’ (Fareed, 34, single, IT consultant).

**Commercial sex as ‘convenience’**

Some respondents felt that they simply didn’t have the time or energy to engage in conventional relationships with women; 21 per cent of respondents cited prostitution representing a ‘quick and easy way to get sex’, or ‘not having to worry about having a relationship’ as the most important reason for seeking the ‘services’ of street-level ‘prostitutes’ (see also Abt, 2008). However, this motivation should not be seen as necessarily unconnected to other motivations, such as risk enjoyment. Implicitly, these findings hint at a conviction that paying for sex enables the stability of a marriage (or significant relationship) to be maintained, whilst simultaneously fulfilling a number of sexual predilections. As Asim divulged:

‘I like being in a stable monogamous relationship, and paying for sex allows me to maintain this’ (Asim, 36, married, courier).

What is noteworthy about the above quote from Asim is that this respondent patently does not equate paying for sex with a contravention of monogamy or at least that it is less of a betrayal than an affair. Perhaps this symbolises a re-interpretation of Sykes and Matza’s (1957) technique of neutralising ‘inner protests’. It certainly resonates with a sense of ‘cognitive dissonance’ (Festinger, 1957), whereby the behaviour of ‘punting’ is at odds with a belief about the importance of fidelity. Both explanations are indicative of the need for some punters to employ psychological defence mechanisms (Fonagy and Target, 2003) as a means of maintaining self-image.

Because some men are known to have difficulty in establishing conventional relationships (Monto, 2000), the literature indicates that these punters seek to also establish conventional relationships with working girls, particularly where shyness or other physical/personality traits limit a man from being able to form close attachments (Jordan, 1997:61). In later conversations with Change interviewees, there was some suggestion that the ‘regulars’ who had established relationships (or a perception of a relationship), were more likely to re-offend:

‘One of the lads who was on the Change Programme with me...he was involved in a relationship with one of the working girls and he said that it would not stop him from seeing her’ (Aakash, 40, married, chemist).
Negating the pressure to perform and other personality traits

For Høigård and Finstad (1992), purchasing sex also enables men to negate women's increasingly high expectations within the sexual encounter and to ignore their own perceived inadequacies. Furthermore, nearly one in ten men enrolled on a psycho-educational programme in Minnesota (Sawyer et al., 1998), stated the best aspect of sex with a prostitute was the companionship aspect as mitigation against loneliness (perhaps representative of the ‘angst ridden’ user as described by Vanwesenbeeck et al., 1993; see also Wortley and Fischer, 2002:49 and Kennedy et al., 2004). Rather than providing merely ‘sexual relief’ some men appear to use working girls ‘as a dysfunctional attempt to resolve unrelated life problems’ (Sawyer et al., 1998:115).

Despite this evidence, only 1 per cent of Change Programme respondents cited loneliness as the main reason they paid for sex. Arguably most men have interpreted this reason as less important than the other available options. Nevertheless, evidence of emotional trauma or loneliness were widely present in follow-up interviews, with a number of men acknowledging that emotional isolation was facilitated by a change in their personal situations:

‘After my divorce I thought that a prostitute, by just having sex with me, might give me [a] boost to my ego. Stupidly, in my head, I thought that the prostitute would end up enjoying the sex with me. What actually happened was that I ended up being disappointed with the whole experience, which made my sense of isolation even worse’ (Deepak, 42, divorced, public sector manager).

Pornography as a motivational facilitator

Much of the interview data suggested a need for men to separate intimacy and sex. Arguably there are also strong correlations here with the impact of sexual liberalism and the ensuing use of pornography (Monto and Julka, 2003; Tewksbury and Golder, 2005; Kipnis, 1999). All interviewees in this research admitted to being regular users of pornography at some point in their lives. Moreover, several respondents made a direct link between their use of pornography and an entitlement to sex, women and prostitution (Lowman and Atchison, 2006:288). Adam candidly acknowledged:

‘Watching pornography frees your mind about sex…it removes your inhibitions because you see people doing it and they’re doing it with joy…at least in front of camera they enjoy it […]. So in a way yes, porn has had an impact [on ‘punting’ activity]’ (Adam, 22, single, plumber).

For Aakash, his use of pornography was identified not only as directly fuelling the desire to engage in previous prostitution activities, but that it would remain an important motivation for future prostitution usage:
‘I can say with some certainty that as long as I use porn I’ll be tempted to pay for sex; whenever I see porn I want to have dirty, anonymous sex. I suppose that’s not a healthy thing to admit, but that’s just the way it is’ (Aakash, 40, married, chemist).

‘Punting’ and revenge

Notions of ‘revenge’, although rare - 3 per cent of men stated their main reason for ‘punting’ was that they had ‘fallen out with their partner/wife’ – were nevertheless present and, on the basis of not being provided as a formal coded option in this research project, possibly under-reported. One interviewee explained that:

‘A month prior to me going out looking for a woman, my girlfriend cheated on me. So basically I wanted to get my own back. I’m not the most outgoing guy, to be able to go out and chat a woman up, so the other option is to go out and attempt to pick up a woman by paying for sex’ (Stuart, 38, long-term partner, warehouse operative).

What is interesting about this quote is that the concept of revenge appeared well developed, and yet this man did not end up telling his partner about paying for sex. In this sense, ‘revenge’ became internalised and as the respondent later acknowledged unfulfilled. Nevertheless, the motivational underpinnings of planned revenge, bears obvious correlations with Monto and McRee’s (2005:524) observation that, ‘prostitution may be a temporary outlet when they [‘punters…] are experiencing difficulties in their intimate relationships’, whilst also supporting Stoller’s (1979) theory that specific ‘perversions’ (‘punting’) can originate from a well-developed sense of humiliation or rage. Once again, the need for research to explore the concept of ‘illicit’ sex as a male ‘refuge’ from domestic problems – or even as a means to avail domestic violence – offers worthy future analysis.

Altruism and denial

When offered the opportunity to explain their prostitution behaviours in a pseudo-altruistic framework, there is some evidence that Change respondents do not leave the Programme with a well-developed empathy for working girls and an opposition to: ‘...a system that oppresses women’ (Monto, 1998:511). But equally the belief from Tony that ‘at the end of the day it is the working girls that need the help not the bloody punters: we’re the ones in the wrong’, is indicative that the Change Programme is capable of eliciting different attitudinal perspectives for some men.

Because respondents classified as ‘deniers’ were included in questionnaire responses, nine per cent claimed that they were innocent, solicited or didn’t realise that the woman they had approached as part of a ‘test purchase’ exercise was a working girl. Shell et al (2001:10) contest that the ‘use of excuses and minimisation’ is not uncommon in rehabilitation
programmes and has parallels with the thinking styles of more serious sexual offenders (Ward et al, 1997). However, given what we know about the problems of ‘due process’ (see below), to assume guilt in all circumstances is highly problematic.

**The motivation to ‘punt’: some reflections**

The findings reported above in relation to Change participants generally seemingly conform to many ‘stereotypical sex buyers’ (SoS-Rapport, 2004:57) that encompasses a broad array of ‘types’:

‘...the shy, awkward, or ugly individual who has difficulty establishing a conventional relationship with a woman; the dissatisfied husband who wants a little more excitement or whose partner will not or cannot meet his perceived needs; the highly sexed individual with few moral limitations regarding sexuality […]; the individual who has been socialised to see prostitution as normal and acceptable; the individual interested in dominating women’ (Monto and McRee, 2005:527).

**Explaining motivational variation(s)**

What is arguably missing from this overview, however, is: i) a precise understanding as to how and why the emphasis on motivation varies between studies; ii) the presence of clustered causal pathways (and contradictions) and; iii) the extent to which this data represents a conflation of punter motivational categorisation between on and off street markets.

What’s more, one could argue that notions of **bounded authenticity** (Bernstein, 2001), or the **delusion of mutuality** (Sanders, 2008; Smette, 2008) bear less relevance for on-street clients than does the process of exchange and ‘sex as recreation’ (Bernstein, 2001). By way of illustration, one respondent who stated that he paid for sex as a quick and easy way to ‘get sex’ was quizzed if that meant he would be happy to engage in unpaid sex with a working girl. The response was unequivocal:

‘That sounds a bit weird to me. I’d be a bit sceptical about her motives – these girls are addicted to drugs and don’t just give freebies and…you know…well, in truth I don’t really think they enjoy what they’re doing; they do it because they need to, don’t they? I’d feel worse if I’d had it for free…I can’t explain, it seems like taking liberties’ (Brian, 50, divorced, copywriter).

In short it is imperative that Change facilitators (and other policymakers) understand the motivational specificity of each market and if these men differ from non-punters in any meaningful way. It is implausible that such questions can be answered from this study alone (if at all) and so more substantial longitudinal data is required. Nevertheless, the evidence base from this research (and elsewhere) is developed enough for us to understand that a core
message that emerges from this section of the analysis is that ‘the prostitute provides a social and psychological emollient while requiring little emotional competence or obligation in return’ (Sullivan and Simon, 1998:152). Evidence from this Change Programme evaluation, broadly concurs with Monto’s (2004:164) observation that paying for sex ‘depends on many factors, cultural and personal, and cannot be seen as an inevitable response to being deprived of satisfying one’s sexual desires’.

For some commentators, part of this socio-cultural specificity relates to a fundamental reorganisation of the privatised nuclear family - including a decline in marriage, a rise in divorce and an increase in single-person households (Sanders, 2008) – so that sex and love have become emotionally distinct for many men. In other words, some men appear to use prostitution as a way of re-asserting their masculinity. There is also some evidence from the fieldwork that the lack of influential and genuine male admonishment serves to propagate this re-assertion of masculinity:

‘Yes they [male friends] took the piss out of me in the pub […], but I was made to feel like a ‘geezer’ rather than some pervert or weirdo’ (Adam, 22, single, plumber).

This leads some commentators to argue that male sexuality must be reshaped so that it sheds its preoccupation with sexual release, promiscuity and commodification and instead embraces notions of female sexuality such as intimacy (Kulick, 2005:223). But as we have seen previously, this reconfiguration cannot be achieved independently of societal, historical and perhaps even biological perspectives, particularly if we consider the increasing influence that the media and pornography play in late modernity.

Closely related to this, Prasad (1999:181) points out that ‘in fervently free-markets […] romantic love might sometimes be subordinated to, and judged unfavourably with, the more neutral, more cleanly exchangeable pleasures of eroticism’. Whether the psycho-educational components of the Change Programme is able to reflect and respond to the ‘shift from a relational to a recreational model of sexual behaviour’ (Bernstein, 2001:397) and how this relates to opportunity structures and socialisation experiences, is the subject of the subsequent analysis.

Perceptions of prostitution: does the Change Programme challenge attitudes at the ‘macro’ level?

One of the stipulated aims of the Change Programme is to challenge any (mis)conceptions that punters have about the scale and scope of British street-level prostitution markets. Despite the limited amount of off-street ‘education’ in the Change Programme, a number of Likert scale questions were designed to evaluate the effect that the Change Programme had in reshaping attitudes both at the narrow street-level definition, and also measured against the broader classification of prostitution. In order to measure the levels of resistance to street-level prostitution, thirteen statements were formulated (see Table 9.21) based on a model adopted by
Abt (2008). Using a scale of 1-5 (where 1 is to ‘strongly agree’ and 5 is to ‘strongly disagree’), Mean Score values were formulated using SPSS. By way of interpretation, Mean Scores with a value of ‘5’ were deemed to be representative of an abolitionist stance and values of ‘1’ a ‘pro-prostitution’ outlook. The exceptions to this correlational relationship were statements ‘I’ (‘prostitutes are the victims of pimps’) and, more controversially, statement ‘B’ (‘the police should go after the men that pay for sex and leave the prostitutes alone’). In order to provide a snapshot of attitudinal attitudes, these Mean Scores were subsequently aggregated to derive an Average Mean Score (AMS).

Before evaluating any observed attitudinal shifts in this area, it is worth revisiting the fact that a number of academics are critical of using these scales to realistically evaluate any attitudinal change facilitated through KCRP engagement (Kennedy et al, 2005). Whilst I accept the potential flaws of Likert scales (see Chapter 7), I disagree with the rationale underpinning Kennedy et al’s scepticism, which is grounded in claims to post-programme ‘social desirability bias’. Enough research literature exists to tell us it would be a mistake to discount the impact of the ‘research environment’ on data collection. Nevertheless, it also seems at odds to presume that any ‘research environment’ impact should be limited to post-programme analysis. This is especially true if one considers that, pre-programme, the majority of participants are generally: a) extremely nervous; b) uninformed about what to expect from the course and; c) – having had no previous convictions – almost certainly in a police station for the first time as ‘offenders’.

Under these strains, it would seem equally likely that pre-programme responses have been tempered by a presupposition about what facilitators (and/or researchers) want to hear. And yet, as we saw at the beginning of this chapter, prior to engaging in the course nearly four in five participants felt that it was okay for women over-18 to sell sex. Evidence from elsewhere would also seem to question Kennedy et al’s (2005) assertion. Wortley and Fischer (2002:38), for example, found that ‘John school’ participants were less likely to identify ‘prostitutes’ as victims after they had completed the programme. If anything, Change Programme participants tended to be more reassured post-programme that their anonymity and confidentiality would be protected, and one could argue they were subsequently more likely to respond openly and honestly. Admittedly, assuming these simplistic ‘before’ and ‘after’ measurements can fully capture the nuances in movement from a pro-prostitution stance to an abolitionist position is arguably unrealistic, but it was anticipated that this aspect of the survey would at least provide some indications for future research to evolve.

---

216 Once again I am grateful to Abt Associates for their assistance in this area.

217 For example, the OSPT (and other selected CJS/support agencies) would almost certainly take a different stance.
A support for abolitionism?

Table 9.21: How strongly respondents agree with pre-defined statements (Mean Score)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Before Session (Mean Score)*</th>
<th>After Session (Mean Score)*</th>
<th>% Change in Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street-prostitution doesn’t really harm anybody</td>
<td>3.30 (38%)</td>
<td>3.92 (67%)</td>
<td>+19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the police should go after the men that buy sex and leave the prostitutes alone</td>
<td>3.62 (55%)</td>
<td>3.30 (44%)</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be ok if my daughter grew up to be a street-prostitute</td>
<td>4.67 (89%)</td>
<td>4.74 (92%)</td>
<td>+1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that generally street-prostitutes enjoy sex with ‘kind’ punters</td>
<td>3.48 (50%)</td>
<td>4.27 (76%)</td>
<td>+23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most street-prostitutes make a lot of money</td>
<td>2.93 (33%)</td>
<td>3.87 (72%)</td>
<td>+32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally, women are street-prostitutes because they want to be. No-one forces them; it’s their choice</td>
<td>3.35 (48%)</td>
<td>4.16 (77%)</td>
<td>+24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex is better with a street-prostitute than it is in a relationship</td>
<td>4.34 (70%)</td>
<td>4.49 (83%)</td>
<td>+3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There’s nothing wrong with paying for sex – it’s what most men do</td>
<td>2.95 (35%)</td>
<td>4.02 (73%)</td>
<td>+36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street-prostitutes are victims of pimps</td>
<td>2.61 (19%)</td>
<td>2.53 (31%)</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally, men need sex more than women do</td>
<td>3.13 (38%)</td>
<td>3.08 (36%)</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As long as a man’s wife doesn’t find out, sex with a street-prostitute can help to save a marriage</td>
<td>3.55 (56%)</td>
<td>3.94 (66%)</td>
<td>+11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying for sex in a brothel/ massage parlour is more acceptable than paying for sex with a street-prostitute</td>
<td>2.86 (34%)</td>
<td>3.41 (51%)</td>
<td>+19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution will always be with us and the best thing we can do is to legalise it</td>
<td>2.17 (15%)</td>
<td>3.25 (44%)</td>
<td>+50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMS (excl. Statement B and I)</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>+18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage disagreeing in parentheses

Whilst mindful of numerous methodological/epistemological pitfalls, in broad terms, the Change Programme appears to have had an attitudinal impact across those categories, loosely defined as favourable to an ‘abolitionist’ stance (Table 9.21). Notably, the AMS for all statements went up by 18 per cent over the two surveys, suggesting that the Change Programme had an

---

218 Excluding statements ‘B’ and ‘I’.
attitudinal impact in the intended direction. The statements most likely to induce disagreement pre-and post-session relate to ‘it would be ok for my daughter to grow up to be a street-prostitute’ and ‘sex is better with a street-prostitute’. The statements most likely to induce agreement relate to: i) legalising prostitution; ii) the acceptability of paying for sex off-street (compared to on-street) and; iii) men needing sex more than women (see Appendix W). Interestingly, it should be noted that the curriculum appears noticeably less effective in challenging the biological permanency of the belief that men need sex more than women; the Mean Scores in this area actually declined over the two sessions.

Furthermore, and resonating with levels of resistance recorded towards criminalisation in a recent Ipsos/MORI survey (Home Office, 2008b: 13), it remains that - post-session - a large minority of men still agreed that prostitution should be legalised. The idea that prostitution should be legalised also proved popular in follow-up interviews:

‘I think it should be legalised for so many reasons. From my point of view, for desperate men like me I think they need somewhere. […] Why should it be illegal? I think it’s an archaic type of approach that says it should be illegal and it comes back to 10,000 years ago…the religion, funny stuff. People are following the same rules’ (Tony, 45, divorced, unemployed).

Another respondent, Fareed, felt his cultural background and experiences in his country of birth [anonymised] was instrumental in shaping his attitude towards the legislative approach taken in England and Wales:

‘Prostitution is illegal in [country X]. But everything in [country X] is illegal. Going out with girls is illegal, watching satellite TV is illegal, drinking alcohol…the line between legal and illegal in [country X] is remote. Because everything is illegal and you cannot stop life, people always do illegal things. I thought this was the same in England…I had heard that prostitution was illegal, but seeing it on the street in this way, I assumed it was one of those illegal things that people just did and got away with’ (Fareed, 34, single, IT consultant).

Generally, attitudes towards legalisation were justified on the basis of a biological imperative and/or with a concern for the safety of punters, working girls and ‘red light’ communities. Ironically – given the circumstances of their arrest - a majority of interview respondents were opposed to legalisation being extending to the street, in large part because of the effect on communities or the local economy:
‘People have been saying about legalisation for years. Yeh, control and manage street-girls and everything will be alright. But then again, what about people in the area? [...] Put it in the industrial estates you get some of the owners of the units complaining...they’re gonna need security, CCTV and so on’ (Iqbal, 24, single, research).

Instead many respondents felt that society should focus its legislative priorities on eliminating street-markets and regulating off-street locations (see also Chapter 10). Follow-up qualitative fieldwork indicated that overall, the Change Programme had a tendency for some to cement: i) a romanticisation of off-street locations and; ii) a belief that selective legalisation is a panacea for tempering and displacing the more pernicious aspects of the ‘trade’, whilst allowing ‘good’ prostitution to flourish. Other respondents responded to this ‘education’ by producing a simplified and diluted understanding of relationship between legalisation and ‘exiting’, best exemplified by Tony, who argued that:

‘You legalise it for street-girls, you’re gonna have more young kids on the street. That ain’t right. Whereas if it’s in the brothel...the women tend to be more in control. And the street-girls would be forced to have medical checks, and if they’re found using drugs they’re out. The best thing is that they can work without being attacked. Working in that environment, they can also get the education as well. A lot of girls have got no qualifications. The only thing they know is how to sell their body’ (Tony, 45, divorced, unemployed).

Generally there remained considerable post-session attachment to the concept of legalisation as a tool to regulate the ‘inevitability’ of prostitution (Table 9.21). Yet the majority of respondents opposed the view that ‘prostitution doesn’t harm anybody’. One might reasonably speculate that this contradiction implies the criminalised status of prostitution is what causes the harm, rather than damage inherent to prostitution per se. Equally, these incongruous responses may actually represent an ‘understanding’ of stratification of ‘damage’ between street and off-street markets. When triangulated with qualitative data, for this small sub-sample of punters, the message of working girl victimisation and harm appears to have been partially taken on board:

‘The course made me realise that you’re giving her the money to kill herself with drugs. You’re paying that girl to use her body and once you leave her she’ll go round the corner, see her dealer and smoke crack or shoot up with heroin. I’m paying her to commit suicide. You can’t just think about yourself. You’ve got to think about that girl, that woman’ (Aakash, 40, married, chemist).

Based on the survey results and accounts like Aakash’s above, it is conceivable that respondents’ accountability improved as a result of engaging in the Change Programme. Nevertheless this perceptible altruism may in fact disguise more self-seeking concerns and to claim that Change attendee’s have unfettered sympathy for working girls may be misguided.
Immediately after making the point about ‘paying working girls to commit suicide’, Aakash highlighted other problems closer to home:

‘What’s more if you get caught again and she’s already got drugs on her…she could very easily drop those drugs in your bloody car. If the police search your car and find those drugs, it’s you getting done…not her’ (*Aakash, 40, married, chemist*).

Other notable attitudinal shifts, included increases in punters disagreeing with the view that ‘most street-prostitutes make a lot of money’ and that there is ‘nothing wrong with paying for sex – it’s what most men do’; importantly, the Change curriculum focuses on tackling both of these (mis)conceptions. However, in follow-up interviews there was reticence to extend the relationship between poverty and prostitution to off-street markets. Once again, it would seem that some men are happy to romanticise/legitimise off-street markets (with ensuing displacement consequences):

‘I picked this one girl up [in his capacity as a taxi driver]…turns out she’d got a house…all paid for. You tell me a job I can get where I can pay my mortgage off in ten years? This girl […] started off on the streets [but] got beat up one night by a pimp because she wouldn’t work for him…so she started making notices up in various adult magazines’ (*Tony, 45, divorced, unemployed*).

Unusual as it is for working girls to migrate from the street to ‘behind closed doors’ (Chapter 6), these accounts provide compelling evidence that attendees may be *selective* in the messages they pick up from the Change Programme. However, the large rise in the number of men opposing the idea that there is ‘nothing wrong with paying for sex’ might, on its own, be seen as a partial questioning of the recent paradigm shift towards an ‘unfettered, consumeristic ‘Playboy philosophy’, many male sexual clients feel they are entitled to’ (*Ehrenreich, 1983 in Bernstein, 2001:401*). Regrettably (for anti-prostitution campaigners) this opposition to paid sex does not translate into an outright rejection of legalisation in all prostitution markets and when triangulated with qualitative evidence, it is improbable that the Change Programme could hope to unpick the ‘sexual consumerism’ paradigm as suggested by the survey data. Instead the quantitative attitudinal shift may represent a reinterpretation of the unsuitability of *street-level* sex, together with a bifurcation of ‘choice’ for all working girls. The consequences of bifurcating choice results in some men appearing to be very content to reinterpret the phenomenon of prostitution into a simplified ‘on street’ bad, ‘off street’ good’ hypothesis. As one interviewee points out:
‘Ultimately we all have choices…if you’re thinking about drug addicts then, yes, their choices are difficult and on reflection\(^{219}\), I would now [after being on the Programme] be less comfortable about paying for sex with a street girl. But in massage parlours, they definitely have choices. They’re doing it with freedom and as a conscious decision. There’s no yes and no…the answer is that we all have choices. The other choice for the drug addict is not to do drugs…it’s difficult but not impossible’ (Asim, 36, married, courier).

That said, three-quarters of all respondents (post-programme) felt compelled to (strongly) disagree with the view that ‘women are street-prostitutes because they want to be and no-one forces them; it’s their choice’ (see Appendix W). As one respondent commented:

‘The way you’ve got to look at street-work is that it’s not a job. As they said on the course, it’s a vicious circle for most of these girls’ (Ben, 29, single, structural engineer).

Despite a broad objection to the notion of street-level working girl ‘choice’ from the majority of Change attendee’s, this empathic perspective was not universally accepted:

‘If I’m a girl, then my view is that my body is my body and I should be free to do whatever I want with it, wherever I want…including the street corner in Mapperley Park. Some people sell their body, like a manual labourer, others like me and you sell our minds. However, in every profession you should make some guidelines or protocols for that profession. So people that don’t have that choice because of drugs or violence or whatever, shouldn’t be a prostitute – that’s where the police or whatever should get involved’ (Fareed, 34, single, IT consultant).

Evidence from the research literature indicates that off-street punters may be more inclined to associate prostitution with choice (Smette, 2008), a theme picked up by Change respondents, as demonstrated in the discussion with Adam below:

‘Adam’ (22, single, plumber): Some of them will have no choice in the matter…they’ll have been forced out there. Others will have the choice.

PH: when you say that some lack choice, what did you mean by that?

\(^{219}\) Having completed the Change Programme.
Adam: well, one of the things that came out of the [Change] course was that many of these women grew up under local authority care. The same again...it all comes down to funding. You’ve got no funds, they don’t run the authority homes properly. They’ve got no control over the kids these days, so the kids are out all hours. But if they run away, the first person they’ll bump into is a working girl. Then the working girl will befriend them. Then they’re with punters and before you know it, they’re on drugs. [...]. But this is the extreme version of prostitution...a lot of these girls in massage parlours...well, a lot of them come from good homes...there’s students, middle class housewives, all sorts really. For me, this is no different to choosing to work in the local bank...and I bet it pays better [laughs].

In many respects the punter’s own messages of abuse being best restricted to on-street markets echoes the political priority – until recently - of cleaning up the most publicly visible manifestations of prostitution, whilst largely leaving ‘closed door’ and ‘on-line’ sex alone (Day, 2008). But as Weitzer (2000) points out, focusing on one segment of the industry inevitably sends out a message of legitimization for those arenas of commercial sex deemed to impact less on a communities’ ‘quality of life’.

Given the prevalence of this mixed message, it is perhaps surprising that the Change Programme has any impact in challenging the acceptability of off-street sex. Although, the Mean Scores of men (strongly disagreeing) that off-street sex is more acceptable than on-street sex rose after completing the Change Programme, nearly half of respondents still did not disagree with this statement after completing the Programme. Consequently, the extent to which this change is genuine, deep-seated and can be maintained in the long-term is questionable.

In line with these mixed messages, there appears to be a degree of ambivalence to other statements intended to examine the extent to which punters might possibly agree with a broad abolitionist framework. Those assenting to the idea that agencies of the CJS should go after punters and leave the prostitutes alone rose by only one percentage point pre/post survey. Judging by the qualitative responses, this may be less to do with a moral objection than a sense that such an approach would simply not produce the desired effect:

‘It [a demand clampdown] might have worked with me, but let’s be honest, as soon as you get one punter off the street, there’s another five waiting’ (Brian, 50, divorced, copywriter).

In line with critiques of the Swedish approach elsewhere (Östergren, 2004), several men felt that punitive demand-led interventions might not lead to supply reductions and actually make things worse for working girls. Of course, this is not quite the same as saying that ‘punters should be left alone’, but as Stuart contended when asked if reducing demand is a good thing:
‘Yeh, but if they ain’t got the punters, then they’re gonna turn to crime…they’ll end up doing street robberies and things like that. Or they’ll take stupid risks […]. Like that girl I picked up. She offered to do it without protection…I said no, but let’s be honest, not all blokes are gonna be like me am they?’ (Stuart, 38, long-term partner, warehouse operative).

Furthermore, the number of punters disagreeing that ‘prostitutes are victims of pimps’ actually rose over the two sessions, suggesting that even when punters recognise street-level working girls’ victimised status, this is less likely to be attributed to coercion from ‘pimps’. This may partly reflect the way in which Change facilitators are generally dismissive of ‘traditional’ pimp stereotypes in the curriculum.

The Change Programme seems also to have been relatively ineffective at challenging notions of a ‘biological imperative’; the Mean Scores associated with ‘men generally needing sex more than women’ remained the lowest of all statements. Although this statement doesn’t necessarily equate to a pro-prostitution stance, it is important to remember that men’s biologically driven ‘sexual urges’ have frequently been cited as a justificatory reason as to why we should take a more regulatory (rather than abolitionist) approach to prostitution (see previous section and Ringdal, 2004).

Challenging the argument that prostitution is about ‘good’ or ‘different’ sex (Månsson, 2006; McKeganey and Barnard, 1996; Monto, 1999 and 2000), or that punters view sex and love as emotionally distinct, the high Mean Score for the statement ‘sex is better with a street-prostitute than it is in a relationship’ in both surveys, suggests little support for the idea that ‘the sexual experiences […] with sex workers were mutually pleasurable for both parties’ (Sanders, 2008:99). Interestingly this lack of support for the delusion of mutuality (ibid) feeds into the previously mentioned separation between off and on street markets. Fareed, who had paid for sex both on the street (latterly) and in massage parlours (formerly), was very unhappy with his experiences on ‘the street’:

‘When I went with these women [street-level working girls] the quality of the service was so low…both the girls on the street were verbally abusive to me. I could tell that this was all about the money for these women. The difference is they treat you as shit on the streets, but in massage parlours in England they are professionals. They give good service’ (Fareed, 34, single, IT consultant).

When questioned as to whether this perception of working girls being focused on the ‘money’ made the encounter feel like a ‘business transaction’, Fareed responded that:
‘Well if it is, it’s like doing business with someone who doesn’t have any customer care. If this was a restaurant I would have refused to pay my bill’ (Fareed, 34, single, IT consultant).

Clearly, these findings broadly correspond with Holzman and Pines’ (1982) observations that punters frequently experience a mismatch between expectations and experience. However, for Change Programme facilitators to completely dismiss delusions of mutuality, or punters enjoying sex, within on-street markets, would be unwise considering the occasional narratives of ‘good sex’ displayed in post-programme follow-up interviews. Brian stated that: ‘I’ve had very enjoyable sex with a prostitute’ (Brian, 50, divorced, copywriter).

Agreement with pre-defined statements: selected socio-demographic variations

Marital status

Equally there is generally little support in the research for the idea that ‘paying for sex can help save a marriage’. The general lack of consensus supporting the idea that prostitution is able to save a long-term relationship seems to be at odds with some of the literature (Shell et al, 2001; Sanders, 2008:122; Kinnell, 1989; see Chapter 6). Perhaps unsurprisingly the survey data also shows an inverse relationship between marital status and the marriage saving statement. Thus, single punters were most likely to (strongly) disagree with this statement, when compared to the other marital groups (Table 9.22). This finding has some resonance with Sandell et al’s (1996) typology of the ‘supplement buyer’ who pays for sex to escape ‘bad (or a lack of) sex’ in a conventional relationship. Indeed it would seem that Shell et al’s (2001) findings regarding punters convincing themselves that working girls can satisfy their innate sexual urges whilst protecting a long-term relationship (retrospective pondering in the case of divorced and separated punters) takes on more relevance when broken down by marital status (although this is not the same as an enjoyable sexual experience).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As long as a man’s wife doesn’t find out, sex with a street-prostitute can help to save a marriage - % (Strongly Disagreeing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Session</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.22: How strongly respondents agree with ‘marriage-saving’ statement: by Marital Status
**Ethnicity**

Going into the Change Programme, South Asian punters had a higher AMS across the 13 pre-defined statements than their white British/Irish counterparts. Not only had this position been reversed post-session, but engagement with the Change curriculum had actually led to a 1 per cent decrease in AMS for the South Asian group. In large part this is attributable to South Asian men being significantly less likely than White punters to disagree post-session that ‘most street-level prostitutes make a lot of money’, that ‘selling’ sex is a choice and that ‘sex is better with a street-level prostitute than it is in a relationship’. Furthermore, South Asian respondents were only marginally more likely to disagree that prostitution ‘does not harm anybody’ having completed the programme. Resonating with earlier findings of the increase in South Asian men stating that they may pay for street-level sex in the future, these findings give further credence to the need to tailor the delivery of Change Programme content. Given the small sub-sample sizes, it is important to retain a sense of caution about these findings, but it would seem that at best the Change Programme is failing to push the right ‘cultural buttons’, at worst is actually counter-productive in terms of reducing demand, as demonstrated by Asim’s comments below:

‘Not every woman on drugs sells her body, so you can’t tell me that they don’t choose this life. Everyone tells me [including Change facilitators] that these women don’t enjoy what they do, but it’s all relative...I’m sure it’s not the best job in the world, but it’s not the worst either and they are earning the money to pay for the lifestyle they chose at the end of the day. We’re told about how paying these women for sex does a lot of harm, keeps them involved in prostitution, drugs and all that, but I’m sorry to say that these women would be fucked up regardless of whether or not [punters] paid them for sex’ (Asim, 36, married, courier).

**Table 9.23: How strongly respondents agree with pre-defined statements – by ETHNICITY**

(Aggregated Mean Score)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White British/Irish</td>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AMS</td>
<td>AMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Please read the following statements and tell us how strongly you agree or disagree with each one (on a scale of 1-5, where 1= strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)</strong></td>
<td>Before Session</td>
<td>After Session</td>
<td>% Change in AMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>+16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In line with findings elsewhere (Wortley and Fischer, 2002:88) the data in this chapter shows that the AMS across the 13 pre-defined statements is lowest for veterans in both surveys, suggesting that these men more readily identify with a pro-prostitution stance (Table 9.24).

Table 9.24: How strongly respondents agree with pre-defined statements – by PROSTITUTION USAGE (Aggregated Mean Score)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prostitution Usage</th>
<th>Novice (1-5)</th>
<th>Intermediate (6-20)</th>
<th>Veteran (21+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Session</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Session</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change in AMS</td>
<td>+12%</td>
<td>+17%</td>
<td>+11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conversely, Kennedy et al (2004:49) found that ‘the only consistent pattern was that First Timers tended to show less attitude change than the other two groups of participants’. The authors attribute the variance between their study and Wortley and Fischer’s (2002) Toronto John School evaluation down to a number of procedural and content differences including a rejection of the confrontational shaming ritual (Braithwaite, 1989), in favour of teaching ‘its participants about street prostitution within an atmosphere of mutual respect’ (Kennedy et al, 2004: 51). The authors argue that experienced punters may be ‘turned off’ by the shaming process on the basis that they have normalised their punting behaviour and are therefore unlikely to recognise this model of ‘shaming’.

Kennedy et al (ibid) also argue that the use of a Sex and Love Addicts Anonymous (SLAA) presentation by ex-punters on the Toronto programme gives participants (especially ‘veterans’) the opportunity to justify their punting behaviour, and in line with evidence from research done in schools (Blatchford, 2003), larger class sizes in the Toronto programme affects participation and therefore opportunities for learning.

Unfortunately the structural framework operating within the Nottingham Change Programme would seem to cast doubt on the power of these observations as explanatory tools. Evidently the Change Programme curriculum (see Chapter 8) is more broadly aligned with the Kennedy et al (2004) study – for example, the class size is never more than 13 and external agencies are never invited to present – and yet the findings in relation to the effects of experience on attitudes remain more aligned with the Wortley and Fischer (2002) data. As one ‘veteran’
respondent commented in follow-up research, ‘men have always paid for sex and always will, it’s not complicated’ (Deepak, 42, divorced, public sector).

Contrast this with the more prevalent view from ‘novice’ respondents: ‘I never realised what these women had gone through. It’s really made me think about things differently’ (Adam, 22, single, plumber).

**Gauging attitudes towards street-level working girls: entry dynamics and the impact on ‘community cohesion’**

The final attitudinal measurement scales looked to gauge the ‘degree of truth’ to which respondents attached to a number of pre-defined statements (Table 9.25). Drawing on the literature, these assertions looked to appraise attitudes towards some of the well-established reasons for girls and women becoming involved in prostitution, the daily abuses they face, and the potential impact that prostitution can have on the communities where street-prostitution takes place (Campbell and O’Neill, 2006; Scambler and Scambler, 1997). Before examining any identified ‘working girl/community’ attitudinal change, it is first necessary to make a short diversion to clarify the rationale for the inclusion of these particular measurement scales.

Effectively these attitudinal statements are included in an attempt to reflect specific ‘educational awareness’ components of the programme curriculum. Importantly the ideas on which these educational elements are based would seem to inform the programme’s ideological standpoint – namely, that paying for street-level sex is a major barrier to supply-side ‘exiting’.

Instinctively, however, opponents of KCRPs worry that – as Self (2003) reminds us – these demand abolition messages appear to contravene the Wolfenden report (1957) guidelines that the state should not cast moral judgements in relation to commercial sex markets. This inevitably leads some opponents of the rehabilitation programmes to ask: what exactly are men being rehabilitated from (Sanders, 2009: 85)? The implication is that punters are being forced to desist from a consensual transaction.

As valid as this observation may be, it also arguably risks reducing demand down to issues of ‘respect’ and contractual obligation. Similar contestations could be made for the relationship between ‘drug dealer’ and ‘drug addict’ (or indeed any other so-called ‘victimless’ crimes – see McWilliams, 1996). But just as working girls have their choices ‘funnelled’ (Chapter 5), so arguably do punters. In light of this, supporters of rehabilitation programmes would be justified in asserting that the polemic between ‘choice’ and ‘coercion’ inadequately captures the motivational and attitudinal nuances inherent to punting. What is arguably missing from the debate about ‘what to do about punters’ is any acknowledgement that the notion of ‘free’ choice for punters might actually be funnelled by a lack of knowledge about what it means to sell sex on the streets.
So, in answering the question that Sanders raises above, one of the central aims of the Change Programme would appear to be rehabilitation of punters from misinformation. This is not to say that men will stop paying for sex just because they become aware of the problems that working girls (and communities) face; the complexity of punters’ motivations and responses in this research clearly suggest otherwise. Equally, Chapter 8 demonstrates that some of the ‘objective information’ presented is factually questionable. But, it is feasible that broadly educating men about the abuses working girls (and communities) face may have additive recidivistic impacts for some men. As discussed in previous sections, the plight of working girls is not always accepted by punters, but in much the same way that society seeks to help rehabilitate those with chronic addictions to Class A drugs, it would seem iniquitous not to provide an educational/rehabilitative framework to re-funnel (or re-focus) the foundations of both working girls’ and punters’ choices. As with any social policy, some will choose to embrace these rehabilitation opportunities, others may not for a variety of reasons. For the latter group, the OSPT and Change Programme facilitators make it clear what the consequences of ‘choosing’ to re-offend will be; it is this aspect of the Programme is evidently most reformist and moralising.

Nevertheless, it is somewhat disingenuous to view these measures outside of the context of the Change Programme operating in an abolitionist – and at times, ‘shaming’ – framework; after all, the ‘sex as work’ ideology is not visibly entertained as an option at any point in the Programme (Van Brunschot, 2003; Wortley et al., 2002). Seen in isolation it is easy to see why the message of ‘you will not pay for sex’ has been equated with moralistic condemnation. But this scepticism may be misguided if one considers the multi-faceted nature of the Change Programme (Chapter 8) and the wider context within which it is posited. In other words, in the clamour to undermine KCRP’s and conflate ‘moralisation’ with ‘rehabilitation’, opponents may be guilty of simplifying (or misunderstanding): i) the Change curriculum and; ii) the underlying principles that feed into this ‘demand abolition’ stance. There may also be a danger of overlooking the elements of the Programme that have some value. To what extent this approach is effective is, of course, the subject of this chapter.

Even if we accept that the Change Programme imposes ‘moral, religious-based ideology supporting heteronormative concepts of how sexuality should be suppressed’ (Sanders, 2008:159), it is difficult to see how any alternative social policy could ever be implemented in a moral vacuum. At some level implementing any social policy (or lack of), is predicated on an assumption that it is the ‘right thing to do’. Operating in an empirical ‘evidence based policy’ framework still requires a degree of morality in the decision-making process. In these circumstances, not acting could be seen to be tantamount to ‘immorality’. Given the OSPT’s daily interactions with the ‘victims’ of street-level prostitution – the ‘worst case scenarios’ (Van Brunschot, 2003) - it is easy to see why there is a desire to ‘educate’ men about the social problems that working girls are almost universally exposed to; whether this is in itself indicative of a ‘moral, religious-based ideology’ is therefore open to debate.
Assessing attitudinal changes towards working girls and communities

Moral relativism aside, the following section seeks to capture and analyse any attitudinal changes towards working girls (and communities) that may have been brought about as a result of the Change Programme curriculum’s focus on the lives of working girls and the antecedents to entry.

Table 9.25: Truth perceptions for pre-defined statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How true do you think the following statements are (on a scale of 1-5, where 1=very true and 5=very untrue)?</th>
<th>Strength of belief*</th>
<th>% Change in (very) ‘true’ Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before Session</td>
<td>After Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Very) True</td>
<td>(Very) True</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street-prostitutes are victimised by pimps</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street-prostitutes are often raped</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities suffer from the effects of street-prostitution in their neighbourhoods</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs and violence are associated with street-prostitution</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street-prostitution can harm local businesses</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community members in neighbourhoods with street-prostitution experience an increased level of fear</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most street-prostitutes were abused as children</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excludes ‘neither true/untrue’ category

What is immediately evident from Table 9.25 is that the percentage of men stating that the statement in question is (very) true rises for every category over the two sessions. Most notably, twice as many punters exit the Programme recognising that childhood abuse is common amongst street-level working girls. However, it remains that a third of respondents do not agree that ‘most street-prostitutes were abused as children’ (the same percentage who do not agree that working girls are victimised by pimps), a finding that will no doubt be of concern to Change facilitators, the OSPT and other support agencies. This may be less surprising to those sexologists who contend that ‘all sexually deviant behaviours have a dehumanised object; there is an inability to feel empathy’ (Hertoft, 1977 cited in Sandell et al, 1996: 164). In fact, respondents are far more willing to identify with the difficulties that street-level prostitution causes to local communities – the ‘public nuisance’ discourse (Kantola and Squires, 2004) - after completing the Change Programme, than they are with the abuse of street-level ‘working girls’ as children. This may be explained by the lack of dedicated focus the Change Programme – and society more generally - places on the antecedents to involvement in prostitution and the role of ‘pimps’ than it does to the socio-cultural ‘moral panics’ (Cohen, 1980b) so prevalent in
the media in respect of the links between prostitution, drugs, rape and underage sex (see Chapter 8).

**Challenging misconceptions: Selected socio-demographic observations**

Whilst it is not my intention to undertake a full socio-economic analysis for the responses to all of these statements, the data relating to ‘most street-prostitutes were abused as children’ is of interest in so much that it indicates if the Change Programme has been effective in re-shaping punters’ attitudes towards a well-recognised antecedent of involvement in street-level prostitution (see Table 9.26 and Chapter 5). Although percentage increases were observed across all socio-demographic categorisations, in line with findings elsewhere in this chapter, older, separated and ‘veteran’ punters were noticeably less likely to identify with the ‘abuse of working girls as children’. In terms of attitudinal change, Table 9.26 demonstrates a huge increase in the number of 35-45 year olds agreeing that most street-prostitutes were abused growing up. Speculating, the message of abuse may have been especially pertinent for this age group because these men are most likely to have teenage children.

Table 9.26: *Truth Perceptions in Relation to Statement: ‘Most Street-Prostitutes were abused as children’*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of respondent</th>
<th>Before Session</th>
<th>After Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Responding True/Very True</td>
<td>% Responding True/Very True</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Before Session</th>
<th>After Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single 1</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single 2</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single 3</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prostitution ‘Usage’</th>
<th>Before Session</th>
<th>After Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novice (1-5)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate (6-20)</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran (21+)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Barriers to desistance**

Evidently, paying for sex is underpinned by a wide range of inter-related and complex motivations and attitudes that are bounded by socio-cultural specificity. It is clear that more research is required to build on these limited preliminary findings. Compounding this motivational heterogeneity, men who pay for sex are frequently exposed to a number of discrete
internally and externally generated opportunity-driven ‘temptations’, which, when interacting with these core motivations, have the potential to operate as facilitators of future recidivism. Whilst it is probably unrealistic for the Change Programme (or indeed any social policy initiative) to tackle each individual motivation, at the very least there needs to be some tangible measurement of how this one day psycho-educational course fits in with other interventions to help men to re-interpret the ‘temptations’ of ‘everyday life’. According to Sawyer and Metz (2008:11), group rehabilitation forums work in facilitating this re-interpretation because it ‘is an opportunity for a man to consider what remote or covert motivation may prompt his buying sex’ and ‘to target inaccurate attitudes and beliefs that can promote and perpetuate purchasing sex’.

**Measuring ‘temptations’ to future recidivism**

A number of questions were asked of punters requiring them to rate their confidence in avoiding paying for sex in a number of discrete circumstances. Obviously, the importance of this survey measurement needs to be seen in the context of the broad aims of the Change Programme (see Chapter 8). There are clearly parallels here with the aspirations of the FOPP ‘John school’ which – amongst other things – looks to challenge:

- The belief that the risk of arrest and legal sanctions are low;
- A denial or ignorance of what motivates punters to solicit prostitutes;
- Ignorance about how to have the ‘healthy relationships’ that could replace their reliance upon commercial sex\(^\text{220}\);
- Denial or ignorance of the negative impact of prostitution on ‘providers’ (Abt Associates, 2008:13)

For those responsible for delivering the Change Programme, the good news is that across all categories, the percentage of men stating that it would be easy or very easy to avoid paying for sex in the given circumstances rises (or at worst, remains static) when measured over the two surveys (Table 9.27).

\(^{220}\) This has obvious parallels with the Healthy Sexual Functioning (HSF) course operating within the Sex Offender Treatment Programme (SOTP) within the prison system (see HM Prison Service, 2007).
Table 9.27: Prostitution Avoidance Confidence in pre-defined circumstances

| How confident do you feel that you would be able to avoid going to street-prostitute in the following circumstances | Level of confidence* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Before Session | After Session | % Change (Easy to avoid) |
| (Very) Easy to Avoid | (Very) Hard to Avoid | (Very) Easy to Avoid | (Very) Hard to Avoid |
| When I really want sex | 69% | 13% | 86% | 7% | +25% |
| When I am high or drunk | 64% | 13% | 82% | 10% | +28% |
| When I am angry | 90% | 1% | 90% | 1% | - |
| When I feel lonely | 76% | 12% | 89% | 3% | +17% |
| When I feel depressed | 79% | 10% | 91% | 5% | +15% |
| When the risk of being caught seems low | 73% | 18% | 83% | 12% | +14% |
| When some risk of being caught | 90% | 0% | 97% | 0% | +8% |
| When I am stressed from my job | 71% | 9% | 90% | 4% | +27% |
| When I am solicited by a street-prostitute | 65% | 18% | 85% | 9% | +31% |
| When opportunity presents itself | 65% | 19% | 84% | 12% | +29% |

*Excludes ‘neither easy nor difficult to avoid’ category.

Prior to their engagement in the Programme, the three situations respondents claim hardest to avoid are: i) when opportunity presents itself; ii) when solicited by a street-prostitute; and iii) when the risk of being caught seems to be low. On this latter point, there is evidence that ‘when the risk of discovery is low, even in the most visible sector of the market [street-level prostitution], the consequences of paying for sex are sufficiently remote as to be exciting, yet not sufficiently high as to discourage’ (Home Office, 2008b: 14). Understandably, the factor least likely to provoke punters into recidivism pre-programme was ‘when there was some risk of being caught’. Emotional states centring on ‘anger’ and ‘depression’ were also not interpreted as being significant to future desistance, which seems to contradict evidence from Sweden (Chapter 6) in which prostitution usage is frequently a result of men sexualising ‘feelings such as sorrow, loss, rage’ (SoS-Rapport, 2004:57).

Table 9.27 demonstrates that the factors interpreted as being most likely to lead to recidivism remained the same after completing the Change Programme. Interestingly one ‘intermediate’ interviewee provided an insight into how unplanned ‘opportunity’ was perceived as a key factor in his decision to pay for sex:

‘If she hadn’t approached me then I don’t think it would have even been on my radar. As I say, I brought a friend into Nottingham and then it just happened’ (Tony, 45, divorced, unemployed).
The correlation between temptation and ‘low-risk/high opportunity’ would seem to give some credence to Cameron and Collins’ (2003) economic modelling of demand which proposes that punter reductions can be achieved through a manipulation of risk. Whilst the inference is that demand in the general population will rise in any situation where the CJS is seen to be ineffective and/or invisible (and reduce when ‘opportunity’ is manipulated), it is equally important to recognise that the Change Programme may have some identifiable additive impact on behavioural accountability. Demonstrating adherence to the ‘Relapse Model’ (Chapter 8) one interviewee noted:

‘One of the things I really liked about the Change Programme was that it made you realise the way that you feel affects what you do [...]. They sort of made me look at things differently…I’m the one in control of what I do and it’s not right to blame falling out with the wife, working a 80 hour week, feeling pissed off, do you know what I mean?’ (Aakash, 40, married, chemist).

Of course whether this is indicative of more widespread cognitive changes at the motivational level is open to debate and further research is required to interpret this seemingly positive result. Besides, punters still remain more likely to apportion the blame for involvement in street-prostitution on the external, supply-driven temptations offered by the market and the influence of the CJS, rather than internal/psychological motivations. This seemingly fits with Aalbers (2005:54) claim that ‘female prostitutes are frequently not the passive victims and male clients not the active sex-hunters they are taken for’. Seen in this light, many men continue to interpret supply as being a key driver of demand, even after completing the Change Programme. Contentiously, this clearly resonates with previous historical imperatives, whereby ‘innocent’ men were seen to be succumbing to the predatory nature of salacious working girls (Brooks-Gordon, 2006). Blaming their ‘punting’ on the overt ‘visibility of sex workers’ (Lowman and Atchison, 2006) is a consistent message propagated throughout the research:

‘Sometimes I used to go to work by my bike...that’s how I got to know that there is something like this [street-level prostitution] in England. Some time later me and my friend were walking through the area and one of these girls I had seen before sees us and says hello and starts to flirt with us. That is when it happened on the street for the first time’ (Fareed, 34, single, IT consultant).

What is fascinating about the above account is not just the fact that Fareed juxtaposes his innocence against the conduct of this ‘salacious’ working girl, but that he legitimises his reaction as a response to this woman’s flirtatious ways. As this respondent went on to state when questioned about why he did not just walk away:
‘Why should I? This woman was behaving in a way that I found appealing and I did not realise that I was doing anything wrong. This woman approached me; what did I do wrong? And anyway, I asked one of the girls if it was illegal...she said it was legal.’ (Fareed, 34, single, IT consultant).

It is likely that the OSPT would take the above account as justification for running poster campaigns in foreign languages such as Farsi to ‘educate’ non-English nationals of the laws associated with prostitution (Chapter 8). Arguably, however, even after being through a ‘cognitive behavioural’ Change Programme, many punters feel vulnerable to the ‘external’ temptations of the market. One could speculate that operating a punitive-only, demonising stance, is likely to add to this culture of demand-centred victimhood.

Desisting from street-level sex: selected socio-demographic observations

Ethnicity desistance

For South Asians going into the Programme (see Appendix X) the comparable data shows that the three highest ranked areas were: i) when opportunity presents itself; ii) when I really want sex; and iii) when I feel lonely. On this latter point, one respondent of South Asian heritage looked to dispel the myth propagated in the literature (Benson, 1990) that extended family structures can confront social isolation:

‘I’ve never really talked about sex with my parents or even my ex-wife. People at work are nice, but I wouldn’t want to talk to them about anything personal. I’ve got all these people to talk to and yet some things are definitely off-limits and this just creates a sense of isolation’ (Deepak, 42, divorced, public sector manager).

Significantly then, the Change Programme seemed to have a lack of impact in changing South Asian punter attitudes towards paying for sex ‘when solicited by a prostitute’. Abramson and Pinkerton (1995:333) argue that attitudes towards sex (and by implication, prostitution) are in part shaped by a ‘cultural symbolism’ in which sex is ‘culturally constructed’ and ‘linked to ideas about kinship, power and religion’. This explanation is especially potent if one incorporates this with Lowman and Atchison’s (2006:288) assertion that ‘for a certain segment of the sex buyer population, demand is at least partly driven by supply’ with availability and/or visibility prompting initial prostitution transactions. Unfortunately, positing demand in the context of ‘cultural construction’ aligned with supply driven demand, poses significant problems for a ‘one size fits all’ Change Programme. It is unlikely that – beyond a delivery of the ‘facts’ underpinning street-prostitution in England and Wales - a one-day course could ever expect to address the embedded psycho-social complexity inherent to the duality of cultural explanations and market forces.
Marital status desistance

In terms of attitudinal impact, the biggest percentage shift occurred in the married/living with partner group (see Appendix X). This may in part reflect the skewed emphasis that the Change Programme places on the impact of street-level prostitution on wives/partners (see Chapter 8) and the associated efficacy of the Change Programme in persuading this group that they have the most to lose from continuing to pay for street-level sex. As Sanders (2008: 108) points out, many married men seek out commercial sex because they perceive it to be a way of providing solutions to sexual – and emotional – needs, but in the final analysis the fear of the consequences of their wives finding out over-rides the emotional ‘benefits of paying for sex. Yet again, the ‘rational choice theory’ (Cornish and Clarke, 1987) inherent to Brewer et al’s (2006) assertion of the deterrent effect of arrest would appear to bear relevance here. Nevertheless, by accentuating the potential for prostitution to become a ‘marriage breaker’, the Change Programme is seemingly attempting to change offenders’ cognitive motives for ‘crime’ rather than only relying on the ‘sheer aversive intensity of sanctions anticipated at some remote time in the future to deter offending’ (Ekblom, 2001:264). Moreover, the Change Programme is clearly attempting to reshape punters bounded rationality (Farrell and Pease, 2006), so that any future decisions are based on an evaluation of the facts. In short, whilst arrest may indeed prevent future ‘punting’ behaviour, it is equally important to recognise that any actualised attitudinal changes may have additive and long-term impacts. As one respondent commented:

‘I didn’t realise what I was about to lose...for that, I am thankful to the Change Programme’ (Stuart, 38, long-term partner, warehouse operative).

Prostitution usage desistance

Street-level prostitution veterans demonstrate the least confidence in avoiding paying for sex in the future (Appendix X), a finding replicated elsewhere (Wortley and Fischer, 2002). Although there were some reductions in avoidance attitudes amongst veterans between the two surveys, the percentage of veteran punters who said it would be difficult to avoid paying for sex rose for the ‘when solicited by a street-level prostitute’ and ‘when opportunity presents itself’ variables. Again it could be hypothesised that this devolves feelings of personal responsibility for recidivism away from the punter towards the ‘market’.

Outside of this veteran ‘hardcore’, there was generally a positive shift in perceptions amongst ‘intermediate’ punters about future desistance, particularly in relation to being ‘solicited by a street-prostitute’, ‘when the risk seems low’ and ‘when they really wanted sex’. One ‘intermediate’ interviewee recognised:

‘The Change course confronted head-on the reality of why these girls solicit you...it’s only for the drugs and paying them isn’t going to make them feel any better about the shit going on in their lives’ (Tony, 45, divorced, unemployed).
Desistance: evidence for ‘deep’ change?

Of course, the difficulty for the evaluator is to establish whether or not these transformations represent a ‘surface/short-term’ or ‘deep/long-term’ change (Damasio, 1994). If the former outcome applies, then the only hope for continued low re-offending rates is that these respondents – and men generally – are sufficiently deterred from paying for sex by the presence of CJS agencies. Should the ‘deep’ psychological and sociological reasons for kerb-crawling remain uncontested, then the agencies of the CJS have to optimistically hope that existing (or would-be) punters perceive the risk of being caught to be high in all sex markets, in all locations, all of the time. Given the resource intensity of KCRPs (Campbell and Storr, 2001; Shortland, 2006) and a lack of aftercare support, it has been argued this may be an unrealistic expectation.

Justifying the continuation – or even extension – of the Change Programme arguably necessitates some evidence that punters have experienced some cognitive changes towards working girls and prostitution in general. However, it is important that policymakers and agencies of the CJS avoid assuming a causal relationship between attitudinal changes and rates of re-offending. The suggestion from the previous section is that the threat of CJS sanctions remains an important deterrent, regardless of motivations and whether or not the individual has been exposed to ‘educational awareness’ campaigns. Through a Foucauldian lens of social control (Foucault, 1980), the threat of punitive discipline and sanctions becomes a means by which society (or the state) is able to ensure a moral ordering over the ‘perverted’.

Arrest as a deterrent

If the process of arrest on its own is seen to be more effective than ‘rehabilitation’ in preventing future punting behaviour, then the question is, why – and on what basis – should the Change Programme continue to operate? According to Brewer et al (2006:6) ‘…any special post-arrest intervention or extra penalty for patronizing may not have a noticeable impact’.

One of the more interesting aspects of Brewer et al’s (2006) study is that it patently contrasts with other research (Bernburg and Krohn, 2003; Huizinga et al, 2004) indicating a lack of ‘specific deterrent effect of arrest among young offenders for other types of offense’ (Brewer et al 2006:6). Monto and Garcia (2001) assert that this discrepancy may be representative of (heterogeneous) punters being generally law-abiding men who have much to lose (including careers, relationships and/or reputations) from being arrested. Given that very few men passing through the Change Programme have previous convictions221, this conclusion would seem equally valid in relation to the Change Programme. Moreover, such themes are often apparent in punters’ comments on arrest, as well as in their responses to the surveys in this research.

221 Change attendees are filtered at the arrest stage (see Chapter 8).
That said, re-educating men does begin the process of engendering more positive attitudes towards future/current relationships with women, which cannot be facilitated by arrest alone. Moreover, focusing only on CJS-centric demand reductions may actually result in long-term negative unintended consequences. Without an opportunity to reflect on their motivations, psychological determinants remain resolutely in situ and despite Brewer et al’s (2006) claim to have factored in displacement, sufficient evidence exists of geographic and temporal displacement amongst punters (Sanders, 2008) to suggest that the ‘problem’ of punting does not just go away. In short, not only are claims to long-term demand reductions facilitated by arrest open to debate, but the intellectual ‘crime reduction’ premise that they are predicated on has yet to be fully understood. Of course, neither should the Change Programme be seen as a recidivistic panacea, but the point is that it is designed to tackle ‘punting’ recidivism in different ways to ‘traditional’ CJS punishment, regardless of how successfully the current curriculum achieves this.

**Change Programme attendance: primary motivating factors**

Importantly, Table 9.28 visibly demonstrates that most men do not ‘choose’ to go on the Change Programme for primarily altruistic reasons; just under two-thirds of respondents stated the primary motivation for attendance centred on avoiding a conviction/criminal record (see also Abt, 2008:63).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage (total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Find out more about street-prostitution</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid work finding out</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid friends finding out</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid wife/partner knowing</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid conviction or criminal record</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>99%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=97 (total)

**Assessing the deterrent effect of the Change Programme**

Respondents were also asked which factors (if any) were most likely to prevent them from visiting street-prostitutes in the future (up to a maximum of three\(^{222}\); see Appendix Y). In many ways this measurement was designed to help unpick findings examined in the previous section,\(^{222}\) Several respondents ticked more than three boxes and in these circumstances their responses were excluded from the analysis.
although the emphasis here was more concerned with the direct effects of the CJS and known abuses of street-level working girls in affecting behavioural change. This latter point is of particular interest to stakeholders on the basis that it once again feeds into the core message of the Change Programme that street-level prostitution ‘causes a great variety of ‘victims’ and ‘harms’’ (Fischer et al, 2002:396), many of which are directly attributable to the activities of punters (especially in relation to drugs and violence).

Of the 23 options specified in the questionnaire, measures related to: a) the welfare of street-level working girls223 and; b) local community/public nuisance issues were felt to be the least important deterrents to recidivism. This deterrence picture is reasonably constant when the analysis is broken down socio-demographically (see Appendix Y).

The option, ‘where the only punishment would be to attend the Change Programme’, had no responses in either survey and was thus the lowest ranked of all 23 ‘deterrence’ options. This correlates with the findings from Macleod et al’s (2008) research with punters in Scotland. For this reason, it could be – and has been - argued that the Change Programme is a ‘soft option’ without any tangible benefits. In effect, publishing the Change Programme as a non-punitive ‘opportunity to avoid criminal justice proceedings’ (Fischer et al, 2002:396), might just ‘reinforce the view that it [kerb-crawling] is not a serious crime condemned by civilised society’ (Mackay, 1995 cited in Sanders, 1988:529). On the evidence from the survey data, this could be interpreted as a view shared by the majority of programme participants. Similar observations by Monto and Garcia (2001) led them to conclude that behavioural changes are most likely to occur as a result of arrest (and the fear of re-arrest) than because of the rehabilitative impact of the programme per se.

Once again, however, the data from the qualitative elements of the research are suggestive of additive attitudinal changes facilitated by the Change Programme. Some of this relates to an appreciation of some of the negative aspects of working girls lives:

‘It [the Change Programme] makes you look at things in a different light. At the end of the day, you went out using a working girl and as the guy on the Change Programme pointed out, most of these girls have been raped or attacked and are on drugs. The question I keeping asking myself is why would I want to be part of that?’ (Ben, 29, single, structural engineer).

Altruistic considerations permeate other aspects of the survey responses, most notably those to the open-ended question: ‘on reflection, what do you think have been the consequences of paying a street-prostitute for sexual contact?’ (see Appendix BB) in which the two most popular responses were: i) recognising that paying for street-level sex had the effect of putting more drugs on the street and; ii) an acknowledgement that maintaining demand increased the

223 Knowing that prostitutes are (i) victimised by pimps; (ii) assaulted and; (iii) raped.
problem for the ‘prostitute’. For other men there was simply a resignation of the futility of street-level prostitution; that it was a ‘complete disaster’ and/or of subsequent ‘psychological’ impacts.

**The ‘role play’ impact**

One of the core principles that the Change Programme is predicated on is the power of ‘reintegrative shaming’ (Braithwaite, 2000; see also McAlinden, 2007). Importantly, the Change Programme indirectly covers this through the inclusion of role play exercises and it is probably more than co-incidence that these role play exercises are perceived by many attendees as having the most emotionally powerful impact of the whole day. One respondent, Brian, openly illustrates this though his observation that:

‘As men we’re encouraged to suppress anything to do with feelings or emotions…it’s not seen to be ‘manly’ to show any sort of emotional weakness; maybe that’s why I’m divorced! I guess that’s why I found the course so refreshing; yes, I left the course with a lot of unresolved emotional issues, but to be frank these needed bringing to the fore anyway…being given the opportunity to sit around with other men discussing feelings and all that...well, that was a really positive thing for me; it’s given me a fresh perspective’ (*Brian, 50, divorced, copywriter*).

Generally, however, in response to being asked what aspect of the Change Programme most stayed with them, any empathy here tended to be reserved for partners or other family members:

‘Well it makes you think...how does prostitution affect your wife, your girlfriend, your family, your friends, your relatives, your colleagues at work. You’re not an individual like you think you are; the consequences hit everyone’ (*Iqbal, 24, single, research*).

Of all the elements of the programme, the impact of role-play was most commonly cited as the aspect that ‘stuck with them’. As Stuart illustrates:

‘Where they got you to play your partner…it knotted my guts up…I was fighting with my emotions’ (*Stuart, 38, long-term partner, warehouse operative*).

Similarly Aakash notes that since the Change Programme:

‘I think I’m more caring towards her [his wife] and I feel that what I did was mostly my fault anyway. I now try and work things out and I’m definitely more open about things...so in that sense it has been an eye opener’ (*Aakash, 40, married, chemist*).
The Change Programme: education, emotional reflection and desistance

In short, enough evidence exists from: (i) the survey data; (ii) anecdotal conversations with men on the day of the course itself; and (iii) follow-up qualitative narratives, to justify the claim that the Change Programme has encouraged some men to embark on a process of emotional reflection and it is not unreasonable to assume that in these circumstances such attitudinal change will act as an additive deterrent to future prostitution (on street) behaviours. Consequently, this translated into all interviewee’s advocating the continuation of the Change Programme/‘rehabilitation’:

‘I think a lot of them [punters] given the information that we got given on the Change Programme would stop a lot of them [paying for sex again]. Education is the key to a lot of this, but it needs to start in the fourth or fifth year at school’ (Asim, 36, married, courier).

‘…if more punters were given the chance to go on the Change Programme then it’s going to hit them a lot harder than sticking them before the magistrate. It was drummed into us…different scenarios and your mind’s working all the time. How you gonna get that down the magistrates? You’re actually picking up, analysing why you went to that girl, and your mind’s constantly on the go’ (Tony, 45, divorced, unemployed).

Facilitators, however, should be aware of the implications of these psychological reflections; as Adler (2003) points out, there are a number of dangers in adopting systems of shaming in crimes that are of a sensitive and/or sexual nature. This concern is even more pronounced if we consider the lack of post-programme support, as exemplified by Adam who reflected that:

‘For me, the course was more like a full day of mental torture. I found the role-play particularly difficult to cope with’ (Adam, 22, single, plumber).

It would be wrong to claim that this level of support for the Change Programme is felt equally across the Change population. Similarly we should also avoid assuming a long-term deterrent impact, especially in the absence of aftercare support. Nevertheless, several respondents admitted that much of the course content had stayed with them. Deepak noted that:

‘I’ve thought about it many times since. So yes, I think my views about street-prostitution have been changed forever’ (Deepak, 42, divorced, public sector manager).

Despite these often-positive qualitative accounts, the notion of working girl empathy is not always obvious from the survey data. Conceivably, those voluntarily agreeing to a follow-up interview are most likely to be enthusiastic about the Programme (hence agreeing to be interviewed) and therefore most likely to be ‘changed’. Nevertheless, the notion that the Change
Programme has positive social policy implications is covered elsewhere in the questionnaire. For example, a quarter of punters completed the open-ended commentary sections (see Appendix Z), an impressive response rate considering how this measure was placed at the end of the questionnaire (Darby, 2007) at the end of a long and emotionally challenging day. One would assume that if respondents felt a strong sense of dissatisfaction, anger or principled opposition to the Change Programme, then the responses here would demonstrate vehement anti-Programme sentiments. In fact, the opposite was true; the majority of those who wanted their comments to be passed on remained positive about the Change Programme. As one respondent confided during a Change Programme break: ‘It’s called a Change Programme and I see why. I feel like a changed man and the things I’ve learnt here will stay with me for a very long time’.

This is in line with findings elsewhere in the research literature. Wortley and Fischer (2002:222), for example, found that men who participated in the ‘John school’ ‘often left in high spirits and would often compliment the facilitator (and mistakenly, the members of the research team) for running such a good program’ (ibid: 222).

Appendix Z shows that about half of all those providing responses, thought the course was insightful, informative and that it should continue. Others stated that they had learnt a lot about themselves and wanted to use this insight as a springboard to change their general outlook on life. There are of course disappointments (for facilitators); in line with findings elsewhere, other attendee’s argue that the focus should be on legalisation or that ‘nothing works’ (Martinson, 1974) - street-prostitution will never be eliminated or controlled. Some men remained opposed to the ‘working girl as victim’ paradigm, expressing the belief that we need to punish ‘prostitutes’ more harshly and there is ‘much to be said about the women too’. Based on the Change Programme’s core aims and objectives, these latter statements are highly symbolic of attitudinal resistance and a wholesale rejection of the core messages propagated by Programme facilitators. Perhaps most pertinently, these were the only open-ended comments not to come from ‘novices’ or ‘intermediates’.

**The Change Programme as coercion: issues of ‘due process’**

How the Change Programme is perceived by its participants in relation to fairness, equity and ‘due process’ has important ramifications for undermining or supporting its legitimacy. By their very nature, diversion programmes are designed around a victim paradigm (Roach, 1999) and are clearly intended to divert offenders away from the formal institutions and processes of the CJS. Unfortunately the underlying principle of diversion also becomes its Achilles heel, since there resides a fundamental paradox between the requirement for attendee’s to admit guilt ‘before any formal determination of guilt has been made’ (Blomberg, 1983:31 in Fischer et al, 2002: 402).
Imposing a compulsory programme fee as a means of securing diversion from court merely compounds this inconsistent application of ‘due process’ and Brooks-Gordon (2006) makes the point that owing to the vested interest that police have in KCRP’s, diversion schemes become exposed to potential ‘net widening’. In the case of the Change Programme, this is less to do with the financial benefits – the fee is shared with working girl support groups (see Chapter 8) – than it is with maximising attendance as a means of protecting the intellectual investment put in and as a key performance indicator. In other words, ‘to avoid court, the man must plead guilty to the charge, [pay a ‘fine’], attend the programme and receive a programme and receive a caution’ (Sanders, 2008:156). Finally, there is evidently the potential for the programmes’ entry stipulations to be viewed as exclusionary along a number of fault-lines; namely for those who lack the appropriate English speaking skills and those who lack the financial means to pay the ‘fee’. Judged against these inconsistencies, any benefits the Change Programme exhibit, are seemingly undeliverable in a way that is sympathetic to due legal process and equity.

Given the widespread criticisms of KCRP’s as an infringement of ‘justice’ and ‘due process’ (Sanders, 2009; Fischer et al, 2002; Wortley and Fischer, 2002; Abt, 2008; Campbell and Storr, 2001), it is surprising that the vast majority of men felt they were given a ‘choice’ of whether or not to attend the Change Programme (see Table 9.29).

Table 9.29: Choice Perceptions Regarding Change Programme Attendance (Before Session)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid Percent (Rounded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the surface, this would imply that concerns the Change Programme presents only coercive ‘choices’ (Fischer et al, 2002; Brooks-Gordon, 2006) is overstated. However, when triangulated with qualitative data, it is clear that the generally positive responses from the survey data mask a number of anxieties. This important discrepancy between qualitative accounts and survey data may in large part be a question of semantics. Namely that Change attendees may not feel able to state explicitly that they were not given a choice, but in reality, the impression of ‘choice’ is more funnelled (Phoenix and Oerton, 2005) than is suggested by this raw data alone. Consequently, the idea that ‘OSPT tactics are heavy handed and intimidating – I felt like there were no options’ was expressed by a number of men in the follow-up interviews:

224 It is important to distinguish between guilt in a legal sense, and an acceptance of one’s behaviours in a cognitive behavioural sense. Indeed, psychologists would argue that there is little point engaging in any sort of cognitive therapy if the basic premise of admitting to the behaviour under consideration is not fulfilled (Moster et al, 2008).

225 The OSPT have recognised this and have begun to deliver programmes in languages other than English (this was originally piloted with Polish and is due to be rolled out in other Middle Eastern languages in 2009/10).
'To be totally honest, no I don’t think they did treat me fairly. I think it’s because they sort of blackmailed me into going on the course. Although I had intentions in my mind [to pay for sex], but I wasn’t caught - to be blunt - with my trousers down...so I felt bullied and pressurised a bit by the police’ (Stuart, 38, long-term partner, warehouse operative).

Correlating with findings elsewhere, what the above account demonstrates is that, regardless of guilt or possessing the financial means to defend themselves in court, many men ‘prefer to ‘admit’ offences and be ‘diverted’ because this option provides certainty that a criminal conviction with all its negative consequences will be avoided’ (Sanders, 1988: 515).

On a similar note, Fischer et al (2002:394) talks about how John schools sell the message that these men have ‘been given a merciful ‘break’ for their harmful and immoral behaviour’: As one interviewee discloses:

‘The way they [the OSPT] framed it was by saying, ‘there’s two ways we can deal with things. One, you go before the magistrates or the other option is the Change Programme’. They explained what the course meant. So I chose the Change Programme’ (Ben, 29, single, structural engineer).

So, did this feel like a choice?

‘Sort of I guess...[but] what really concerned me was when they [the OSPT] warned me that there was a strong chance that I would go straight from the magistrates into the local paper...it makes for a quick, easy story that is popular with readers. Once it was explained that the Change Programme was a one-off...do it again and you’re before the courts....it was a no-brainer’ (Ben, 29, single, structural engineer).

On this evidence, revisiting the claim from 92 per cent of Change respondents that they felt they had a choice in whether or not to attend the Change Programme takes on a completely different perspective. Attendee’s palpably lack any sense of being able to achieve acquittal should they pursue to contest their innocence via the traditional CJS avenues. As Brian notes, positioning guilt as a fait accompli tends to be the default position for the OSPT:

‘One of the officers said that if they felt you weren’t co-operating [during the Change Programme] they could still take you to court, where you’d end up with a conviction anyway’ (Brian, 50, divorced, copywriter).

---

226 This account is somewhat surprising given the OSPT’s reservations about ‘naming and shaming’ (see Chapter 8).
**Inconsistent application of discretion**

Whilst observing the Change Programme, it was also noted how discretion was used inconsistently, particularly in relation to late-comers and those contesting their innocence. To illustrate this point, during my fieldwork I observed one attendee being allowed to leave at the first ‘comfort break’, having persuaded the OSPT of his innocence in paying for (or attempting to pay for) sex. No other criminal sanctions were imposed on this individual. Several other ‘contestees’ - unable to persuade the OSPT of their ‘innocence’ - were subsequently asked to leave the Programme due to their unwillingness to accept ‘guilt’ and were told that they would be summoned to court to face solicitation charges. Whilst there may well be objective criteria affiliated to these decisions, to the neutral outsider, these decisions often seemed rather subjective and like Wortley and Fischer (2002:228), I would argue that these decisions need to be at least grounded in tangible, explicit and consistent standards.

Accounts associated with ‘due process’ give further credence to the claim that CJS agents play a key and critical role in contributing to and shaping the ‘ordering of justice’ (Erikson and Baranek, 1982 in Fischer et al, 2002:404). Framing the Change Programme as a ‘coercive alternative’ (Brooks-Gordon, 2006) is a significant problem and to enhance the legitimacy of the Programme further (and indirectly its impact as a deterrent to recidivism), it is vital that this imperfection in process is addressed as a matter of some urgency.

**If not the Change Programme, then what?**

Generally, it was observed that the factors most likely to discourage recidivism were less to do with a concern for strangers (working girls/local community) and more to do with a concern for oneself/one’s family. Over the two surveys, the most popular reasons cited as facilitators of deterrence were:

‘…knowing that it would be hard to tell if a girl was between 16 and 18, and that’s one of the things you can get done for. There’s also the diseases that you can catch. And obviously being caught by the police’ (Aakash, 40, married, chemist).

Other respondents stated that paying for sex in the future was not an option because of the legal implications. When asked if he had been tempted to pay for sex since attending the Change Programme, Fareed commented that:

‘Physically, yes; I believe that if you need sex, you need sex and you should respond to that, but the fear of being caught has stopped me. […]. And I’ve now got a mark on my

---

227 Although it is unclear whether this threat was actualised as this information was not obtained from the OSPT.
dossier, on my criminal record. I don’t want another mark’ (Fareed, 34, single, IT consultant).

Evidently, as much as the Change Programme seeks to educate punters on the prevalence of abuse amongst street-level working girls, ‘self-preservation’ (and the fear of the CJS) become defining factors in discouraging recidivism. These findings are strongly echoed in findings elsewhere in the literature (Abt, 2008; Kennedy et al, 2004) and would yet again seem to give credence to Brewer et al’s (2006) conclusions about the specific deterrent effect of arrest (or CJS sanctions).

These findings reinforce others in the research that, whilst the CJS clearly plays a major deterrent role, the extent to which this actualises core motivational changes is questionable. Moreover, any deterrence determined by the CJS does not take place in an attitudinal vacuum and there is enough evidence to suggest that the additive impact of attitudinal changes feeds into the obvious and well-documented impact of CJS interventions. From a long-term perspective, the inability to place empathy (friends, family or working girls) as a key desistance motivation, may have recidivistic implications for those punters tempted to pay for sex in the future. Should these punters remain convinced that the chances of being caught is low (on and/or off-street), then a lack of engagement with the ‘working girl as victim’/’public nuisance’ discourse, may manifest itself in re-offending behaviour.

**Post-Programme attitudes towards prostitution**

*Table 9.30: Principle Attitude Perceptions (Post-Change Programme)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which statement best describes your attitude following the Change Programme?</th>
<th>Valid Percent (Rounded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential impact on me/family. Less concern for street-prostitutes</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathy for working girl, but main reason is fear of being caught again</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devastating impact for women and girls selling sex</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasn’t taught me anything that I didn’t already know</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing wrong with paying for sex, but better done off-street</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no winners. Men should stop buying, women stop selling</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional corroboration of a primary concern for the ‘self’ is derived from the replies to the post-session question about how respondents would describe their main attitude towards prostitution (Table 9.30). Over half of all respondents were motivated by the ‘potential impact on me/family
and less concern for street-prostitutes’, or an expression of ‘...fear of being caught again is the main reason I will not pay for sex in the future’. Because a lack of ‘victim’ empathy is seen to be a major contributing factor to – sexual – (re)offending (Perkins et al, 1998), Change facilitators may be disappointed that only 13 per cent of respondents stated that their main attitude following the Change Programme was with ‘the devastating impact of street-prostitution for the girls and women involved in selling sex’. However, the findings from the follow-up interviews were more positive in this area:

‘I was actually quite shocked at how these women are treated and yes, I do feel guilty to even be part of that’ (Stuart, 38, long-term partner, warehouse operative).

Equally encouragingly (for Change facilitators), few men stated they ‘got nothing out of the day’, whilst approaching one in five men describe their main attitude towards prostitution as being either that there are ‘no winners in street-prostitution’ or that ‘men should stop buying street-level sex and we should try to stop women selling street-level sex’. Of all the options open to respondents, this latter alternative is probably most closely aligned to transmission the ‘abolitionism plus support’ message.

Revisiting spatial displacement

Correlating with other findings elsewhere in this chapter, Table 9.30 also demonstrates that a persistent minority of punters remain convinced that paying for sex is acceptable, providing that it is done off-street. Displaying classic displacement traits, some individuals clearly recognize – and even accept – the ‘moral’ and ‘public health’ victim message pertaining to street-level sex, but resist the application of this message to other commercial sex arenas. It is quite feasible that the reframing of off-street sex markets as lacking victims, is subsequently used by these men as one of many psychological tools to legitimise future ‘off-street’ prostitution activity.

It is perhaps not surprising, therefore, that only half of respondents expressing the view that there is ‘nothing wrong with prostitution (providing that it is done off-street)’, felt confident to make the claim that they would never pay for sex with an off-street working girl (Appendix AA). When we compare this to punters whose main concern is for the ‘devastating effect on the women and girls selling sex’ over ninety per cent of men in these categories have no intentions of pay for off-street sex in the future. From this it seems reasonable to assume that a respondent’s principal attitude towards street-level prostitution post-Programme is also a good indicator of future off-street prostitution behavioural intentions228.

228 Although as previously discussed we should exercise caution in assuming that ‘intentions’ will be translated into off-street ‘behaviours’ or even long-term attitudinal change.
Reinforcement of this position is provided when considering the broader attitudinal position towards legalisation (Table 9.31). Those who see ‘nothing wrong with off-street prostitution’ are the most likely to advocate the legalisation of prostitution. Irrespective of its modus operandi, all of this suggests a reluctance to recognise the ‘prostitution-harm’ message propagated by Change facilitators. Arguably Nunes et al’s (2007) conclusions that a ‘denial of impact and effects’ predicts recidivism for some (non-prostitution) sexual offenders, may be equally valid in relation to prostitution offences.

Table 9.31: Principle Attitude Perceptions cross-tabulated with over-16s/18s legalisation variables (post-Programme responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should it be legal for over-16s to get paid for sex?</th>
<th>Which statement best describes your attitude following the Change Programme?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The devastating impact that paying for street-level sex will have for my family and me. I am less concerned about the street-prostitutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sympathy for any girl/woman involved in street-prostitution, but fear of being caught again is the main reason I will not pay for sex in the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Devastating impact of street-prostitution for the girls/women involved and this is the main reason that I will try to never pay for street-level sex again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nothing necessarily wrong with paying for sex, but it better to visit massage parlours/brothels than pay for sex from street-prostitutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No winners in street-prostitution. Men should stop buying street-level sex and we should try to stop women selling street-level sex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 100% 100% 100% 100% 100%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should it be legal for over-18s to get paid for sex?</th>
<th>Which statement best describes your attitude following the Change Programme?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The devastating impact that paying for street-level sex will have for my family and me. I am less concerned about the street-prostitutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sympathy for any girl/woman involved in street-prostitution, but fear of being caught again is the main reason I will not pay for sex in the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Devastating impact of street-prostitution for the girls/women involved and this is the main reason that I will try to never pay for street-level sex again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nothing necessarily wrong with paying for sex, but it better to visit massage parlours/brothels than pay for sex from street-prostitutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No winners in street-prostitution. Men should stop buying street-level sex and we should try to stop women selling street-level sex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 100% 100% 100% 100% 100%

Recidivism amongst punters: analysis of OSPT arrest data

Re-iterating Butler et al’s (2006) observations at the start of this chapter, measuring ‘attitudinal change’ may be seen as a precursor to future recidivism reductions. Because the Change Programme is ultimately judged by its effectiveness in engendering desistance towards street-level prostitution, this section seeks to understand if the identified attitudinal ‘rehabilitation’ in areas such as: i) perceptions of street-level prostitution; ii) proclivity to pay for sex in the future and; iii) attitudes towards close personal relationships, have appeared to translate empirically into behavioural change and ultimately reductions in recidivism.
Methodological considerations revisited

According to Wortley and Fischer (2002:23), research findings of the kind examined in this thesis should be contextualised against official police arrest data. In this case, the arrest data supplied by the OSPT has a number of advantages. Firstly the data was gathered from the Police National Computer (PNC\(^{229}\)), enhancing the chances for spatial displacement to be captured and ensuring that the data would not be simply reflect Nottingham recidivism rates. Secondly, the dataset includes all men arrested for street-level prostitution offences in Nottingham since 2004 (excluding 2008-9 data\(^{230}\)), not just those passing through the Change Programme. Finally, the data also includes arrest data for non-prostitution offences committed before and after involvement with the OSPT.

However, the strengths of external data sources should not detract from the significant methodological limitations and impediments to making causal (rather than correlational) assumptions. PNC data is clearly favourable to local data, but nevertheless assumes that other police forces have the same resources and commitment to tackling street-level prostitution. It also assumes that the OSPT have policed Nottingham’s red-light district consistently since June 2004. Allied to the fact that the number of offenders actually caught and apprehended by the police will never truly be representative of the total number of offenders, it is conceivable that Change Programme punters become more astute in avoiding future detection than their non-Change Programme counterparts. Furthermore, the timescale under consideration may be insufficient to capture those tempted into behavioural ‘relapse’, particularly considering the absence of sufficient aftercare support (see Chapter 8; Gendreau, 1996). Patently such data is also unlikely to capture those men who have re-directed their prostitution activities to indoor markets.

Moreover using this (re)arrest data, demonstrably operationalises a research design that falls short of the controlled experiment ‘gold standard’\(^{231}\). Rather than be randomly assigned to either the Change Programme or ‘normal adjudication’ (Abt, 2008:72), all men that are eligible to attend a KCRP are invited to do so (see Chapters 7 and 8). Consequently even if a ‘control group’ was operationalised, this would be restricted to a small number of men whose offender profile is markedly different to those passing through the Change Programme. As Shadish et al (2002) point out, the failure to conduct a controlled experimental design for ‘public safety’ interventions – to withhold a treatment for some eligible men - is ethically and practically untenable, even in the absence of empirical evidence that the programme under consideration works.

Of course other options exist that sidestep these ethical/practical concerns. Comparisons could, for example, be made with arrest data from police jurisdictions not running a KCRP and

\(^{229}\) See Home Office (2005).

\(^{230}\) In addition to national PNC re-arrest data provided for Nottingham punters, the OSPT also provided local arrest data for the period January 2004-May 2009.

\(^{231}\) As discussed elsewhere, my aim was to use a ‘realist’ framework to examine the Change Programme.
therefore possessing a large pool of punters processed through the courts instead. This option was ruled out because of the lack of a relationship with other police forces (and the potential difficulty in getting this data), and because of the problem of selection bias and comparability compromises related to differences in policing, local demographics and application of the law. Alternatively Change programme arrest/recidivism data could be compared to arrest/recidivism data for punters caught in Nottingham before the Change Programme was set up; again the problem in getting hold of reliable data ruled this out as a viable option.

Methods and results

Instead, given the practical and ethical limitations of alternative approaches, the crude – and somewhat unsatisfactory - indicator of recidivistic success used here involves comparing the national re-arrest rates of Change and non-Change arrestees (2004-2007).

Table 9.32 outlines the number of men who have attended (or been invited on) the Programme in Nottingham since the OSPT’s involvement in June 2004:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of men attending (or invited to attend) Change Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004 (June onwards)</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 (up to May)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This equates to a combined total of 602 men who have taken, or been invited on the Change Programme in Nottingham since 2002. The OSPT have subsequently identified five Change attendee’s who have re-offended by paying for, or attempting to pay for, street-level sex. Two of these attended the course prior to June 2004 and one of these was caught by Northamptonshire Police, with the other two men caught in Nottingham. Excluding data for 2008-9, this equates to a recidivism rate of 0.7 per cent since the involvement of the OSPT. This figure compares favourably with the recidivism rates of other ‘John School’ evaluations, including the 2.4 per cent (n=21) of Toronto School attendee’s who were recorded as having a ‘communicating’ charge, or an ‘indecent act’ charge subsequent to being diverted to the KRCP (Wortley and Fischer, 2002:25).

233 Because national recidivism data is not available for 2008-9, the data that recidivism percentages are calculated on is for the period 2002-2007 inclusive, which equates to 497 men attending the Change Programme.
234 Data valid up until January 2008.
It also compares favourably with the re-arrest rates of men not attending the Nottingham Change Programme (due to refusal or ineligibility). Since 2004, there have been 426 men arrested for street-prostitution offences in Nottingham who have been dealt with outside of the Change Programme, the majority of whom have been dealt with via an ‘immediate caution’. The likelihood is that non-English speakers represent the majority of these ‘immediate cautions’ on the basis that these men are not eligible for the Change Programme and it was deemed inequitable to subject these men to the courts as a first offence. Unfortunately it is unclear what criteria are used to action a caution rather than being compelled to be ‘rehabilitated’. Below is a summary of charges brought against non-Change arrestees since January 2004:

Table 9.33: Arrest charges for non-Change programme arrestees 2004-May 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009 (up to May)</th>
<th>Total (Charge)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charged (kerb crawling)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charged (drink / drive)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charged (Class A drug offence)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charged (other offences)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate caution (kerb crawling)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused charge</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASBOs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Year)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Removing inhibitions: the role of alcohol in OSPT arrest data

Before discussing the recidivism of non-Change arrestees, it is important to explore what Table 9.33 tells us about the role of alcohol in purchasing sex. Evidence from the research literature suggests that alcohol plays a role in providing men with the confidence to realize previously unfulfilled prostitution fantasies; nearly a third of men in Wortley and Fischer’s (2002) multi-response study cited alcohol as a factor in their decision to pay for sex. In Nottingham over one in ten of the Change Programme sample claimed alcohol consumption was a key motivation to future desistance. For Ben alcohol was perceived as an important facilitator because:

---

235 As discussed in Chapter 8, the Change Programme has in recent months been rolled out in Polish, with plans to run other language programmes in due course.
‘Many times I drove through the vice area and wondered what it’d be like to have sex with a prostitute, but you always tell yourself to stop being a twat…‘what if ‘x’ finds out, blah blah’. But this one night I’d had a few jars and I just thought fuck it’ (Ben, 29, single, structural engineer).

In Nottingham, the OSPT (2008) show how 75 per cent of men picked up by the police were driving at the time of arrest, compared with only 22 per cent on foot. Data from the OSPT also shows that of the 426 men dealt with outside of the Change Programme since June 2004, nearly 10 per cent (n=40) were charged with drink driving. This suggests that alcohol plays a role for men who ‘kerb crawl’ using a motor vehicle. Clearly more research is required to clarify exactly how men pay for sex in relation to alcohol consumption. Far less significant, is the use of Class A drugs amongst men picked up by the OSPT with just over 1 per cent (n=6) being charged with Class A drugs offences. This might indicate that punters are unlikely to offer drugs as payment for sex (Sterk and Elifson, 1990) or that working girls prop up Class A drug markets by selling drugs to their clients on behalf of dealers (May et al, 1999).

**Recidivism amongst non-Change punters**

In terms of recidivism rates, 29 non-Change Programme punters have been arrested more than once for street-level prostitution offences (up to January 2008) equating to a 7.9 per cent recidivism rate - over 8 times the recidivism rate of those who attended the Change Programme. However, because the recidivism data for Change Programme attendee’s is only taken from involvement with the OSPT, a more equitable representation of recidivism for non-Change arrestees is to gauge the number of men re-arrested after involvement with the OSPT, rather than prostitution offences under a previous jurisdiction. Using this criterion, the recidivism rate comes down to 3 per cent (or just over three times the rate of Change Programme attendees). Added to the methodological problems associated with this comparison, it is difficult to state with certainty that the Change Programme has a discernable effect on recidivistic behaviour over and above conventional CJS sanctions; clearly more research is required, ideally utilising a longitudinal controlled experiment design. Interestingly, only 5 per cent of non-Change arrestees (n=18) were known to have committed a prior prostitution related offence at the time of arrest by the OSPT. To assume that 95 per cent of men picked up by the OSPT were paying for street-level sex for the first time is likely to be an underestimation and demonstrates the potential for a proportion of punters to remain invisible to the agencies of the CJS.

236 Up to and including May 2009.
237 Again, these crude statistics should be used carefully, as many of the men who did not attend the Change Programme clearly did so because of their previous convictions or refusal to admit the offence, potentially making them exposed to a higher risk of re-offending anyway.

238 The socio-demographic detail for this small sample of recidivists is represented in Appendix CC.
Evidently most recidivists (both Change and non-Change arrestees) live in Nottingham and are spread evenly across the age profile. What is notable, however, is the over-representation of South Asian punters, which one might speculate correlates with the ‘future punting intentions’ findings discussed earlier in this chapter. This tentative pronouncement in relation to ‘ethnicity and recidivism’ at the very least requires further investigation.

The arrest data supplied by the OSPT also indicates that across the whole punter profile (all Change and non-Change arrestees), 3.6 per cent of men had committed at least one non-specified ‘sexual’ offence prior to being arrested by the OSPT, with a further 34.4 per cent of men committing at least one non-specified non-sexual offence. Further to involvement with the OSPT, the corresponding recidivism figures were 0.8 per cent for non-specified sexual offences and 9.3 per cent for non-specified sexual offences. Table 9.34 outlines the breakdown of this data by Change and non-Change arrestees:

Table 9.34: Non-Prostitution Offences Committed by ALL Punter's (pre/post OSPT arrest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-specified sexual offence</td>
<td>Non-specified, non-sexual offence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (% of all attendee's)</td>
<td>1.8% (n=9)</td>
<td>28% (n=138)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the basis that eligibility for the Change Programme is in part dictated by previous conviction history – for example certain sexual crimes or domestic violence – it is unsurprising to see a higher percentage of non-Change arrestees who have committed non-prostitution offences.

However, the data supplied by the OSPT brings up a number of anomalies that have implications for due process. Firstly, although prior sexual offences do not automatically exclude punters from being invited to attend the Change Programme (it depends on the precise nature of the offence), it is perhaps unexpected to see nine men with identified sexual offences subsequently attending the Change Programme. Furthermore, one of the clear eligibility criterions for attending the Change Programme relates to the absence of previous prostitution offences. It is therefore concerning to see in the data provided by the OSPT, four Programme attendee’s having had previous prostitution related offences. What is noticeable is that two of

---

\[239\] Base= 497 Change arrestees, 367 non-Change arrestees.
these four previous ‘offenders’ were from outside of Nottinghamshire and another man was described as ‘Black Caribbean’ (rather than ‘Black British’), suggesting that this offence may well have taken place outside of the UK. Nevertheless, whilst other ‘John School’ evaluations have also demonstrated how some men can ‘slip through the net’ (see Wortley and Fischer, 2002; Abt, 2008), the presence of these men on the Change Programme raises questions about whether or not ‘due process’ protocols have reliably and systematically been adhered to.

Both the national PNC and local OSPT arrest data demonstrate the infrequency with which CJS measures - other than fines - are imposed on punters for street-level prostitution offences. More serious penalties for kerb-crawling are virtually non-existent, with only two punters being served ASBOs since 2004 (and none since October 2004). In line with the findings in Chapter 8, the OSPT have acknowledged in written correspondence that this is due to being unable to:

‘..catch anyone often enough to warrant an ASBO. There are very few men that we see more than once and hardly anyone more than twice. It's still in the armoury, but doesn't come out very often for men’ (OSPT, unpublished).

Even less prevalent has been the sanction of disqualification from driving as introduced in the Power of the Criminal Courts (Sentencing) Act 2000; to date only one man has received this penalty. Despite claims to the contrary in the Change curriculum (Chapter 8), the problem of underage prostitution would also seem to be overstated in the Change curriculum; no punters have been charged with paying for sex with an under-18 year old. Although ‘naming and shaming’ has been commonplace in the local media (requiring separate content analysis), Change Programme attendees tend not to be exposed to this intervention and because the sample excluded non-Change arrestees, it is unclear what impact this measure has had for non-Change punters.

Most notably, the arrest data shows that the number of men being apprehended for street-level prostitution offences in Nottingham has been in decline since 2007, a pattern replicated in the number of letters sent to ‘cruisers’ in the same period (Table 9.35). Unfortunately the success of cruiser letters in deterring men from re-entering the ‘red-light’ area for the purposes of kerb-crawling cannot be ascertained from this data alone, as this measurement has not been recorded.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004 (from June)</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009 (up to May)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total arrested</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average arrests per month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(rounded)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16 (Average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of letters</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sent to ‘cruisers’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% letters sent to Notts</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>72% (Average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>address (rounded)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whether or not this decline in arrests and ‘cruiser’ letter symbolises a real decline in demand is the subject of debate and covered widely in this thesis. Quite conceivably is may be that the concerted efforts of the OSPT over six years have resulted in less men being motivated to pay for sex in any circumstances. Equally, however, it may reflect operational pressures on the OSPT, resulting in them policing the red-light area differently over the period in question. It may simply be representative of spatial, temporal or offence displacement. Of course, that this debate exists in relation to raw data, gives added importance to examining ‘attitude change’ as a means of measuring how and why behavioural change might be manifested.

**Reactions to prostitution: how punters interpret ‘feelings’**

Assessing how punters process and understand their prostitution experiences are another important element of understanding future reactions to sex markets (Monto and McRee, 2005). Table 9.36 suggests that ‘guilt’ is the overriding emotion felt in response to paying for sex for this group of men. Arguably guilt could be seen as a psychological manifestation of ‘cognitive dissonance’ (Festinger, 1957) especially amongst men with ‘conservative’ attitudes. For others, there was a sense of emotional resignation associated with the perception that paying for sex was driven principally by a ‘biological’ reaction to a lack of sex. As Fareed –somewhat derogatorily - contests in the following contestation:

‘I felt sad, because you know this is an act of…it’s like a similar feeling that you’re so thirsty that you drink muddy water. You do not enjoy it’ (Fareed, 34, single, IT consultant).
Table 9.36: Feelings after paying for sexual contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feelings:</th>
<th>Which of the following best describes how you felt…</th>
<th>…after paying for sexual contact [ON REFLECTION]?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I felt guilty</td>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt sexually satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt excited</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt as though I had done wrong</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt happy</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My feelings were no different than prior to paying for sex</td>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got caught before paying for sex</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Improving knowledge**

Arguably, ‘changing’ attitudes towards (street-level) prostitution partly necessitates the imposition of ‘hard’ facts to challenge potential misapprehensions about: (i) how the CJS deals with prostitution and; (ii) the scale and scope of the problem. Unfortunately, the Change Programme makes no attempt to test punters’ knowledge uptake of the Change curriculum, which means there is no benchmark data to compare the results of the knowledge-based questions undertaken in this research.

**Knowledge uptake: Open-ended questions findings**

In the first instance, punters were invited to speculate on the estimated scale of the prostitution problem and how this is currently dealt with through the CJS (see Table 9.37 and Chapter 8). In 2006 it was estimated that there were approximately 80,000 prostitutes (off and on street) in the UK (Home Office, 2004). Understandably, only 2 per cent of punters estimated this correctly pre-Programme. When asked the same question post-session, 55 per cent correctly remembered the information given to them. Similar results were achieved when punters were asked to guess how many sexual encounters – on average – the typical ‘street-prostitute’ has over a 12-month period (the Change Programme facilitators estimate this to be about 7000 a year; see Fig. 7.13). The number of punters correctly identifying the (estimated) number of sexual encounters of a ‘typical’ working girl rose from 4 to 69 per cent over the two sessions. Both of these results suggest an improved knowledge uptake.
Table 9.37: Open Ended Knowledge Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage of respondents guessing correctly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many prostitutes do you think there are in Great Britain?</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many men/sexual encounters does the average street-prostitute have sexual contact with over a 12-month period?</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the worst punishment (in a British Court of Law) that can be given to a man caught paying for sex with a (street) prostitute between the ages of 16-17 years old?</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the worst punishment (in a British Court of Law) that can be given to a man caught paying for sex with a (street) prostitute over 18 years old?</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Knowledge uptake regarding the maximum punishments applicable for paying for sex remained even more resistant. Post-Programme only a quarter of all punters knew the maximum punishment available for those found guilty of paying for sex with 16-17 year olds\(^\text{240}\) with less than a third aware of the punishment if found guilty of soliciting/kerb crawling with over 18's\(^\text{241}\). This has important implications, particularly if increasing the punishment tariff is to be used as a disincentive to recidivism. Qualitatively, however, the detail appeared less important than recognising the broad principle of how severely the law could deal with men who paid for sex with underage working girls:

‘I didn’t actually realise that it was against the law to go with a prostitute who was 16 or 17...that part of the course really shocked me. Just knowing that going with one of these girls could put you into serious trouble was very, very scary’ (Deepak, 42, divorced, public sector manager).

Perhaps a more pressing issue for those responsible for policymakers is how to get this message over to the general population before offending takes place.

**Knowledge uptake: closed question findings**

In addition to these open-ended questions, punters were asked to determine whether or not a number of pre-determined statements were ‘true’ or ‘false’. Respondents were generally far more successful at answering these closed-questions pre-post session (Table 9.38), than the open-ended questions outlined above.

\(^{240}\) Currently the maximum sentence for this offence is seven years’ imprisonment (Home Office, 2004).

\(^{241}\) Kerb-crawling or persistent soliciting carries with it a Level 3 fine, as well as being an arrestable crime by CPJA 2001 and can now result in a disqualification from driving.
**Table 9.38: True/False Knowledge Responses to Pre-defined Statements (correct answer in parentheses)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Percentage of respondents giving correct answer*</th>
<th>Before Session</th>
<th>After Session</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) I can always tell if someone has an STD or HIV by looking at them (FALSE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>+2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I cannot get an STD from unprotected oral sex performed on me (FALSE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) I cannot be prosecuted for soliciting a street-prostitute unless I am caught in the act of soliciting (FALSE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>+53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) The police carry out undercover operations in massage parlours (TRUE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>+46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) You can tell whether a street-prostitute is under age by looking at them (FALSE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>+34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) If I am caught for soliciting a street-prostitute or loitering with intent then I will be arrested (TRUE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>+5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) If a street-prostitute says she is 18 or older, but is really younger, a man who has sex with her can be imprisoned (TRUE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>+4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) It is legal to pay for sex in off-street locations, such as massage parlours (TRUE – with provisos)</td>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>+30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) It is illegal to talk to a street-prostitute about buying sex (TRUE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>+29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine Statement Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>+13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correct answers in parentheses

Although knowledge generally improved over the two sessions, many punters went into the Change Programme with a broad awareness of many of these facts anyway. This was confirmed in conversations during the follow-up interviews:

‘Most blokes on the Change Programme knew about the STI’s, but didn’t know about the hepatitis’ (*Tony, 45, divorced, unemployed*).

The vast majority of punters were also aware that if they were caught soliciting or loitering with intent then they would be arrested. Surprisingly, most men came into, and went away from the session with an understanding that they could be imprisoned if they paid for sex with a girl under the age of 18, even if she claimed to be older. Clearly this has important policy implications. If an understanding existed prior to being caught paying for sex, then the inference is that these men knew the risk of paying for sex but were willing to take it; it was a price worth paying. If, on the other hand, these punters only became aware of the potential sanctions post-arrest but pre-Change Programme attendance, then there is clearly a need to better educate men in general about the legal repercussions that paying for sex brings with it. The problem of being able to determine age is given much attention in the Change Programme (Chapter 8) and judging by the post-session survey results, this exercise would appear to have some additive knowledge-based impact.
Over two in five respondents went into the Change Programme with a belief that the police did not carry out undercover operations in massage parlours. Arguably, these beliefs – if unchallenged – could easily transcend into offence displacement from on-street to off-street prostitution, particularly if coalescing with an ‘on-street bad, off-street good’ discourse (see earlier discussion and Chapter 8). Given the overwhelming focus of the Change Programme curriculum on street-level prostitution, it is perhaps understandable that not all punters get the anti-prostitution message that illegal off-street prostitution markets are regularly policed and should not be viewed as a more acceptable way of paying for illegal sex. This is particularly pertinent in the current climate of the Government considering a ‘strict liability offence of paying for sex with […] those who have been trafficked or exploited by any other means’ (Home Office, 2008:15). However, when asked this question again, a vastly improved 86 per cent of respondents were aware that the police carried out these off-street operations.

**Knowledge and socio-demographic profiling – selected findings**

**Employment status and knowledge**

Table 9.39 highlights how the knowledge gap significantly closes between employed and unemployed punters as a result of the information provided in the Change Programme.

**Table 9.39: True/False Knowledge Responses to Pre-defined Statements - by EMPLOYMENT STATUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nine statement average % (by EMPLOYMENT STATUS)</th>
<th>Before Session</th>
<th>After Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed f/t</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whilst this is an important development, the lack of pre-programme knowledge of unemployed attendee’s should be of some concern to policymakers, particularly those responsible for sexual health messages; only half of unemployed punters went into the course knowing that it was possible to contract an STD from unprotected oral sex (a figure which fell when measured post-session).

**Ethnicity and knowledge**

South Asian respondents have a much lower average score correctly answering the nine closed questions pre-session (Table 9.40). South Asians score particularly poorly in correctly guessing that: (i) it is possible to be prosecuted for soliciting, even if not caught in the act; (ii) police run undercover operations in off-street locations; (iii) it is not always possible to tell if someone is underage by their appearance. Understanding the phenomenon of prostitution through a culturally-determined lens is a recurrent theme throughout this chapter and there is mixed
evidence about the suitability of the Change Programme in challenging the cultural misconceptions that exist in relation to street-level prostitution markets and working girls (see Chapter 8). In this instance the Change Programme appears to be instrumental in improving South Asian’s knowledge base. However, given the findings elsewhere in this chapter, it is not possible to state that improvements in knowledge will be matched with a corresponding change in attitudes amongst South Asian men. Clearly more qualitative and longitudinal research is required to establish the causal link between ‘knowledge’, ‘attitudes’ and ‘anticipated future behaviour’ (see Sutton et al, 2007). What is evident is that motivations to behave in a certain way inevitably require more than throwing several facts and figures into the arena.

**Table 9.40: True/False Knowledge Responses to Pre-defined Statements – by ETHNICITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nine statement average % (by ETHNICITY)</th>
<th>Percentage of respondents giving correct answer – by ETHNICITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White British/Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before Session</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Session</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=82

**Prostitution usage and knowledge**

Further evidence for this lack of clarity concerning the causal relationship between ‘knowledge’, ‘attitudes’ and ‘behaviour’ is demonstrated in relation to ‘prostitution usage and knowledge’ findings (Table 9.41). Prior to the research, one might have reasonably hypothesised that ‘veterans’ are able to justify the continuation of their punting behaviour because of misinformation about street-prostitution. Accordingly, tackling misinformation would be seen as vital in promoting anti-prostitution messages. Unfortunately this causal linearity is not evidenced here: veterans are the most knowledgeable group (post-programme) and yet are simultaneously the group most likely to exhibit pro-prostitution attitudes.

**Table 9.41: True/False Knowledge Responses to Pre-defined Statements – by PROSTITUTION USAGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nine statement average % (CLOSED QUESTIONS)</th>
<th>Percentage of respondents giving correct answer – by PROSTITUTION USAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novice (1-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before Session</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Session</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=99
Some observations on how men pay for sex

According to Cornish (1994), offences unfold via a ‘series of decision points through which the would-be offender passes in the process of crime commission’ (Laycock, 2005:682). These ‘crime scripts’ draw heavily on the cognitive sciences and in relation to prostitution demonstrate obvious parallels with the ‘Relapse Model’ (Chapter 8) and Holzman and Pines’ (1982) discussion of a psychological build-up associated with ‘becoming a punter’ (Chapter 6).

Applied to on-street prostitution, crime scripts are useful because they demonstrate that appropriate interventions need not be restricted to the ‘final act’ of paying for sex. Holzman and Pines (1982) argue that the majority of punters migrate through four stages in the phenomenology of being a ‘client’ and crime scripts therefore offer a mechanism to ‘expose a range of potential intervention points’ (Laycock, 2005: 682).

Although several interviewees were adamant that their decision to pay for sex had been entirely spontaneous and the result of being ‘innocently’ solicited by on-street working girls, this ‘one stage’ model was the exception rather than the rule. For the majority of the interviewee sample, there was a widespread acceptance that paying for sex had been preceded by a number of decisions and actions, correlating strongly with Holzman and Pines (1982) four-stage model. The ‘conception of intent’ (or in the vocabulary of the ‘Relapse Model’, the process of ‘thinking/wanting’ and ‘making it ok’) was especially prevalent, as demonstrated by the comments of Stuart:

‘[prostitution] was something I had thought about quite a lot before trying to pay for it...what the girl would look like, what I would do, how I would do it, how I’d feel’ (Stuart, 38, long-term partner, warehouse operative).

A number of men also admitted that any subjective interpretations preceding their involvement in prostitution had been shaped by popular culture and pornographic websites:

‘Before I’d been with a prostitute, I could only guess what it would be like, from what I’d seen and heard. The Internet was a big thing for me, you see websites where men pay random strangers to have sex with them...I sort of had these images in my mind...how she’d look, how I’d pay her, how’s she’d behave when we were having sex’ (Adam, 22, single, plumber).

Although it is feasible to design interventions around ‘conceptions of intent’, this phase is arguably the most difficult to address for policymakers. Because ‘intentions’ are typically psychologically internalised, this stage tends not to manifest itself in visible behavioural changes (or at least invisible to agencies of the CJS). Moreover, managing ‘intent’ through the control of the media and new technology formats would require immense structural changes at the social and cultural level.
More realistic for policymakers, is to develop responses to the ‘pursuit’ stage (Holzman and Pines, 1982) (or ‘opportunity creation’ in the ‘Relapse Model’). Once ‘conceptions of intent’ have materialised, there is often a period in which men undertake activities related to their ‘fantasies’ of prostitution - but falling short of the ‘encounter’ stage. Adam, for example, described how:

‘...it was about a month between fantasising about paying for sex and actually paying for it. Looking back, I’d look for excuses to drive to the ‘red-light’ area…’it’s a short cut for work blah blah’. In retrospect, I knew all I was doing was making excuses in my head to suss out how it all worked…what was the least risky way of picking up a prostitute?’ (Adam, 22, single, plumber).

This ‘pursuit’ phase of the crime script is well recognised as a preceding behaviour to the actual offence and helps explain the rationale of the OSPT using CCTV evidence to send warning letters to ‘cruisers’ in the ‘red-light’ area (although this did not affect Adam in the example above; see Chapter 8). In other words the decision to offend is seen to be made less likely by this early intervention.

For other respondents, feelings of ‘nervousness and fear’ (Holzman and Pines, 1982:111) in the ‘pursuit’ phase require unique ‘opportunity creation’ measures:

‘This particular night I went for a walk round the red-light district…I actually walked around for about an hour and a half [because] I hadn’t got the money on me, so I went to the cash-point and then went back to the red-light district. I knew I wouldn’t have the bottle to go up to one of these ladies, so I tried to make it as obvious as possible that I was ‘buying’. Eventually a girl came up to me and asked if I was looking for business and I said ‘yes’.

Such accounts were commonplace amongst interviewee’s and evidently give a degree of legitimacy to Cornish’s (1994) emphasis on crime scripts as an opportunity to actualise pre-offence interventions (in this case solicitation). In fact all respondents who admitted to thinking about prostitution in advance of paying for it, initially came to the attention of the OSPT as a result of the behaviours they demonstrated during the ‘pursuit’ phase; driving or walking around the red-light area continuously over the course of one evening became the ‘core’ activity central to all respondents, accompanied by at least one other ‘signal’ behaviour, such as getting money out of the ATM or being under the influence of alcohol/drugs. In short, men clearly pay for sex in numerous different ways, but for those that conform to the four-stage model of punting, there is some evidence that particular behaviours lend themselves to early intervention in advance of the ‘encounter’ phase.
Perception of and reactions to CPTED measures and poster campaigns

Chapter 8 discussed how the OSPT have implemented a number of CPTED measures as a means of designing out demand. With regards to one such measure – road closures - none of the respondents in this research recalled this intervention being implemented in Nottingham’s ‘red-light’ district. Despite this, respondents were unanimous in their view that this may affect behaviour. Equally, however, there was a view that the consequences would be temporally and spatially limited:

‘It sends out the message that they’re on to you. If you’ve not got a reason to be on that street then you’re a sitting duck as far as I’m concerned. In that situation [the road closures] I’d have kept my head down until they got rid of it or the girls move somewhere else’.

Few men recalled seeing the ‘Respect for Nottingham’ poster campaign(s) or more general anti-‘punter’ media campaigns/signage. Views on their potential impact were mixed:

‘It would make you think about what you’re doing. Not that it’s wrong, but that the authorities are taking it seriously and that you might get caught’ (Brian, 50, divorced, copywriter).

Stuart, on the other hand, felt that:

‘It’s a gimmick. It’s like that piracy campaign for films…you watch it and might even take it in, but it don’t stop you buying the cheap knock-off DVD’s down the market’ (Stuart, 38, long-term partner, warehouse operative).

In relation to improved street lighting, some respondents acknowledged that they would be less inclined to pay for street-level sex in well-lit locations or in daylight hours. Other interviewees, however, argued that such a measure may have unintended consequences:

‘Better lighting works in favour of the punters too…if they [the OSPT] can see you, then you can probably see them’ (Adam, 22, single, plumber).

Adam went on to point out that the flexibility of his and other men’s jobs (particularly for those who are self-employed) meant that punting in daylight hours was a realistic alternative:

‘Men don’t just get horny in the night [laughs], but from what I’ve been told, the police tend to run operations of a night when they know they’ll catch more punters. In the day, it’s a lot easier to be anonymous…you could be picking your kid up from school, on a work job or whatever. It’s a lot harder for the police to prove, so why are they going to bother’ (Adam, 22, single, plumber).
Conclusions – tackling the demand for street-level sex in Nottingham: re-education as 'misplaced enthusiasm' and the limitations of a 'one size fits all' intervention model

Intense scepticism levelled at increasingly utilised KCRPs (see Chapter 8) has tended to focus on two key perceived weaknesses. Firstly, there has been a concern with the lack of intellectual clarity in the aims and objectives of prostitution ‘diversion’ schemes. Secondly there remains a widespread doubt that KCRPs are ineffective at transforming attitudes/beliefs and that these can ever act as a catalyst for behavioural change (Sanders, 2009).

Evidence from this research is insufficient to categorically identify a direct causal link between attendance on the Change Programme and recidivistic reduction benefits. Nevertheless, what the research data outputs palpably – and perhaps surprisingly - demonstrate is that the Government’s enthusiasm for ‘re-education programmes’ (Home Office, 2004 & 2008) may not be as misplaced as Brooks-Gordon (2006) assumes. No doubt the Change Programme’s design, delivery and adherence to ‘due process’ incorporates some notable imperfections and faultlines. But as a mechanism for engendering aspects of ‘attitudinal change’ there are clear signs that – counter to Sanders’ (2008) concerns about the ineffectiveness of North American ‘Johns Schools’ - the Change Programme is indeed ‘effective’. Speculating on why this apparent John School/Change Programme ‘effectiveness differential’ exists, necessitates an understanding of the potential ‘cultural’ differences associated with paying for sex (Sawyer et al, 1998:124), together with a recognition that there are fundamentally divergent content and delivery mechanisms underpinning ‘re-education’ programmes on both sides of the Atlantic. More research is required to ascertain the extent of this ‘effectiveness differential’ and the role that programme content and delivery plays.

The upshot is that when compared with pre-session responses, more men leave the Programme stating that they will never pay for street-level sex again (or any form of sex for that matter). On its own, this may be enough for the OSPT and other interested parties to declare the programme a ‘success’. More promising still is that the data triangulated from survey responses and follow-up interviews indicates that this resistance is not only the product of being ‘fearful of being caught again’. Rather, a critical mass of attendees seemed able to recognise the cognitive processes and life circumstances underpinning their decision(s) to pay for sex. This is important, since it implies future desistance from prostitution (for these men) is not wholly dependent on a visible police presence and/or the threat of CJS sanctions. As suggested by the data in table 9.27242, the Change Programme potentially empowers more attendees to desist from future ‘offending’ on their terms, rather than being compelled by external agencies.

242 For example, wanting sex or being under the influence of drink and drugs are no longer seen as justified temptations for the majority of men completing the Programme.
Firmly in line with the findings of Wortley and Fischer (2002) and Abt (2008), respondents also tend to leave the Change Programme with a greater sense of ‘responsibilisation’ (Scoular and O’Neill, 2007) for their behaviour and more pronounced negative perceptions of street-level prostitution generally. Whilst there is recognisable cognitive resistance towards seeing working girls through an altruistic lens, there is enough evidence to suggest that the role play exercises facilitate concern for others (mainly partners or close family members) beyond the ‘self’. This ‘reintegrative shaming’ (Brathwaite, 2000) by proxy is important if one considers the embedded role that empathy can play in challenging ‘techniques of guilt neutralisation’ (Sykes and Matza, 1957) and how this may ultimately help to reduce the potential for relapsed prostitution behaviours.

Of course, even if we accept that reducing the demand for street-level prostitution is a legitimate enterprise, then using the potentially temporary ‘cognitive realignment’ of less than 100 men to legitimise the disbanding of the OSPT, or the suspension of other CPTED-based interventions, may be somewhat imprudent. Research outputs outlined earlier in this chapter imply that any attitudinal changes prompted by the Change Programme will probably, at best, result in additive recidivistic benefits only. Rejecting the role of the OSPT in ‘keeping a lid’ on the demand for street-level sex, is clearly misguided given that the factor least likely to provoke punters into recidivism post-programme was ‘when there was some risk of being caught’ (table 9.27). In addition, it was widely felt that the Change Programme was ineffective at deterring potential future offenders. Moreover, given the relatively short timescales in which the Change Programme has been operating (and therefore the time period in which it has been evaluated), and in the absence of any long-term psychological support for Change Programme attendees, it is still not clear whether such ‘attitudinal change’: i) is permanent and/or; ii) can actually be seen as a precursor to behavioural change. Significantly, there are signs that the Programme in its current guise is likely to be less effective – or even counter-productive - for some ‘groups’ of men, in particular those who have a history of paying for sex. It is also likely that any KCRP-generated improvements in ‘knowledge’ about street-level prostitution are highly transient and largely un-correlated to any identified attitudinal ‘realignment’.

Despite these limitations it seems likely that the Change Programme is effective in helping some men – especially for ‘first-timers’ and ‘intermediates’ - to challenge their attitudes and beliefs towards street-level prostitution. In other words, it seems reasonable to tentatively claim that for those men that fulfil certain socio-demographic/cultural criteria, the Change Programme may exert some additive recidivistic reduction benefits over and above ‘traditional’ CJS interventions.

What we can say with some degree of certainty is that to talk of a ‘typical’ punter is a misnomer. Although it is clear that some groups are statistically over-represented (for example, South Asian punters and those in the 25-34 age bracket), men caught paying for street-level sex in Nottingham are represented across all socio-demographic classifications. Seemingly of more significance is evaluating how age, education, marital status and perhaps most significantly,
ethnicity, might: i) impact on preconceptions about what it means: a) to be a working girl and; b) to pay for sex, and ii) influence the extent to which the Change Programme shapes attitudinal transformations across a socio-demographically heterogeneous group of men. Given the sub-group sample sizes, it is difficult to come to any firm conclusions here. Nevertheless, these limited research findings offer a fascinating glimpse into the role that ‘culture’ and previous prostitution usage plays in shaping men’s cognitions towards (street-level) sex. Such a ‘realistic evaluation’ approach necessarily brings into sharp focus the dangers of applying a ‘one size fits all’ model in ‘re-educating’ men about (street-level) prostitution. Above all, ignoring socio-demographic and/or socio-cultural variations simply ensures that the structural fault-lines identified in Chapter 8 will be replicated. On the evidence from this research, the pursuit of a ‘one size fits all’ approach to delivering the Change Programme is not only intellectually flawed, but on the basis that it neglects the ‘cognitive needs’ of certain ‘groups’ of punters, morally flawed too. It certainly fails to account for the need to tailor Change Programme content to the peculiar risk factors affiliated to this socio-culturally heterogeneous target groups.

**A final word: ‘we’re still victims now’**

Despite tentative evidence that the Change Programme might conceivably contribute to reducing the demand for street-level sex for some men in some circumstances, paying for sex is clearly only one half of the demand-supply nexus. Even after being subjected to ‘cognitive realignment’, a number of respondents expressed the view that demand was largely supply led, and that demand could only be designed out by ‘tackling supply’ (which appears to challenge the broad consensus amongst Home Office policymakers that reducing demand remains integral to tackling supply). The paradox is that punters claim they will stop paying for street-level sex, but that these measures are not going to make a difference on their own, because there will always be ‘new’ men coming through tempted by the broader socio-cultural canvas and visible manifestations of the ‘market’.

In light of this, the following chapter explores what working girls think about demand reductions. For example: have they noticed any changes in the number and/or type of men paying for sex in Nottingham? What impact would (or has) a reduction in punter numbers have on them (including crime, safety and working practices)? Do working girls subscribe to the ‘permanency’ of the market? Inevitably, this requires exploring why women get involved in prostitution in the first place and what impact the ‘support plus enforcement’ approach has had in facilitating exiting.
Chapter 10 - Working Girls and the Demand-reduction Paradigm: Assessing the Potential Impact of ‘Market Disruption’ in the Purchasing of Sex

Irrespective of the value of innovative schemes such as the Change Programme in potentially transforming behaviour (Monto, 1999), their mere inclusion as a crime reduction tool, indicates that tackling the demand for prostitution is becoming increasingly ‘mainstreamed’ in political and social policy debates. Symbolically, by re-framing prostitution as a market crime and working girls as its victims, the politics associated with criminalising the buying of sex arguably become easier to navigate (Gould, 2001). Moreover, reducing demand is seen by the Government to have real, tangible benefits for working girls. In other words, the embedded assumption is that there exists an identifiable direct correlation between demand and supply.

Even if the tentative findings in the previous chapter suggest some success in changing attitudes (and by implication, behaviour), the Change Programme and other non-punitive interventions can, however, only ever expect to ‘re-educate’ those men who have been caught paying for sex. More resistant demand will be elicited from those non-arrestee ‘offenders’ who are: 1) sufficiently tempted by the ‘cultural normalisation’ (Bernstein, 2001) of the sex industry (seen in the context of other ‘motivational’ factors) but; 2) insufficiently deterred by the CJS/public shaming implications. Yet, based on the findings from the previous chapter, it is quite conceivable that even in the short-term, a combination of punitive and rehabilitative measures may have a discernable impact on the numbers of men seeking to pay for sex. What is less clear is the potential long-term consequences of such measures and - as Östergren (2004) points out in her critique of the Swedish model - the impact that any demand reductions will have on working girls’ day to day lives.

Importantly, the socio-psychological dynamics of ‘choosing’ to pay for sex are fundamentally different from the reasons why women become involved in prostitution in the first place and in considering these motivational disparities, it seems reasonable to at least question the intellectual premise that reductions in prostitution can be achieved by taking action against the ‘sex buyer’. It may well be that the policies implemented to attack the primacy of demand result in reductions in the number of women involved in selling street-level sex. For those that remain, however, it is somewhat of a leap of faith to assume that this manipulation in the demand-supply nexus is devoid of negative unintended consequences (or will necessarily facilitate long-term exiting). In short, if all that is achieved is a spatially and temporally displaced working girl ‘community’ more exposed to risk and danger (see Chapter 8), then we have to ask ourselves: is this a ‘price worth paying’?

Against this background, this chapter explores how working girls in Nottingham understand their ‘decision’ to become involved in prostitution and how these entry and retainer risk factors may ultimately determine the success of any speculative demand reductions and/or an ‘enforcement plus support’ approach towards supply. If there is a genuine belief that street-level working girls are coerced ‘victims’ lacking any choice, then those responsible for devising and implementing
policy have a duty to produce the appropriate evidence confirming that tackling demand to reduce supply will i) facilitate exiting and; ii) alleviate, rather than exacerbate, any problems for this newly-labelled victim group.

**Socio-economic profiles of working girl interviewees**

Before discussing how working girls from this sample understand their: 1) trajectories into prostitution; 2) their interpretations of demand and; 3) their construction of the potential/actual consequences of criminalising punters, it is necessary first to engage in a brief outline of the socio-economic background of this group of women. The ‘supply side’ sampling process is articulated in some detail in Chapter 7 and it is not my intention to repeat these methodological observations here.

\[i\] **Age**: Unlike the age heterogeneity demonstrated amongst Change punters (see Chapter 9), this sample demonstrated very little age variation; all respondents were aged between 19-32 years of age. This relatively narrow age variation is in line with findings elsewhere in the research literature (Hester and Westmarland, 2004).

\[ii\] **Ethnicity**: Two interviewees described their ethnicity as ‘mixed race’. All other respondents classified themselves as ‘white British’. Compared to other research data, white interviewees were significantly over-represented in this sample.

\[iii\] **Marital Status**: none of the interviewees was married, although 72 per cent of respondents (n=16) did have ‘partners’. One respondent was divorced, whilst the remainder, (n=6) classified themselves as single.

\[iv\] **Highest Educational Qualification (HEQ)**: one respondent (‘Lucy’) had continued in post-16 education (3 A-Levels, Grade A-C), with another five respondents achieving at least one GCSE at grade A-C. A further four interviewees had completed a variety of ad-hoc training programmes and IT courses. The remaining sample (n=12) was classified as school leavers with no qualifications (or not specified).

\[v\] **Length of involvement in street-level prostitution**: length of involvement ranged from seven months to nine years ‘on and off’. Importantly, respondents’ involvement in street-level prostitution was often characterised by sporadic involvement over extended periods (Pitcher, 2006). The earliest age that a respondent became involved in street-level prostitution was 14, the oldest, 24 years old. In addition to street-level prostitution, seven respondents had also worked in indoor sex markets.

In this chapter, direct quotations are followed by the interviewee’s pseudonym, age and length of involvement in street-level prostitution (cumulative months/years).
Drugs, victimisation and childhood abuse: revisiting working girls’ narratives of ‘sex working’

The Influence of Class A drugs

In exploring the lived realities of selling sex (Phoenix, 2008) the literature demonstrates time and again a seemingly symbiotic relationship between the sex and drug markets (see Chapter 5). Correlating with the research evidence that there is limited (and a differential) use of illegal drugs in off-street markets (see Sanders, 2006:105; Taylor, 2003; Church et al, 2001; McCullagh et al, 1998; Norton-Hawk, 2003), several research participants in this study recognised that ‘street-prostitution is all hard drugs and […] massage parlours are all soft drugs or alcohol’ (Louise, 30, five years).

Certainly the evidence from this research does little to dispel the potency of this relationship with every one of the women interviewed in this study recognising that an addiction to drugs was integral to their sex working in some way (the most commonly used drugs were crack cocaine (18 respondents) followed by heroin (14 interviewees\(^\text{243}\)). For this group of women, problematic drug use lies at the heart of street-level prostitution:

‘Other working girls reckon they do it for other reasons, but it’s not. They’re all on drugs – ‘crack and smack’ [heroin] - and this is what it’s about. Although they say I need the money for such and such\(^\text{244}\), it’s not like that’ (Kate, 27, five years).

Put simply, street-prostitution is inexorably linked to drugs, especially: ‘…the crack. If I have a binge on crack it turns my whole life upside down. It controls everything I do’ (Sarah, 23, four years). Interestingly, for those women who have been involved in street-level prostitution for some time, this symbiosis is perceived to be a fairly recent phenomenon and unlike previous eras, interpreted as unrelated to the ‘feminisation of poverty’ (O’Neill, 1997):

‘When I first started, a lot of women were doing it for their kids, cos they were in debt and that…it’s only relatively recently that it’s all drugs, drugs, drugs. Before they would do it mainly for their kids and to better themselves and their homes rather than to get off their heads’ (Bernadette, 32, nine years).

As one might expect with such chronic addictions, once this relationship has been established it tends to be all consuming:

‘99 per cent of what I make from prostitution goes on drugs. If I’m getting 50 quid here, 50 quid there, […] it’s not going to buy me a house or anything decent and really that

\(^{243}\) A number of working girls were using heroin and crack cocaine co-dependently.

\(^{244}\) For off-street workers this may be a valid claim; 74 per cent of indoor workers in Church et al’s (2001) study stated their primary reason for ‘sex working’ was related to household expenses and children.
money is not lawfully legal, so I can’t really invest it. So you get used to earning this money quickly and spending this money even quicker’ (Chantal, 23, five years).

Moreover, this relationship appears to be directly correlational:

‘Prostitution is directly related to the stage you’re at in relation to your drug taking. In the beginning I used to make about £50 to £80 a night – 3 or 4 punters. But as I’ve got older my drug taking has got less, some nights I might just see one punter’ (Sue, 27, five years).

On the whole, for this sample of women, Class A drug use was an important antecedent to any involvement in street-level prostitution, with little support for the claim that women and girls enter street-level prostitution clean from drugs (see Dalla, 2002; May et al, 1999; Cusick et al, 2004). Simultaneously, however, discussions with these women exhibited strong evidence that off-street prostitution can precede problematic illegal drug use; notably, seven respondents in this sample began their prostitution ‘career’ in off-street locations free from addiction to Class A drugs. Ruby’s story is typical:

‘I began working for this escort firm and everything was great at first…good money, nice blokes. Then I got introduced to this guy who sort of became my boyfriend…anyway, it turned out he was a [heroin] dealer and I started using with him. Because I was taking gear and that, she [the woman who ran the escort agency] would ring me up and say you’ve got a client and you’ve got half an hour to get ready. But I just used to stick my hair up and that was it. So I wasn’t looking the best that I could. She always used to say to me ‘I know you’re on drugs and that’ and she said that unless I stop it then she would ask me leave. And then she asked me to leave. But I needed to fund my drug habit because I was addicted at that time. That’s how I ended up on the streets’ (Ruby, 24, three years).

Sophie tells a similar story:

‘I started off escorting in Blackpool years ago. I started off on soft drugs and then started hanging around with the wrong crowd and went onto harder drugs….the less stable I became and unable to hold down a decent…you know, off-street work. So…that’s how I ended up working the streets’ (Sophie, 27, six years).

This narrative is important, since it symbolises the ways in which working in off-street locations can also act as a precursor to illegal drugs and ultimately street-level prostitution. Primarily off-street prostitution introduces working girls to individuals for whom drug taking is part of everyday life. As Plant (1997) points out, the environment in which some working girls make contact with punters can be conducive to encouraging substance (mis)use. Once drugs have taken their hold, the consensus is that it becomes untenable to work in off-street locations;
organisational rules within off-street parlours typically prohibit drug use (Brewis and Linstead, 2000). Because these women have already been exposed to some of the emotional and psychological challenges of selling sex commercially, the transition between off and on-street markets as a means of funding a drug habit is often seen as a logical step-change. Unlike punters who appear to migrate ‘up’ the prostitution continuum (from on-street to off-street; see Sanders, 2008), it seems that for those involved in selling sex the migration is more causally sporadic (see Green et al, 2000; Cusick, 1998). Whilst there are examples of working girls moving from on-street to off-street locations, Benson and Matthews (1995:401) argue that there remains restricted mobility between these two markets, often because of the minimum prerequisite to abstain from Class A drugs (Campbell and Van Nooijen, 2005 cited in May and Hunter, 2006). This is a pre-condition that most on-street working girls are unable or unwilling to maintain. As Grace states:

‘A next door neighbour ran a massage parlour and I hadn’t worked the streets for about 6 months…I was clean as I’d just come out of rehab. Because I needed the extra cash I started working there. I worked there for about 5 months. […] The problem was I didn’t really know what to do with all this money and I got back on the chiva [heroin] and ended up working the streets again’ (Grace, 26, four years).

Regardless of the causal direction, once involved in street-level markets, there remains a broad consensus that the use of drugs represents a coping mechanism from the stresses of the ‘job’ (May et al, 1999; Cusick, 1998; Barnard, 1993):

‘When you take heroin, you choose to think about what you want to think about…so yes you can switch off. So that’s why people relapse when they come off it, because they have to start to think again, face their demons…’shit, my mum’s dead rah rah rah’. All the thinking and memories come back and you can’t help that because you haven’t got the drugs to block it out. I’m scared of the thought of having to face life without the drugs’ (Mia, 25, four years).

On this evidence, to deny a link between drugs and street-level prostitution would be imprudent. Nevertheless, there is also a danger of homogenising a relationship that is far more nuanced than is represented by simplified relational narratives (see Chapter 5). Working girl accounts clearly reveal that it is often a culmination of life events that underpin their trajectories into using illegal drugs (and ultimately street-level prostitution). Mia describes how her self-labelled ‘pretty normal’ life, quickly descended into drug addiction and on-street prostitution:

‘My mum died and I was drinking a lot and I ended up fighting […] Then there was this one serious offence, she bottled me and I glassed her and we both got sent to prison…that’s when I got introduced to heroin. I also had my first lick of a crack pipe in jail as well. So, yeh, in jail, that’s where it all started to go wrong’ (Mia, 25, four years).
The notion that the role of dealer, partner and pimp has become so interwoven that ‘many women [have] close relationships with dealers’ making them ‘dependent on them for their drug supply’ (Hunter and May, 2006:177), was a hypothesis expressed by a majority of respondents. Resonating with findings elsewhere (May et al, 1999; Hester and Westmarland, 2004), exploitative ‘boyfriends’ it seems play a major contributory role in women’s involvement in prostitution. Typically:

‘When your boyfriend’s on drugs you can’t get away from it even if you wanted to. If I had left, he’d have hunted me down and I’d have ended up dead or battered’ (Sarah, 23, four years).

‘Sometimes pimps can be a boyfriend, but mostly they are drug dealers as well. Having said that, what I’ve found out is that the partners will take the money and score...so you’re working to sort out your partner as well’ (Chantal, 23, five years).

Compounding the problem of coercive, abusive boyfriends, is the fact that most of these women have a ‘social circle’ that facilitates and normalises the culture of drugs:

‘I’ve got friends...but they’re all addicts. I don’t have any non-working girl, non-drug addict friends and I’ve only ever lived with addicts. I need to be taken away from society and to deal with the shit that’s gone on in my life in the past 10 years […]. The problem with addicts...even those that are supposed to be your mates...them lot can take milk out of tea, they’ll rob you blind if they can’ (Emily, 25, six years).

The upshot is that for some women, there is a perception that breaking this ‘cycle’ requires making a clean break altogether: ‘the only way I’m going to get out of prostitution is if I move out of Nottingham’ (Gemma, 23, three years). Conversely, several respondents questioned the logic of this argument: ‘I can take my fucked up memories and drug problems with me anywhere; Nottingham has got nothing to do with it’ (Eve, 22, five years).

Nevertheless, it would appear that the physical and psychological addiction to drugs is often exacerbated by a lack of structural stability and appropriate support from peers, family, partners or friends. Consequently this ‘lifestyle’ becomes a claustrophobic, vicious circle difficult to escape. Asked if it was the drugs that prevented her from exiting prostitution, one respondent Lily, stated that:

‘Do you know what, it’s not...it’s my empty lifestyle right now. My daughter’s in care, I spend all day, every day hanging around skanks who are just looking for their next fix and I’ve got court orders, nowhere stable to live. Every way I turn there’s a sign saying ‘fuck you, you ain’t going nowhere’. I don’t know how to pull my life back together’ (Lily, 21, four years).
Tragic as this account is, many of the respondents also recognised the value that getting drug rehabilitation played in facilitating exiting. Although the presence of violent partners or other disruptive influences meant that rehabilitation was often unsuccessful, for Hannah the power of such schemes lay in their capacity for self-reflection:

‘They teach you about yourself, to face your fears and how to live your life without drugs’ (Hannah, 29, five years).

One could argue that there are other ways to fund chronic drug addictions other than prostitution, but given the well-documented ‘chaotic lifestyles’ associated with Class A drugs (Matthews, 2008), the options for legitimate employment are notoriously funnelled (Bean, 2008). Accordingly a number of respondents sought to justify their prostitution activities precisely on the basis that it represented lawful work and was deemed to be more favourable than engaging in acquisitive crime (see later discussion). In this context, street-level prostitution is not only interpreted by working girls as the ‘right thing’ to do (especially when counterbalanced against ‘morally ambiguous’ acquisitive crime), but from a pragmatic perspective is seen to be more lucrative and less likely to result in a custodial sentence (Cusick et al, 2004):

‘I’m originally from a small town in Notts and there’s no prostitution there at all, so prostitution wasn’t an option for me…basically to shoplift was the only way to make your money as a drug addict. Then me and my partner moved to Nottingham and suddenly there was another option, because there is a red light district and it’s a well-known district which everybody knows about. This option was there and I just chose it instead of shoplifting’ (Megan, 24, two years).

That street-based working girls are major customers of drug dealers is well documented (MacDonald et al, 2003; McKeganey and Barnard, 1996). There is also some evidence to suggest that working girls prop up Class A drug markets not only by their own prolific use, but also by selling drugs to their clients on behalf of dealers who are often partners (May et al, 1999). Once again, however, the respondents in this survey made claims to be operating within their own strict moral/pragmatic framework. For instance, when asked if drugs were ever offered to her clients, Eve responded that:

‘Yes, but I’d only ever use with a regular…using with a guy you’ve just picked up; that’s when you’re most likely to get attacked or bounced [robbed]’ (Eve, 22, five years).

Evidence from official OSPT arrest data for the period June 2004-May 2009 (Table 10.1) potentially gives further credence to the idea that - contrary to May et al’s (1999) findings – selling drugs to clients is not a widespread phenomenon amongst Nottingham’s working girls. Significantly, punters were more likely than working girls to be charged with Class A drugs
offences (see Chapter 9). It also suggests that there is considerable scope for the police to overlook personal possession of Class A drugs by working girls.

**Table 10.1: OSPT arrest data for supplying and possessing Class A drugs amongst street-level working girls**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009 (up to May)</th>
<th>Total (Charge)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charged: possession Class A drug</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charged: supplying class A drug</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Year)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearly the evidence for a co-dependent relationship between (on-street) sex and drugs markets is compelling and goes some way to explaining the government’s desire to review the current legislative approach to prostitution (Home Office, 2004, 2006 & 2008). Although this is an already theoretically saturated field of enquiry, understanding the impact of demand-led interventions for this group of women partially necessitated an appreciation of the role of drugs in their lives.

**The interplay between drugs and other risk factors as antecedents to involvement in street-level prostitution**

**Childhood maltreatment**

As important as it is to understand the role of Class A drugs as facilitators to entry into street-level sex markets, there is a real danger of ‘giving too much priority to drug use as an independent process and to overlook its links with the personal histories and lifestyles of those involved in prostitution’ (Matthews, 2008:74). It was therefore important that this research captured any complex relationships, in much the same way that contemporary ethnographic studies have increasingly sought to explore the means by which violence, criminalisation, childhood abuse and poverty coalesce to propel and lock women into prostitution (Phoenix, 2008:37). As Hunter and May (2006:172) point out, the interdependence of the sex and drug markets is predictable given that they ‘...largely share the same set of interconnecting risk factors’. The evidence from this research does not fundamentally diverge from these representations, and much of this data substantiates the claim that these interconnecting risk factors are integral to our understanding of not just why women (and girls) become involved in prostitution, but what keeps them from exiting once involved.

One such theme centres on the impact of family life in the process of marginalisation and normalisation. To illustrate the way in which emotional desensitisation can permeate childhood, even apparently ‘unconventional’ childhood influences can become underplayed and normalised:
'I was never abused...but my dad was an alcoholic who I saw beat my mum up quite a bit and my brother was a smack head and it [drugs] was always around me and it was something that I grew up with, but I was never abused and I was never in care or anything. As I say...it was a normal childhood' (Sophie, 27, six years).

That Sophie considers her childhood to be ‘abuse-free’ of course raises questions about: (i) how we label childhood maltreatments; (ii) how individuals interpret the concept of ‘abuse’ and; (iii) the morality of externally imposing labels of ‘abuse’ and ‘normality’. Is it right for researchers to imply that research ‘respondents’ are suffering from a form of abuse ‘false-consciousness?’ (Chapter 3). Based on fifteen indices of abuse (see Harding and Hamilton, 2008), all the women in this research could be said to have experienced at least two forms of abuse during childhood. Importantly some women did not appear to recognise all of these indices as representing ‘abuse’. Only when the subject of physical and sexual abuse arose, was there a consensus concerning the label of abuse. Pronounced physical and sexual abuses were particularly prevalent and depressingly, some women had extensive and chronic sex abuse histories that started at a very young age. Demonstrating parallels with the theories of Boyer and James (1982) in Chapter 5, Charlotte has interpreted her ‘sex working’ as psychological response to being abused by a paedophile ring from the age of eight for two years:

‘I guess what I learnt is that when you’re being neglected and lonely, the best way of getting attention is by providing sex. And that has kind of carried through my life’ (Charlotte, 25, six years).

Equally disturbingly, Emma experienced a catalogue of traumatic events from an early age:

‘My dad and granddad sexually abused me from when I was about 4. I saw my dad kill my sister when I was 8 and I had a heroin habit at 12 years old. I basically brought myself up’ (Emma, 19, seven months).

Exploring the relationship between ‘risk’ factors

Exploring the relationship between a woman’s experience of abuse and her decision to ‘sex work’ raises the question of what is different in the experience of an abused woman who sells sex (Vanwesenbeeck, 2001) from one who does not. The kind of childhood trauma outlined above, in particular, has been seen as a precursor to sex work, (Campbell et al., 2003; Jehu et al., 1998; James and Meyerding, 1977), especially when combined with problematic drug use (Stoltz et al., 2007).

However, as discussed in Chapter 5, it is important not to confuse correlation for causality (Seddon, 2000). Jehu et al. (1988) suggest that, rather than the sexual abuse itself leading
directly to sex work, it is the vulnerability of the women, caused by other social and economic factors (as well as problematic drug use), which coalesce to funnel choices and leave these women (and girls) open to exploitation. This would seem to add weight to Brannigan and Van Brunschot's (1997) assertion that the spotlight of analysis should be posited within a cluster of wider social and situational factors that negatively impact on relevant social ‘bonds and boundaries’. In this context, Matthews’ (2008:72) ‘pathways into prostitution’ model (see Figure 1 below) has a great deal of value as an explanatory tool:

**Figure 10.1: Pathways in Prostitution (taken from Matthews, 2008:72)**

![Pathways in Prostitution Diagram](https://example.com/fig101.png)

Although Matthews (2008) goes on to stress that not all women go through all three stages, the evidence from this research adds credence to this heuristic device.

We have already seen that child abuse/neglect were present for the majority of respondents in this research. Having fulfilled this ‘predisposition’ phase, there is also evidence that a process of marginalisation clusters around these childhood ‘predispositions’. Five interviewees disclosed how they perceived running away from home to be a direct and significant precursor to their involvement in street-level prostitution. Importantly each of these five respondents felt that running away from home was directly correlated to the aforementioned childhood ‘dispositions’. Lily vividly describes how this layering had manifested itself in her life:
‘I had the most fucked up childhood you could imagine […]. I guess you could say there wasn’t much going on in Nottingham for me, apart from men who were offering me to go on the street and stuff like that. At that time I wasn’t in school and spent most of my time dosing down at a mate’s house who had her own flat. Anyway, when I was 16 I went to London with my mate. Got off a train, met this guy at King’s Cross and then I tried the crack. I wasn’t exactly running away; I just wanted to get out of Nottingham. And at the time I was full of myself…I’d never do that [sell sex]…do you know what I mean? But as soon as I ended up in London and took the crack it was a different thing’ (Lily, 21, four years).

A number of respondents also commented about how growing up in local authority care had not only resulted in running away, but had exposed them to a ‘normalisation’ of delinquency (see Matza, 1964; Sutherland and Cressey, 1978). In line with other research (Jordan, 2005; Cusick, 2002), there is strong evidence that most respondents became involved in street-level prostitution after being ‘chaperoned by other workers who [teach] them how the system works’ (Jordan, 2005:36). For Sarah:

‘This one girl […] tried to persuade me to join her on the street one night; ‘all you’ve got to do is give a couple of guys oral and you’ll be minted’. I wasn’t on the drugs then, but I guess it was always in the back of my mind, so when I needed the cash to score later on it seemed like the easiest way to earn a lot of money quickly and because I’d got someone there to show me the ropes it didn’t seem as intimidating’ (Sarah, 23, four years).

Criminological theory tells us that we should not be surprised by Sarah’s account; ‘differential association’ theory (Sutherland, 1947) proposes that an individual’s interaction with others results in learning the values, techniques, attitudes and motives for criminal behaviour.

The role of abusive partners

It seems likely from this research that a significant clustered risk factor includes the presence of coercion by individuals significant to the women. Many of the working girls interviewed volunteered the information that they had felt coerced into prostitution by their partners—often abusive and violent men. Accordingly, it would appear that an individual’s experience of abuse in childhood and adulthood, combined with a process of marginalisation and ‘grooming’ (or facilitation) can have a cumulative effect when considering entry into ‘sex work’ (Dillane et al, 2005). Once abusive childhood predispositions have been experienced, verbal abuse, emotional abuse and the issuing of threats in adulthood — interspersed with periodic demonstrations of affection and obsequiousness - can be a way of further eroding personal confidence and self-esteem until it is increasingly difficult to resist further ‘social control’ and exploitation (Collins, 2003):
‘Girls do it because they’re lonely, especially, girls have complexes about things, feel bad about themselves and it makes you feel good if you go out with a guy and he treats you right, even if it’s for only some of the time...any sign of affection is usually enough to help you through the times when you’re being beaten for not getting enough cash to score or whatever’ (Lindsey, 22, eighteen months).

In line with Pheterson’s (1993:51) discussion on ‘psychological dishonour and unworthiness’, this constant erosion of psychological well-being, led one respondent to disturbingly confide:

‘Prostitution has made me feel worthless and different from everybody else. As far as I’m concerned I’m damaged goods’ (Mia, 25, four years).

Domestic violence, in all its various forms (Walby and Allen, 2004) is particularly relevant here (Williamson and Cluse-Tolar, 2002). Most of the women interviewed had experienced domestic violence in terms of being controlled by men (Johnson and Ferraro, 2000), especially in relation to drug taking:

‘I was working down in London and this one night he [the ‘boyfriend’] got very angry […]. I had an epileptic fit and couldn’t work and get any money, so he decided to start a fight with me and the guy upstairs phoned the police and he got arrested. I didn’t press charges in the end as he said he was sorry and […] I thought it would make things worse. As mad as it sounds, I still needed him around’ (Sophie, 27, six years).

Again, it is worth stressing that domestic violence and grooming are likely to be part of a range of concurrent abusive and coercive events. Besides, this process of ‘grooming’ was not universally experienced by all respondents:

‘I’ve had boyfriends and things, but I started this on my own….I’ve just used them [‘boyfriends’] as drugs partners […]. Independence is something that men don’t want to believe somehow...you know, a girl like me can go out and make her own money without there being a guy behind it pulling the strings’ (Hannah, 29, five years).

‘I don’t want to be selling myself for someone else; I don’t want anybody else to have shares in my body. I thought, ‘if you can do this, then do it for yourself” (Lucy, 25, three years).

Despite these obvious clusters of risk, it may well be that only in the absence of ‘protective factors’ (Kruttschnitt et al., 1987) such as one nurturing adult245 that the ‘predispositions’ inherent in Matthews’ (2008) model leads to ‘marginalisation’ and in turn ‘facilitation’. Ultimately this research further demonstrates that the catalysts in a woman’s ‘decision’ to enter into sex

245 Due to the lack of a control group, it was beyond the scope of this research to determine what these protective factors may be.
work are multi-faceted and interdependent (Bronfenbrenner, 1989) and the precise role of each risk factor is difficult to disentangle. What we can say with some certainty from this research, however, is that the predispositions of childhood maltreatments, the marginalisation effects of drug abuse, and growing up in local authority care, as well as being ‘groomed’ by significant peers, are frequently present in the narratives of working girls’ explanations for entering into street-level prostitution. Significantly, these same interdependent risk factors help our understanding of why many women continue to be involved in street-level prostitution. Improving our understanding in this area is integral to an evaluation of the potential (and actual) impact of discrete social policies on the relationship between supply and demand. However, before exploring which risk dynamics are most likely to contribute to women remaining in street-level prostitution (and the corresponding relationship with ‘demand’), working on the assumption that ‘governments can potentially learn from client behaviour to help design the demand side of regulatory policy in a way that balances the interests of sex workers, clients and community neighbourhoods’ (Collins and Judge, 2008:137), it is first necessary to appreciate the core motivations and behaviours of punters from a working girl perspective.

**Understanding the demand for sex: a working girls perspective**

**Motivations, behaviour and violence: a challenge to punter stereotypes?**

Understanding demand indirectly through the lens of working girls’ narratives was deemed to be an important means of broadening the motivational spectrum to further evaluate the likely impact of current and future demand-led policy interventions. After all, the motivations of Change Programme attendees (see Chapter 9) are unlikely to be entirely representative of the broader street-punter population; we know that the majority of working girls are physically or sexually attacked at least once whilst ‘sex working’ (Farley and Barkan, 1998; Kinnell, 2008), yet all Change respondents in this research expressed vehemently anti-violence views and were broadly dismissive of the working girl ‘rape myth’ (Monto and Hotaling, 2001).

One of these overlapping themes related to the idea of ‘risk’ present in Månsson’s (2003) notion of the ‘dirty whore’ fantasy. Accordingly risk is eroticised for punters so that ‘to transgress and then return to ‘normal’ life unscathed’ is said to ‘heighten sexual pleasure’ (O’Connell Davidson, 1998:154). Several working girls picked up on this theme:

‘A lot of men say ‘it’s sad really, but they can’t help it’; they look forward to paying for sex - and these are married men; it makes them feel like they’ve got a bit of adventure in their lives. I know of other guys who drive round, day in day out….some drive round...

---

246 As a methodological rider to this, it is worth pointing out that ‘despite the clarity with which childhood phenomena and exposure to victimisation were reported, memories of the formative years are nonetheless filtered and interpreted through an adult lens’ (Dalla et al. 2003: 1391).

247 Understandably given that these men were speaking to an unknown researcher. Nevertheless, my own interpretation was that these respondents were engaging honestly and therefore these accounts represented the ‘social reality’ for this sample of men.
wanking. They need to have the buzz, the risk of wanting to be caught’ (Sarah, 23, four years).

Once succumbing to this emotional state:

‘Men can be very easily manipulated. Especially, at first, when they first come and look for a girl and they’re really buzzing, which makes them even more sexually excited. When the punters are like this you can haggle and if you know how to play them, then you can really play them to what you want’ (Grace, 26, four years).

Interestingly, this account would appear to indicate that women use this excitement to wrestle a degree of control back in the transactional process. This may explain why both punters and working girls simultaneously claim to be in control of a seemingly iniquitous and skewed relationship (McKeganey and Barnard, 1996). Consequently, some women were keen to stress that it was they - not the punters - who actually held the ‘control’:

‘If I feel that I’m not in control, I’ll stop them and ask them to let me get out...I can’t handle these situations’ (Charlotte, 25, six years).

Unfortunately, most working girls’ responses suggest that the account above is an overstatement of the degree of control that working girls feel they have whilst ‘sex working’. More insidiously, some punters appear to demonstrate a preoccupation with the ‘whore’s’ sexual debasement to such an extent that they take sexual pleasure in the idea of the woman’s willingness to perform’ as an ‘utterly degraded sexual object’ (O’Connell Davidson, 1998:145 and 148), as illustrated below:

‘I’ll be seeing girls in filth. I always make sure that I have clean underwear on. I’m clean and have a shower when I get back. And then you see girls that haven’t had a shower for months and they get picked up like that [clicks fingers]...this just shows how they [punters] want dirty, vulnerable girls’ (Ruby, 24, three years).

Consequently there was a broad consensus amongst this sample of working girls that, regulars aside, the majority of punters were only interested in objectifying and dehumanising them in a way that reduces them down to a ‘vagina, breast or buttock’ (Hollway, 1996:105). Stripping a working girl of their individuality and humanity most obviously manifests itself in sexual violence/aggression or in a reluctance to engage in any meaningful dialogue:

‘Apart from my regulars, when they [punters] want to have a conversation, it’s only ever ‘how much’ and ‘talk dirty to me bitch” (Lily, 21, four years).

Predictably, the process of ‘dehumanisation’ leads some men to seek sex with working girls who fulfil a particular predetermined physical characteristic (Månsson, 2003). Despite the
findings in Chapter 9 that the majority of Change respondents do not believe that it should be legal for 16-17 year olds to sell sex, a common theme amongst all but one of the working girl interviewees, was that age remains a critical motivator, with a large number of punters seemingly only interested in young (or young looking) girls:

‘A lot of guys tell me they like me because I look really young. When I first started, I didn’t really understand this; one guy asked me how old I was and when I said 24, he just drove off because he said I was too old. So the next time a punter asked me how old I was I said 16 and I could tell this guy was really turned on like…you know saying things like ‘daddy’s little girl’ when I was giving him oral. I know it’s sick, but I doubled my money with this guy and I think if it keeps paedophiles away from really young girls then it’s a good thing, no?’ (Chloe, 26, two years).

If a punter seeks out such girls and/or believes the girl to be under age, then it seems reasonable to assume that this desire to purposively seek very young women/girls is yet another symbol of an attempt of some men to reassert male supremacy (Smette, 2008). Perhaps as O’Connell Davidson (1998:147) argues, these men feel that ‘adult prostitutes exert too much control over themselves’ and the abuse of the ‘delightfully powerless’ and vulnerable is particularly sexually exciting.

**Punters and violence: ‘give them what they want’**

Concurrently, in line with the findings in Chapter 9 that punters motivations are heterogeneous and can fluctuate over short periods of time, a number of working girls pointed out that the motivations/behaviours of punters tend to ebb and flow according to different phases in the transaction process. Disturbingly, these ‘objectified’ motivations often take on a more sinister turn after sexual ‘discharge’ (Stoller, 1976):

‘As soon as the deed is done, then they change, they switch, their release is over and they want you out of the car as fast as possible. For me this is the most dangerous time to be with a punter, especially if they’ve been drinking or are off their face – I’ve only ever been attacked after a punter has come’ (Sarah, 23, four years).

For obvious reasons, these accounts notably diverge from the motivations stated in the fieldwork with Change punters (although as discussed in Chapter 9, the majority of punters acknowledged a degree of guilt after paying for sex). Regrettably, it also appears that these motivational switches can be triggered by other risk factors working in tandem with emotional

---

248 This is in direct contrast to other research. Dodd (2002), for example (commenting on the findings from the 2002 Channel 4 Dispatches documentary ‘Prostitution - the laws don’t work’) found that although the majority of working girls in this sample were ‘attacked for no apparent reason’, pre-sex triggers were frequently present, including working girls refusing certain sexual services, insisting on wearing a condom and the punter being unable to get an erection (see also Kinnell, 2008).
changes post-sexual release. Most notably, problems occurred when punters had taken drugs or other stimulants. Kate recalled one such disturbing experience:

'I got seriously attacked about 3 months ago now. The guy who picked me up asked me if I knew where to score and I don’t normally score with punters [so] I said no….but he said ‘I’ll give you 150 quid if you come back, spend 3 hours and we’ll have a smoke and that back at this hotel’. Anyway, I got it to an hour and a half for 150 quid and he’s gone and scored his crack and he’s sniffed a bit of Charlie as well, and had a couple of pipes on the way to this hotel. All the way down there […] he was obsessed with having anal and I was like ‘no, no, no’. Because he’d been smoking he’d got himself aroused…’I can’t wait….will you just give me oral now’. So I said alright then, so I started giving him oral and as soon as that was over, he said that he might as well drop me off, but he’s already paid his 150 quid. I always get my money before I do anything. As I was putting my jacket back on and that, he’s had a sniff of Charlie and then he’s knocked me clean out. When I came round, he’s put his head over my face and was going ‘give me my money, I want my money, I want my drugs’. So I give him my money, but when I was putting my 150 quid away before, he’s seen that I had another 60 quid on me and he’s taken that as well. So he’s taken everything off me. If he had of just robbed me then I would have let it go, because it’s just part and parcel of the job. But then he started being pervy and that, trying to shine a torch up my arse…if I hadn’t have fought with him, then he could have really hurt me or someone else on the streets. I did report him to the police' (Kate, 27, five years).

In addition to the obvious psychological dysfunctions and psychopathic tendencies intrinsic to such behaviour, in many ways this incident of extreme and harrowing sexual violence has strong correlations with control and the need to re-assert gendered hegemony (Smette, 2008; see Chapter 6):

'I think they [punters] want sex to be detached, different perhaps and I think that they quite like being able to pick. I definitely think that control is a key factor. Not only in the way that they can walk down the street and pick you to have sex with, but also in the way they have sex with you and speak to you. In the way they conduct themselves around the ‘business” (Lucy, 25, three years).

Revisiting ‘biological urges’

Contrasting these socio-psychological explanations, a common view from respondents was that such narratives unnecessarily complicated the motivations of a ‘typical’ punter. Correlating with many of the responses in Chapter 9, most working girls seemed to – fully or partially - subscribe to the view that punters’ motivations were a response to the straightforward need to fulfil biological urges/entitlements and a desire for ‘another kind of sex’ (Månsson, 2003):
‘...for men it’s more a physical thing. It’s…I think men are more, women are more emotional, men are driven by their dicks...it’s much more instantaneous’ (Bernadette, 32, nine years).

‘They’re [men] very impulsive; they see it and they want it and if they have to pay for it, then they’ll pay for it...just look at their big cars! And they want different...a different girl every week’ (Lucy, 25, three years).

Significantly, both punters (and working girls) felt that it was essentially the ‘sex worker’ that took advantage of men’s ‘innate biological weaknesses’ (see Chapter 2), that demand can somehow be manufactured by the girls themselves, that it is ‘supply driven’ (see Chapter 9):

‘They want sex, we want money...and we know exactly how to make sure we get what we want. As I said to you before, I like to think of myself as a hustler rather than a prostitute [laughs]’ (Ruby, 24, three years).

‘I find it easy on the street, you’re getting loads of guys driving by and seeing all these girls...it could be a guy that doesn’t even want business, but he drives by, sees you and thinks ‘yeh I’ll have a bit of that’. It might be there and then, or it might be a week later, but the seed has been sown’ (Jessica, 22, less than a year).

This latter point has some resonance with different ways of soliciting, particularly with regards to a ‘psychological build-up’ (Holzman and Pines, 1982) and the extent to which supply drives demand. As Lucy points out:

‘Some girls will flag cars down or get in cars when they pull up at lights, but I wouldn’t do that [...] because I don’t want to seem desperate and if you seem desperate then they will sense that and try and take the piss’ (Lucy, 25, three years).

Some working girls also recognised that justifying punting as ‘another kind of sex’ was being endorsed, promoted and ‘culturally normalised’ (Bernstein, 2001) by the state through the sanctioning of an expanded and diversified sex industry:

‘Because with like porn, sex shops, sex is just a marketed thing isn’t it? And it is more out there for everybody to see and it is more accepted because it’s more out there’ (Gemma, 23, three years).

Although there was a desire to stress the primacy of ‘culturally normalised’ biological urges/’another kind of sex’, simultaneously it was recognised that this could in turn lead to more entrenched psychological problems (Abt, 2008). For example, Julie observes that:
‘Some men pay for sex because sex workers will do things that their partners won’t, especially ‘blow jobs’, but then some of them say that once they’ve done it once, then it becomes like an addiction’ (Julie, 22, three years).

Similarly there was also a view that an ‘innate sexual desire’ has its roots in other personality ‘deficiencies’, most obviously ‘confidence’ (Jordan, 1997; Monto, 2000) and ‘loneliness’ (Wortley and Fischer, 2002; Kennedy et al, 2004):

‘They’re insecure, and many of them haven’t got confidence, they’re lonely or have got problems at home. More often than not this means they just need to get their end away without any emotional ties or to do something different. Wham bam, here’s 20 quid thank you mam [laughs]’ (Chloe, 26, two years).

However, when punters sexual requests involve unconventional paraphilias such as urophilia, coprophilia and sexual masochism, these men are widely regarded as transcending the acceptable boundaries of ‘another kind of sex’ and ‘innate’ biological urges. Written-off as ‘weirdos’, these men are routinely denied by working girls the same motivational categorisation(s) afforded to ‘normal’ punters (especially related to the ‘need for (different) sex’):

‘I’ve had guys wanting me to beat them with sticks with nails on…another one wanted to put a live fish between my knickers and take photos of the fish…not my face, just the live fish and the knickers. Weird, perverted shit…how do you explain that?’ (Hannah, 29, five years).

Difficult as it is to explain these sexual ‘deviations’, such accounts are perhaps yet again suggestive of punters’ desire to disempower ‘dirty whores’ (O’Connell Davidson, 1998) or, conversely to actively seek to eroticise the power of these ‘Othered’, powerless women (ibid:148).

**Punters’ motivational heterogeneity: working girls’ socio-demographic observations**

In line with the socio-demographic variations noted in Chapter 9, a number of working girls stated that distinct behaviours, characteristics and motivations could be directly attributed to different ‘types’ of men. In particular, variations were noted by several respondents in relation to ‘wealth’ and ‘social class’ (see Wortley and Fischer, 2002). As Lucy contends in the example below:

‘Those with the Mercs [the richer punters] are usually the ones that behave as if you are just something they had stepped in. They’re also the ones that ask for anal and other weird stuff for some reason. Because they’ve got money, they think they own you, that you’re worthless, that they’re better than you’ (Lucy, 25, three years).
More contentiously, approaching half of all respondents (n=11) suggested that the motivations underpinning violent or aggressive ‘punting’ behaviours could be delineated by ethnicity. Specifically, four of the women interviewed disclosed that they now purposively avoided soliciting (or being solicited by) ‘black’ men. Perhaps as a reaction to this, none of the working girls had ‘black’ regulars at the time of interview. Mia’s narrative is typical:

‘I know it sounds bad, but I’ve stopped going with black guys cos they’re so sexually aggressive...not always violent but definitely aggressive. I think that might be a racial thing...the amount of times I’ve been called a ‘white bitch’ I’ve lost count of’ (Mia, 25, four years).

Inevitably discussing violent punters against the backdrop of ethnicity is a highly sensitive area (Kinnell, 2008:132) and there is a real danger that such accounts become hijacked by those committed to racist discourse(s) and a counter-productive stigmatisation of such men. Clearly it would be wrong to assume that the experiences of this sample of Nottingham-based working girls is in any way representative of broader experiences with ‘black’ punters. CJS data outlining the ethnicities of men that attack and murder working girls is a clear empirical counterbalance to such perspectives (Kinnell, 2008). For example, in the UK, the two most recent and notorious serial killers of working girls– Peter Sutcliffe and Steve Wright – were both white.

Equally, however, it would be wrong to dismiss out-of-hand such accounts. It is well documented that crimes committed against working girls can go unreported to the police (one respondent in this research comments, ‘the last time I got attacked I didn’t report it because nothing will happen and don’t see the point. You have to end up dead before they [the police] do something’; see Penfold et al, 2004; Barnard et al, 2002) and these official statistics may therefore be a poor reflection of actual prevalence (UKNSWP, 2008). Kinnell (2008:132) argues that our understanding of punter violence is poorly served by ‘avoiding these areas of discomfort’, a view recognised in the good practice guide for identifying ‘Ugly mugs and dodgy punters’ (UKNSWP, 2008:7), which points out that ‘details about ethnicity, nationality and regional origin can all be useful’. Of course, as the aforementioned report points out, the identification of other distinguishable features may have more value than a simple classification by ethnicity, but the point is that where working girls are having issues with punters along ‘ethnic lines’, then it is imperative that working girls circulate alerts and share this information with police to maximise collective safety, irrespective of the political sensitivity of such matters. Unfortunately, the working girls in this study were not always forthcoming in reporting their experiences of ‘dodgy punters’ and consequently their collective safety becomes compromised.

249 This is obviously a broad term; most women in this sample were unable to be more specific about this ethnic classification. For the UKNSWP (2008:7), a general description of a perpetrator as a ‘black man’ is ‘not useful and could be considered racist’.

250 As an aside, it would appear that when these extreme acts of (sexual) violence do occur, it has a significant deterrent impact on working girls. As one interviewee commented: ‘Ipswich really affected the number of girls out...there was just me and another a girl for about two to three weeks’ (Bernadette, 32, nine years).
Considering the scarcity of academic literature examining who commits violence against working girls (Brooks-Gordon, 2006:186), it is perhaps not surprising that academics have so far had very little to say about the socio-demographic variations of violent punters. Anecdotally the women interviewed in this research, suspected that any sexual violence and aggression exhibited by ‘black’ punters occurred because these men were also the most likely ethnic group to coincide punting with Class A drug use. This admittedly anecdotal hypothesis becomes especially relevant when considering the evidence from the research literature of a link between substance abuse and sexual violence (Abracen et al, 2000; Fagan, 1990). Furthermore, because research has indicated that a ‘relatively small proportion of all clients are responsible for a disproportionate number of attacks’ (Kinnell, 2000 cited in Penfold et al, 2004:366) and given that working girls do not always circulate ‘Ugly Mug’ alerts effectively, it may well be that we are actually talking about the same violent men. A complex and sensitive issue it may be, but more research is required to ascertain the validity of such ethnic generalisations, particularly if previous sexual or violent offences exclude some men from qualifying for the Change Programme (or that they are more adept at avoiding being caught by the police).

If these accounts are indeed representative of working girls embarking on a racist discourse, then it would appear from this research that any working girl ethnic prejudices do not generally extend to British Asian punters251 in the same way. Difficulties with this group of men tended to be restricted to ‘haggling’ over the cost of the ‘sexual service’ offered (as Iqbal comments in the previous chapter, ‘they want to charge you for everything’). Generally, however, the implication from Lucy and other interviewees was that for British Asian men (especially older generations), ‘the fantasy of the prostitute woman’s power is explicitly eroticised’ (O’Connell Davidson, 1998:148; see also Chapter 9). Lucy comments that:

‘The [British] Asian guys are very different [to other ethnic groups]...they’ve got so much shame about [paying for] sex. They’re very coy and I definitely don’t think it is about sex for them. [...]. Maybe it’s about interaction with a white British woman…the excitement of going outside your cultural boundaries. When I’ve sex worked with these men, I’ve always felt as though I’m the one with the control. They’re not sexually experienced often and I think that generally Asian men have a lot of pressure to be the leader and when it comes to prostitution, they purposely choose not to be in control’ (Lucy, 25, three years).

**On-street vs off-street: exploring motivational variations**

Regardless of punters’ core motivations, those (nine) women who had worked in both on and off-street markets were keen to demarcate between on-street and off-street punters, despite the

---

251 Again this is a very indistinct term open to misinterpretation. Some women talked of ‘Indians’, or ‘Pakistanis’, others ‘Asians’. Some men were also described as being of ‘Arab’ descent (usually correlated with poor spoken English). Of this latter group, one interviewee did mention that she had anecdotal evidence that ‘Iraqis’ had ‘been responsible for a rise in the number of girls getting raped’, although this was something she had not experienced herself.
evidence that men can and do pay for sex in both locations (Sanders, 2008). As one respondent, Sophie, pointed out:

‘You get two completely different types of men. The men that you get on the street… they don’t care who they go with and they want to spend as little money as possible, and they want to do whatever they can to you. Whereas men that you get escorting, they’re normal men, they’re respectable men. They don’t want to go in and treat you badly and say ‘I want to do everything that I can for 10 pounds’…they’re not like that. It’s a completely different type of person that you get’ (Sophie, 27, six years).

Resonating with a simplified ‘off-street punters good, on-street punters bad’ paradigm (Day, 2008) for several respondents, these variations could be explained by considering the different power dynamics between working girls in massage parlours and women ‘on the streets’. Bernadette argues that - despite contradictory evidence from Change Programme respondents – punters enter into the prostitution transaction all too aware of working girls’ vulnerability and susceptibility to abuse:

‘Girls on the street are vulnerable and men know [how] to take advantage of a vulnerable person. It’s a power thing…definitely. But women in the massage parlours are just as powerful as the men. They earn more money and the men that go to massage parlours know […] she’s not going to be vulnerable, she’s just a normal woman like your wife…they’re not out to take advantage of anybody, they just want company and sex. They don’t want power over you and make you feel like you’re not in control, but men on the street do. They’re completely different people’ (Bernadette, 32, nine years).

**Regulars: facilitating a continued involvement?**

Importantly, the structural differences between the street and off-street locations, has implications for a street-level working girl being able to develop a ‘regular’ client-base:

‘Especially with a girl in a massage parlour, once you find one that you like you know that she’ll be there, but you can’t guarantee that with a girl on the street and most street-punters don’t want that anyway’ (Sophie, 27, six years).

When questioned further, most interviewees felt that difficulties in establishing a significant ‘core of regulars’ on the street was noteworthy because of the ‘normality’ and emotional stability that regulars engendered when compared to ‘one off’ punters. In short, working girls claimed to feel safest and most valued when with ‘regulars’. Although the frequency of visitation and nature of intimacy achieved in on-street transactions with regulars is unlikely to be equivalent to that of off-street locations (Lever and Dolnick, 2000; Sanders, 2008), the process of becoming a ‘street regular’ would nevertheless appear to erode the intensity and pervasiveness of working girl
objectification. For ‘regular’ punters, there is evidence that the ‘working girl’ becomes a kind-hearted ‘comforter’ (O’Connell Davidson, 1998:152) who counteracts feelings of ‘loneliness’:

‘For me, my regulars are not just punters, they’re mates. I can really talk with them and get on with them. And I think it’s who you click with and I know that my regulars appreciate having someone they can open up to. They can say what they want to us and they know we’re not going to judge them like their wives do…and they’ve got a guaranteed fuck at the end of it [laughs]’ (Mia, 25, four years).

Given that ‘regulars’ claim to gain emotionally from their involvement with working girls, it is perhaps not surprising that ‘veterans’ (see Chapter 9) were the socio-demographic group: i) least likely to be able to commit to future desistance behaviours and; ii) the most resistant to anti-prostitution messages and stereotypes. After all, it is unlikely that ‘regulars/veterans’ could expect to achieve the same degree of emotional attachment if there was a sense that their punting activities exacerbated the problems for the women they were emotionally attached to (or indeed if they allowed themselves to believe that these women had problems in the first place). In many ways because working girls respond most positively to ‘regulars’, there is a risk that this becomes a self-perpetuating cycle. Rather than seeing themselves as ‘part of the problem’, the positive interactions experienced between punter and working girl, are used by these men to convince themselves that those involved in street-level prostitution are not as vulnerable as is claimed, or if they are, that they are in a good position, as regular punters (or ‘mates’), to make their lives more palatable. The unique relationship between ‘regulars’ and working girls arguably means this transaction is more resistant to policy interventions. Any future ‘prostitution-reduction’ strategy therefore needs to be attuned to the symbiotic relationship in which ‘regular’ punters need working girls to fulfil a number of emotional/physical needs, and working girls rely on ‘regulars’ to provide a regular income relatively risk-free (in comparison to the dangers associated with ‘one-offs’).

**The ‘delusion of mutuality’: working girl perspectives**

Closely associated with the above, a number of working girls recognised that establishing a base of ‘regulars’ necessitates not only being able to deliver a ‘good service’, but that this service has to be grounded in the delusion of mutuality (Sanders, 2008; Smette, 2008; O’Connell Davidson, 1998). Most women stressed that any expressions of enjoyment were very much ‘delusions’ and fervently contested the notion that they would derive sexual satisfaction from ‘sex working’:

---

252 Although this is predicated on an un-substantiated assumption that ‘veterans’ are simultaneously ‘regulars’. 
'Most of them [punters] convince themselves that they are ‘special’, that this is the one time the girl they’re with isn’t faking it, that we’re loving having sex with them...you know, the type of men that say they can turn lesbians straight, pull a lap-dancer, that sort of thing. Of course I don’t do anything to make them think otherwise’ (Grace, 26, four years).

Moreover, it would appear that exhibiting the ‘myth of mutuality’ (Plumridge et al, 1997) becomes both a survival and revenue maximisation strategy for these women. For Hannah, her experiences working on the streets indicated that:

‘The girls that make the most money are those who know how to pull the right strings with these men; massage their egos and that’ (Hannah, 29, five years).

However, in line with Fareed’s comment about his disappointment with the lack of ‘customer care’ amongst street-prostitutes (Chapter 9) respondents also recognised the danger of not playing to the delusion of mutuality:

‘...punters know when you’re going through the motions [and] that’s when they can get narky or violent’ (Gemma, 23, three years).

Although rare, several women acknowledged that there were occasions when the delusion of mutuality was replaced by a ‘genuine’ mutuality (Sanders, 2008:99):

‘There have been a couple of punters that I did actually fancy....it was like ‘shit, I could actually do this for free’ with these people. It’s not all fat, balding, 60 year old men who want to have sex with you because you look like their daughter’ (Lucy, 25, three years).

Whilst reticent to claim that Lucy is suffering from ‘false consciousness’, it is equally important to recognise that a dissemination of such accounts can be precarious if mainstreamed and de-contextualised by those keen to downplay the prevalence of abuse and propagate a ‘mutual enjoyment’ agenda. Most street-level working girls in this research intimated that they supplied sex reluctantly - in the vast majority of circumstances - and to claim that there is a reciprocation of pleasure is clearly misguided. In addition, we should guard against the presumption that men demand sex willingly; from the accounts given by these working girls, it would appear that men are just as, if not more, prone to purchase sex (on the streets) as a ‘reluctant necessity’ stemming from feelings of compulsion, desperation, refuge, frustration and loneliness, than they are from well-defined notions of enjoyment. This clearly correlates with Fareed’s disclosure in Chapter 9 that ‘it’s not something that I enjoy [paying for sex]. I hate it actually. But when you don’t have sex for 3-4 months...it’s purely a sexual thing’. Whether challenging men’s delusion of mutuality through the Change Programme would have any discernable (or unintended) consequences is of course another matter entirely.
**Working girls’ perspectives on punters’ motivations: a summary**

Building on the findings from Chapter 9, it is evident that working girls’ interpretations of demand-led motivations share a degree of synergy with the responses given by Change respondents themselves. Accordingly, these women were just as likely as KCRP attendees to express the view that paying for sex was the product of complex interactions between wanting ‘another kind of woman’, ‘another kind of sex’, the ‘whore fantasy’, loneliness, low self-esteem, control and power. But this aspect of the fieldwork also suggests that canvassing Change Programme punters for their attitudes, beliefs and motivations is stratified in a way that has the potential to overlook extreme motivational and behavioural outliers more prevalent amongst punters ineligible for the Change Programme. In other words, the spectrum of motivations captured in research with Change Programme attendees may be limited by the selection process for eligibility on the course (in particular the exclusion of men with prior convictions). Plumridge et al’s (1997:178) observation in relation to his fieldwork that, ‘the talk of this small group of men could hardly expect to exhaust all possible ways of talking about prostitution’ may be equally relevant to Change Programme attendees. Whilst one should avoid concluding from this that: i) punters not eligible for the Change Programme all possess radical, extreme attitudes, or that; ii) the motivations of Change Programme attendees are so weak that future desistance is guaranteed, it does nevertheless imply that relying on the CJS as the only tool of behavioural change at the extreme end of the street-level punting continuum may be imprudent.

In discussions with working girls, it appears that punters who are ineligible for the Change Programme due to previous convictions may have the greatest potential for sexual and non-sexual violence and the exclusion of such men from the rehabilitative framework has potential implications for demand - and indirectly, supply - reductions and working girl safety.

**Tackling the demand: tackling the supply?**

Extending the logic of being seen to be doing something positive about the ‘problem of men’ (Phoenix and Oerton, 2005) requires that there are corresponding positive and tangible benefits for those involved in sex working (Brooks-Gordon, 2006:259). Put another way, it is assumed that demand reductions, when combined with dedicated support projects for working girls, will lead simultaneously to analogous reductions in supply (Home Office, 2006 and 2008b) and a diminution of the abuses women face daily. Examined alongside the multiple, entrenched and complex personal reasons for entry into and continued involvement in prostitution (for working girls and punters) as discussed in this chapter so far, this section seeks to examine the perceived impact of policy interventions intended to tackle these supply-side antecedents and demand-led motivations and importantly the relationship between them. A number of key questions evolve from this consideration.
Firstly, do the experiences of these women indicate that the CJS taking action against the sex buyer (Home Office, 2008b) has had a discernable impact on men’s punting behaviours? Moreover, is there any evidence from the experiences of working girls that such interventions are long-term, resistant to displacement and unlikely to harbour any negative unintended consequences for working girls, punters and the local community?

In speculating on the future scale and scope of demand, working girl interviewees were invited to share their experiences and subjective observations of the number of punters operating in Nottingham since the inception of visible, high profile demand-led intercessions from the OSPT. Against this policy background, working girl respondents were asked to rate the current policies used to ‘tackle’ prostitution and, where dissatisfied, to suggest favoured alternative legislative model(s). Of course, this is not to suggest that working girls necessarily know the best way of making prostitution policy, but it would be remiss not to hear their voices as part of the policymaking process. Furthermore, the context of ‘entry dynamics’ (as a precursor to supply-side behaviours) is used as an analytical tool to investigate the claim from Potterat et al (1998) that successful long-term interventions on behalf of women involved in (or at risk of becoming involved in) street-level prostitution, necessitates a paradigm shift away from the external ‘immediate needs’ of working girls, towards an appreciation of internal psychological mechanisms that often trap working girls in a ‘cycle of victimisation’ (Silbert and Pines, 1982b:131).

A challenge to the inevitability of prostitution? Assessing punter prevalence in a demand-led interventionist world – a working girl perspective

As a principle of legal and moral equity, most respondents demonstrated little disagreement with the notion that the gaze of the CJS lens needs realignment:

‘As long as guys aren’t violent, I think punters and [working] girls should be left alone to get on with it. But if we’re getting fined, arrested, ASBO’d and that, I don’t see why the men should get away with it. Working girls are going to be out there come rain or shine, because they need to make their money, whereas the men are out there because they want to be’ (Julie, 22, three years).

Unfortunately, for those advocating the primacy of demand-led interventions, this support for re-balancing funnelled choices lacked equivalence with an acceptance that such actions would have any discernable impact on men’s desire to pay for sex:

‘Men will always pay for sex no matter what you do. It’s not a bad thing to pay for sex, so why make it such a big deal?’ (Lindsey, 22, eighteen months).

Respondents were conspicuously willing to accept prostitution on the basis of its historical inevitability (Chapter 2) and working girls were generally content to claim that ‘there’s never
gonna be no punters’ (Chloe, 26, two years) because men pay for sex primarily as a response to innate ‘sexual urges’. Once again, many working girls claim that prostitution exists to fulfil the associated need for ‘another kind of sex/woman’.

That said, some respondents indirectly recognised that there may be other subtle issues at play here; age-related demand being one such dynamic:

‘There’ll always be punters out there cos there’ll always be fresher, young looking girls coming through…and men like sex with young girls’ (Hannah, 29, five years).

Cameron (2002:191) argues that older men in particular have a marked preference for young working girls, since it is seen to be easier ‘to get younger partners through the paid market than the informal market of regular dating (or adultery)’.

Understandably, this enthusiastic belief that biological predispositions ensure a constant flow of punters, translated into a cynicism about the likely long-term impact of discrete CJS interventions/social policies to reduce demand. Whilst many women had heard of the Change Programme, this did not extend to a detailed knowledge of the curriculum (let alone being consulted on the logic of its design or solicited for their opinions on the likely attitudinal/behavioural outcomes of these re-education initiatives). In commenting on the likelihood that the Change Programme could moderate behaviour, most respondents, including Megan (below), felt that the imposition of KCRPs would be short-lived at best, ineffectual at worst:

‘It will just scare some of them off for a bit...like when they showed that TV programme on Nottingham,\(^{253}\) it really went down for a couple of months. But for most of them [punters], it will just delay them coming out again. They’ll keep their heads down, but I don’t think that it will stop any of them using prostitutes, they might just do things a little differently, that’s all’ (Megan, 24, two years).

Even the threat of ‘naming and shaming’, increasingly heralded by New Labour as an effective means to tackle crime (Casey, 2008) - specifically prostitution (Home Office, 2006) - was viewed by some with scepticism:

‘One punter who I was with, got arrested on the job and he wasn’t eligible for that course because he’d got previous. The police said that they’d be writing a letter to his home address so his wife would be finding out and if he got caught again, his name and picture could be in the Evening Post […]. Anyway, they let this guy go, gave him a warning and 20 minutes later he was back up there. Made no difference whatsoever’ (Chloe, 26, two years).

\(^{253}\) Crimefighters (2005).
Arguably, the Government may have insufficiently examined exactly by what mechanism ‘naming and shaming’ might work (and for whom and in what circumstances). As Pawson (2002) points out, the implementation of public disclosure initiatives requires that policymakers at least have an elementary understanding of the conditions under which shaming sanctions might work. Without this, it is unsurprising that many commentators view such schemes as little more than an unnecessary (and un-evidenced) diversion (Berlins, 2006). Ironically, one respondent actually felt that the working girls were doing a better job of deterring punters than the police:

‘It’s getting ridiculous now...there’s so many girls dipping [robbing] punters that it’s scared a lot of the guys off’ (Bernadette, 32, nine years).

Away from hypothesising about men’s potential future behaviours, respondents were subsequently asked if the OSPT’s focus on punters had actually resulted in less ‘business’. In contrast to the official OSPT arrest statistics in the previous chapter, just over half of working girls (n=12) in this sample said they had noticed very little change:

‘The police are out all the time and you know what, they’re still not stopping it...you’re still guaranteed to get a punter when you go out. There’s still the same amount of men as there ever was. It’s like [drug] dealers...as soon as you get rid of one, it might go quiet for a bit, but you know it’s only a matter of time before they’re replaced by someone else. I also get quite a few female punters now, some regulars...I don’t suppose the police have thought about that?! [laughs]’ (Lucy, 25, three years).

Paradoxically, this status quo was not universally felt amongst all working girls, with 45 per cent (n=10) of respondents stating that there had been noticeably fewer punters in the preceding 12 months. The fact that cities like Nottingham have mimicked many aspects of Sweden’s proactive abolitionist stance (Ekberg, 2005), may be taken by some as an indication that these policies are beginning to work:

‘When I first started...because there were so many more guys around, the girls were less visible because they were getting picked up straight away. Now it’s taking a lot longer and you see more girls because nobody is really getting picked up as much. When they do, the prices are lower because the men know the girls are desperate. I don’t think there’s been much change in the number of girls out there, but the girls are now out longer and for less money because it’s harder’ (Sarah, 23, four years).

‘Personally I’m still working the same as I ever was...I can still go out there and pick up in an hour or so. But I know other girls, especially the older ones, who are saying that it is becoming harder [to get punters] and it might now take them 3 or 4 hours’ (Olivia, 24, two years).
Unfortunately, evaluating these mixed messages in the context of non-punitive measures such as the Change Programme (from a working girls’ perspective) is problematic. As Megan points out:

‘I’ve been with a couple of punters who were caught by the police ‘in the act’ [and were asked to go on] the [Change] course, but I’ve never seen these men before or since. One offs are one offs and there’s loads of men that you never see again anyway’ (Megan, 24, two years).

Consequently the only way of establishing post-programme behavioural change (from a working girls’ perspective) is by assessing the activities of ‘regulars’. Only one of the respondents had a ‘regular’ disclose they had attended the Change Programme, and as a result it would be difficult to come to any reliable conclusions from this data alone. Putting aside this major data limitation, the working girl’s account of the reaction of this ‘regular’ would seem to substantiate the view that ‘veterans’ are less likely to exhibit attitudinal change and more prone to recidivism, albeit in different circumstances:

‘One of my regulars who’s been on the course said it was a complete waste of time. Having said that, it’s changed the way that we meet up…we don’t meet in the ‘red light’ area any more. So it hasn’t stopped it, but it’s changed it…made it more difficult’ (Sue, 27, five years).

On the basis that the OSPT (and other stakeholders) have committed to reducing punter numbers, any evidence that demand is slowing suggests the efficacy of this approach. Of course, the intended corollary to demand reductions is that there is supposed to be an equivalent contraction in supply, to ‘get women off the street’. What the narratives above patently demonstrate is that the repositioning of the client has failed to achieve this intended outcome. The view ‘from the street’ is that the number of women involved in street-level prostitution is highly resistant to fluctuations in demand. Interestingly, evidence supplied for the latest ‘Respect for Nottingham’ (RFN) publication (NCC, 2009; see Chapter 8) contradicts this ‘view from the street’, with evidence that the number of working girls in Nottingham has reduced 32 per cent for the period 2006-8.

Importantly for the OSPT and other agencies committed to reducing street-level prostitution, this would seem broadly correlated with the – contested - demand reductions suggested by the OSPT arrest data in Chapter 9. However, ‘official’ OSPT arrest data somewhat complicates this picture of concurrent demand and supply reductions (see Table 10.2). Apart from a dip in 2007, the numbers of charges for prostitution offences, cautions or arrests on warrant has remained relatively static since 2004. Unfortunately, these statistics do not tell the full story, since the data refers to total arrests/cautions (737) and not necessarily the number of working girls that have come into contact with the OSPT. In other words, each working girl may have experienced more
than one caution, charge or arrest by warrant over the time period in question. Consequently this data may be skewed where individuals have experienced especially ‘chaotic’ episodes over short time periods and therefore should not be relied on to accurately reflect the numbers of working girls on the street in any one year.

Table 10.2: Number of cautions, charges for prostitution offences and arrests on warrant for working girls in Nottingham since June 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004 (June onwards)</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009 (up to May)</th>
<th>Total (Charge)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caution (prostitution offence)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charged (prostitution offence)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested on warrant</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Year)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of OSPT interventions per month*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on cautions, charges for prostitution offences and arrests on warrant

Irrespective of these contestations, supporters of the Swedish model would likely contend that getting women ‘off the streets’ in large numbers will not materialise until the model has been fully implemented in the UK; tinkering at the edges of policy inevitably dilutes the message, which inevitably impinges on the efficacy of deterrent/exiting outcome strategies. Critics of the Swedish model, however, widely contest the claim that the number of street-level ‘working girls’ and punters operating in Sweden has reduced (Ekberg, 2005; SoS-Rapport, 2004), instead asserting that street-prostitution diminished dramatically in the first few years, but has since returned to pre-legislation levels (The Local, 2008; Randers-Pehrson, 2005; Stridbeck, 2004; SANS, 2009).

Based on the (limited) qualitative observations from working girls in this research – and contrary to ‘official’ RFN data - the temptation is to conclude that in the current quasi-demand abolitionist environment, demand is more responsive to discrete criminal interventions than supply. Clearly aligned with previous empirical work suggesting that many clients are responsive to risk level variations (Cameron and Collins, 2003) several respondents relate these variations to differentials in what punters and working girls feel they have ‘got to lose’ from remaining involved in street-level prostitution. Accordingly, it may be that punters in general tend to care more about their particular social standing in the community than do street-level working girls (Della Giusta et al, 2005). In this context, social capital (Putnam, 1995) and this new form of governance (Scoular and O’Neill, 2007) is less relevant to sellers of sex, mainly because their ‘social exclusion’ (Silver, 1995) and alienation from ‘conventional’ communities undermines the
typical utility derived from a positive evaluation by others in the social groups to which they belong (Casson, 1991). As one respondent argues:

‘You can penalise the girls and they’ll be like ‘I’m not really bothered who finds out’ and they’re still going to go out anyway. But the men, they’ve got wives and they’ve got jobs and they don’t want to get a criminal record…they’re afraid of the law and they don’t want anyone to find out so they will pay attention [to changes in the policing of ‘red-light’ districts] and change their habits (Sue, 27, four years).

But even if we accept that demand reductions can and have been achieved, it is unclear from this alone why these reductions have not been experienced across the board for this sample of working girls. Moreover, do men stop purchasing sex altogether or, as Sue points out in relation to her post-Change Programme ‘regular’, do they simply moderate their prostitution behaviours temporally and/or spatially? Given the understandable opposition to street-level prostitution from local communities and the subsequent influence of community complaints on national policy (O’Neill and Campbell, 2006), it may be that a degree of attrition is perceived as preferable to the continuation of ‘red light’ areas.

Recent evidence from McKewen (2008) indicates that some working girls have shifted to providing their mobile telephone numbers to clients to arrange ‘illicit’ meetings. This suggests that a measure of displacement - the classic ‘Achilles heel’ of crime prevention measures (Newburn, 2008) - is occurring in UK street-level sex markets. It may also partially explain why some women feel that demand has remained relatively static. Judging by the responses from working girls in this research, the phenomenon of punters contacting street-level working girls by mobile phone (and vice versa) is becoming increasingly mainstream in Nottingham’s street-level markets:

‘Since the police have been around more, I’ve started to give regulars my mobile number and a lot of them ring me now, rather than go [kerb] crawling, especially the ones that need looking after. For them it’s better to keep it from vice; there’s less risk of getting caught’ (Gemma, 23, three years).

*Effects of the ‘war on demand’ for working girls: a suitable exiting strategy or an invitation for risky behaviour?*

The quote from Gemma above suggests that although regulars are vulnerable to being spatially displaced to locations outside the ‘red light’ area (Holt *et al*, 2008), the adoption of remote modes of communication had enabled some working girls to maintain a ‘normal’ working relationship with many of their regulars. Maintaining contact with regulars was widely regarded by this sample of working girls as key to staying healthy and safe. For reasons outlined elsewhere, regulars are deemed to pose considerable less risk in terms of physical and sexual violence. Regulars also appear – in some circumstances - to play a major role in reducing the
amount of time women spend on the street. Where this relationship is disrupted, then the likelihood is that women will spend proportionately more time back on the streets, once again exposing them to pronounced health and safety risks:

‘I had a sugar daddy paying for all my rent, but my family have chased him away and all that’s happened is that I’m back out on the streets having to put up with the same old shit’ (Charlotte, 25, six years).

Punitive anti-kerb-crawler policies would seem to act as deterrents to regulars’ engagement in traditional kerb crawling ‘crime scripts’ (Cornish, 1994), but such measures arguably have little, if any, impact on the psycho-cultural motivations underpinning their puntng behaviour. Even when the rules of the game change, regulars ostensibly remain determined to continue paying for sex. Again, this resonates with the responses given by veterans in Chapter 9. Moreover, because regulars tend to be motivated less by the need to experience the ‘illicit’ nature of the street (Hoigard and Finstad, 1992) or the risk of ‘arrest, disgrace or physical violence’ (Faugier and Cranfield, 1995) 254, it seems consistent that these men should demonstrate less resistance to changes in the spatial modus operandi of the sexual transaction. Conversely, one could speculate that the occasional visitor - often possessing fundamentally different motivations to the regular - is just as likely to be temporally displaced as he is spatially. Interestingly, for regulars, the unintended displacement consequences brought about by these demand-led interventions, are frequently reinterpreted with a positive ‘spin’ 255. As Grace reflects in relation to giving punters her mobile phone number:

‘I think the regulars like it to be honest; they say it’s now a lot easier to get hold of me and they’re not always looking over their shoulder for Vice [the OSPT]. I reckon if they’re honest they also like having the same ‘personal service’ that they would get from a girl working off-street…and for half the price! Maybe I should put up my prices, what do you think?! [laughs]. As I said to you before, regulars are important because you can count on them in the quieter weeks’ (Grace, 26, four years).

Because not all working girls will offer this mobile phone service to regulars, several interviewees acknowledged that the increased police activity towards punters had disrupted contact with some of their best ‘clients’: ‘one guy I’ve seen for years got picked up about six months ago and I’ve not seen him on the streets since’ (Hannah, 29, five years). Other respondents admitted that they did not restrict the distribution of mobile numbers to regulars; details were also given out to ‘new punters who seemed decent’ (Gemma, 23, three years). Without any reliable benchmark data, it is of course speculation as to whether such behaviour is

---

254 There is of course a danger of homogenising the motivations of regular customers; to simplify in this way may be seen by some as unhelpful. Nevertheless given the evidence from a wide range of research data, it seems reasonable to at least acknowledge that for many working girls, regular punters are generally less inclined to violence than is exhibited by ‘one offs’.

255 Again, from a ‘public nuisance’ discourse, the local community may also view this attrition highly favourably.
likely to result in an increase in violence towards working girls. After all, street-level working girls have to make similar value judgements on the relative ‘risk’ of each punter every day of their lives (Kinnell, 2008). Therefore to assume that this mode of communication is innately riskier than a reliance on ordinary methods of soliciting in ‘red light’ areas may be misinformed. It is, however, a development that inevitably makes prostitution more difficult to detect, although contentiously it could be argued to be a positive development for residents living in ‘red-light’ areas. Moreover it compromises women’s visibility and access to harm reduction services (Cusick and Berney, 2005). Unfortunately the current punitive climate (and the difficulty of accessing working girls and their clients more generally) may prove an additional barrier to helping the OSPT police these spatial modifications more effectively.

Besides the obvious physical risks posed to working girls by changes in the ‘market’, there are also latent economic implications associated with punter reductions. Cameron (2002) provides a number of explanations as to why working girls have typically been able to demand high wages, ranging from a compensation for the risk involved (disease, arrest, violence) through to reparation for anti-social hours and psychological distaste. It is also contended that high wages are a product of excess demand; basic economic theory (Cleaver, 2004) dictates that ceteris paribus, the greater the demand for a service, the higher the price that can be commanded. Applying the model’s same logic, markets with declining demand, will produce excess supply and unless the price of the service reduces (or more men decide to pay for sex) then demand and supply will remain in disequilibrium. Of course, as Cameron (2002) points out, wages are not only dependent on demand variations while factors such as young age are seen to be fairly demand inelastic. In other words, younger (looking) working girls may be better placed than older working girls to maintain high prices in situations where demand is declining (see sections above). Despite these potential economic ‘outliers’, the view from the street strongly suggests that the recent clampdown on punters had been instrumental in driving prices down:

‘When I first started 9 years ago, there were lots of punters and not that many girls...you could almost ask for the price that you wanted. But now there are not as many punters around, and with so many girls out there, so much competition, tricks are now becoming a lot, lot cheaper’ (Sophie, 27, six years).

Predictably, price appears to be at its most sensitive when demand reductions and the impact of drug dependency intersect:

‘Nottingham is one of the cheapest markets around. Say compared to Manchester, it doesn’t pay as well. There are not as many businessmen here. Girls in Nottingham aren’t asking the proper prices. […] When I first started working you could get 50, 60 pound for full sex, but it takes so much longer to get a punter now, so when a punter offers you a tenner, then that girl’s obviously gonna take that tenner, cos she needs to get the drugs. Because that guy knows he’s got it for a tenner, when he goes up to another girl a couple of weeks later and she’s saying 30 quid, he’s not going to want to
pay her when he knows he can get it for 10 pound down the road. It’s definitely a buyers’ market now...the only chance of getting a decent price is from your regulars or to hustle the first-timers that don’t know any better and are too nervous to hang around haggling. Me, my price is 30 quid and I won’t change it for anyone’ (Hannah, 29, five years).

In ‘normal’ markets, one might expect that an overcapacity in supply (and the associated lower prices) might be ‘corrected’ by women seeking alternative ‘employment’. Evidence from Sweden, however, has indicated that where prices have fallen this has not always happened. Instead the most vulnerable street-level working girls are increasingly prepared to sell unprotected sex at a premium (Östergren, 2004; Stridbeck, 2004). Whilst some working girls engage in unprotected sex because they are unaware of the risks (Lau et al, 2002) or that condoms are unavailable or expensive (Negroni et al, 2002 in Gertler et al, 2005), this tends to be the exception rather than the rule in ‘Western’ markets. Rather than being driven by ignorance, in locations where demand and prices are falling, it is claimed that working girls are willing to risk STI/HIV infections if they are suitably compensated. Subsequently, Gertler et al (2005:520) argue that ‘even knowledgeable sex workers armed with condoms, might be willing to supply unprotected sex if the price is right’. In spite of this evidence, when asked ‘whether the disruption of punters had (or would) result in their willingness to engage in better paid unprotected sex?’, the response from all interviewees was unequivocally dismissive:

‘I’ve had blokes come up and say I’ll give you such and such for sex without a condom. I’d rather go without money and rattle\(^\text{256}\) and go shoplifting than do a punter without a condom...you’ve got one life, got to live it for as long as you can’ (Olivia, 26, two years).

Despite these universal personalised protestations, it was simultaneously recognised that there were working girls in Nottingham’s street-level sex markets that were willing to offer punters unprotected sex:

‘There are girls, the young ones, that offer unprotected sex for sure. I’ve seen guys that have asked me for unprotected sex and I’ve seen him the next day picking another girl up. I know this guy only wants unprotected sex so that means that she’s doing it. It’s not my position to judge that but it’s proof that there are girls out there that will do that’ (Emily, 25, six years).

Rather than substantiating the theory that a readiness to engage in risky sexual practices is a means by which ‘prostitutes’ can maintain high wages as a compensation for the extra risk

\(^{256}\) ‘Rattling’ is usually representative of all aspects of withdrawal symptoms including the psychological effects that would have resulted in a working girl’s heightened emotional state and the physical side-effects of ‘pulmonary edema (excessive fluid in the lungs) characterized by ‘rattling’ respirations’ (American Medical Students Association, 2008).
taken (Rao et al, 2003; Gertler et al, 2003), the view from this sample of women was that these ‘other’ working girls frequently offer unprotected sex for ‘meagre’ sums:

‘Get real...there are women out there now who will have unprotected sex for a tenner. I always get asked for unprotected sex or oral. And sometimes I’ll say yeh, get my money and then make out to them that I didn’t realise they wanted unprotected’ (Lindsey, 22, eighteen months).

‘For a bloke to go down ‘poundland’ [Cranmer Street] and pay for unprotected sex with a corpse for a quid is beyond me. At the end of the day we’re prostitutes, we sleep with so many different people a day, why would you want to put yourself at risk like that? It’s a death wish if you ask me. These are the sick blokes that freak me out…they obviously don’t give a shit about themselves, so why are they going to give a shit about me?’ (Lucy, 25, three years).

What the above disclosures demonstrate is not just that unprotected sex is very much on the agenda for some working girls, but that even amongst the street-level ‘prostitute community’ there is a tendency to delineate and stereotype along hierarchical lines. According to the pyramid model of prostitution (Perkins, 1991), the street-level ‘prostitute’ is empirically well represented by the lower-classes (Norton-Hawk, 2003). Possibly as a means to reclaim back some self-esteem, the respondents in this research were keen to point out they were not ‘bottom of the heap’; a sort of ‘we’re bad, but there are worse’ stance. Accordingly, the ‘corpses’ down at ‘poundland’ are viewed with the same emotional and psychological distancing that ‘high-class’ escorts are said to feel towards street-level working girls (Norton-Hawk, 2003). On their own these biases are not terribly helpful, but nor are they hugely problematic. Significantly more problematic is what stems from this hierarchical delineation and ‘competition’ amongst street-level working girls; namely that there is a growing reluctance from working girls to support each other, particularly in relation to ‘dodgy punters’. As Sophie starkly illustrates, the notion that working girls act as an informal community is increasingly under threat:

‘Because there’s so much competition now, we don’t look out for each other any more like we used to. If I get attacked I’ll let other girls know, but it’s not always like that. I know it sounds really sick, but it’s almost like, if I’m out of action because I’ve been attacked, then it’s less competition for this girl to worry about’ (Sophie, 27, six years).

The criminalisation of demand: assessing risk in the transactional process

Besides the potential for engaging in risky sexual practices and the problems associated with spatial displacement, it is widely assumed that the ensuing battle to secure ‘business’ in a diminishing market - combined with the desire of punters to remain anonymous and undetected in an increasingly policed environment - affects the time it takes working girls to negotiate with potential clients (Kinnell, 2008; ECP, 2009; Fraser, 2008; Sanders, 2004; UKNSWP, 2009). As
Östergren (2004) highlights in relation to her research with Swedish working girls, ‘sexworkers say it is now harder for them to assess the clients’. The clients are more stressed and scared and negotiation outdoors must be done in a more rapid manner.

Although the ‘Swedish model’ has yet to be fully implemented in England and Wales, evidence from this research suggests that such findings are increasingly resonating with the experiences of women in this sample (n=19):

‘I’ve definitely noticed that men want you to get into the car much quicker now…before you could chat with them a bit first, suss them out like, but now it’s all ‘just get in’ kind of thing…a lot of them [punters] can’t relax until they feel like they’re well out of the vice area and you can sometimes end up driving quite a way and then you’ve got to get back. Also, before you’d see the men drive around a few times – you know round the block as it were – and you could get a feel for the dodgy one’s that way. Men realise that Vice are ‘out and about’ a lot more than they used to be’ (Olivia, 26, two years).

In these circumstances, one might assume that the number of ‘foot punters’ would decline. After all, if men feel more exposed to being caught, then paying on foot would be the least desirable option. However, in line with the findings from the OSPT (Appendix R), the majority of women (n=15) stated that the number of ‘foot punters’ has (anecdotally) remained static, possibly even increased. Several respondents put this down to the effects of alcohol:

‘I get a lot of ‘one offs’ on foot when they’re coming back from town. They’re not thinking in that logical way, so it’s an impulse decision…’yeh, I’ll have a quick blow job before going home to the missus’…they’re not really thinking about the police or whatever [and] you do feel a bit more in control cos it’s not so rushed and you can at least stay in the area…plus you can hustle the vulnerable ones…you know, students like you [laughs]’ (Hannah, 29, five years).

Outside the influence of alcohol-related ‘foot punting’, for Gemma, unemployed and immigrant men constitute the largest percentage of ‘foot punters’:

‘...these are the guys that aren’t working, from overseas and that…they can’t afford a car or don’t have a driving licence they can use here [Britain]…and a lot of them don’t really know about the police on the beat and that’ (Gemma, 23, three years).

Interestingly this would seem to validate the OSPT’s policy of ‘removing the excuses’ for non-English speaking men (see Chapter 8) and Fareed’s comments about ‘not knowing’ (Chapter 9).

257 The idea that working girls have a sixth sense about ‘dodgy punters’ was questioned by several respondents. In the words of Chantal, ‘I know a lot of girls say they can tell ‘dodgy punters’, but I can’t…men are such good actors; in fact, whenever I’ve been attacked or raped it has been by men who seemed normal, nice even’ (Chantal, 23, five years).
More generally, the anecdotal view that punters in motor vehicles undertake the solicitation process more quickly would suggest that men are generally aware of the greater risk of being caught, but are simply moderating their behaviour rather than desisting from prostitution altogether. The risk is that the ‘perverted’ and dangerous punters become more statistically prevalent on the basis that they ‘know what to do not to be arrested and fined’ (Östergren, 2004) and working girls have less time to ‘pick out’ such men.

**The case for supply-side displacement**

Of course it is conceivable that as time progresses, policy interventions drive down/displace punter numbers considerably further. Even in these extreme circumstances, one respondent was convinced the numbers of ‘girls’ working would remain high:

‘It might work for some of the older ones, but you’d have 2 or 3 younger ones coming through in their place. There’s too many drugs, too many desperate women to stop it’ *(Mia, 25, four years).*

Nevertheless, it was generally accepted that if demand continued to decline sharply in the medium to long-term, then supply-side overcapacity could not be sustained. In much the same way that punters become displaced to off-street locations, it would seem that this sample of working girls might be tempted to migrate to indoor locations *(n=14)*, rather than seek ‘legitimate’ employment outside of the sex industry. A number of respondents appeared unopposed to the principle of selling sex - ‘I don’t see anything wrong with it’ *(Jessica, 22, less than a year)* – whilst simultaneously recognising that childhood maltreatments had inevitably distorted their perceptions:

‘I’m sure if I was a girl brought up in a proper lifestyle, then I wouldn’t do it, but it’s second nature to me now’ *(Bernadette, 32, nine years).*

But equally, this sample of working girls also recognised the differences between indoor and outdoor prostitution markets:

‘If I didn’t have a drug problem then I definitely wouldn’t be working on the streets, but as far as indoor work goes, then, yes I probably would, because there is a lot of money to be made. I don’t know if that makes me a bad person, but it’s something that I can do and I’m not ashamed of that’ *(Eve, 22, five years).*

Obviously it is important to critically reflect on the motivations, legitimacy and authenticity of working girls’ claims to future behavioural intentions. Given the physical and psychological challenges these women face, it is easy to see how the above narrative may be perceived by some commentators as classic ‘false consciousness’ (Mackinnon, 1989). For reasons asserted elsewhere, denial is not the issue here; what is at stake is a protection of the moral self and I
would argue that at worst this is representative of a funnelling of consciousness rather than ‘false’ consciousness. Clearly, to cope, to retain some semblance of sanity, women like Eve try to exert that they can at least control the choices they make in relation to their ‘occupation’.

Nevertheless, even if we tentatively accept the ‘social reality’ of such assertions, any concept of the future is not always easy to comprehend for a group of women in which ‘one day at a time’ (Emily, 25, six years) becomes a primary consideration (Raphael, 2004). Unlike Change respondents who were asked to comment on something that might be construed as being ‘socially acceptable’ (desisting from future punting activities), this sample of active working girls were being asked to comment on something that is generally ‘socially unacceptable’ (continuing to sell sex), with obvious incentives to answer in a way that helps them to reclaim a de-stigmatised, ‘morally’ desirable identity. Yet a majority of respondents (n=12) said they would be content to remain in prostitution, even if ‘clean’ from drugs. Again, we should be careful not to conflate ‘saying’ with ‘doing’. Primarily the reason for wanting to remain in prostitution is not out of a love of the job, but as a rational choice, whereby prostitution is seen to be the best way for these generally unqualified women to maximise their earning potential. In considering their antecedents to prostitution, this position is perceived to be a pragmatic interpretation of the reduced alternatives open to them, a restraint of hope and the rejection of ‘skills-based’ projects as a precursor to obtaining a well-paid job in the ‘conventional’ marketplace (Pitcher, 2006 in Campbell and O’Neill, 2006). For example, Louise believes herself to be:

‘...low-life, because I have committed crime. Even if I was off the drugs, the chances of me getting a good job with good pay is very small percentage...I’m a prolific offender, with no qualifications or skills – apart from the obvious [laughs] – and my criminal record is dreadful. Most jobs are closed to me and those that aren’t, aren’t worth having. Yes, maybe I could do a computer course or whatever else they’re asking me to do...that might get me a job on minimum wage, but how long do you think that’s gonna last when I know that I could be earning 500 a week in a massage parlour down the road?’ (Louise, 30, five years).

Against this background, a common view (n=9) was that off-street locations represented the best opportunity of actualising high wages in an environment that is: 1) considerably safer than the one in which they are currently operating:

‘I think we should get it off-street...it would stop a lot of the attacks. At the moment we have to go into parks and dark alleys, but if you’re in a house with other people, bouncers, CCTV and that, you’ve got more of a chance of avoiding violence’ (Olivia, 26, two years).

And 2) is less likely to be subject to the attention of agencies of the CJS. This view correlates with Day’s (2008) discussion about how the post-Wolfenden legal framework has – until recently
- created an informal free market where the abolitionist state penetrates far less in indoor markets:

‘Massage parlours are kind of left alone and it is the streets that the police are looking at. I agree with this…I do think that they should get girls off the street and try…instead of stamping it out they should try and control it…to make it safer, to make sure the girls get tested, proper health care and that’ (Sophie, 27, six years).

Rather than ‘displacement’ being some abstract concept, two women admitted that the recent changes in demand had already forced them to re-evaluate their modus operandi:

‘I work mostly from a flat now, but I’ve got it [business] all from the street, so it takes me off the beat a lot more’ (Lily, 21, four years).

However, in direct contrast to the above account, one respondent rejected the notion of working off-street on the basis that:

‘I find it a lot easier on the street, more business. Think about it, how much business are you gonna get from someone picking a paper up, seeing thousands of names and picking one out and ringing it? You’re hanging around for the next punter and you end up doing a lot of thinking…and thinking leads to head fuck and head fuck leads to drugs and you’re back to square one. You might as well take your chances being clean and busy on the streets’ (Emily, 25, six years).

Interestingly, and in contrast to the (mixed) evidence for spatial displacement in Chapter 9, several respondents also commented that knowing what they did about men’s motivations (risk, violence, excitement), moving prostitution to off-street locations ‘would be less appealing for a lot of the men’ (Ruby, 24, three years).

In interpreting these accounts, rather than being seen along conventional ‘displacement’ lines, any movement between outdoor and indoor locations actually represents a deflection from crime (Pease, 1997). Taking Pease’s (ibid) argument, any transformation in prostitution activities resulting from demand-led interventions, generally produces an improvement in safety for working girls and reduced ‘public nuisance’ for local communities. Consequently, given the choice between a continued commitment to street-level prostitution or spatial displacement tendencies, it is quite feasible that the OSPT would unofficially favour a movement to off-street locations.

Even more favourably for the OSPT, the remaining respondents (n=10) expressed a desire to exit prostitution completely and enter into mainstream employment. Unfortunately - and in line with other findings (Caputo, 2008; McKeeganey and Barnard, 1996) - there was also a recognition from respondents that as long as their psychological and drug problems remained
unchallenged (and in the absence of any formal qualifications), then it was likely that demand-reductions would result in functional displacement towards acquisitive crime. For some working girls, avoiding acquisitive crime has evolved as a pragmatic, rational 'business' decision:

‘I don’t shoplift, I don’t rob punters. I am an opportunist, don’t get me wrong…if someone drops their wallet, I’ll pick it up, but I won’t dip [rob] a punter, because it’s bad for business. I want to be picked up straight away, and I don’t want a punter driving past and saying, ‘she robbed me last time I’m not picking her up’ (Lucy, 25, three years).

However, there was a feeling that if demand reduced significantly, then ‘the crime rate would go up…but the prices would go down and they’d [working girls] do all sorts’ (Chloe, 26, two years). Other respondents subscribed to this view on the basis that:

‘We’re survivors, we’re resilient because we’ve put up with so much shit in our lives…anything is better than having to face yourself. But if there was nothing at all, no punters…then I think that I’d take up shoplifting. But I really wouldn’t want to do that if I could help it’ (Julie, 22, three years).

Clearly different ‘lifestyle phases’ (Williamson and Folaron, 2003) affect working girls at different times of their lives and as the above discussion demonstrates, exiting prostitution is far from linear. According to Pitcher (2006: 247), the take up of different options (whether punitive or rehabilitative) will be dependent on the extent to which women are ready to take up the (dis)incentives on offer. This clearly aligns with Cornish and Clarke’s (1987) argument that any displacement effects (whether ‘spatial’ or ‘functional’) very much depend on ‘choice structuring properties’. In other words, consideration needs to be given to the differential nature of the choices faced by offenders under differing circumstances. More importantly, whilst other problems remain in situ (particularly problematic drug use), the findings from this research suggest that the challenges ensuing from a loss of ‘business’ might lead to other unintended consequences; women will either remain in prostitution but in different, less visible locations or they will turn to acquisitive crime. Consideration evidently needs to be given to which of these scenarios is most desirable in circumstances where women are unable to achieve the ‘utopian’ vision of exiting prostitution altogether.

**Enforcement plus support: experiences of, and attitudes towards, multi-agency support organisations**

In Chapter 8 we saw how the Government proposes to move away from ‘voluntary support’ mechanisms towards a ‘support plus enforcement’ model of control. However, research with this

---

258 Acquisitive crime and street-level prostitution are not necessarily mutually exclusive. There is some evidence (O’Neill, 1997) that women supplement ‘sex working’ with the proceeds from shoplifting and theft.
sample of working girls generally supports the idea that: i) support agencies are doing a good job already and; ii) the notion of voluntarism is actually vital in ensuring a continued engagement with support agencies.

**Working girl support agencies: a positive experience?**

The vast majority of working girl respondents were extremely satisfied with the support services on offer in Nottinghamshire. The comments below are typical:

‘I go to Jericho Road and they’re absolutely brilliant. I never feel they’re judging me or getting me to do stuff I’m not comfortable with. You can go there every day from one o’clock and they’ll offer you a warm meal, showers, clothes, things like that. They don’t do medication, scripts, drug scripts and they don’t do acupuncture, it’s just a Christian organisation offering support’ (*Eve, 22, five years*).

Similarly positive views were noted with regards to ‘case workers’:

‘I’ve got [ANONYMISED] as my case worker; she’s great and I love her to bits. So I do take advantage of the fact that there are agencies out there that will help you. I’m really happy with everything support wise at the moment’ (*Mia, 25, four years*).

Whilst support agencies were generally well regarded, the ‘politics’ of multi-agency working had appeared to filter down to some of the more experienced respondents in this research (see Sutton, 2006; Hamilton, 2005). In particular there was a sense that the Prostitutes Outreach Workers (POW) were dissatisfied with the increasingly prominent role of Jericho Road (and their relationship with the OSPT):

‘POW don’t like you spending time at Jericho...if Jericho ring up and say can I have an appointment to get a girl scripted, POW will just say ‘send the girl down here’’ (*Sophie, 27, six years*).

‘I don’t really like POW. They’re very judgemental. At the end of the day you’re all supposed to interlink and help each other...but in my experience this doesn’t happen’ (*Bernadette, 32, nine years*).

**Make support compulsory?**

Whilst the consensus was that support agencies were providing a quality service, respondents unanimously felt that support agencies had to let women engage on their terms, not the agency’s. Closely correlated with this was recognition that compulsory engagement would be a ‘recipe for disaster’ (*Mia, 25, four years*). In discussing her experience at HA1 (Chapter 7), Kate felt that:
‘They’re realistic here, it’s not ‘you can’t do drugs, you can’t do this, you can’t do that’...as long as they’re aware of it, it’s not out of hand, or a big communal thing where you’re all using together, then they’re fine. Obviously they want you to get off the drugs, but they let you come to them in your own time rather than ramming it down your throat. If they did then they’d end up with a lot of women on the streets’ (Kate, 27, five years).

The sanctity of ‘voluntarism’ was ultimately seen as being key to building relationships between working girls and the various agencies:

‘My first year with the services...I wasn’t at the stage of thinking about getting out. I cut my hair off in a basin, gave myself a black eye, I was high on crack...I was in a bad place and it was very much one step at a time. So if you’d come to me back then and said ‘you’ve got to get scripted or you gonna get an ASBO’, I would have said bring it on. Now, I’ve got my drugs worker and it’s all good, but it’s the right time. All this ‘do this, do that’ won’t work for the girls’ (Sue, 27, four years).

Another respondent, Chantal, questioned how compulsory engagement with a drugs worker would be any more likely to succeed:

‘I think whoever thinks that they’re going to force a working girl to turn up at a certain time at a certain day needs a reality check. It ain’t gonna happen. And then what...we get an ASBO, go to jail...what good is that going to do?’ (Chantal, 23, five years).

In the final equation, Ruby’s comments below neatly summarise the views of the majority of working girls in relation to engaging with support agencies:

‘You’ve got to make the choice to stop doing it, not someone else making that decision for you. The agencies have been great...but if you’d have come to me two years ago and tried to force me to do things I wasn’t ready to do, then I don’t think I’d be where I am today. And you can tell them [the policymakers] that...it’s working well here in Nottingham, the agencies have got it just right...so don’t go fucking around with something that ain’t broke’ (Ruby, 24, four years).

**Working girl perceptions of street-prostitution as a ‘public nuisance’**

Street-prostitution is widely regarded as a ‘public nuisance’ to local communities living in Nottingham’s red-light areas (Hubbard, 2006; NCC, 2009). Whilst the vast majority of working girl respondents recognised the potential ‘public nuisance’ of street-level prostitution, there was also a sense that they were sensitive to the needs of the community and were not personally responsible for any problems caused:
‘I haven’t had any problems with the local community because I go out late at night when there aren’t that many residents about, but it can’t be nice for those living in that area seeing that sort of thing, but I’ve not personally experienced any problems with the residents round there’ (Jessica, 22, less than one year).

Moreover, to assume that all working girls engage in street-level prostitution without due consideration for the local community may be misguided. Megan demonstrates a considerable degree of reluctance about selling sex in on-street locations and tries to moderate her behaviour accordingly:

‘I don’t like doing it on streets where there are houses and everything, so I try to go in a park or something. But sometimes I do go on the road, not exactly inland as it were’ (Megan, 24, two years).

Simultaneously, there was a belief that if significant demand reductions were experienced then this might actually be worse for the local community:

‘If girls are desperate, then they’re gonna stop every Tom, Dick and Harry. That’s when the local residents are going to get really pissed off’ (Gemma, 23, three years).

‘Regulatory model’ suggestions

Closely associated with the above was a belief that the existing regulatory system was integral to the funnelling of choices in a way that negatively impacted on these women’s and local residents lives. Asked if we should re-assess the way in which we deal with prostitution, all respondents claimed that the current way of dealing with prostitution exacerbated, rather than mitigated, the violence, abuse and stigmatisation they faced on a day-to-day basis (see Benson, 1998) and problems for local communities. The belief that prostitution (primarily indoor) should be legalised is illustrated in the quotes below:

‘Because it’s illegal the girls aren’t reporting things whereas if it wasn’t, then a girl could report things and she wouldn’t feel that she was going to get into trouble. And it might mean that the nice punters, the regulars, would come forward about any ‘dodgies’ they’ve seen around. It’s too cloak and dagger at the moment. At the end of the day if it’s more open, then it’s going to put off the violent punters. That’s just my opinion’ (Sarah, 23, four years).

259 ‘Dodgy punters’.
‘I think it should be legalised. They’ll never stop it, the police being around all the time isn’t stopping us selling and men buying…I suppose because it’s illegal at the moment, they have to appear to be doing something don’t they, but why not change the way we deal with it, do it properly and set up houses and that. I would personally feel a lot safer working with someone else’ (Louise, 30, five years).

Away from this general support for ‘legalisation’, one respondent felt that more emphasis should to placed on tackling ‘root causes’ underpinning involvement. In this context, the clamour to ‘legalise’ prostitution may be an unnecessary diversion away from the real problems that working girls face:

‘You could give it [legalisation] a try, but ultimately they need to take a lot of the problems away from the girls…they need to look at the psychological reasons why girls are on a mission to self-destruction’ (Sue, 27, five years).

The desire to exit: ‘social’ and ‘psychological’ barriers

Regardless of the potential for displacement to off-street markets, all women interviewed for this research universally expressed a desire to ‘exit’ street-level prostitution in the ‘right’ circumstances. Inevitably this brings us back to the age-old debate about whether prostitution symbolises abuse and coercion or is a free rational choice. For a woman to claim some sense of agency - that ‘I choose to do it’ (Julie, 22, three years) - is obviously important for self-esteem and a re-assertion of one’s self-identity. But equally it is difficult not to view these women’s accounts with a sense that interpreting one’s own ‘voluntarism’ can be a grey area as articulated by Millett (1971) in Chapter 5 and as exemplified in the quote from Emma below:

‘Yes, my background meant that people were introducing me to drugs all the time when I was growing up and if you’re not being offered them then you’re obviously not going to be able to say yes. But I’ve got my own mind. It was my choice to do it, I have to take responsibility for that, but there were a lot of influences at the same time’ (Emma, 19, seven months).

Other women were more resolute that their continued involvement was directly attributable to lacking agency and a feeling of physical and psychological entrapment. In these situations there was a sense that ‘you can’t get away even if you wanted to’ (Eve, 22, five years), particularly when attached to violent, abusive partners. On this evidence, it would appear that the subject of choice is represented on a continuum; for some women the choices they face (or have faced) are clearly constrained, but for others the fear, the violence, the abuse is so pronounced and

---

260 Intriguingly, despite the support of the ECP (2009) and International Union of Sex Workers (Fox, 2008) for the decriminalisation model (as operating in New Zealand) on the grounds of safety for working girls, the focus of regulatory change amongst this sample of women was more closely aligned with the Dutch-inspired legalisation approach.
pervasive that to talk of anything other than outright coercion would be a misrepresentation of their personal circumstances. Herein lies the complexity for researchers of balancing the desire not to ‘assume a more privileged view of their [working girls] circumstances and motivation’ nor ‘to claim that they are all deluded’ (Overall, 1992:713), with a need to ensure that working girls have the right environment to encourage an acknowledgement of their own victimisation. Nevertheless, whether one is an abolitionist or a reformist rejecting the notion of ‘funnelled’ choices, common ground exists; in short, there remains a need to identify those factors that deny or funnel the decision making process.

So far we have seen that drugs, abusive partners, poor literacy, family background and a lack of formalised education all play a major role in keeping this group of working girls involved in prostitution. This section builds on these identified ‘barriers to exiting’ and explores how two key areas – housing and the CJS itself – further exacerbate and interconnect to these ‘exiting’ obstacles.

The importance of housing as a facilitator of exiting cannot be overplayed (Shelter, 2004; Aris and Pitcher, 2004; Stewart, 2000). Although the situation in Nottingham is arguably better than many cities, the fact remains that there is a lack of social housing provision available to working girls that use drugs (Shelter, 2004). Without appropriate accommodation, women’s vulnerability to violence and abuse is heightened (UKNSWP, 2004) and is clearly a major factor in women being unable to access services such as health, drug and GP services, benefits, education and training (Pitcher, 2006). Arguably, being housed appropriately is a minimum prerequisite that has to coincide with – or even precede - other exiting strategies:

‘Housing’s been the worst part for me. Housing has caused the majority of problems in my adult life…I’ve got nowhere stable to live and it’s stopping me exiting’ (Megan, 24, two years).

‘The council housed me right in the centre of the beat…how stupid is that? If they were serious about helping me escape prostitution then they should have housed me outside the beat’ (Charlotte, 25, six years).

Interestingly, a lack of suitable housing was also seen by one respondent as a reason why she had not made her preferred migration to off-street work:

‘Well, […] one of the reasons I work on the streets is that I haven’t got my own flat. I’ve been offered loads of jobs in places, but they want so much of your money and they’re only charging 50-60 quid for full sex and that’s what I charge anyway. For me to end up with 30 instead of 60 quid is why I work on the streets…you need to offer things like houses for young girls to work from…we’re offering a service, but it’s all sordid at the moment and that’s not what most of the girls want’ (Chantal, 23, five years).
Building on this, how the police deal with these women is also seen to affect the efficacy of multi-faceted exiting strategies; every respondent in this sample had either been cautioned, arrested, jailed or fined (over periods ranging from two to ten years) and yet all these women were still involved in street-level prostitution. This gives some legitimacy to Sanders’ (2007) claim that any involvement with the CJS merely hampers the exiting process. For example, the application of Anti Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs) to working girls involves these women in the CJS further, leading to an increase in prison sentences and social exclusion (Sagar, 2007). Arrest data taken from the OSPT (Table 10.3) suggests that the impact of ASBOs has been patchy at best, with 127 working girls breaching their ASBOs 163 times since June 2004 (although the number of breaches has declined since 2006).

### Table 10.3: Application of ASBOs and associated breaches since June 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004 (7 months)</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009 (5 months)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of new ASBOs imposed</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of working girls breaching new/existing ASBO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of breaches</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, the data in Table 10.3 also clearly demonstrates that the use of ASBOs has declined since 2004. This correlates well with OSPT’s tendency to use ASBOs as a last resort in circumstances where ‘a woman is so chaotic that she’s out there all the time, quite possibly homeless, but also creating issues for the local community in terms of her presence on the streets’ (OSPT, unpublished). The rationale for this reluctance to impose ASBOs is partially due to the implications of persistent breaching, which can result in imprisonment; according to the OSPT one working girl has spent 18 months in and out of prison partly due to issues associated with breaching her ASBO.

Interestingly, in spite of this wealth of evidence of breaches, the findings from this research suggest that ASBOs can work in the short-term, although they seem to have little effect in the long-term, especially in the absence of ‘inclusive inter-agency initiatives’:

‘I didn’t work for two years when I had my ASBO, but I’ve been out there ever since. They [ASBOs] worked for me, although I felt I didn’t get much support during that period…we’re only trying to make a living, not harming anybody’ (Bernadette, 32, nine years).
In general, however, the evidence suggests that punitive CJS sanctions not only sustain prostitution involvement (in the long-term) but also send out a derogatory, stigmatising signal to the non-'prostitute' community that potentially legitimises 'hate crime' and violence towards working girls (Sanders and Campbell, 2007).

The police do of course have a duty to ‘protect and serve’ local communities and balancing the needs of working girls with local community concerns is in many ways contradictory (see Chapter 8). This raises some very difficult questions about which “victims” protection should be prioritised and the benefits of concentrating misery on one set of victims (the local community or working girls). But the policy of criminalising working girls apparently serves no-one well; women continue to sell sex in geographically displaced circumstances, which in turn ‘causes more dispersal and, in the absence of containment, more communities experience problems associated with prostitution’ (Sanders, 2008c).

What is evident from this and other research is that the way in which the police interact with working girls on the ‘street’ is integral to encouraging women involved in street-level prostitution to embrace housing and support provision. Most importantly, how the police deal with physical and sexual violence from partners and punters is seen to be paramount in facilitating available exiting support (Campbell and Storr, 2001). Not being taken seriously or being penalised because of their status (Campbell and Kinnell, 2001) may make it difficult to escape violent partners, and will undoubtedly exacerbate the detrimental psychological effects associated with this increased stigmatisation. As Potterat et al (1998) point out, it is unlikely that exiting will be permanent whilst pronounced psychological factors remain in situ. Against this background, some women felt that the OSPT were doing a good job:

‘The police have been good to me…they’ve put me in touch with specialists when I’ve been attacked and that. I have to say that they used to be really bad, but in the last couple of years, I feel like they’re looking out for you rather than just looking to pick you up all the time’ (Kate, 27, five years).

‘Most of the time, they [the police] look out for us in a way. There’s a lot going on around here at the moment. Girls being attacked and raped all the time’ (Emily, 25, six years).

With the rape conviction rates in the general population running at a paltry six per cent (Hirsch, 2009), it is not surprising that some respondents were less complimentary about the (lack of) ‘joined-up’ service they received from the police:

‘I’ve been to the police and they don’t do anything about it [being raped and physically attacked]. That just makes me feel like shit…they’re supposed to be there to protect you and they’re not. One copper even turned round and said ‘it’s part of the job and it goes with the territory’ (Lily, 21, four years).
‘The police didn’t really do very much about it [being raped] cos I worked on the beat. It’s the same if you’re a working girl and your boyfriend rapes you. The police don’t really do anything about it because it’s your boyfriend’ (Ruby, 24, four years).

The significance of these narratives is that the appropriateness of response from the police is evidently just one of a number of factors that feed into the psychological well being of working girls. This is important if we accept the view from Potterat et al (1998:340) is that ‘while social factors may set the stage for prostitution, the script to become a prostitute may be written by psychological factors’. The view from one respondent, Eve, gives some credence to this claim:

‘I’ve got low self-esteem and prostitution has stripped this from me even further. It’s gonna take me a long time to build this back up again’ (Eve, 22, five years).

In essence, what this implies is that policies intended to tackle the known antecedents to entry (and continued involvement) into street-level prostitution - including drug rehabilitation, housing strategies, training and education – are likely to be ineffective in the long-term whilst issues of poor mental health persist. It certainly undermines the view that reductions in demand will on their own automatically lead to reductions in supply. Potterat et al (ibid) go on to point out that current ‘orthodoxy’ posits ‘psychological morbidity as an antecedent to substance abuse, which is itself [...] antecedent to prostitution’. Again, the responses from respondents in this research feed into this perspective:

‘I think I need some counselling if I’m going to get out of this mess. Drugs is the easy way out...but it’s not the solution. I guess the more important question for me is why do people like me feel the need to take drugs in the first place?’ (Chantal, 23, five years).

Taking this perspective further, Silbert and Pines (1982b: 131) discuss how working girls find themselves in a ‘psychological paralysis’ characterised by ‘acceptance of victimisation, feeling helpless and hopeless and an inability to take the opportunity to change’. This standpoint arguably helps contextualise why the response of the police is so important in breaking this ‘cycle of victimisation’. If the police (and other agencies) show little enthusiasm in dealing with working girls’ experiences of rape and violence, then this will only further exacerbate the feeling that there is ‘no aspect of [their] life over which they could exert control’ (ibid: 130) and as we have seen, battling for ‘control’ is a common theme throughout this chapter. More so, the emotional trauma of rape is compounded for street-level working girls by: i) the sense that they are unable to lean on social institutions (including the police) and personal contacts for assistance with the trauma and; ii) these negative events further exacerbate the feeling that they have no control over events (ibid). Ultimately feelings of hopelessness and a belief that bad consequences will occur no matter what they do, mean that:
…you lose all respect for yourself and if you don’t respect yourself, then you don’t expect other people to respect you and it’s just not nice’ (Jessica, 22, less than one year).

Attesting to the impact of the cumulative psychological damage experienced since childhood, for most of the respondents the future remains uncertain:

‘The future terrifies me because it means I have to confront my past. For me to put my life into order, I’ve got to be a baby again, start from scratch. There’s got to be something good to come from my life, but I need help, I can’t do this on my own’ (Grace, 26, four years).

Relapse rates amongst women involved in street-level prostitution are extremely high (Dalla, 2002), with working girls often moving in and out of prostitution over extended periods (Pitcher, 2006). This certainly has implications for ‘exiting’ data presented by Nottingham City Council (see Chapter 8). For Plummer et al (1996) this lack of permanency in exiting is directly attributable to a neglect of psychological factors such as depression and post-traumatic stress disorders. Addressing social factors (housing, drug addiction and so forth) within a multi-agency framework is clearly a necessary condition for exiting, but long-term success requires the simultaneous implementation of intensive and prolonged psychological interventions. Based on the narratives of women involved in this research, the observation from Silbert and Pines (1982b: 132) that working girls can become ‘trapped in a lifestyle they do not want, yet psychologically feel paralysed and unable to leave’ is particularly pertinent. Overcoming this dichotomy arguably requires policymakers to actively intervene to help ‘guide them toward recognising and effectively coping with both the positive and negative outcomes of their actions, thus restoring and fostering a sense of control over their lives’ (ibid). Yet again, it is unlikely this will be achieved through ‘Compulsory Rehabilitation Orders’, a neglect of mental health resources or indeed a reduction of men willing to pay for street-level sex.

Working girls and the interrelationship between demand and supply: some conclusions

To claim that this sample of working girls has ‘one homogeneous story’ to tell would be dehumanising and contrary to the narratives provided. Nevertheless there are undoubtedly overlapping themes; disturbing tales of physical and sexual abuse, drug dependency, and childhood maltreatments tend not to be very far from the ‘lived realities’ of these women. Equally, a number of commonalities emerge in relation to working girls’ interpretation of punters motivations to pay for sex, with a strong sense that biological predispositions are fundamental to our understanding. Not surprisingly there simultaneously surfaced a belief that prostitution was somehow inevitable, although this did not manifest itself in an outright denial of the role of the social, cultural and psychological.
Understanding these (simplified) constructions of punting motivations and antecedents to entry is itself of value, but arguably takes on additional importance in the context of interpreting the reactions to punitive and rehabilitative demand-led sanctions. It certainly gives additional and differential contexts to the findings in the previous chapter. Although there are obvious contradictions in the level of demand contractions experienced, enough formal and anecdotal evidence exists to suggest that punitive demand-led interventions are having some impact, primarily it seems because the fear of arrest is more of a deterrent for punters than it is for working girls. However, rather than resulting in outright desistance, the observations and experiences of these respondents suggest that the impact of policy interventions — seen in the context of punter’s motivations — has often been one of spatial and temporal displacement.

Evidently, displacement (whether actual or intended) appears not to be limited to ‘punting’; a number of working girl respondents expressed that as much as they wanted to exit street-level prostitution, this should not be confused with an opposition to prostitution per se. Several respondents had already made the move to contacting many of their punters via mobile phone and arranging ‘illicit meetings’ outside the ‘red light’ area (often in ‘working flats’). In short, against a background of significant criminal records and lacking formal qualifications, many women interviewed felt that multi-occupancy indoor work represented their best pragmatic opportunity to earn ‘good money’ relatively safely. Opposition to street-level prostitution was not a moral opposition to selling sex, but a rejection of its association with drugs, violent ‘boyfriends’ and punters, physical and mental health problems and rape. Many of these women expressed a desire for regulatory change as a means of challenging these issues of health and safety. Ultimately there was a clear consensus amongst this sample that policymakers should focus on moving prostitution to indoor locations, rather than striving for its indiscriminate elimination, which in the final evaluation has the propensity to make things worse.

There was a rejection also of using demand-led interventions as a blunt instrument to control supply. Even if demand reductions have been experienced (and as demonstrated above, the ‘view from the street’ is ambiguous), there is plenty of evidence to suggest that current levels of demand reduction have not had a corresponding impact on the numbers of women selling sex in Nottingham, or indeed had any tangible diminution of the abuses they face on a daily basis. In line with findings elsewhere, arguably all that has been achieved is that: i) prices have been driven down even further; ii) spatial/temporal displacement has been widespread and; iii) perhaps most worryingly, selling sex appears to have become inherently more ‘risky’. In fact, there was a sense that the people to have benefited most from these interventions were the unpleasant, ‘perverted’, dangerous punters.

Taking a wider perspective, the evidence provided in these narratives gives a degree of credence to Potterat et al’s (1998) contention that a paradigm shift is needed that moves us away from the ‘immediate needs’ of drugs rehabilitation, housing needs and a variety of other ‘social policy’ interventions. Only by focusing on long-term psychological factors, will these necessary, but ultimately insufficient measures have any long-term benefits. The widespread
incidence of sporadic and short-term exiting amongst this group of women suggests that the current strategy is limited in its effect. Reducing demand is not only potentially dangerous, but it defies the intellectual premise that such a paradigm shift requires. Demand may decline in the short-term, it may be displaced in the long-term, but for these women who are very much in the 'thick of it', there was a sense that demand-reductions working in tandem with discrete social policies are on their own unlikely to provide the long-term impetus for the permanent exiting from street-level prostitution that these women appear to yearn for. What's more, the idea that rehabilitation can somehow be imposed on working girls lacks justification on the evidence from this research. If - as Grace tragically admits - the future terrifies these women to such an extent that they become locked into a cycle of drug taking and prostitution, then we have a duty to adopt policies that will best ameliorate their 'root causes'; namely, to encourage these women to engage in prolonged and intensive psychological interventions (allied with the aforementioned and necessary 'social policies'). Despite the potentially credible intentions of switching the emphasis of punitive CJS sanctions from working girls to punters (combined with clear improvements in the police's attitudes towards working girls), based on the evidence from this research, this focus on demand has the potential to exacerbate rather than mitigate the problems these women face and may in fact lead to other forms of criminality, including increases in acquisitive crime.

Against this background, the final chapter of this thesis seeks to reconcile the potential benefits achieved from adopting a variety of demand interventions (such as the Change Programme) with the potentially damaging impact that such measures can have on the 'working girl' community. The discussion will subsequently be opened out politically to ascertain whether or not the needs of working girls, punters and communities are reconcilable. In addition, the chapter will seek to evaluate how policymakers can build on the positive elements of the Change Programme and how this might be incorporated in a policy framework that benefits punters, local communities and working girls alike. Inevitably this requires casting a critical eye away from the micro management of street-level prostitution towards the potential need for macro changes in the way we regulate prostitution and a wholesale shift in the 'cultural' landscape.
Chapter 11 - Conclusions and the Way Forward

This chapter reaches conclusions on the current logic, impact and efficacy of specific street-level prostitution policy interventions implemented as a response to the ideological re-positioning of punters and working girls in street-level prostitution markets. Following this, recommendations are suggested for future policy development.

Reducing demand through ‘court diversion’ programmes: a ‘coherent approach’?

Labelling men who pay for sex as ‘abusers’ of vulnerable women and facilitators of ‘public nuisance’ has enabled policymakers to pursue a three-pronged approach to ‘tackling demand’: informal warning; court diversion; and prosecution (Munro and Della Giusta, 2008). Much of this thesis has focused on the second of these stages through the ‘re-education’ of Nottingham’s punters via the Change Programme, principally on the basis that this intervention demonstrably lacks any structured evaluation to justify its inclusion in the policy agenda, over and above the questionable belief that ‘re-education programmes have proved to be effective’ (Home Office, 2004:68). That such rehabilitation programmes have relied so heavily on anecdote to legitimise their implementation (Brooks-Gordon, 2006) is surprising given the central role of re-education as a ‘coherent approach’ to reducing demand for street-level sex. Perhaps partly due to the usual limitations of Postgraduate doctoral research and evaluation, the empirical research undertaken with Change Programme attendees has thrown up more questions than it answers. I would certainly make no claims to have reached ‘theoretical saturation’ in this field of enquiry. Nevertheless, in spite of the methodological limitations of the thesis - including the lack of a controlled experiment research design and the absence of ‘statistically significant’ findings - the research has produced a number of insights that it is hoped will act as a framework for future funded longitudinal enquiry.

Assessing the benefits of the Change Programme

Inevitably the first question that is asked of any policy intervention is ‘does it work’? In relation to ‘re-educating’ Nottingham’s punters, the conclusions reached are shaped by the success criteria on which the Change Programme is being assessed. Conceivably, success can be measured by simply determining the extent to which the Change Programme has inspired punters to change their attitudes and beliefs towards street-level prostitution. Importantly, focusing on this measure of success is seen to be inextricably linked with the general aim of significantly reducing street-level prostitution; as Abt (2008:58) point out of the FOPP ‘John School’, the hope is that attitudinal change will result in ‘improved behaviour’ and a reduction in punting activity.

Like Abt (2008:85) the research was approached ‘objectively’ and with an open mind (Abt, 2008), but it was nevertheless difficult to see how the Change Programme could engender
attitudinal change and/or alter established patterns of sexual behaviour (Monto, 2004:183), particularly when the course is not ‘intense, sustained, and has no aftercare’ (Abt, 2008:85). Moreover, even when intensive, long-term behavioural programmes have been delivered by trained psychologists, the evidence for their efficacy in challenging problematic sexual attitudes (and behaviours) is patchy at best (Kenworthy et al, 2004). It was also difficult to reconcile the Change Programme’s optimistic assumptions that ‘through an act of conscience and an awareness of personal risks, customers can and will decide to give up their use of prostitutes’ (ibid) with the body of research on the problems inherent within such offender treatment programmes.

As flawed as the programme undoubtedly is, evidence from my research, surprisingly, directly challenges much of this scepticism. From an ‘attitudinal change’ perspective, there is enough evidence from the survey results and interview data to validate the view that those men exposed to the Change Programme curriculum perceive street-level prostitution to be less desirable. In this sense the Change Programme may reasonably be considered a ‘success’ and to be ‘working’. Most obviously, the findings outlined in Chapter 9, at the very least indicate a degree of temporary ‘cognitive realignment’ following engagement with the Change Programme. Summarising - and demonstrating parallels with the Wortley and Fischer (2002) and Abt (2008) ‘John school’ research evaluations - respondents tend to leave the Change Programme:

- Empowered on the basis of being able to reconfigure the notion of ‘choice’ in relation to future behaviours;
- Understanding the ‘cognitive processes’ that underpin the decision to pay for sex;
- Being aware of the potential risks associated with street-level prostitution, particularly in relation to sexual health, arrest and ‘naming and shaming’;
- Rejecting positive attitudes towards street-level prostitution;
- Displaying a greater sense of ‘responsibleisation’ (see Scoular and O’Neill, 2007; Wortley et al, 2002:378) and accountability for their punting behaviour;
- Engendering empathy with regards to the impact on one’s immediate family and as a result recognising that ‘punting’ brings with it emotional/relational consequences;
- Appreciative of the ‘delusion of mutuality’ and;
- Recognising that street-level prostitution is not without its victims.

The Change Programme and the implications of ‘shaming’

‘Re-education’ courses - including the Change Programme - have been criticised for ignoring the positive components of other ‘restorative justice’ diversion schemes (Braithwaite, 2000), such as ‘re-integrative shaming’ and ‘reparation’, instead focusing on non-integrated and damaging shaming techniques (see Sanders, 2009; Brooks-Gordon, 2006; Fischer et al, 2002). Having observed the programme first hand, it is feasible that aspects of moralising that undoubtedly permeate the Change Programme curriculum, could lead to ‘stigmatisation’ and all
the recidivistic problems that brings (Cohen, 1955). But rather than engaging in un-evidenced hyperbole about the widespread damaging effects of the Change Programme, my research found that the Programme curriculum operating in Nottingham is more nuanced than is credited in the literature. It is, for example, undoubtedly a significantly different programme than the ‘John schools’ operating in North America (Chapter 8).

Consequently, I would tentatively conclude that – in the short-term at least - the Change Programme achieves the aim of getting the majority of men to acknowledge the supposed harm associated with paying for sex, without being exposed to the potentially damaging effects of labelling. This may be partly due to the benefits of the group environment and recognition that most punters are ‘ordinary men just like them’. Equally, because engagement on the course necessitates attendees taking responsibility and accountability for their decision to pay for street-level sex – and contentiously for some, acknowledging that working girls and communities are ‘victims’ - course facilitators have the space to deliver ‘anti-punting’ messages in a broadly supportive environment. In short, there is little evidence that attendees are excessively dehumanised or only labelled according to their prostitution offence. Far from it; by teasing out other aspects of the men’s lives (what their hobbies are, family background, employment background and so forth), men tend to be humanised in a way that allows their prostitution activities to be properly contextualised. And perhaps in a way that has never been facilitated in their lives before, these men are forced to critically examine the roots of their behaviour. It may be, therefore, that their attendance on the Change Programme - though brief - was the most profound anti-punting message they had ever received in their lives.

Consequently, the Change Programme may be closer to Braithwaite’s (2000) model of ‘reintegrative shaming’ than might reasonably be expected from a programme that has so obviously neglected to garner the appropriate supporting evidence-base. Much of the evidence provided in this thesis would seem to indicate that the ‘shaming’ aspects of the Change Programme work because they effectively and directly use empathy to challenge the offenders ‘techniques of guilt neutralisation’ (Sykes and Matza, 1957) that men periodically use to justify their prostitution activities and that it tackles the behaviour, not the individual, as the ‘problem’.

There is plenty of evidence that the Change Programme ‘communicates disapproval within a continuum of respect for the offender; whereby the offender is treated as a good person who has done a bad deed’. This rehabilitative modus operandi appears to prevail over any disrespectful shaming of stigmatisation whereby ‘the offender is treated as a bad person’261 (Braithwaite, 2000:282). The session is usually wrapped up by the facilitator with a message along the lines of: ‘the majority of you here today are good people, who have done wrong in one area of your lives. All we’ve tried to do today is to make sure that you avoid repeating these mistakes’. This is symbolic of the termination of shaming programmes with ‘gestures or

261 As is the case with media-driven ‘naming and shaming’ campaigns, which it is argued only serve to label and stigmatise ‘offenders’ (McAlinden, 2007:217).
ceremonies of acceptance and forgiveness’ (Braithwaite, 1989:100-1) and was a message that all follow-up interviewees in this research enthusiastically took up.

Inevitably, a significant minority of men do remain resistant to this approach. Equally we need to be alert to ‘the ways in which it [‘pure’ re-integrative shaming] could make things worse’ (Johnstone, 2002:7) and cognisant of the empirical criticisms that it is ‘an unproved movement that risks failure’ (Levrant et al, 1999:16). But there is also a need to recognise that enough research exists to demonstrate that restorative justice processes ‘can impact on re-offending when compared with matched offenders dealt with solely in the criminal courts’ (Morris, 2002:612) and the findings from this research suggest that for those able to honestly and enthusiastically engage in the curriculum, the outcomes are often positive.

**The Change Programme and ‘knowledge’ improvements**

There is also evidence that the Change Programme improves the short-term knowledge-base of respondents with regards to prostitution laws and the scale of the UK ‘problem’. Unlike attitudinal change, however, improvements in knowledge were more transient, with little verification that attendees were able to retain this factual information even a couple of weeks after attending the re-education session. On this evidence, the Change Programme is more effective at eliciting attitudinal change than it is ‘educating’ men about the scale and scope of UK street-level prostitution. In light of this, one could conclude that the retention of knowledge plays a limited role in shaping attitudinal change, although counter-intuitively, the use of such knowledge in the short-term may play some role in facilitating gradual long-term attitude and behaviour change or a sudden change in the future. More research is needed here.

**The Change Programme versus ‘John Schools’: evidence overlap**

As mentioned above, in many ways the conclusions here correlate with findings elsewhere in the literature. Even highly critical ‘John school’ evaluations, talk of the positive effects that diversion programmes can have in: i) holding men accountable; ii) helping men confront the emotional problems associated with paying for sex; iii) facilitating changes in attitudes (particularly relating to guilt and the reporting of negative attitudes towards prostitution) and to a lesser degree; iv) changes in knowledge (Wortley and Fischer, 2002:220-222). Similarly Abt (2008:85) conclude that ‘the FOPP appears to have produced substantial benefits with minimal investment in time or resources’, whilst Kennedy et al (2004:58) argue that a British Columbia diversion programme appears to have changed punters attitudes and behaviour in the ‘intended direction’.

Given these positive ‘evaluative’ outcomes, it could be concluded that Sanders and Campbell’s (2008:168) claim that existing evaluations unanimously show little support for the effectiveness of ‘John schools’ – and by implication, the Change Programme - is too sweeping to present an accurate picture.
Contradictions and limitations of the Change Programme

That said, these positive findings should not mask the significant limitations of the Change Programme in its current guise. In particular, the research findings presented in Chapter 9, present aspects of attitudinal resistance and a number of contradictions that are difficult to reconcile even with the benefit of triangulated interview data.

For example, whilst the Change Programme evaluation demonstrates improvements in respondents ability to acknowledge the harms that street-level working girls experience on a daily basis (see Table 9.21), the data analysis suggests that any deep-seated empathy is considerably more difficult to engender towards anonymised strangers who have historically been ‘Othered’ (O’Connell Davidson, 1998 and 2001b), than it is when psychological attachment to ‘loved ones’ is present. Consequently, focusing ‘anti-punting’ measures exclusively on the harm to working girls and communities is likely to be limited in its impact. This of course has potential design implications for the Change Programme curriculum (and other demand-reduction measures) and once again for future empirical work on effective attitude change in this area. Furthermore, a number of attitudes remain stubbornly resistant to change, particularly in relation to both a wish for legalisation and a belief in the inevitability of prostitution (see Chapter 9). This demonstrates the obvious limitations and boundaries of attitudinal change brought about by the Change Programme and perhaps most symbolically reveals the influence of entrenched socio-cultural influences in shaping perceptions of the permanence of commercial sex markets.

Attitudinal versus behavioural change

Whilst these and other attitudinal variances and contradictions will no doubt be disappointing for Change Programme facilitators, they do not appreciably weaken the underlying ethos of the Change Programme, particularly with substantial evidence of attitudinal change in the intended direction for a number of key measurements.

The primary measure of success, however, is not dictated by attitudinal change per se, but how these attitudes translate into recidivism reductions over and above ‘traditional’ CJS interventions. Ascertaining whether or not punters would be as effectively deterred by measures other than criminal prosecution (Archard, 2008) is clearly important in justifying the continuation of court diversion programmes. The challenge for researchers is to establish whether attitude changes are: i) permanent and; ii) whether they result in behavioural change. Unfortunately, as it stands this research is unable to definitively conclude that the Change Programme has recidivistic reduction benefits.
On the surface, arrest data provided by the OSPT indicates that the Change Programme is effective at reducing street-level recidivism. When combined with research findings demonstrating an increase in the number of respondents stating that they will never pay for sex with a street-level ‘prostitute’ again, the claim that the Change Programme facilitates ‘recidivism reductions’ seems to be a strong one. However, given the substantial operational and methodological limitations of the programme/research - most notably, the data supplied by the OSPT fails to account for the lack of a reliable control group - any claim that the Change Programme is more effective than other interventions at reducing recidivism lacks empirical credibility. Ultimately there is a real danger that attitudinal shifts in favour of desistance (as outlined in this research) are (mis)used by those keen to extol the benefits of ‘re-education’ programmes to further validate the limited ‘re-offending’ data. In short, the lack of reliable research data on re-offending means we need to guard against conflating ‘correlation’ with ‘causality’ in relation to the Change Programme and its impact on recidivism.

Furthermore, given the results from the fieldwork in relation to ‘deterrence’, it is difficult to disagree with the findings of Brewer et al (2006) that arrest remains a significant disincentive to recidivism. Quite conceivably the Change Programme is limited in the short-term recidivistic value it provides over and above the impact of arrest, increased police presence and other ‘Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design’ measures. After all, it was arrest that led to every punter on the Change Programme being there in the first place.

If, however, a degree of attitudinal change has occurred as a result of ‘educating’ men about the crises inherent to street-level prostitution, and in turn their own lives, then this is an important development. This ‘creative approach to reducing the demand for prostitution’ (Monto, 1998) may, in the right circumstances, operate as a long-term protective factor against future recidivism, in a way that is not possible with arrest alone. As McAlinden (2007:217) argues, ‘coercive criminal justice will not deter offenders or protect victims […] except perhaps in the short-term’. In other words, it is feasible that ‘the proclivity toward re-offence [will] increase as the arrest and conviction [falls] further into the past’ (Monto and Garcia, 2001:6). Naturally, any durable recidivistic reduction benefit actualised from attitudinal ‘realignment’ remains highly speculative until the academic community is able to validate this finding with further surveys, longitudinal research and rigorous evaluation. Nevertheless, this should not detract from the attitudinal changes noted in this research and the opportunity for gains to be made by continuing and refining the Change Programme to build on lessons learnt.

**Operational and structural considerations**

On this latter point, any preliminary conclusions outlining the positive attitudinal benefits generated by ‘re-education’, cannot ignore the considerable reform required of the Change Programme. Quite rightly any positive outcomes from this research have to be counter-balanced against serious structural and operational concerns and the obvious impact of arrest, a move towards multi-agency policing and other ‘opportunity reduction’ measures. In its current
guise, the Nottingham Change Programme is exposed to the same criticisms that have been levelled towards North American ‘John schools’ (Sanders, 2009; Wortley and Fischer, 2002; Wortley et al; Abt, 2008). Accordingly its ‘success’ – based on this research and despite fundamental structural differences - can be challenged on the same basis that a number of ‘John schools’ have. Namely:

i) The lack of appropriate ‘due process’

It is extremely contentious to assume that transformations in attitude and knowledge – without irrefutable evidence for future behavioural change – can ‘justify the temporary suspension of due process rights and the creation of an ‘arrests for revenue’ diversion process’ (Wortley et al, 2002:397). What is clear from both the survey data and subsequent follow-up interviews is that the Change Programme is presented in such a way that the choices open to men are at best, funnelled. The Change Programme ‘option’ is clearly attractive because it not only enables men to protect their anonymity (paying for sex is predominantly a secret and shameful activity), but guarantees that criminal charges will be dropped (Wortley and Fischer, 2002). This guarantee is not possible with a criminal trial (ibid). Less transparent still, is the fact that ‘no criminal record’ does not equate to ‘no record of arrest/caution’ and many of the research respondents felt that this point was not adequately stipulated on arrest (Sanders, 2009). Several respondents went as far as to say that this would have affected their decision to attend the Change Programme and to contest their guilt in a court of law.

Research data also highlights how many men felt unable to challenge the authority of the OSPT and expressed concerns that the police overplayed: i) the illegality of paying for sex and; ii) the implications of not accepting to go on the Change Programme. Although plans are in place to run the Change Programme in languages other than English262, it also remains true that the way in which English and non-English speaking punters are dealt with by the OSPT remains inequitable. In this sense the conclusions here strongly correlate with Fischer et al’s (2002:406) findings that voluntarism in effect ‘unfolds as a coercive mode of operation’. Based on my research, I have no doubt that for some men on the Change Programme, this was the first time they had attempted to pay for sex and whose only crime was to speak with a street-level working girl.

ii) Concerns about the Change Programme fee

Taken on face value, donating a share of the Change Programme fee to working girl support groups would seem a worthy act. However, as Wortley and Fischer (2002:231) point out, for voluntary organisations with limited funds, creating a situation where their revenue stream is partially related to the number of men passing through the Change Programme creates an awkward paradox; on the one hand the assumption is that reducing demand will encourage
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women to leave the sex trade, whilst this very same demand simultaneously provides an source of revenue that contributes to supporting appropriate ‘exiting’ strategies. Evidently – as has been discussed in relation to ‘John schools’ - the financial relationship between the Change Programme and working girl voluntary organisations needs to be closely scrutinised.

**iii) Heterogeneous risk factors, socio-demographic variations and the ‘one size fits all’ approach**

The research data flagged considerable motivational variations and socio-demographic diversity amongst attendee’s (see Chapter 9). Yet the Change Programme curriculum largely ignores these variances and in spite of the aforementioned attitudinal change, to assume a ‘one size fits all’ approach to re-education would seem strangely ignorant of the heterogeneous socio-demographic profiles and socio-cultural motivations associated with buying sex.

Small sub-sample sizes limit the conclusions that can be drawn with regards to socio-demographic analysis, but it appears that ‘prostitution usage’ is a good indicator of attitudinal resistance. This would suggest that as ‘cognitive distortions’ (for example, assumptions that working girls enjoy their ‘work’, or the ‘delusion of mutuality’) become ever more entrenched, so the mechanisms of challenging these psychological pre-conceptions become less effective. Conversely, according to Monto (2004:183), for men ‘early in their career of prostitution seeking, ‘John schools’ may lead to a reconsideration of their perspectives toward prostitution and may undercut some of our cultural fantasies surrounding prostitution’. In this sense the stratification of attendees is clearly an important component in how and why the Programme works for some men but not others. This selection process is important because, as Abt (2008:85) point out, in its current format ‘it is likely the programme has little effect […] on men [demonstrating] psychopathy or (pronounced manifestations of) misogyny’.

Predictably, the group unable to attend the Change Programme, with its ‘first offender’ selection criteria, is the already detected and prosecuted ‘veteran’ user (or ‘regular’). Of all socio-demographic groups, previously undetected ‘veterans’ also happen to be the group most likely to exhibit ‘pro-(street-level) prostitution’ attitudes after engaging in the Change Programme. Given the opportunities to ‘normalise’ their prostitution behaviours over a period of time, it is not surprising that these men tend to have the most embedded views going into the Programme, especially with regards to re-offending, street-prostitution and perceptions that they are somehow ‘saving’ working girls. Evidently it would appear that ‘length of involvement’ is a key determinant of the Programme’s success, and facilitators need to be aware of the higher levels of resistance that ‘veterans’ bring with them. As it stands, the Change Programme is failing to deliver the same level of attitudinal changes for ‘veterans’ and there is a strong argument to reassess how these men are dealt with in the diversionary model of ‘re-education’. How a revised Change Programme curriculum might impact on previously detected and prosecuted ‘veterans’ is a primary area for future research.
Attitudinal variances were found across other socio-demographic groupings, with older, better educated and South Asian punters demonstrating particular resistance to future recidivism. Again, due to the methodological limitations associated with these small sub-sample sizes and the problem of ‘proxy’ indicators, it is evident that further research is required to better validate these preliminary findings. Nevertheless, the preliminary conclusion here is that socio-cultural specificity is not well catered for in the programme design.

**iv) Promoting a curriculum that presents ‘facts’ that are dubious and content which is not always relevant/effective**

Although the Change Programme curriculum has been refined, the core curriculum has broadly remained consistent since June 2004. And yet the evidence from this research indicates that some aspects of the Programme have little, if any, impact; for example, very few men cited the informational components of the curriculum associated with the ‘realities’ of selling sex as staying with them. Any ‘educational’ messages that were successfully recollected tended to be restricted to the personalised ‘sexual health’ or the penal/CJS impacts of paying for sex. This stands in contrast to the aspects of the Programme focusing on the emotional and relational impact(s) of punting (as covered in the role-play exercise for example) which retained its psychological impact and recollection weeks and months after attending the course.

In addition, I also have some concerns with the reliability of this ‘educational’ content. Perhaps taking its cue from the Shapiro’s ‘Scared Straight’ programme in the 1970’s (see Petrosino *et al*, 2004), programme facilitators seem content to present ‘facts’ of questionable validity, seemingly with the sole intention of scaring men into desistance through a focus on the adverse consequences of continuing to pay for sex. Presenting information in this way is not only ethically questionable, but may eventually prove to be counter-productive if attendee’s are aware of the reality of risk or else presented with contradictory information at a later point.

Finally, although the subject of ‘trafficking’ is touched upon, there is generally a notable absence of any discussion about the ‘facts’ of off-street markets and the possibility for ‘choice’ and ‘abuse’ to reside on a continuum. The implicit assumption is that men are expected not to pay for sex in any circumstance and the ‘scaring’ tactics associated with street-level prostitution are doubtless intended to have a desistance trickle down effect. Without clear aims about the boundaries of regulation – and the reasons why – then it is quite feasible that this lack of clarity will manifest itself in confusion about what is deemed to be ‘acceptable behaviour’. This of course may have ‘displacement’ implications, although the evidence for such displacement attitudes in this research was mixed. Again, more research is required to assess what impact this lack of clarity in programme aims will have in terms of attitudinal change and displacing men to ‘off-street’ locations.
v) Resource intensity

Running a monthly Change Programme – and any associated ‘sting’ operations - clearly requires considerable resource intensity from the OSPT and course facilitators (although the programme fee probably ensures that the programme is self-funding). Whether or not this represents ‘value for money’ is of course dependent on the difficult to quantify opportunity costs of allowing ‘kerb crawling’ to continue. However, unlike other North American evaluations (for example, Abt, 2008) this is largely beyond the scope of this thesis, so no conclusions have been reached with regards to cost effectiveness.

vi) Insufficient aftercare

Arguably one of the biggest problems facing the Change Programme is the lack of sufficient aftercare. In the climate of punters being seen as ‘abnormal deviants’ it is unlikely that potentially costly aftercare interventions would ever be sanctioned over conventional CJS sanctions for those already given a chance of ‘re-education’. Interestingly this stands in contrast to the support widely available to ‘criminalised’ punters in Sweden (see discussion on KAST in Chapter 4). Whilst the OSPT claim that the Change Programme is only ever intended to ‘signpost’ men to the antecedents of their punting attitudes/behaviours, without any form of aftercare support, programme facilitators are left to hope that this ‘signposting’ is sufficient to maintain any positive attitudinal outcomes generated by the programme. Although the results from this research suggest that the impact of the course are largely positive, there are also narratives within this research that suggest that the long-term harms of prostitution affect punters, as well as working girls and communities (Home Office, 2006:6).

In many ways this suggests the need for structured non-CJS support, although the lack of longitudinal data and the limited sample size means that it is not possible to say with certainty what the long-term implications of not supporting men post-programme may be. To assume that Change Programme attendees have the psychological and practical skills necessary to translate ‘signposting’ into something positive and long-lasting may be dangerously misguided. Certainly more research is required to ascertain whether incidents such as the punter who went on to commit 17 sexual offences after attending the Change Programme (Chapter 9), can be attributed to a lack of aftercare support and whether such incidents will become more prevalent amongst attendee’s over time.

The Change Programme: a cure-all?

The Change Programme is clearly a long way off being a panacea for the control of street-level prostitution and I would agree with Brooks-Gordon (2006:56) that it is unrealistic ‘to expect

---

263 See Deepak’s account in Chapter 7 that outlines his frustration at the lack of available information and/or ‘punter support’ networks.
policing agencies\textsuperscript{264} to take responsibility for addressing the root cause(s) of any [harmful] behaviour'. Making claims about attitudinal change is not the same as saying that the Change Programme will result in additive recidivistic reduction benefits over and above the impact of arrest or other ‘punitive’ interventions, nor will necessarily translate into long-term desistance from street-level prostitution (let alone off-street locations). There is enough counter-evidence and attitudinal contradictions in this research to make it difficult to categorically substantiate such claims and further research is clearly required to evaluate the preliminary findings outlined here, together with evaluating the potential for spatial, offence and temporal ‘displacement’ (Hindelang \textit{et al}, 1978). What is more, there needs to be greater clarity for stakeholders about what exactly the Change Programme seeks to achieve and how the programme can be understood in the context of what Bernstein (2001:409) flags as the contradiction between the normalisation and problematisation of commercial sex (see ‘Ways Forward’ section below). As it stands, it is unclear whether the principle aim is to get men to stop paying for sex in any circumstance or whether it is to stop men paying for street-level sex through the actualisation of attitudinal change and educational messages. In other words, is the principle aim to reduce demand or the change the nature of demand as an interim measure?

To claim that the Change Programme embodies a successful ‘cognitive behavioural’ tool is almost certainly an overstatement; proper ‘cognitive behavioural modelling’ requires intense and long-term commitment from ‘offenders’, facilitators and by default researchers/evaluators. Although the Change Programme differs from ‘John schools’ in so far that it incorporates a ‘relapse model’ to help men motivated by compulsion or sexual addiction, the infrequency that this aspect of the Programme is cited in the survey or follow-up interviews, suggests a limited impact. More likely, is that the cross-section of men on the Change Programme contains a number of non-‘veteran’ punters who are consequently amenable to [real] change (Abt, 2008:85).

Even if we accept that the Change Programme has some additive benefits, this research categorically demonstrates that there is room to better tailor the Programme to the needs and risk factors of a streamed target audience. There is plenty of evidence from this research (and elsewhere) that a lack of aftercare support is likely to undermine any potential long-term benefits provided by the programme. Whilst the Programme is purposively designed to encourage men to begin the process of recognising relapse triggers and developing means of engaging in replacement behaviours (Chapter 8), there is then a tragic failure to refer attendee’s to resources ‘that would assist them over time as part of an aftercare component or on a voluntary referral basis’ (Abt, 2008:109).

Nevertheless, even when combined with the methodological limitations of this research - specifically small sub-sample sizes and the lack of a control group - these valid criticisms should not mask what the Change Programme does well and the real additive benefits that ‘re-

\textsuperscript{264} Loosely including Change Programme facilitators.
education’ undertaken properly could bring to conventional CJS interventions. The programme is generally very well received by men who participate in it. Furthermore, in considering the conventional constructions of heterosexual male sexuality emphasising masculine ‘prowess’ and sexual performance (Sanders, 2008), this is almost certainly the first time that men have had their attitudes and beliefs about (street-level) prostitution challenged in any meaningful way, an approach which seems to have had some success in helping men to recognise the difference between an ‘excuse’ and a ‘motivation’ and in signposting men to: i) their personalised antecedents to punting; ii) the ‘risks’ involved; (iii) anticipated future behaviour in street-level markets; (iv) perceptions of street-level prostitution and; iii) the emotional/relational consequences of paying for sex (see also Abt, 2008). On this latter point, the findings from this research indicate that, as a rule, the Change Programme is more successful in appealing to self-interest and familial/partner sacrifice, than it is an appeal to working girl altruism. Clearly it is important to recognise the boundaries of the programme and this limited ‘altruism’ is perhaps once again symbolic of the limitations of a one-day rehabilitation Programme as a ‘cognitive behavioural’ tool.

In considering these findings, perhaps one of the most pertinent questions emanating from this aspect of the research is: if the evaluative process actively encourages improvements to be made to the programme design and any additive recidivistic/attitudinal impacts can be externally validated by researchers over a period of time, then on what basis should we oppose the continuation (and expansion) of the Change Programme?

**Deterrent/recidivistic impact of other demand-led interventions**

In answering the above question it is important to consider that the Change Programme does not operate in a policy or media vacuum. In these circumstances, it is not unreasonable to speculate that the media and Government discourse stigmatises in a way that the Change Programme largely avoids (or at least mitigates with more positive messages), and in these circumstances we are taken back to a simplified ‘construction of the client as an abnormal deviant’ and ‘dehumanised’ and ‘unrespectable’: in need of punishment and treatment’ (Sanders and Campbell, 2008:170). Unfortunately the track record of the state using the media to change behaviour is unproven and as such we know little about how and why media campaigns work (or don’t) to change attitudes and behaviour (see Sutton *et al*, 2007). There is certainly little evidence to suggest that ‘anti prostitution’ media campaigns work in the same way that the Change Programme does. Interestingly, only a couple of punters taking part in this research mentioned vaguely recalling seeing the ‘Respect For Nottingham’ poster campaign or were aware of other ‘environmental’ measures such as road closures (see Chapter 8). More awareness was demonstrated towards public signage, but even here there was a scepticism that such messages were simply a means of pacifying the local community that something was being done about the problem. On the whole these interventions played an insignificant deterrent role for this group of men.
Naturally, preventing recidivism and deterring men from offending in the first place are not comparable concepts. Even if it were possible, this research did not incorporate research with men tempted to pay for sex (but who had not actualised this temptation) and it would be imprudent to use the findings here as a definitive template for what does or doesn’t work as a preventative deterrence. Naturally the findings outlined in this thesis provide only an insight into the thought processes of arrested punters. Although there may be men who have been deterred from ‘punting’ due to adverse publicity, Home Office poster campaigns, road closures, improved lighting (or a combination of all the above) these were not crime reduction initiatives cited by men in this study as having a significant deterrent effect. Similarly, whilst the Change Programme may have useful recidivistic reduction benefits, as a tool of deterrence, respondents deemed the Programme to be inconsequential. Based on these research findings, arrest, imprisonment and ‘naming and shaming’ all exert a far greater deterrent – and recidivistic - impact. In fact, of all these elements, the threat of a secret act being exposed publicly through the process of ‘naming and shaming’ was most commonly cited in follow-up interviews as the possible intervention that generated the most fear. It is possible that in these circumstances measures such as poster campaigns may have an deterrent additive benefit, much like the Change Programme may have in relation to reducing recidivism. As it stands, however, more research is required to substantiate any hypothesis regarding the additive impact of ‘public information’ messages as a deterrent to potential new punters.

Interestingly, both the threat and imposition of ‘naming and shaming’ may be deemed an important area of deterrence on the basis that it is one of the few areas where policy has matched rhetoric, ensuring the high profile of this intervention. Less commonly implemented – and therefore reported – have been the imposition of policy measures such as driving disqualifications and ASBOs, which may help explain why Change Programme attendee’s perceive these to be less of a deterrent than being fined or exposed in the media. Of course, for a variety of reasons, the threat of ‘naming and shaming’ – or indeed any other intervention - proved insufficient to prevent attendees from paying for sex, but without primary data from non-offenders it is difficult to reach any conclusions about why and how men who have been tempted to pay for sex have resisted acting on these ‘temptations’. One of the answers may be circumstantial; a number of research respondents felt strongly that ‘supply drives demand’ and it is therefore the funnelled opportunities associated with being exposed to the activities of working girls that starts the process of psychological build-up (Holzman and Pines, 1982). As Lowman and Atchison (2006:288) point out, ‘demand and supply interact: for a certain segment of the sex buyer population, their initial demand [is], at least partly, supply driven’. Although difficult to unravel, more research is needed in this important area.

Because the Change Programme is only open to first time offenders (or arrestees), respondents in this research will have not been exposed to ‘naming and shaming’ for prostitution offences. Therefore, we can only reliably talk about the ‘threat’ – rather than imposition – in this context.
Reducing demand or controlling supply?

Evidently further research is required to validate any conclusions that the Change Programme plays an additive, long-term role in reducing recidivism. Likewise, further research is required to ascertain any additive benefits of media campaigns over and above the impact of punitive CJS interventions and ‘naming and shaming’. The important point here is that there is insufficient evidence to suggest that the benefits of non-CJS measures are any more than ‘additive’ and to deny the effectiveness of punitive CJS sanctions in discouraging recidivism – including ‘naming and shaming’ – may be misguided.

Whilst a combination of OSPT arrest data, punter narratives and working girl’s experiences ‘on the street’ lead to some contradictory findings, on the whole the evidence from these disparate sources strongly indicates some demand reductions experienced on the streets of Nottingham since 2004. Of course, it is not possible to say with any certainty the extent to which this reflects spatial, offence and/or temporal displacement, particularly amongst those who have not been ‘re-educated’ through the Change Programme. Therefore, what is important to re-stress, is the need for longitudinal data to validate these tentative findings.

Whether or not further long-term research of the Change Programme refines (or rejects) these conclusions remains to be seen, but for some the mere fact that punters have come onto the policy radar is representative of a paradigm shift in victimisation away from working girls to punters, and is consequently seen as the right thing to do morally. As Wortley and Fischer (2002:220) illustrate ‘re-education’ (amongst other things) ‘may be a step towards reducing the perceived gross gender imbalance that has traditionally marked the way in which the CJS deals with prostitution issues’.

Unhappily for those seeking the eradication of street-level prostitution, what this research has simultaneously demonstrated is the folly of assuming that demand reductions will automatically equate to a corresponding reduction in supply. Worse still – and in line with findings from Sweden (Östergren, 2004) and Scotland (UKNSWP, 2009) – demand reduction may actually lead to damaging unintended consequences for working girls in a declining market.

The vast majority of working girls in this research felt that the number of Nottingham-based on-street working girls had remained broadly unchanged during the time they had been involved in prostitution (see Chapter 10). Regrettably the contradictions present in official OSPT data make this claim difficult to substantiate; OSPT data can be interpreted in a number of ways and this arrest data neither categorically signifies that the number of working girls has increased, declined or remained static.

Nevertheless, in a notoriously secretive world, the view ‘from the street’ is perhaps as good an indictor as any of the number of active working girls. On this evidence, one of the tentative
conclusions to be drawn from the ‘supply-side’ research is that, working girls are more resistant to CJS interventions than punters.

Importantly, supply levels appear to be resilient to actual (rather than geographically displaced) fluctuations in the number of street-level punters. Of course there will always be a ‘tipping point’ towards which significant supply contractions will be realised, but the findings in this research suggest that this ‘tipping point’ threshold is highly resistant to - and largely independent from – i) moderate fluctuations in demand and; ii) CJS interventions. Certain aspects of the economic model of demand and supply seem to be pertinent here, with claims from several respondents that women were increasingly willing to sell sex for a ‘tenner’ as a response to any decline in the number of active punters. This clearly correlates with basic economic theory, which dictates that when demand and supply is in disequilibrium (in this case ‘excess supply’), then the principle way of ensuring revenue streams is by reducing the price of the relevant goods or services on offer. On this evidence it would appear that street-level prostitution is relatively price elastic and as prone to the consequences of the ‘credit crunch’ as brothels and other off-street locations (Das Bild, 2008). And yet, a number of respondents commented on the ease to which girls who ‘looked young’ had been able to maintain high prices in an apparently declining market, symbolising the demand inelasticity for this particular type of ‘service’ and working girl. In short, it would appear that high pricing is unlikely on its own to attract or deter punters into street-level markets in all circumstances. It is also important to recognise that (socio-cultural) motivational differences between off and on street punters (Chapters 5 and 10), working girls being able to offer ‘services’ appropriate to punters motivational variations and of course the power of CJS interventions to ‘distort’ the market, are likely to play an important part in shaping demand.

**Contextualising ‘exiting’ resistance**

Arguably a key question for policymakers is why supply should be resistant to policy interventions and demand reductions, particularly when punter-focused interventions appear to be having some success in changing behaviours and attitudes through interventions such as the Change Programme. The answer it seems is that resistance is strongly correlated with motivational and antecedent differentials. Evidence from this research further validates findings elsewhere that men pay for sex for a variety of reasons. For some men, these reasons can be relatively superficial and therefore especially responsive to policy interventions. Therefore, for such men it may well be that – in the short-term at least – attitudes and (mis)conceptions about street-level prostitution do not need to be challenged for behavioural change to be realised. Naturally, given the socio-cultural diversity of punting, other men have more complex motivations and the evidence from this research (and elsewhere) is that once these motivations become cognitively established, then it can be difficult to ‘break the chain’ of offending. To re-iterate, the ‘additive’ impact of the Change Programme appeared to be limited for those men with embedded and psychologically complex punting motivations (more obviously, ‘veterans’). For the majority of men, however, the socio-psychological dynamics of ‘choosing’ to pay for sex remain fundamentally different to the reasons why women end up becoming – and continue to
be involved in street-level prostitution. None of the punters interviewed said that they had experienced systematic childhood mistreatment, nor chronic addictions to Class A drugs, whereas all of the working girls taking part in this research said they had Class A drug addictions and had been exposed to at least one regular form of abuse growing up (and beyond). Consequently, it seems reasonable to assume that these motivational and antecedent disparities will result in policy interventions having a disproportionate impact; the ‘ordinary’ punter will typically feel he has more to lose than the ‘Othered’ working girl.

**Displacement revisited**

In addition to these demand-supply motivational disparities, understanding the lack of widespread supply contractions requires an appreciation of how working girls have attempted to respond to subsequent operational and structural changes in the ‘market’. Evidence from this research unmistakably reveals that, as in Sweden (see Chapter 4), working girls are increasingly using technologies – primarily mobile phones - to arrange liaisons with punters in locations away from the gaze of the OSPT (and therefore away from the red-light district; see also Sanders *et al*, 2009:28). Crucially - and further validating the findings from the Change Programme evaluation that regulars/veterans tend to be more resistant to recidivism measures—many of the women interviewed for this research stressed the importance of these changes as a means of maintaining contact with ‘regulars’ (and therefore ensuring a steady income). On this evidence, some working girls have been able to react creatively to increasingly prevalent and punitive demand-led interventions. In this case their response has been to change the *modus operandi* of their interaction with clients, rather than by ‘exiting’ prostitution altogether. Potentially, using technology to respond to these changes may prolong working girls on-street working life in comparison to their predecessors, since it makes the process more flexible and potentially easier to negotiate. This insight suggests that some punters are increasingly aware of greater ‘risk’ of being caught paying for sex in Nottingham and in order to mitigate this risk, some ‘transactions’ are now being negotiated away from the traditional red-light area and/or undertaken very quickly to avoid detection.

In many ways this response mirrors that of the legitimate economy, but rather than being framed as ‘entrepreneurial’, such behaviour is labelled through the lens of deviancy and displacement. More worryingly, working girl respondents disclosed other reactions to these market changes that potentially expose them to additional danger(s) in an already hazardous line of work. For example, a minority of women also admitted to carrying out ‘business’ with ‘one-offs’ outside the red-light district. The upshot is that in a market with reduced demand, working girls are less able to make good decisions about ‘dodgy punters’, with decent punters being: i) driven away from street-level locations and; ii) reluctant to report crimes against working girls for fear of the CJS repercussions (see Östergren, 2004). Simultaneously, excess supply has created increased competition amongst working girls to such an extent that for some respondents, any semblance of ‘sex worker community cohesion’ had been completely eroded. Encouragingly, all respondents interviewed in this research stressed that they would not sell
unprotected sex under any circumstance, although most respondents knew of (younger) working girls - often starting out - who actively sold unprotected sex to fund their drug addiction. Overall – and in line with the research literature - there was a sense amongst respondents that selling sex had becoming noticeably more risky since the introduction of demand-focused policy interventions.

‘Choice versus coercion’

One of the key themes to transpire from working girl conversations was the importance that these women placed on being able to say that they chose to sell sex. This is not to say that respondents were not aware of the role that childhood mistreatment and problematic drug use played in funnelling their choices; issues of poverty, drug dependency, unemployment, personal histories of abuse, local authority care, loneliness and low self-esteem are common amongst on-street working girls (Scambler and Scambler, 1997; Faugier and Sargeant, 1997; Sanders, 2008; Harding and Hamilton, 2008). But as unpalatable as it is for some to accept, in the final equation the majority of women were adamant that it was their choice to become a working girl and respecting a woman’s expression of her decision to sell sex, however diminished her ability to choose for herself might be, is crucial in demonstrating a non-judgemental attitude towards vulnerable women. Once involved, persistent sexual or physical violence at the hands of punters or ‘boyfriends’ and chronic addictions to illegal drugs, ensures that these choices continue to be – at best - funnelled for the majority of women. The paradox is that at the same time that respondents were vehemently defending their decision to sell sex, all women simultaneously acknowledged a desire to exit street-level prostitution owing to the persistent physical and mental damage associated with ‘life on the street’. The importance for policymakers is not to translate this as a desire to exit prostitution altogether; the consensus amongst this group of women, was that they would continue to sell sex in off-street locations on the basis that they understood this to represent a much safer and more profitable way of selling sex (Verkaik, 2008). Failing this, many women admitted that if they weren’t ‘on the streets’, then they would be engaging in acquisitive crime such as shoplifting. Inevitably this brings us back to the concept of offence displacement.

Seen in this context, it is the funnelled choices that keep working girls involved in street-level prostitution and not high (or low) levels of demand. Rather than reducing supply, policies at ‘tackling demand’ are only likely to force women to seek ways of maintaining revenue streams, which on the evidence from this research points to engaging in ever-risky and ‘innovative’ ways of maintaining contact with street-level punters. As has been widely recognised (including the Home Office (2004, 2006)) creating the environment for women to fulfil their desires to exit street-level prostitution requires a flexible and holistic focus. The reality is that the aspirations of the vast of majority working girls in this research are framed by a desire to reduce or eradicate their dependency on drugs and to work in a safer environment. Accordingly, the problem that they express is a lack of choices not prostitution itself. Moreover, based on the evidence here, moderately reducing demand is highly unlikely to have the desired effect.
What is required is to effectively support women in the transition from ‘street-level’ sex work. The strategy of multi-agency support has come a long way in recent years and should be commended; many of the women in this research were complimentary about the OSPT and the quality of the services provided by other agencies. However, the voluntary aspect of engagement was seen to be critical for these working girls, with forced engagement widely regarded as being detrimental to long-term exiting strategies. Despite their renewed ‘victim’ status, working girls have been subject to an enhanced process of criminalisation in circumstances where they fail to take the ‘holistic’ support on offer. That working girl ‘victims’ are still subject to criminalisation can only be understood in the context of ‘risk and responsibilisation’ (Scoular and O’Neill, 2007), the prioritisation of ‘community cohesion’ and the pre-eminence of the ‘public nuisance’ discourse (Kantola and Squires, 2004). When combined with punitive sanctions (such as ASBOs) and kerb-crawling initiatives that reduce client numbers on the street, there is a real danger that women will disengage with support services. In short, history tells us that trying to get working girls to exit through compulsion and punitive CJS sanctions is not the way to facilitate ‘exiting’.

**Ways forward**

a) Re-evaluating abolitionism

Inevitably, any scope for change at the local level is constrained by the regulatory model in operation (inter)nationally. As Sanders and Campbell (2008:176) contend, the UK’s current commitment to abolitionism lacks a ‘framework for regulating markets, no governance of commercial sex and no encouragement for responsibly managed establishments or practices’. According to Della Giusta (2008:131), rather than strive for liberal policies that ‘maximise welfare by lifting stigma associated with the sector’, politicians have somewhat hypocritically opted for repressive regimes ‘which demonstrably worsen the lives of sex workers remaining in the trade, as well as those of society at large’ (**ibid**). The failure of recent UK prostitution reviews to embrace more deep-seated reform and to wholeheartedly take on board the lessons of alternative regulatory responses has been critiqued extensively elsewhere in this thesis. Whilst accepting that any consideration given to alternative models of control may be a poisoned chalice politically (Brooks-Gordon, 2006:61), results from New Zealand, for example, suggest that a move towards decriminalisation may not only promote positive developments for working girls, punters and local communities, but need not necessarily be politically unpopular (in the first instance). That said, there is some value in recognising – as the Home Office (2008) has done— the unpredictability of transferring legislative models across different socio-spatial contexts and the ‘power of law as a reformist institution’ (Munro and Della Giusta, 2008:5).

Nevertheless, subscribing to a discourse of ‘total victimisation’ (for working girls; Phoenix, 2008:48) leaves little room for manoeuvre outside of the punter criminalisation paradigm (the ideological reasons for which are discussed extensively elsewhere in this thesis). Consequently
if the aim of policy is unequivocally eradication rather than harm reduction, then policy interventions on the ground are restricted in the extent to which they can ‘mirror and match the complexities of client behaviour’ (Brooks-Gordon, 2006:259) and to support working girls effectively. Against this background, many of the other recommendations outlined below can only be realistically unlocked if there is an openness to the reform of the overarching regulatory model in operation.

b) Change Programme

As it stands the Change Programme is one initiative that is constrained by the regulatory model in which it is posited. Whatever the core message is, it needs to be communicated more effectively, as any mixed messages may be counterproductive and potentially liable to displacement effects. However, given its re-educative and rehabilitative credentials, a major advantage of the Change Programme is its transferability to other regulatory regimes. In other words, even ‘legalisation’ or ‘decriminalisation’ regimes could benefit from its implementation (albeit not in its current format).

Given the power of the Change Programme to challenge stereotypes and misconceptions about street-level prostitution, it would seem counterproductive to abolish this re-educative tool altogether. Taking inspiration from Abt’s (2008) and Wortley and Fischer’s (2002) ‘John school’ recommendations, more sensible is to reform the Change Programme through operational transformation:

i) The first area to address is ‘programme content’. Facilitators and programme designers need to be attuned to those aspects of the programme that don’t work well – for example, engendering working girl ‘empathy’ - and to have the confidence to strip out these unproductive components altogether and focus on the areas that have the greatest impact – for example, the role plays. Failing this there is a need to at least present the ineffective material more creatively. As it stands the ‘knowledge’ components of the programme are presented rather didactically and more attention needs to be given to: i) making these sessions more interactive and; ii) using different resources to reflect the different learning styles of attendee’s. Whilst these changes are important, it is also critical that the conciliatory style of the Change Programme remains so as to avoid the potential damaging impact of un-integrated ‘shaming’ rituals.

ii) Although programme facilitators contend that small group sizes and interactive sessions (such as the role-play) highlight who is and who isn’t actively engaging in the programme, there also needs to be a mechanism to formally measure participant’s accountability and active learning. Besides the research undertaken here, there is no audit trail for programme facilitators to accurately measure (or promote) knowledge uptake/attitude change. In theory attendee’s could leave without learning anything, so another recommendation is to incorporate an obligation to learn and to formally gauge participant knowledge/attitudinal change uptake (for example, through structured tests). Passing these could be made a condition of engagement in
the Change Programme. There is also scope to run sessions without formally testing knowledge uptake – a control group - and to then use this as a comparative measurement tool for recidivism rates.

iii) At the present time, arrestees with criminal records against women or those with previous prostitution offences are excluded from taking part in the Change Programme. Yet, the OSPT contend that these men have higher recidivism rates than Change Programme attendees. If the Change Programme is indeed capable of facilitating ‘change’ then there is no conceivable reason why the programme should be restricted to first time offenders. Admittedly such men are excluded on the basis that they tend to demonstrate more complex motivations which – as the ‘veteran’ data from this research has shown – are resistant to the programme’s content in its current format. Nevertheless, rather than simply accepting that these men are more likely to re-offend, it would seem reasonable to re-design the Programme in a way that attempts to address the unique challenges that such a group brings with them. Accordingly, the programme needs to be tailored to similarly motivated punters, via a risk needs assessment tool on arrest. Evidently, the Change Programme needs to be more responsive to ‘offender’s’ needs through the consideration of static factors (such as prostitution and/or sexual offence history) and dynamic factors (including sexual motivations and drug/alcohol addictions) (Craig et al, 2008).

There is also no reason – other than financial – why these core messages could not be used as part of broader preventative education programme beyond men caught paying for sex. Like Abt (2008:114), a number of respondents approached me during the research period and asked ‘why hasn’t anyone told us these things before’? On this basis, there is some justification for the promotion of these messages to a wider audience.

iv) Arguably, for the Change Programme to be truly effective in the long-term, there needs to be a process of aftercare support. At the very least respondents should be provided with detailed handout material and the provision of links/information on local and national support agencies. In the long-term there may be a requirement to develop this aftercare support in much the same way that Sweden has resourced the KAST programme (see Chapter 4).

v) Fault-lines in due process needs addressing as a matter of urgency. To a large extent, the recommendations of Wortley and Fischer (2002) are relevant here. Firstly, the inequity of language barriers needs to be rectified. This could be achieved by: 1) running the Change Programme in other languages (as is now being rolled out in Nottingham); 2) through the provision of interpreters on the day, or; 3) through distance learning (for example, by using WebEx or e-learning in the appropriate language). Of course all of these ‘solutions’ have pitfalls and cost implications, but without such changes the Programme will continue to be undermined.

---

266 Even if it is made virtually impossible to fail, the threat of a test may focus attendee’s attention.
Participants also need to be aware of the ‘no criminal record’ limitations of attending the course. A number of men were concerned that the ‘caution’ they received on arrest could potentially be picked up by future employers, voluntary agencies and other relevant organisations through enhanced criminal checks. In order to make an informed decision about whether or not to attend the Change Programme, all arrestees need to be made aware of this limitation well in advance of enrolment.

Finally, like Wortley and Fischer (2002) I would recommend using the Change Programme as a sentencing option. In other words, if arrestees do decide to contest the charge and are subsequently found guilty, then they still have the option of the Change Programme and the certainty of no criminal record.

vi) In line with the findings of Sanders (2008 and 2009) the principle focus of the Change Programme should be to promote safer sexual practices, less abusive forms of purchasing sex and practical guidance on maintaining healthy intimate relationships, rather than the eradication of prostitution per se. In other words, changing the scope of demand (particularly where harmful) is of more importance than reducing demand as a strategic objective. As alluded to above, this is realistic only in circumstances where there has been a paradigm shift in the way prostitution is regulated in the UK and an acceptance of the contradictions of UK prostitution policy (see below).

c) Working girl strategies

Rather than seeking to eradicate supply through the potentially ineffective imposition of ‘Compulsory Rehabilitation Orders’ and demand reduction strategies, policymakers should pursue a policy of harm reduction. Above all, the Government’s strategy of helping women exit prostitution is not one that can be rushed for the sake of meeting statistical and arbitrary political targets associated with prostitution reductions, and there needs to be a recognition that working girls might continue to ‘sex work’ on the streets while receiving support. There is also a personal perspective in that a woman is required to transform her life, including her income source, drug use, psychological health, stable housing, support network with other working girls and relationship with an abusive partner, for example. Too much change in too many areas at once is unfair and would undoubtedly fail, resulting in the support failing women who need it most. Moreover, some women may successfully ‘transform’ their lives around, but still continue to ‘sex work’, albeit in safer and more profitable circumstances. Where working girls have made this ‘decision’, any punitive interventions are liable to result in counter-productive repercussions.

Ultimately, that abused and vulnerable women should choose to sex work has tended to be overlooked in official discourse. Yet this is a much-needed debate: government policy will remain peripheral unless it is understood that the rhetoric of victimhood is frequently ignored by the women it seeks to assist.
**d) Future research**

There are a number of areas for future research that have been identified in this thesis:

* i) **Change Programme** – there is a general requirement to produce longitudinal and statistically significant research to validate or refute the findings presented in this thesis. In addition to building up the evidence-base about if and why the Change Programme is effective, more specifically, there is a obligation to better understand the socio-cultural constructions of punting – for example, amongst certain members of the Asian community - and how this impacts upon attitudinal resistance and future offending patterns. Finally, the results should be compared with research data from the other Change Programme’s operating in the UK to ascertain any regional variations.

* ii) **Demand recidivism research** – not enough is known about who re-offends and more importantly why. Consequently, research should be undertaken with street-level Change and non-Change recidivists - perhaps as part of a more comprehensive ‘National Prostitution Survey’ - to understand the motivation to continue paying for sex and the personal risk factors for such men.

* iii) **Other demand interventions** - as it stands we know very little about how other demand interventions work as a deterrent and/or their impact as an educational tool. Research should be undertaken with both punters and men tempted by commercial sex markets (but who have desisted from paying for sex) to evaluate the (additive) deterrent impact of measures such as poster campaigns, ‘beer mats’ and improved street lighting.

* iv) **Working girl research** – Nottingham’s street-level working girl population should continue to be monitored for their responses to changes in street-level sex markets and ‘compulsory’ engagement in rehabilitation.

* v) **The role of education** – can education at a young age challenge the prevailing socio-cultural messages about sex in a way that re-aligns the perceptions of prostitution as a legitimate activity?

**e) Challenging contradictions about ‘sexual cultures’**

According to Sanders (2008), policies that seek to criminalise the purchasing of sex are futile because late modernity has transformed sexual culture so comprehensively. That levels of demand (and supply) fluctuate according to the dominant socio-cultural environment perhaps challenge the notion that prostitution is inevitable. However, this is not the same as saying that ‘eradication’ is a realistic aim.
As a society, it would arguably be wrong to stand by and let misconceptions about selling street-level sex amongst vulnerable women go unchallenged. In this sense, the Change Programme, regardless of proven crime reduction impacts, has some value in confronting the ‘socio-cultural’ misconceptions and contradictions that have accumulated in the media and the ‘overall climate of contemporary and market forces’ (Sanders, 2008: 187). But the reality is that Change attendee’s still have to return to a culture that places primacy on the commodification of sex, the cultural constructions of female sexuality and the ‘power of sexual imagery’ (Hawkes, 1996:9). Egan et al (2006: xxvii) argue that this permeates life to such an extent that ‘our cultural imagination is simultaneously hypersexual (wanting sex, selling sex and making sex a spectacle)’. Add to this the impact of pornography and it is easy to empathise with the view from many commentators that eradicating prostitution is pure fantasy.

The reasons why men pay for, and women sell sex has been discussed widely in this thesis and it is not my intention to re-visit these motivational antecedents, nor to revisit the ways in which notions of ‘McSex’ (Blanchard 1994 in Monto, 2000) have become entrenched in late modern Western democracies. The point here is that in relation to ‘ways forward’, policymakers have a duty to face the obvious social contradictions inherent in current prostitution policy. As Sanders (2008:201) so astutely observes, ‘purchasing sex in the twenty-first century represents ‘the tensions between mass consumerism, the sexualisation of culture and the constraints of neo-liberal sexual conservatism’.

Taking on board the evolving problems of coercion, organised crime and drugs that have dogged the legalisation of ‘sex markets’ in the Netherlands, policymakers could seek to eradicate these social contradictions by pursuing local, action-research centred, realist policies that seek to reduce harm, rather than adopting policies that unrealistically pursue the eradication of demand in all locations. Additionally, there is some validity in ‘educating’ men about the vulnerability of working girls and the emotional/relational impact that punting can have. It is right that ways are found for working girls and communities to co-exist harmoniously and that residents should not expect to be solicited or be exposed to the negative consequences of street-level prostitution. It is right to use a multi-agency framework - free from compulsion and stigmatisation – as a tool to support working girls in the psychological and pragmatic challenges they face. Balancing these disparate objectives is clearly a major challenge, particularly in a regulatory regime that has so far proved largely unsuccessful.

While not subscribing to a general philosophy of the inevitability of prostitution, what is not likely is that prostitution will go away in the immediate foreseeable future when commercial sex and the marketing of sex and desire so obviously permeates all aspects of modern life, including the marketing of consumer produce and art. In this sense, education has its limitations in terms of deterrence and recidivism. As long as the current socio-cultural conditions persist, then a far more realistic short/medium-term aim is not to expect policy to result in desistance from all prostitution activities, but to use policy to encourage men to pay for sex safely and in ways that do not contribute to women’s abuses and vulnerabilities. The unfortunate paradox is that if this
message is successfully taken to all street-level punters, then the market for street-level girls will inevitably decline (rather than be displaced), thus making these women more vulnerable and exposed to risky behaviours. Once again, this would suggest that the regulatory model needs to be re-assessed away from the lens of abolitionism, so that ways are found to allow these women to work safely and collectively in off-street locations. Such a legislative change sends out the message that begins to ‘remove the ambiguous social status of those working in sex industries and instead replace the stigma with the status of sexual labourer and professional’ (Sanders, 2008:206).

From here, in the long-term, British society has to decide if the sexual commodification of every facet of life is a trajectory it is happy with. If it is not, then – assuming that it is possible to reverse these entrenched socio-cultural conditions - there may be further scope to reduce the demand for prostitution yet further. Whether or not this is the right thing to do will remain the subject of much debate and research.
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Appendix A: Selected Punter Socio-demographic Data – 2001 Census Data for England and Wales vs (Inter)national/Local Research Data

**Age**

**Table 1a: Age Breakdown by 2001 Census (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001 Census Data (England and Wales) Males age 15+, n=20,293,252</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1b: Age Breakdown by Male Punter Sample (%)**: National Studies vs 2001 Census Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001 Census Data –collapsed (England and Wales). Age range 15-59, n = 15,549,417</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellings et al (1994) – Natsal (1990) - n= 540 (6.8% of base 7941) Area: National</td>
<td>7.4 (16-24 years)</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 Census Data –collapsed (England and Wales). Age range 15-44, n = 10,669,105</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellings et al (1994) – Natsal (1990) - n= 336 Base: Age 16-44 only Area: National</td>
<td>12.0 (16-24 years)</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward et al (2005) - Natsal (2000) - n= 197 (4.2% of base 4699) Area: National</td>
<td>20.9 (16-24 years)</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wortley and Fischer (2002), n= 366 Area: Toronto, Canada</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1c: Age Breakdown by Census (%) and Male ‘Punter’ Sample (%): Regional Studies vs 2001 Census data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Radford (2007)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2004-6, n=574, Area: Nottingham)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2001 Census Data (Nottingham), Males age 15+, n= 107,099</strong></td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brooks-Gordon (2006), n=505, Area: London</strong></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2001 Census Data (Inner London), Males age 15+, n=1,081,751</strong></td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shell (2001), n=45, Area: Southampton</strong></td>
<td>1.0 (17-19 years)</td>
<td>21.0 (21-29 years)</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2001 Census Data (Southampton), Males age 15+, n= 89,750</strong></td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kinnell (1989), n=126, Area: Birmingham</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boyle (1994), n=760, Area: Birmingham (excludes unknown values, n=127)</strong></td>
<td>0.7 (17-19 years)</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benson and Matthews (1995a), n=280, Area: Birmingham and Norwich</strong></td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2001 Census Data (Birmingham), Males age 15+, n= 363,780</strong></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1c cont: Age Breakdown by Census (%) and Male ‘Punter’ Sample (%): Regional Studies vs 2001 Census data

|----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|
| **WYPA (1998/9), n= 71**  
Area: West Yorkshire | N/A  | 28.0 (19-30 years) | 58.0 (31-50 years) | 14.0 (51-60 years) | N/A  |
| **2001 Census Data (Leeds), Males age 15+, n= 277,245** | 8.7  | 10.3  | 9.0   | 27.6  | 22.1  | 22.3  |

|----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|
| **Faugier and Cranfield (1995), n = 120**  
Area: Manchester | Respondents ranged in age from 19 to 61 years old. The mean age of respondents was 39 years (compared to 38.65 for England and Wales). No other age profile information given |
| **McKeganey & Barnard (1996), n= 143**  
Area: Glasgow | Respondents ranged in age from 21 to 60 years old. The mean age of respondents was 36.8 years (compared to 38.65 for England and Wales). No other age profile information given |

Ethnicity

Table 2a: Ethnicity Breakdown by 2001 Census and NATSAL (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White British</th>
<th>White other</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Asian Indian</th>
<th>Asian Pakistan</th>
<th>Asian Bangladeshi</th>
<th>Asian Other</th>
<th>Black Caribbean</th>
<th>Black African</th>
<th>Other Black</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2001 Census Data (England and Wales) Age 15+, n=20,293,252</strong></td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Area: National | 87.2 | - | - | 1.6 | <0.1 | - | - | 3.4 | 1.3 | - | 6.8 |
## Table 2b: Ethnicity Breakdown by Census (%) and Male ‘Punter’ Sample (%): Regional Studies vs 2001 Census data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White British</th>
<th>White other</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Asian Indian</th>
<th>Asian Pakistan</th>
<th>Asian Bangladeshi</th>
<th>Asian Other</th>
<th>Black Caribbean</th>
<th>Black African</th>
<th>Other Black</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2001 Census Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nottingham - all)</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Radford (2007)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Radford 2007) for</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>year 2004, n=93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area: Nottingham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Radford (2007)</strong></td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Radford 2007) for</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>year 2005, n=238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Radford (2007)</strong></td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Radford 2007) for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>years 2004-6, n=574</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White British</th>
<th>White other</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Asian Indian</th>
<th>Asian Pakistan</th>
<th>Asian Bangladeshi</th>
<th>Asian Other</th>
<th>Black Caribbean</th>
<th>Black African</th>
<th>Other Black</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2001 Census Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Manchester - all)</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faugier and Cranfield (1995)</strong></td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area: Manchester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White British</th>
<th>White other</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Asian Indian</th>
<th>Asian Pakistan</th>
<th>Asian Bangladeshi</th>
<th>Asian Other</th>
<th>Black Caribbean</th>
<th>Black African</th>
<th>Other Black</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2001 Census Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Southampton - all)</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shell (2001)</strong></td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area: Southampton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2b cont: Ethnicity Breakdown by Census (%) and Male ‘Punter’ Sample (%): Regional Studies vs 2001 Census data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White British</th>
<th>White other</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Asian Indian</th>
<th>Asian Pakistan</th>
<th>Asian Bangladeshi</th>
<th>Asian Other</th>
<th>Black Caribbean</th>
<th>Black African</th>
<th>Other Black</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2001 Census Data (Liverpool - all) n= 439,479</strong></td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campbell (1998); n= 28 Area: Liverpool</strong></td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White British</th>
<th>White other</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Asian Indian</th>
<th>Asian Pakistan</th>
<th>Asian Bangladeshi</th>
<th>Asian Other</th>
<th>Black Caribbean</th>
<th>Black African</th>
<th>Other Black</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2001 Census Data (London - all) n= 7,172,091</strong></td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brooks-Gordon (2006); n= 504 Area: London</strong></td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on ‘apparent’ ethnicity

Table 2c: International data by ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>White other</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Asian (Chinese)</th>
<th>Asian Other</th>
<th>Black (non-specified)</th>
<th>Other Black</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freund et al (1991); n= 101 Area: Camden, NJ</strong></td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Marital Status of Punters

Table 3a: Marital Status Breakdown by Census (%) and Male ‘Punter’ Sample (%): Regional/National Studies vs 2001 Census data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Description</th>
<th>Living in a couple</th>
<th>Not living in a couple</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married/ remarried</td>
<td>Co-habiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 Census Data (England and Wales) Males Age 16+, n= 19,554,122</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward et al (2005) - Natsal (2000) - n= 197 (4.2% of base 4699) Area: National</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellings et al (1994) – Natsal (1990) - n= 540 (6.8% of base 7941) Area: National</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faugier and Cranfield (1995), n = 120 Area: Manchester</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKeeganey &amp; Barnard (1996), n= 143 Area: Glasgow</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYPA (1998/9), n= 71 Area: West Yorkshire</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell (2001), n=45 Area: Southampton</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell (1998), n= 28 Area: Liverpool</td>
<td>68.0 (includes 14% as steady non-cohabiting relationship)</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson and Matthews (1995a), n= 280 Area: Birmingham and Norwich</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLeod (1982), Area: Birmingham</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

85% reported they were married
65% reported they were married or co-habiting
### Table 3b: Marital Status – International Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area: San Francisco &amp; Portland</td>
<td>41.0 (not specified whether living in a couple)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area: Vancouver</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area: Toronto, Canada</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Employment status/economic activity

#### Table 4a: Employment Status/Economic Activity Breakdown by Census (%) and Male ‘Punter’ Sample (%): Regional Studies vs 2001 Census data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economically Active (73.8% of base)</th>
<th>Economically Inactive (26.2%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed P/T (&lt;30 hours)</td>
<td>Employed F/T (30+ hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 Census Data (England and Wales) Males Age 16-74</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 Census Data: England and Wales High and Low Values</td>
<td>6.3 (Tower Hamlets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 (Mid-Beds)</td>
<td>32.7 (Ceredigion, Wales)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell (2001), n=45 Area: S’ton</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell (1998), n= 28 Area: Liverpool</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson &amp; Matthews (1995a), n= 280 Area: Birmingham and Norwich</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4b: Employment Status/Economic Activity Breakdown – International Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Employed P/T (&lt;30 hours)</th>
<th>Employed F/T (30+ hours)</th>
<th>Self Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>F/T Student</th>
<th>Retired</th>
<th>Looking After Home/Family</th>
<th>Sick</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radford (2007) for years 2004-6, n=502</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnard &amp; McKeeganey (1996)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 per cent of respondents unemployed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy et al., (2004), n=734</td>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minto and Mcree (2005), n=1633</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0 (described as ‘other’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wortley and Fischer (2002), n=362</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Mr _____________

RE: CHANGE COURSE – KERB CRAWLING REHABILITATION SCHEME

Date of course: Saturday 8th September 2007

I write following you recently being stopped in the vice area of Nottingham after which you were arrested and reported for summons for kerb crawling.

I have now reviewed the evidence within the file submitted by the arresting officer and I can confirm that strong evidence has been obtained, sufficient to serve a court summons upon you for the purposes of prosecuting you for the offence of kerb crawling.

I am, however, able to offer you an invitation to attend a one-day kerb crawling rehabilitation course to be held at Central Police Station, North Church Street, Nottingham. This course is offered as an alternative to a court appearance, but is not in any way a softer option. It is run by the police with a Chartered Forensic and Clinical Psychologist. Your attendance, along with other offenders, is dependant upon the following:

1. An acceptance of the allegation against you.
2. Payment of an attendance fee of £200 (cheque or postal order only).
3. Attendance and full participation within the course.

If candidates satisfactorily complete and fully participate on the course then you will be issued with an official caution for the offence of kerb crawling and you will not then be required to go to court. You will also be expected to sign an Acceptable Behaviour Contract regarding your future conduct. The course begins at 8.30am and finishes at approximately 5.15pm. Lunch, coffee and tea will be supplied. Please report to the front office at the police station. A map showing directions is enclosed.

This course is being independently verified and your progress will be monitored.

The fee requested is set at an average fine issued by Magistrates for conviction of this type of offence, so you are not being asked to pay any more than a court would probably fine you for this offence. It is used to cover all administrative costs incurred with running the course. There will, however, be a small sum remaining which will be distributed by the charity administering
the process amongst community schemes operating within the area in which the offence took place.

Should you accept the allegation made against you and wish to take up the offer of attending this course, then please complete the tear off strip below and send it to the following address, together with a cheque or postal order for £200 payable to:

**Change Course**

Change Course [ANON ADDRESS]

Payment in full must be received within 14 days of this dated letter. If payment is not received then it is presumed that the offer is declined with the non-acceptance of the allegation made against you. As such, we will choose to reinstate court proceedings and a summons to court will be issued against you. By dealing with the matter in this way may require the notification of this offence to employers of those with notifiable convictions.

If you have any questions then please feel free to contact me on the telephone number at the top of this letter.

Yours sincerely

[xxxx], PS lxxxx
Kerb Crawling and Prostitution Task Force
Nottinghamshire Police

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------- please tear off here -------------------------------------------

**CHANGE COURSE – KERB CRAWLING REHABILITATION SCHEME**

Name: ________________
Course date: 08/09/2007

I acknowledge receipt of this letter and wish to state the following:

i. I accept the allegation made against me and wish to be allocated a place on the next available course.

ii. I enclose a cheque or postal order for £200.

iii. I will attend and participate fully on the scheme.

iv. I will accept a caution for the offence.

v. I will agree to an Acceptable Behaviour Contract re my future conduct.

Date: .................................

Signed: ........................................................................................................
Appendix C: HA1 Informed Consent Form

Reducing Demand, Controlling Supply: Evaluating New Street-Level Prostitution Policy Interventions in Nottingham

Consent Form Information

Description of Study:

I am undertaking research based at Nottingham Trent University (NTU) as part of a postgraduate research degree. The research will look at the impact of policies operating within Nottingham that attempt to:

- Reduce re-offending amongst ‘kerb-crawlers’,
- Stop men paying for sex in the first place and
- Help with ‘exiting’ for street-level ‘sex workers’

An organization called the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) is funding me throughout the research, but apart from that connection I am working independently. I intend to present the key findings of the study, although the exact format and dates has yet to be decided. If you are interested in receiving these key findings, then copies will be available - via [HA1] - on completion of the project.

Project Participation: What Will You Need To Do?

To participate in the research, all you need do is complete and sign the consent form at the back of this document. It is expected that interviews will last up to an hour and, with permission, all interviews will be tape-recorded. We want to know how your experiences of prostitution have shaped what you think about the world around you. Your contribution is crucial to achieving the aims of the project because it will help (a) establish whether polices designed to ‘tackle’ street-level prostitution have benefited you and (b) find out ways in which policy could be improved in the future.
Are There Any Risks to You?

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary; you can refuse to answer any questions that you are uncomfortable with, or to end your participation in the study at any time. All NTU staff involved in this project\(^1\) are obliged to sign a guarantee to protect your information. Your answers are completely anonymous and there is no way for anybody else to connect you with anything that you say in the interview. Please note, however, that if you were to disclose any information that gives us cause for concern for you or another, we will need to pass this on and will tell you why.

Vouchers

As a thank you for your contribution to the research, we would like to offer you a £20 voucher redeemable at either Boots, Wilkos, WH Smith, Tesco or Asda\(^2\).

Project Contacts: Who Can You Contact for More Information and Post Interview Support?

If you have questions about the study or about your rights as a participant, please ask NTU staff at any time throughout the interview. We realize that talking about sensitive issues, such as prostitution, can be distressing for many people. If you need somebody to talk to as a result of the things that we have talked about today, then please contact the Mental Health Support Team from HLG at any point after the interview.

You may keep this form for your records.

Thank you for your cooperation.

---

\(^1\) Which consists of myself, my three University supervisors and an independent University colleague present here today

\(^2\) It is expected that you will have chosen your retail store voucher prior to the interview session – this will ensure that your voucher can be given to you on the day, rather than forwarded on at a later date.
**Consent Form**

This consent form is to check that you are happy with the information that you have received so far, that you are aware of your rights as a participant and to confirm that you wish to take part in the study.

*Please tick as appropriate*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Have you been made aware of the research topic?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Have you had the opportunity to discuss the research with the researcher?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you understand that you are free to refuse to answer any questions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you understand that you are free to withdraw from the research at any time?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you understand that the researcher will use all information confidentially* and anonymously?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are you happy for the interview to be tape-recorded?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do you agree to have another independent observer present throughout the interview?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Do you agree to take part in this study?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In the event of information disclosed that gives us cause for concern for you or another, we will need to pass this on and will tell you why

Signed: __________________________________________

Print name: _____________________________________

Date: ___________________________________________
Appendix D: HA1 Interview Topic Guide

Epistemological presupposition(s): life experiences [marked by where we are situated socially] have a significant bearing on how we give meaning to our lives and the wider social world. This presupposition is reflected in the determination for the fieldwork to examine the heterogeneous experiences of a supposedly homogeneous group (the group in question being street-'prostitutes’). Exploring this heterogeneity of experience will allow for a greater understanding of which policies are most likely to work for whom and in what circumstances they are most likely to be effective.

NOTE: the following is a broad-based topic guide. It is likely that tangential discussions will appear over and above these topic guides throughout the course of the fieldwork. All respondents will be reminded that they are free to withdraw from the research at any point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HA1</th>
<th>Interview Schedule – TOP LINE TOPIC GUIDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) <strong>Consent form discussion</strong> including full background information underpinning the thesis and the ways in which (and where) the research will be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Upon agreement, <strong>tape recording</strong> to commence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Brief discussion on <strong>preferred terminology</strong> as a gentle ‘introduction’ to the research – consistency of language used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Having defined the most appropriate language, <strong>interview process to begin</strong> with:-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exploring interviewee’s involvement in street-level prostitution

- I guess the most logical place to begin the interview is by asking what has been the nature of your involvement in prostitution?
  **PROBE** if necessary and **INCLUDE**: age of entry, how long involved and region(s) operated in

- Looking back, do you understand how you got involved in prostitution in the first instance?
PROBE and if necessary discuss the ‘big 5’ - (i) drugs/alcohol misuse (ii) family background (any exposure to ‘abuse’) (iii) ‘peer pressure’ to enter prostitution (iv) the role of growing up in Local Authority care and, underpinning all of this, (v) the presence/feminisation of poverty – [EXERT EXTREME CAUTION IN HOW THESE SENSITIVE ISSUES BROACHED]

• Did you feel as though you had any other realistic options at the time you began to engage in prostitution activities?

PROBE if necessary

NOTE: at this point explain to respondents that some of the issues relating to ‘entry’ and ‘exiting’ are areas that I would like to come back to at a later point if time allows. In the interim, I would like to discuss respondent’s interactions with the CJS (in particular the police) and ‘hypothetical’ policy scenarios.
The Criminal Justice System (CJS) and multi-agency approaches

- Explore the relationship with the police incl.
  - Consistency
  - Laissez-faire?
  - Nature of relationship
  - Trust and protection
  - Abuse of power
  - Community vs. innocent victim
  - Police avoidance techniques
  - Do the police make any difference in aiding ‘exiting’?
- Did respondents’ prostitution activities ever result in arrest?
- If YES to the above, what was the CJS process like and did it make respondents consider ‘exiting’ prostitution?
- ASBO’s—experiences and attitudes (there will potentially be ‘exiting’ issues here)
- Would legalisation or decriminalisation (including concepts of ‘toleration zones’) of prostitution be a good thing? PROBE IN THE CONTEXT OF WHETHER IMPROVING WORKING CONDITIONS MORE IMPORTANT THAN UNREALISTIC CRIMINALISATION.
- Attitudes towards ‘naming and shaming’ (exiting)
- Experiences of environmental measures (exiting)
- PROBE for awareness of multi-agency approach/experiences [as briefed by [ANON], interviewee’s may be aware of ‘names’ of individuals rather than the organisation itself- PROBE if necessary]
- Does the CJS deal effectively with violence (from ‘punters’, pimps and other ‘girls’) against women involved in prostitution? Is there a view held amongst some in the CJS, that ‘prostitutes’ are un-rapeable?
- Did respondents feel the ‘carrot’ or the ‘stick’ more? How did/do they react to ‘carrot’? And ‘stick’?
- FOR THE FOLLOWING QUESTION, EXERCISE EXTRA SENSITIVITY: Can I ask if you have any children? IF YES: did your involvement in prostitution have any implications for your children, particularly in relation to the CJS? How did you feel and would it/did it have any role in re-assessing your involvement in prostitution?
- Do respondents think that the police should crack down on prostitution generally, and street-level prostitution specifically? Why?
Demand and supply: is tackling demand for sex the Holy Grail?

- Have demand reductions been experienced?
- Demand reductions discussions to incl. (i) can Sweden work in Nottingham? (ii) views on the ‘Change’ programme and (iii) why do respondents think it is mostly men that pay for sex
- **NOTE:** IT IS UNLIKELY THAT ‘SWEDEN’ AND ‘CHANGE’ WILL MEAN MUCH TO RESPONDENTS – FULL EXPLANATION REQUIRED.
- **IN ISSUES RELATING TO ‘PUNTERS’, PROBE VIEWS ON ‘KC’S’, REGULAR CUSTOMERS, HETEROGENIETY OF CUSTOMER BASE, WHAT CLIENTS ARE LOOKING FOR**
- Out of sight, out of mind? Implications on women’s lives and interrelationship between on and off-street markets. Is off-street prostitution a real option?
- Relationship between safe sex and changes in demand?
- Would criminalizing demand make prostitution less safe?
- Will prostitution always be with us? Why?
Exploring what works – ‘PULL’ VERSUS ‘PUSH’

- How do respondents feel they were/could be helped out of prostitution?
- Why did/do respondents want to exit?
- Are issues of poverty still prevalent in respondent’s lives?
- Are there/have there been any blockages that have/will prevent exiting from prostitution? NOTE, THERE MAY BE ISSUES OF COERCION AND 3RD PARTY (‘PIMPS’/BOYFRIEND) INFLUENCES HERE
- Explore experiences and knowledge of housing, social services, welfare and benefit systems (including child care facilities)
- Role of education, rehabilitation, employment and training opportunities in exiting
- Is mentoring important?
NOTE: the following subjects may have already been discussed in the course of the interview. These are all ‘nice to knows’, but time restrictions may prevent further discussion. Where time permits, some or all of these issues may be discussed with respondents.

Abuse and coercion as barriers to exiting and precursors to entry

- Do respondents feel that their involvement (initial and continued) in prostitution was/is the result of ‘free choice’ or ‘coercion’?
- NOTE: In other words, there will be an exploration of issues of agency and notions of victimhood. If respondents deny the presence of ‘coercion’, then mention feminist perspective of ‘false consciousness’ (but not confrontational or using this terminology)?
- Role of pimps/boyfriends (on a continuum of pimping) in respondent’s involvement in prostitution?
- Prevalence and nature of violence (sexual, physical and mental) related to prostitution (that is, from ‘clients’ and/or ‘pimps'/boyfriends)

Coping mechanisms and the impact of ‘labelling’

- Many commentators have talked in detail about the ‘whore stigma’. Was this something that respondents encountered inside (and outside of) prostitution? How did they cope with this labelling (if applicable)?
- What mechanisms were employed to cope psychologically with the demands of the ‘job’ (if applicable)?
- Was there any point where they got job satisfaction/ever enjoyed being involved in prostitution?
- Is involvement in prostitution ‘immoral’?
### Social exclusion, social capital and community cohesion

- Have respondents ever felt empowered? For example, through challenging patriarchal images of femininity, whereby society dictates the role of the woman is to be a good wife, a good girl, reliable and passive
- Were there ever any conflicts with local residents? How were these resolved?
- Any engagement in local community activities or part of any local groups/forums?
- Exploring any involvement with prostitute rights organisations
- What do respondents think that the communities in which they operated and society at large thought about them? Do they care? Could respondents ever be considered outside of the ‘prostitute’ label?
- Do/did respondents feel excluded socially (for example, access to housing and health facilities) when engaged in prostitution?
- Do/did respondents feel part of a community when involved in prostitution?
- Do communities suffer from the effects of street-prostitution in their neighbourhoods?
- And businesses?
- And any impact on local residents quality of life?
- Discussions relating to linkages between crime and prostitution – personal experiences
**Socio-demographic & background information**

- Marital status, educational qualifications, schooling experience, employment status/history, ethnicity - pre and post involvement in street-prostitution
- Socially, were respondents readily able to mix with community members not engaged in prostitution? Were respondents open about their prostitution activities to their non-‘prostitute’ friends?
- Explore attitudes towards the commodification of women in society generally – for example, what do respondents think of ‘Nuts’, ‘FHM’, lap dancing and pornography

**General**

- Is prostitution cultural, sociological or biological? In other words is there an inherent innateness about it?
- What role do respondents think the media plays in shaping public perceptions of prostitution?
- Does prostitution affect self-esteem?
- It has been said that the presence of prostitution is a visible manifestation of male dominance in society. Do you agree?

**The ‘clients’ and ‘pimps’**

- Awareness/involvement in ‘ugly mugs’ scheme?
- What percentage of money earned from prostitution did respondents get to keep?
- What do respondents think about men generally?
- Has prostitution affected attitudes towards ‘conventional’ relationships?
- Exploration of any involvement with ‘pimps’ [at any point on the continuum of ‘pimping’]
- **IF YES to the previous question** – Are there any positive benefits? Any negative effects?
Appendix E: Interview Schedule with ‘Martin’ (OSPT): 17th November 2007

Background Info

I guess the first question I’d like to ask you is about the structure of the OSPT. Who is currently in the team and what are their roles?

Can I ask a little bit about the history behind the OSPT. What happened before the unit was set up? When was the unit set up? Why was the unit set up? Does the set up differ now to the original set up & do you anticipate any changes to the structure moving forwards? How has the unit evolved over the years?

Do you work with any other organisations? Who? How? Why? Does this work? Are there any groups that you don’t work with, but think you should? Are there any conflicts?

Does the team have such a thing as a ‘mission statement’ and if not, can I ask what outputs are used to measure success? Is this realistic?

Why do you think that more forces don’t have a dedicated unit for the control of prostitution? Would you like to see a national set-up?

Are there any ways in which you think the team could work more effectively; either internally or with regards to its’ workings externally?

What do you think Nottingham’s street-level sex markets would look like if the OSPT didn’t exist? Do Nottingham’s street markets look different to other cities markets?

Are there any structural or financial barriers to you being even more successful?

The Law & policing

Can you clarify what the situation is with regards to the law and prostitution? What are the offences and how are they punished? What are the maximum sentences? How are ‘punters’ and ‘working girls’ processed by the police? ASBO’s…any breaches & if so, what happens? How do you determine who should go on the Change Programme? Is this consistent?

Why should we criminalise prostitution? Do you think that we should ever contemplate decriminalisation or legalisation? What about going down the ‘Swedish’ route, and criminalising demand only?
In your opinion is it realistic to only use the agencies of the CJS to control sexual behaviours? Would the CJS have the same effect for occasional versus habitual users of ‘working girls’? In other words, how does the CJS challenge underlying motivations?

For those men who are ‘habitual’ users of prostitutes, what do you think is the best way of dealing with them and why is it realistic to assume that demand for street-level prostitution can be ‘designed out’ through ‘situational crime prevention’ measures and deterrence?

Do you have any evidence (for or against), that the measures operating in Nottingham have displaced the ‘problem’ of street-level prostitution?

**Change Programme**

With regards to the Change Programme specifically, in what ways do you think the programme works, for whom is it effective and in what circumstances?

What do you think about the current curriculum?

Are the Change Programme and the OSPT effective at challenging the causes rather than symptoms of paying for sex?

Are there any challenges/areas for improvement with the Change Programme?

**Facts and Figures**

How many women have reoffended a) from the ‘Change’ programme and b) not on the Change Programme?

How many men have gone through the Programme?

How many men have you arrested that haven’t gone through the Programme?

How many women do you estimate have left prostitution since the inception of the unit? Has any follow-up analysis taken place with this group? What are these women doing now?

How many women left in prostitution in Nottingham (estimate)?

**Theoretical Stuff & ad-hoc**

In your opinion....
(i) Are ‘working girls’ victims?
(ii) Are concepts of ‘choice’ relevant when considering whether or not to sex work?

Why don’t more men pay for sex? Why don’t more women pay for sex?

Do we do enough to understand the reasons why men pay for sex? What preventative measures are in place? Does the ‘stick’ approach work for all men and if not, what can we do differently? Do you agree with ‘naming and shaming’?

Are social factors or innate biological factors more responsible for men paying for sex? Is paying for sex ever about sex and if so how can these desires get re-channelled?

For example….do you think that there are any links between an increasingly sexualised society and the demand for paid sex? In other words, do you think that the proliferation of lap dancing bars, sex toys in Boots, lads mags and so on makes your job more difficult?
If YES…..what can you do to counteract this?
If NO….why do you say that?

If and how do you think that demand and supply are connected in street-level sex markets?

Related to this, in a demand reduced world, what will the consequences be for those women who continue to have problematic drug usage?

What are the links between prostitution and drugs?

Is there a ‘type’ of man that pays for sex? For example, are most men in relationships? Is there a noticeable ethnic breakdown? Are there different socio-economic explanations in the demand for paid sex?

How do men pay for sex? What are the crime scripts? Are there patterns?

To summarise, in terms of paying for sex, do we think we know enough about the ‘how’, ‘why’ and ‘who’?
Appendix F: Original Research (Punters) Recruitment Draft Letter (not utilised)

A Safer Nottinghamshire For All

Nottinghamshire Police
Oxclose Lane Police Station
Nottingham
Tel: [ANON]
Fax: [ANON]
19/04/2006

Dear Mr A.N.OTHER

Change Programme: Saturday 7th August 2004

I am writing to you following your attendance on the above course. I know from speaking to you at the time that you found this to be a beneficial and worthwhile experience. I am sure that this is something that you wanted to put behind you, but I am now asking for your help. It is the intention to have an independent review of the Change Programme carried out by Nottingham Trent University. The reason for this is to provide an evaluation of the success, or otherwise, of the course with a view towards developing and improving the process. By this means we will be able to offer this service to more men with greater effect.

I should stress that at this stage, no personal information regarding yourself has been disclosed to anyone at the University, nor will this happen without your consent.

The purpose of writing this letter is to ask for your co-operation in this process. This will be by means of a researcher contacting you to ask a series of scripted questions. The means of contact can be negotiated and may be in person at a location of your choice or by telephone. If a telephone is used, you may be asked a few questions to prove your identity. This researcher will be from the university and will not be a police employee.

There will be a degree of confidentiality similar to that on the day of the course. If you were to disclose that you had used prostitutes since the course or a related minor crime, then this information will not be disclosed to the police in any format that would identify you. Everything will be anonymous data. However, I should point out that any disclosure of a serious crime, such as child abuse or assault etc, will be passed to the police and an investigation would be likely to follow. With this one proviso, this information will be used solely for the purposes of this research.

The information you disclose will only be available to the researchers. It will be securely stored at the university for the duration of the research. Following this the data will be stored anonymously and any reference to you as an individual will be destroyed. In the case of computer data this will be by permanent deletion. In the case of any written or paper records, then this will be by secure destruction. Nothing that can identify you will be used in any publication of this review. No one other than the researchers and the police will be aware of your attendance on the Change Programme or your involvement in this review.

Additionally, a check will be made to see if any offences related to the use of prostitutes anywhere in England or Wales have been brought against you since your attendance on the course. With your permission, this will also be used in the review. No information regarding unrelated offences will be disclosed.

I ask that you sign the attached form authorising me to pass your details on to the researchers for this purpose only.
Many thanks in anticipation.

‘Martin’, PS [ANON]
Nottinghamshire Police
A Safer Nottinghamshire For All

Please complete this section and return it to the police as per the address on the front page.

Consent for disclosure of personal and contact details.

I, the undersigned, hereby give consent for the police to provide my personal and contact details to researchers at Nottingham Trent University for the purpose of evaluating the Change Programme. I understand that a limited confidentiality will apply, but any serious crimes disclosed may be referred to the police.

I also understand that any personal details of mine will be securely stored and destroyed at the conclusion of the review so that only anonymous details will remain.

I confirm that I have read and understand the attached letter.

Name: A.N.OTHER
Date of birth: 01/01/1999
Date of attendance on Change Programme: 07/08/2004

Signature authorising above:

Preferred means of contact by researchers:

Refusal of Consent for disclosure of personal and contact details.

I, the undersigned, do not give consent for the police to disclose any information relating to me, my participation in the Change Programme or any reasons for my being on the said course. This will include all personal information such as my name etc.

I confirm that I have read and understand the attached letter.

Name: A.N.OTHER
Date of birth: 01/01/1999
Date of attendance on Change Programme: 07/08/2004

Signature not authorising above:
Appendix G: Change Programme Questionnaire (Before Session)

Before Session Survey – ‘Change Programme evaluation’. Remember, it will not be possible to match your answers with who you are. It is important that you do NOT put your name on this survey.

Q1. What is your year of birth? __________

Q2. How would you describe yourself [tick ONE box only]:

- White
  - British
  - Irish
  - Other (please write in) ______________________

- Mixed
  - White and Black Caribbean
  - White and Black African
  - White and Asian
  - Any other mixed background (please write in) _______

- Asian/Asian British
  - Indian
  - Bangladeshi
  - Pakistani
  - Chinese
  - Other South Asian background (please write in) _______
  - Other East Asian background (please write in) _______

- Black/Black British
  - Caribbean
  - African
  - Other black background (please write in) _______

Q3. What is your current marital status? [Tick ONE box only]

- Married/living with long-term partner
- Separated
- Divorced
- Widowed
- Single (never married) and living with parent(s)/relative
- Single (never married) and living with friends
- Single (never married) and living alone

Q4. What city/town did you live in at the time of arrest by the On Street Prostitution Team? _______________________________________

Q5. What is your HIGHEST academic qualification [tick ONE box only]:

- School leaver with no qualifications
- CSE/O’level/GCSE
- NVQ/GNVQ
- A-level
- Undergraduate Degree
- Post-graduate Degree
- Other (please write in) ________________
Q6. Are you currently employed? [Tick ONE box only]

- Employed full-time (35+ hours per week)  GO TO Q7
- Employed part-time (less than 35 hours per week)  GO TO Q7
- Self-employed  GO TO Q7
- Unemployed/laid off  GO TO Q8
- Studying full-time  GO TO Q8
- Not in labour force (retired, disabled, volunteer)  GO TO Q8
- Other (please write in) ____________________________  GO TO Q9

Q7. Which of the following best describes your main job [Tick ONE box only]:

- Manager/Senior Official
- Professional Occupation
- Associate Professional/Technical Occupation
- Administrative/Secretarial Occupation
- Skilled Trades Occupation
- Personal Service Occupation
- Sales and Customer Service Occupation
- Process, Plant and Machine Operative
- Other manual Occupation
- Other (please write in) ___________________________________________________

Q8. Were you given the choice of whether or not to attend the ‘Change programme’?

- Yes
- No

IF YES TO ABOVE: Which of the following was the MOST IMPORTANT reason you chose to attend today? [Tick ONE box only]

- To find out more about street-level prostitution
- Avoid work finding out
- Avoid friends finding out
- Avoid wife or partner knowing
- Avoid conviction
- Avoid criminal record
- Other (please state reason) ___________________________________________________

Q9. Which ONE of the following is the MAIN reason you decided to and/or attempted to have sex with a street-prostitute(s) [Tick ONE only]:

- I struggle to attract women and it was a quick and easy way to get sex
- They (street-prostitutes) need the money and I help them by paying them for sex
- I liked the power of being able to pick whom to have sex with
- Don’t have to worry about having a relationship
- It was exciting
- I felt horny
- They will do things sexually that other women won’t
- I liked the risk
- Other (please write in) ___________________________________________________
Q10. Do you think that it should be legal for someone **over 18 years old** to **get paid** for sex if they choose to do so?

- Yes
- No

Q11. Do you think that it should be legal for someone **between 16-17 years old** to **get paid** for sex if they choose to do so?

- Yes
- No

Q12. If you were to guess:

   How many prostitutes do you think there are in Great Britain?

   ___________________________________________________________

Q13. If you were to guess:

   How many men/sexual encounters does the average street-prostitute have sexual contact with over a 12-month period?

   ___________________________________________________________

Q14. If you were to guess:

   What is the worst punishment (in a British Court of Law) that can be given to a man caught paying for sex with a street-prostitute between the ages of 16-17 years old?

   ___________________________________________________________

Q15. If you were to guess:

   What is the worst punishment (in a British Court of Law) that can be given to a man caught paying for sex with a street-prostitute over the age of 18 years old?

   ___________________________________________________________

Q16. How old were you the first time you paid a street-prostitute for sexual contact?

   ___________________________________________________________
Q17. How many times in your life have you paid a street-prostitute for sexual contact? [Tick ONE box only]

- Once
- 2-5 times
- 6-10 times
- 10-20 times
- 20-30 times
- Over 30 times

Q18. When was the last time you paid a street-prostitute for sexual contact (not counting the situation that led to your attendance here today)? [Tick ONE box only]

- More than 6 months ago   GO TO Q19
- 3-6 months ago          GO TO Q19
- Within the past 3 months GO TO Q19
- Not applicable – this was my first time   GO TO Q22

Q19. Have you ever paid a street-prostitute for sex in Britain, but outside of Nottingham or Nottinghamshire?

- Yes
- No

IF YES TO ABOVE, how many times have you paid for sex with a street-prostitute in Britain (outside of Nottingham/Nottinghamshire)? [Tick ONE box only]

- Once
- 2-5 times
- 6-10 times
- 10-20 times
- 20-30 times
- Over 30 times

Q20. Have you ever paid a prostitute for sex in ANOTHER COUNTRY other than Britain?

- Yes   GO TO Q21
- No    GO TO Q22

Q21. Was this your first experience of paying for sex with a prostitute?

- Yes
- No

Q22. Besides your recent arrest and attendance here today, has going to street-prostitutes ever caused you serious problems in your life?

- Yes   GO TO Q23 (overleaf)
- No    GO TO Q24 (overleaf)
Q23. Which of the following have been problems for you as a result of paying a street-prostitute for sexual contact? [Tick ALL that apply]

- Spending more money than you could afford
- Getting sexually transmitted diseases (STDs)
- Damaging or ending a marriage or relationship with a girlfriend
- Damaging a relationship with another family member (other than wife/partner)
- Psychological damage (including guilt and/or depression)
- Lowering your self-esteem
- Being robbed/assaulted
- Taking drugs offered by street-prostitute
- Taking undue time off work
- Other (please list other problems) ________________________________

Q24. How confident do you feel that you would be able to avoid going to a street-prostitute in the following situations? Please answer on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1= very easy to avoid and 5= very hard to avoid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I feel confident that I can resist the temptation to go to a street-prostitute…[circle one for each line]</th>
<th>Very easy to avoid</th>
<th>Very hard to avoid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A When I really want sex</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B When I am a little high or drunk</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C When I am angry</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D When I feel lonely</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E When I feel depressed</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F When the risk of being caught seems very low</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G When there is some risk that I might be caught</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H When I am stressed out from my job</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I When a street-prostitute asks me if I want to pay for sexual contact with her</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J When opportunity presents itself</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q25. Please read the following statements and tell us how strongly you agree or disagree with each one. **Please answer on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1= Agree Strongly and 5= Disagree Strongly**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Circle one for each statement]</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Street-prostitution doesn’t really harm anybody</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B I think that the police should go after the men that buy sex and leave the ‘prostitutes’ alone</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C It would be OK if my daughter grew up to be a street-prostitute</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D I think that generally street-prostitutes enjoy sex with ‘kind’ punters</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Most street-prostitutes make a lot of money</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Generally, women are street-prostitutes because they want to be. No-one forces them; it’s their choice</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Sex is better with a street-prostitute than it is in a relationship</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H There’s nothing wrong with paying for sex – it’s what most men do</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Street-prostitutes are victims of pimps</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Generally, men need sex more than women do</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K As long as a man’s wife doesn’t find out, sex with a street-prostitute can help to save a marriage</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Paying for sex in a brothel/massage parlour is more acceptable than paying for sex with a street-prostitute</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Prostitution will always be with us and the best thing we can do is to legalise it</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q26. How true do you think the following statements are? **Please answer on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1= very true and 5= not at all true.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Circle one for each statement]</th>
<th>Very true</th>
<th>Not at all true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Street-prostitutes are victimised by pimps</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street-prostitutes are often raped</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Communities suffer from the effects of street-prostitution in their neighbourhoods</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Drugs and violence are associated with street-prostitution</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Street-prostitution can harm local businesses</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Community members in neighbourhoods with street-prostitution experience an increased level of fear</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Most street-prostitutes were abused as children</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q27. Of the following statements, which [if any] are most likely to prevent you visiting street-prostitutes in the future? [Tick maximum of THREE boxes only]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowing that street-prostitutes are victimised by men who have sex with them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge that the ‘quality of life’ is negatively affected in communities with street-prostitution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely I will have to pay a fine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely I will be robbed by a street-prostitute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely that the street-prostitute is under the age of 18 years old</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely I will go to jail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant risk of being infected with a STD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely I will have to face other criminal justice consequences (including losing my driving licence)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing that street-prostitutes are often drug addicts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely that my name will be in the local paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My only punishment would be to have to anonymously re-attend the ‘Change’ re-education programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely that I would be offered drugs by a street-prostitute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely I will be caught by the police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing that street-prostitutes are victimised by pimps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing that businesses lose custom because of the presence of street-prostitution in their area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely that someone in the community would turn me in to the police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant risk of being infected with HIV/AIDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely I will be arrested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing that street-prostitutes are often victims of rape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing that street-prostitutes are often assaulted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely that my family or friends would find out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing that house prices suffer in the neighbourhoods where street-prostitution is present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing that drugs and violence are associated with street-prostitution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q28. Which of these words BEST describes how you felt IMMEDIATELY AFTER paying for sexual contact with a street-prostitute? [Tick ONE box only]:

- I felt guilty
- I felt sexually satisfied
- I felt excited
- I felt as though I had done wrong
- I felt happy
- My feelings were no different than prior to paying for sex
- I felt powerful
- Other (please describe)________________________________________
Q29. **ON REFLECTION** and after you had time to think about your experience with a street-prostitute, which of these words **BEST** describes how you generally feel/felt after paying for sexual contact with a street-prostitute? **[Tick ONE box only]**:

- [ ] I felt guilty
- [ ] I felt sexually satisfied
- [ ] I felt excited
- [ ] I felt as though I had done wrong
- [ ] I felt happy
- [ ] My feelings were no different than prior to paying for sex
- [ ] I felt powerful
- [ ] Other (please describe) ________________________________

Q30. Have you told any of the following about your attendance today at the ‘Change’ programme? **[Tick ALL that apply]**:

**YES**, I have told a:

- [ ] Friend
- [ ] Brother
- [ ] Sister
- [ ] Father
- [ ] Mother
- [ ] Co-worker
- [ ] Wife/Partner
- [ ] Other male relative
- [ ] Other female relative
- [ ] My own children

- [ ] **NO**, I have not told anybody about my attendance today

Q31. Please read the following statements and indicate whether you think each one is true or false:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>I can always tell if someone has an STD or HIV by looking at them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>I cannot get an STD from unprotected oral sex performed on me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>I cannot be prosecuted for soliciting a street-prostitute unless I am caught in the act of soliciting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>The police carry out undercover operations in massage parlours and strip clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td>You can tell whether a street-prostitute is under age by looking at them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>If I am caught for soliciting a street-prostitute or loitering with intent then I will be arrested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong></td>
<td>If a street-prostitute says she is 18 or older, but is really younger, a man who has sex with her can be charged with rape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong></td>
<td>It is legal to pay for sex in off-street locations, such as massage parlours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td>It is illegal to talk to a street-prostitute about buying sex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q32. Do you plan to go to a street-prostitute in the future? [Tick ONE box only]

- Yes, I plan to continue to pay street-prostitutes for sexual contact
- Yes, but I plan to do it less frequently
- Yes, but I am working on stopping
- No plans to go to a street-prostitute, but I might ‘slip up’ if tempted
- No, I will never go to a street-prostitute again

Q33. Do you plan to go to any other prostitute in the future? [Tick ONE box only]

- Yes, I plan to pay prostitutes for sexual contact
- Yes, but I plan to do it less frequently
- Yes, but I am working on stopping
- No, I do not plan to go to a prostitute but I might ‘slip up’ if tempted
- No, I will never go to a prostitute

Thank you for completing this anonymous pre-session survey. Remember, it is not possible to match your answers with who you are. It is important that you do NOT put your name on this survey

NOW THAT YOU ARE FINISHED, PLEASE FOLLOW THESE INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Put your completed survey, in the envelope that we have provided – labelled ‘Before Session Survey’
2. Seal the envelope
3. Put the envelope on the desk at the front of the class, next to the sign ‘Completed Before Session Surveys Here’
Appendix H: Change Programme Questionnaire (After Session)

After Session Survey – ‘Change Programme evaluation’. Remember, it will not be possible to match you to the answers that you provide. It is important that you do NOT put your name on this survey.

Q1. If you had not agreed to take part in the ‘Change’ programme, what do you think would have happened to you if found guilty through the Criminal Justice system?

__________________________________________________ __________________
__________________________________________________ __________________
__________________________________________________ __________________

Q2. Do you think that it should be legal for someone over 18 years old to get paid for sex if they choose to do so?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Q3. Do you think that it should be legal for someone between 16-17 years old to get paid for sex if they choose to do so?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Q4. Based on the information provided at the ‘Change’ programme today:
   Approximately how many prostitutes are there in Great Britain?

__________________________________________________ __________________

Q5. Based on the information provided at the ‘Change’ programme today:
   Approximately how many men/sexual encounters does the average street-prostitute have sexual contact with over a 12-month period?

__________________________________________________ __________________

Q6. Based on the information provided at the ‘Change’ programme today:
   What is the worst punishment (in a British Court of Law) that can be given to a man caught paying for sex with a street-prostitute between the ages of 16-17 years old?

__________________________________________________ __________________

__________________________________________________ __________________
Q7. Based on the information provided at the ‘Change’ programme today:

What is the worst punishment (in a British Court of Law) that can be given to a man caught paying for sex with a street-prostitute over the age of 18 years old?

__________________________________________________

__________________________________________________

Q8. Besides your recent arrest, has going to street-prostitutes ever caused you serious problems in your life?

☐ Yes  GO TO Q9
☐ No   GO TO Q11

Q9. Which of the following have been problems for you as a result of paying a prostitute for sexual contact? [Tick ALL that apply]

☐ Spending more money than you could afford
☐ Getting sexually transmitted diseases (STDs)
☐ Damaging or ending a marriage or relationship with a girlfriend
☐ Damaging a relationship with another family member (other than wife/partner)
☐ Psychological damage (including guilt and/or depression)
☐ Lowering your self-esteem
☐ Being robbed/assaulted
☐ Taking drugs offered by prostitute
☐ Taking undue time off work
☐ Other (please list other problems) ____________________________

Q10. How do you intend to deal with, the problems identified in Q9?

[If any, please describe below]

__________________________________________________

__________________________________________________

__________________________________________________

__________________________________________________
Q11. How confident do you feel that you would be able to avoid going to a street-prostitute in the following situations? **Please answer on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1= very easy to avoid and 5= very hard to avoid**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I feel confident that I can resist the temptation to go to a street-prostitute... [circle one for each line]</th>
<th>Very easy to avoid</th>
<th>Very hard to avoid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A When I really want sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B When I am a little high or drunk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C When I am angry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D When I feel lonely</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E When I feel depressed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F When the risk of being caught seems very low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G When there is some risk that I might be caught</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H When I am stressed out from my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I When a street-prostitute asks me if I want to pay for sexual contact with her</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J When opportunity presents itself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q12. Please read the following statements and tell us how strongly you agree or disagree with each one. Please answer on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = Agree Strongly and 5 = Disagree Strongly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Circle one for each statement]</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Street-prostitution doesn’t really harm anybody</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B I think that the police should go after the men that buy sex and leave the ‘prostitutes’ alone</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C It would be OK if my daughter grew up to be a street-prostitute</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D I think that generally street-prostitutes enjoy sex with ‘kind’ punters</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Most street-prostitutes make a lot of money</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Generally, women are street-prostitutes because they want to be. No-one forces them; it’s their choice</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Sex is better with a street-prostitute than it is in a relationship</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H There’s nothing wrong with paying for sex – it’s what most men do</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Street-prostitutes are victims of pimps</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Generally, men need sex more than women do</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K As long as a man’s wife doesn’t find out, sex with a street-prostitute can help to save a marriage</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Paying for sex in a brothel/massage parlour is more acceptable than paying for sex with a street-prostitute</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Prostitution will always be with us and the best thing we can do is to legalise it</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q13. How true do you think the following statements are? Please answer on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = very true and 5 = not at all true.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Circle one for each statement]</th>
<th>Very true</th>
<th>Not at all true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Street-prostitutes are victimised by pimps</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street-prostitutes are often raped</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Communities suffer from the effects of street-prostitution in their neighbourhoods</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Drugs and violence are associated with street-prostitution</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Street-prostitution can harm local businesses</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Community members in neighbourhoods with street-prostitution experience an increased level of fear</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Most street-prostitutes were abused as children</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q14. Of the following statements, which [if any] are most likely to prevent you visiting street-prostitutes in the future? [Tick maximum of **THREE** boxes only]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Tick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowing that street-prostitutes are victimised by men who have sex with them</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge that the ‘quality of life’ is negatively affected in communities with street-prostitution</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely I will have to pay a fine</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely I will be robbed by a street-prostitute</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely that the street-prostitute is under the age of 18 years old</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely I will go to jail</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant risk of being infected with a STD</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely I will have to face other criminal justice consequences (including losing my driving licence)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing that street-prostitutes are often drug addicts</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely that my name will be in the local paper</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My only punishment would be to have to anonymously re-attend the ‘Change’ re-education programme</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely that I would be offered drugs by a street-prostitute</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely I will be caught by the police</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing that street-prostitutes are victimised by pimps</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing that businesses lose custom because of the presence of street-prostitution in their area</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely that someone in the community would turn me in to the police</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant risk of being infected with HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely I will be arrested</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing that street-prostitutes are often victims of rape</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing that street-prostitutes are often assaulted</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely that my family or friends would find out</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing house prices suffer in the neighbourhoods where prostitution is present</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing that drugs and violence are associated with street-prostitution</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q15. Will you tell any of the following about your attendance today at the ‘Change’ programme? [Tick ALL that apply]:

**YES**, I will tell a:
- Friend
- Brother
- Sister
- Father
- Mother
- Co-worker
- Wife/Partner
- Other male/female relative
- My own children

**NO**, I will not tell anybody (else) about my attendance today
Q16. Please read the following statements and indicate whether you think each one is true or false:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>I can always tell if someone has an STD or HIV by looking at them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>I cannot get an STD from unprotected oral sex performed on me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>I cannot be prosecuted for soliciting a street-prostitute unless I am caught in the act of soliciting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>The police carry out undercover operations in massage parlours and strip clubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>You can tell whether a street-prostitute is under age by looking at them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>If I am caught for soliciting a street-prostitute or loitering with intent then I will be arrested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>If a street-prostitute says she is 18 or older, but is really younger, a man who has sex with her can be charged with rape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>It is legal to pay for sex in off-street locations, such as massage parlours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>It is illegal to talk to a street-prostitute about buying sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q17. Do you plan to go to a street-prostitute in the future? [Tick ONE box only]

- Yes, I plan to continue to pay street-prostitutes for sexual contact
- Yes, but I plan to do it less frequently
- Yes, but I am working on stopping
- No plans to go to a street-prostitute, but I might ‘slip up’ if tempted
- No, I will never go to a street-prostitute again

Q18. Do you plan to go to any other prostitute in the future? [Tick ONE box only]

- Yes, I plan to pay prostitutes for sexual contact
- Yes, but I plan to do it less frequently
- Yes, but I am working on stopping
- No, I do not plan to go to a prostitute but I might ‘slip up’ if tempted
- No, I will never go to a prostitute

**IF YOU HAVE ANSWERED ‘Yes, I plan to continue to pay street-level prostitutes for sexual contact’ IN Q.17 PLEASE GO TO Q.20.**

**IF YOU HAVE TICKED ANY OTHER BOX FOR Q.17 PLEASE GO TO Q.19**
Q19. Which of the following statements BEST describes your attitude following the ‘Change’ programme that you have attended today? [ Tick ONE box only]

- The ‘Change’ programme has made me realise the devastating impact that paying for street-level sex will have for my family and me. I am less concerned about the street-prostitutes.
- I feel sympathy for any girl or woman involved in street-prostitution, but fear of being caught again is the main reason I will not pay for sex in the future.
- The ‘Change’ programme has made me realise the devastating impact of street-prostitution for the girls and women involved in selling sex and this is the main reason that I will try to never pay for street-level sex again.
- The ‘Change’ programme has not really taught me much more that I didn’t already know.
- I don’t think that there is necessarily anything wrong with paying for sex, but it is better to visit massage parlours/brothels than pay for sex from street-prostitutes.
- There are no winners in street-prostitution. Men should stop buying street-level sex and we should try to stop women selling street-level sex.

Q20. On reflection, what do you think have been the consequences of paying a street-prostitute for sexual contact?

___________________________________________________
___________________________________________________
___________________________________________________
___________________________________________________
___________________________________________________

Q21. Do you have any other (anonymous) comments that you would like us to pass on to the ‘Change’ programme team?

___________________________________________________
___________________________________________________
___________________________________________________
___________________________________________________
___________________________________________________

___________________________________________________
Thank you for completing this anonymous after-session survey. **Remember, it will not be possible to match you to the answers that you provide.** It is important that you do **NOT** put your name on this survey.

NOW THAT YOU ARE FINISHED, PLEASE FOLLOW THESE INSTRUCTIONS:

- Put your completed survey, in the envelope that we have provided – labelled ‘After Session Survey’
- Seal the envelope
- Put the envelope on the desk at the front of the class, next to the sign ‘Completed After Session Surveys Here’
Appendix I: Change Programme Questionnaire - Informed Consent Form

Consent Form Information

Description of Study:

You are here today as a participant in the Kerb Crawler Rehabilitation Programme (KCRP), informally known as the “Change” Programme. The programme is run by specialist rehabilitation professionals on behalf of Nottinghamshire Police. Both the police and these rehabilitation professionals have been involved in running the course since 2004 and are now interested in formally understanding whether or not the “Change” programme is effective. Nottingham Trent University (NTU) has been approached to independently review the programme. All NTU researchers involved in this project are funded from non-police sources and are NOT police or rehabilitation specialist employees.

As part of this research, NTU are here today asking participants in this class to complete two questionnaires, one before the course and the other at the end of the course. The questions ask you to provide information about you and your opinions about prostitution, as well as your understanding of the risks and consequences of prostitution. **Your answers are completely anonymous: you do not put your name on the questionnaire, and there is no way to connect any questionnaire to any individual in this class.**

Your participation is important to the success of this study because it will help us to establish whether the “Change” programme benefits people like you or whether the training needs to be improved moving forward. All “Change” programme participants over a nine-month period (maximum) will be asked to participate in this study, resulting in about 100-150 survey respondents.
Project Participation: What Will You Need To Do?

If you agree to participate, we will ask you to complete one questionnaire before the course and a second questionnaire after the course. Each questionnaire will take about 20 to 30 minutes to complete.

**Important note:** For the research to work effectively, we urge you to complete the questionnaires honestly and genuinely. We want to know what you think; the questionnaires are not exams and you will not get a score. Because the questionnaires will not have your name on them, you can answer any embarrassing or personal questions in the knowledge that these answers cannot be traced back to yourself.

Project Participation: Are There Any Risks to You?

The project does not have any physical or medical risks to you. Some of you may feel nervous or embarrassed about answering personal questions. There are no other significant risks to participating. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer. If you reach a point where you do not want to complete the questionnaire, please tell the NTU researcher.

Voluntary Participation: Can You Say “No”?

Your participation in this study is voluntary; you do not have to complete the questionnaire if you do not want to. You can always refuse to answer a question, or to end your participation in the study at any time. Your decision to complete the questionnaire will not affect your participation in the “Change” programme or your solicitation case. If you decide not to participate in the study, we are not allowed to report this to anyone.
Information Privacy: How Do We Protect Your Information?

It is important that you feel comfortable answering our questions, and we have to follow strict rules about privacy protection. All NTU researchers involved in this project are obliged to sign a guarantee to protect your information.

Only the research staff will have access to the anonymous questionnaires. No information about individual survey responses will be shared with anyone involved in the “Change” programme. Your name will not be on the questionnaire, and we will not get your name from any other source. No reports on this evaluation will contain personal information about any individual participants.

Project Contacts: Who Can You Contact for More Information?

If you have questions about the study or about your rights as a participant, please ask one of the NTU staff members at any time. If you would like to talk with the study’s research analyst, you can call Paul Hamilton on (0115) 848 [ANON] or e-mail him at paul.hamilton@ntu.ac.uk

You may keep this form for your records.

Thank you for your cooperation.
**Consent Form**

This consent form is to check that you are happy with the information that you have received so far, that you are aware of your rights as a participant and to confirm that you wish to take part in the study.

*Please tick as appropriate*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Have you been made aware of the research topic?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Have you had the opportunity to discuss the topic with the researcher?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you understand that you are free to refuse to answer any questions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you understand that you are free to withdraw from the research at any time?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you understand that the researcher will use all information confidentially</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you agree to take part in this study?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed: ________________________________

Print name: ________________________________

Date: ________________________________
Appendix J: Change Programme Opening Script Template

‘Change Programme Script’

A very good morning to you gentlemen.

I can see from the looks on your faces that you are wondering who I am? Well, there’s good news and bad news. The good news is that I’m not a police officer, nor am I an employee of the police force. My name is Paul Hamilton and I’m an independent researcher from Nottingham Trent University.

The bad news is that I’m going to ask you to use your brains at 8.30 on a Saturday morning. The reason why I’m going to ask you to use your brains is that I’m doing some evaluative research on the ‘Change’ programme that you are all participants of today.

So, before you go to the ‘Change’ class, Sergeant Neil Radford and his team have very kindly allowed me to speak to you this morning about this research. However, I’ve only got about 30 minutes with you now, so I need to crack on.

Basically, the research is looking to establish whether the “Change” programme benefits people like you and whether or not the training needs to be improved moving forward.

The research today is in two parts. I’m going to ask you to complete a questionnaire before the class and then to complete another questionnaire after the class. You’ll see in front of you a document called ‘Consent Form Information’ – this document tells you more about the research project and if I may I would like to spend a couple of minutes going through this with you.

The first section.....AND THEN GO THROUGH EACH SECTION BRIEFLY WITH PARTICIPANTS........

- Description of study
- What you’ll need to do
- Are there any risks to you?
- Can you say no?
- How do we protect your information?
- Contact details

Stress the need for honesty to make the research worthwhile.
Appendix K: Change Programme Follow-up Interviews – Informed Consent Form

Evaluation of the Kerb Crawler Rehabilitation Programme (KCRP), or “Change” Programme

Follow-up Consent Form Information

Overview:

Once again thank you for your cooperation with the research project.

The information contained in your responses to the questionnaire(s) will be central in evaluating the effectiveness of the “Change” programme. The one drawback of only using questionnaire responses, however, is that there is a lack of space for you to tell us your personal stories. And these are stories that we are very keen to hear; personal testimonies are vital in bringing to life the important findings from the questionnaires.

Because of this, all “Change” programme participants are being asked if they are willing for Paul Hamilton from Nottingham Trent University (NTU) to contact them after their attendance at the “Change” programme. The purpose of this follow-up is to talk to you in more detail about your experiences of prostitution, the Criminal Justice System and the “Change” programme itself.

The method of contact for the follow-up interview can be negotiated and may be in person at a mutually convenient location or by telephone. If a telephone is used, you may be asked a few questions to prove your identity. The interview should take no longer than one hour and there will be a voucher incentive in place.

More detailed information will be supplied at the time, but the purpose of this consent form is to ask you if you are happy in principle for the NTU researcher to contact you again.
**Project Participation: Some important points**

Like the questionnaire, the project does not have any physical or medical risks to you.

There will be a degree of confidentiality similar to that on the day of the course. If you were to disclose that you had used prostitutes since the course or a related minor crime, then this information will not be disclosed to the police in any format that could identify you. All data will be anonymous and this information will be used solely for the purposes of academic research.

The information you disclose will only be available to the NTU researcher team. It will be securely stored at the University for the duration of the research. Following this the data will be stored anonymously and any reference to you as an individual will be destroyed. In the case of computer data this will be by permanent deletion. In the case of any written or paper records, then this will be by secure destruction. Nothing that can identify you will be used in any publication of this review. No one other than the NTU researcher and the police will be aware of your attendance on the “Change” Programme or your involvement in this review.

Although individuals will not be mentioned by name in the final report, we would like to make use of quotations from discussions to authenticate the analysis. We will obviously ensure that any quotations used will also be anonymous and that any third party individuals, organisations and/or addresses are not identified. It will not be possible to associate you with any quotations that come up during the course of the interview.

During the interview, you do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer. If you reach a point where you do not want to complete the interview, please tell the NTU researcher and the interview will be terminated.
Voluntary Participation: Can You Say “No”?

Your participation in this follow-up study is voluntary; you do not have to take part if you do not want to. You can refuse to take part in the follow-up interviews, by signing your name and ticking the ‘no’ box at the bottom of this letter. Your decision to participate in the follow-up has no effect on your solicitation case. If you decide not to participate in the study, we are not allowed to report this to anyone.

What if I change my mind between now and the scheduled interview?

The consent form at the end of this letter is not a contract. Therefore even if you agree to take part in the follow-up research now, but change your mind in the meantime, you can simply let a member of the NTU team know by phone, e-mail or letter (see ‘Project contacts’ section below) and we will ensure that you will not be contacted in the future.

Similarly, if you have decided not to take part now, but change your mind some time in the future, we would love to hear from you (also via the ‘Project contacts’ section).

Information Privacy: How Do We Protect Your Information?

It is important that you feel comfortable answering our questions, and we have to follow strict rules about privacy protection. All NTU researchers involved in this project are obliged to sign a guarantee to protect your information.

Only the researcher will have access to the interview data. No information about individual responses will be shared with anyone involved in the “Change” programme. Your name will not appear on any of the interview transcripts.
No reports on this evaluation will contain personal information about any individual participant.

**Project Participation: What Will You Need To Do?**

If you agree to be contacted, please complete the consent details form at the bottom of this letter. We only need to be able you to contact you by one method (telephone, e-mail or letter), so please complete the method of communication which you feel to be most appropriate.

**Project Contacts: Who Can You Contact for More Information?**

If you have questions about the study, your rights of withdrawal or about your general rights as a participant, please ask NTU staff at any time. If you would like to talk with the researcher of the study, you may call Paul Hamilton on (0115) 848 [ANON] or e-mail him at paul.hamilton@ntu.ac.uk

**You may keep this form for your records.**

Thank you for your cooperation.
Evaluation of the Kerb Crawler Rehabilitation Programme (KCRP), or “Change” Programme

Consent for follow-up contact

☐ Yes please

I the undersigned, hereby give consent for a Nottingham Trent University researcher to contact me after my attendance at the “Change” programme with a view to carrying out a face-to-face or telephone interview.

I understand that I can withdraw from the research process at any time

I also understand that any personal details of mine will be securely stored and destroyed at the conclusion of the review so that only anonymous details will remain.

I confirm that I have read and understand the attached letter.

Name [print]:________________________________________

Date of attendance on Change Programme:________________

Signature authorising above: ____________________________

Preferred means of contact by researchers [please tick one box only and provide appropriate details]:

☐ Telephone
number______________________________________________

☐ E-mail
address__________________________________________________

☐ Postal
address__________________________________________________

________________________________________________________
Refusal of Consent for follow-up contact

☐ No thanks

I the undersigned, do NOT give consent for the Nottingham Trent University research team to contact me after my attendance at the “Change” programme with a view to carrying out a face-to-face or telephone interview.

I understand that I can contact the NTU research team at any time if I wish to be included in the research process.

I confirm that I have read and understand the attached letter.

Name [print]:__________________________________________

Date of attendance on Change Programme:______________

Signature not authorising the above: ____________________
### Interview Schedule – TOP LINE TOPIC GUIDE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e) <strong>Consent form discussion</strong> including full background information underpinning the thesis and the ways in which (and where) the research will be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Upon agreement, <strong>tape recording</strong> to commence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Brief discussion on interviewees <strong>preferred terminology</strong> as a gentle ‘introduction’ to the research – consistency of language used. For example...‘Client’, ‘customer’, punter’, other? ‘Prostitute’, ‘working girl’, ‘other’?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having defined the most appropriate language, **interview process to begin** with:-
Background to Prostitution Use and Subsequent Attendance at ‘Change’ Programme

I wonder if, perhaps, the best place to start the interview is to ask you….

➢ When you attended the ‘Change Programme’, was this as a result of being caught from the first time that you had paid for sex (or attempted to pay for sex)?

If yes: how old were you at the time? Filter: go to next section.

If no to first time:
  o Can you remember how old you were when you first paid for sex?
  o How long have you been paying for sex with prostitutes?
  o [also explore whether they have had sex with a prostitute and not paid – why? Was it a free trial, bonus, or not satisfied, or was she a girlfriend? ]
  o Roughly, how many times have you paid for sex since the first time?
    ▪ If cannot remember how many times – then how regularly and over how what period of time?
  o Have you always paid for sex with a street prostitute only?
    If paid for both off/on-street sex: How often paid for off-street sex compared to street? What did you ‘prefer’ and why?
    How did sex with a non-street level prostitute compare? IF used STREET more than OFF-STREET, but PREFER off-street explore why (e.g. convenience, price, fear etc).
  o Why did you decide to go back and pay for sex again? If necessary, probe: perhaps it was not the prostitute experience that made them go back at all …maybe it was just that they hated the last experience but
had optimistic /romantic attitude that next time would be better? Maybe just very lonely? Maybe drunk and lonely. Maybe self-abuse/destructive behaviour?
Experiences within Prostitution

In relation to the event that led to your attendance at the ‘change’ programme, I would like to ask you a couple of questions in relation to that incident:

➢ I suppose the first thing to ask, is what actually happened?

If not covered in answer to question above, also ask:

(i) Did you ‘pick’ up a prostitute on your own?
(ii) How did you know where to find street prostitutes?
(iii) Did you know how much it would cost you in money?
(iv) Did you pick up a prostitute in a car?
(v) Did you pick up a prostitute straight away or had you driven/walked around the area beforehand to get the courage to pick her up?
(vi) Did you approach the prostitute or did they solicit you?
   *If the latter:* Did this make you feel less guilty?
   *Even if solicited:* Did you behave in a way that suggested you were a potential punter? Did you go out purposely to pick up a prostitute or was it unintended?
(vii) Were there other prostitutes that you rejected first?
(viii) Did some reject you first?
   *For both (vi) and (vii):* Why do you think that was?
(ix) Was the decision to pay for sex with a prostitute an ‘off the cuff’ decision or had you thought about the time, date and location prior to the visit?
(x) Researchers talk about the following stages: intent, pursuit, the encounter, the aftermath (*explain this terminology if necessary*). Does this represent your experience or is part of it true but other parts not?
(xi) Had you been drinking alcohol prior to picking up a prostitute? *If yes:* Did you feel drunk when you picked up a prostitute? *NOTE:* also explore drug taking.
(xii) How did you dress when you went into the red light area? Smart, casual, aftershave?
(xiii) Did you have a preference for where the sexual act took place?
   And: Did or would you consider going back to a prostitute’s home,
   or a building she used?
   If no: why not?

   If visited prostitutes before (i.e., not first time), then probe: Was this
   experience representative of other experiences?
   If used off and on street: How does the contact process differ?

To all:

➢ Did you have high expectations about what it would be like to have sex
  with a prostitute?
  Probe: Were these expectations fulfilled?

➢ Did the encounter feel like a business encounter or did you feel that there
  was a degree of ‘romance’ involved?
  Probe further: Did you feel that the prostitute liked you?

➢ What communication did you get from the prostitute? In other words, did
  she speak to you much/at all?
  If not much: how did this make you feel?
  Probe further (if necessary): Were you interested in companionship
  when you went with a prostitute? If yes: did you get it?

➢ Did you feel at all anxious when you paid for sex?

➢ When you paid for sex, did you feel like you were in control?
  Probe: Why do you say that?

➢ Did you like the power of being able to pick which woman to have sex
  with?
➢ Can you tell me your emotions: (i) anticipating paying for sex (ii) at the point of payment (iii) having sex (iv) thinking about it afterwards?

➢ Did you find the prostitute attractive?

➢ Would you/did you look for prostitutes that looked younger than yourself?

➢ When you paid/attempted to pay for sex, was one of the turn-ons the fact that there was a chance that you would be able to do certain sexual acts not possible in a long-term/casual relationship? 

   **Probe further if appropriate:** Was it more important to you that the prostitute ‘looked attractive’ or ‘looked kinky’ and sexually adventurous?

➢ How did/do you feel emotionally after you had visited a prostitute? Why do you think that was?

➢ In your experience(s) with –a- prostitute(s) did/have you (ever) feel angry or violent towards them? **IF YES:** was this before, during or after?

➢ Have you ever encouraged a friend or colleague to pay for sex?
Before talking about the ‘Change’ programme, I would like to ask you a bit about your personal background, including your current and previous relationship situation. As with all the questions in the interview, you are not obliged to answer any of these questions, some of which may be extremely sensitive. Note: exercise extreme caution here….if respondent distressed, make usual judgement call regarding which questions are appropriate.

Relationships

Were you in a relationship at the time of being picked up by the police for prostitution offences?

- If yes: Are you in the same relationship?
  - If yes: How do you feel about your relationship since the ‘change’ programme? Has it improved? Why do you feel this way?
  - If no: Are you in a different relationship?
    - If yes: Have any of your relationships suffered since you paid for sex/attended the ‘change’ programme?
    - If no: are you in a relationship now?

- If in a relationship at the time of arrest or subsequently: did your partner (then or now) know about the incidence with a prostitute?

- Did you have problems in your relationship when you went with a prostitute?
➢ If in a relationship at the time of arrest: Did you have problems in your relationship when you went with a prostitute?
If yes: how did these problems manifest themselves?
Probe: Do you think that one of the reasons that you visited a prostitute was because of difficulties in communicating with your partner?

➢ If in a relationship at the time of arrest or subsequently: do you think that you visiting a prostitute have affected your sexual relationship with your current/previous partner?
Probe: Do you feel sexually desired by your partner?

To all:

➢ Would /do you mind it if your partner earned / earns significantly more than you?

➢ Would/ do you mind it if your partner had / has a more powerful job than you?

➢ Would you say that at some point in your life you have had difficulties meeting women? Do you still feel that way?

➢ Do you think that women find you attractive?

➢ Would you find it easy to chat a woman up in a bar/nightclub?

➢ Has a woman ever humiliated you when you’ve tried to chat her up?
Probe: How did that make you feel? Has this happened often or is it a rare event?

➢ How do you tend to deal with emotional problems that you have?

If not mentioned above: Are you able to speak with your male friends about feeling and problems?
In what ways do you express feelings of intimacy in a relationship?
Personal Background

What was your working situation when you picked up a prostitute?

If working: Were you happy in your job at that time? Did you travel a lot with your work?

If not happy/travel: Do you think either of these factors were significant in your decision to visit a prostitute? PROBE: when you picked up a prostitute, were you working away from home/lunch break/to or from work?

If not working: What is your working situation now?

If working: Are you happy at work? Do you travel a lot with your work? Does that get lonely? Would your job affect your ability to avoid prostitution?

➢ What is your working situation now?

To above: Are you happier in work now than when you got picked up by the police for visiting a prostitute?

To all:

➢ Have you ever served in the armed forces?

Moving on from the world of work, can I just ask you:

➢ Would you say that generally you are confident?

➢ How would you describe your childhood? Only probe if respondent cannot answer question e.g. school, friends, girls, happiness etc.

➢ Ask the following question with extreme caution: Did you ever experience physical or sexual abuse growing up? If yes: do you think that this has had any influence on your decision to pay for sex?
Might want to ask questions about (1) parental attitudes to prostitution (2) friends attitudes (3) colleagues attitudes (4) literature – lads mags attitudes.

The ‘Change’ Programme

- Why did you decide to go on the ‘change’ course?
  
  *Probe:* Did you feel at all coerced into attending the ‘change’ programme?

- Do you think that the ‘change’ course is the best option for men caught paying for sex?
  
  If no: what is?

- What’s the one thing that most sticks out from the ‘change’ programme?

- Generally, what do you think worked well? What did you feel was a waste of time?

- How did you feel about paying the money to attend the ‘change’ programme?
  
  *Probe:* Do you think this was justified?

- Have you been tempted to pay for sex since you went on the ‘change’ programme?
  
  If yes: did you act on this urge?
  
  If no: why not? *Probe:* worried about the CJS?

- And as we sit here now, do you feel more or less likely to visit a prostitute than before you attended the ‘change’ programme?

- Were you worried about STD’s before the ‘change’s session? *Explain* STD’s if required.

- Were you worried about STD’s after the ‘change’s session?
  
  If yes: did you do anything about this?
➢ Even if you have not visited a prostitute since the ‘change’ programme, have you used the thought of being with a prostitute since you went on the ‘change’ programme…for example, through masturbation or a sex game?

➢ Have you changed any aspect of your life as a result of the ‘change’ programme?

➢ Have you done any of the following before the ‘change’ programme?
  a) been lap dancing. If yes here, how often and why?
  b) Strip club
  c) Pub where stripping going on
  d) Stag night stripper
  e) gone to brothel. If yes here, how often and why?
  f) bought any men’s magazines such as Nuts
  g) bought or watched any porn….if yes here explain that we will revisit this later in the interview
  h) had any one night stands. If yes here, how many?

➢ Have you done any of the following since the ‘change’ programme?
  a) been lap dancing. If yes here, how often and why?
  b) Strip club
  c) Pub where stripping going on
  d) Stag night stripper
  e) gone to brothel. If yes here, how often and why?
  f) bought any men’s magazines such as Nuts
  g) bought or watched any porn….if yes here explain that we will revisit this later in the interview
  h) had any one night stands. If yes here, how many?

➢ Before going on the ‘change’ programme, had anyone made you feel that it was wrong to pay for sex, or did you assume that it was just one of those things that men do?
Following the ‘change’ programme, do you think you have changed your attitudes towards prostitutes?
If yes: in what way?
If no: why not?

Following the ‘change’ programme, do you think you have changed your attitudes towards women generally?
If yes: in what way?
If no: why not?
The Police and KCTF

When you made a decision to pay for sex:
  o Were you at all worried that you may have been picked up by the police?
  o Did you look out for the police?
  o Did you know that police patrolled in unmarked cars?

➢ What is your opinion of the police’s Kerb Crawler Task Force? If not sure what this is, mention Neil, Andy and Dav.

➢ Did they treat you fairly?

➢ Do you think they were respectful to you?

➢ Do you think that the police can make any difference to the number of men that are willing to pay for sex with a prostitute?
  
  **Probe:** Why do you say that?
Ok, for this last bit of the interview, I just want to talk to you generally about your attitudes towards prostitutes, prostitution, women and sex generally. Some of my questions may seem very personal, so I apologise in advance. If you feel embarrassed by the questions, let me know straight away and we can move on to the next question.

Attitudes Towards Prostitutes

- Do women have a choice in whether or not they sell sex?
  - If yes: why do you think that they make this choice?
  - If no: why not?

- Is it fair that men should be held responsible for prostitution, whilst prostitutes often get off on the basis that they are ‘victims’?
  - Probe: Do you see yourself as a victim too.?
  - Probe further regarding: society-creating opportunities of temptation?

- Do you look at street prostitutes as different to other women?
  - If yes: why and in what way?

- Do you look at street prostitutes as different to other prostitutes?
  - If yes: why and in what way?

- You may remember Ian and Lynne mentioning in the ‘change’ programme that prostitutes are extremely likely to be raped whilst ‘working’.
  1. What does this mean to you?
  2. How do prostitutes get raped?
  3. Is raping a prostitute different to other forms of rape, for example a businesswoman being raped in her own home by a stranger?

- Prior to the ‘change’ programme, where did you get your views about prostitutes from?

- Would you consider kissing a prostitute?
  - Probe: Why/why not?
➢ Do you find the image of the ‘dirty whore’ (maybe rephrase this street talk) exciting?
  Probe: Why do you say that?

➢ Did you have prostitute fantasies before the encounter happened?

➢ Do you feel that you treated the prostitute better than most other men do in that situation?
Attitudes Towards and Knowledge of Prostitution Markets

- What are your views on prostitution since attending the ‘change’ programme?
  - Has it made any difference to the way you view it?

- Do you think that we should just legalise it?
  
  **Probe:** Why?

- If prostitution were legal, do you think you would you use prostitutes?
  
  **Probe:** Why/why not?

- If prostitution were legal, do you think it would be as pleasurable/exciting?

- Do you feel that you made a choice when purchasing sex?
  
  **Probe:** did you feel pressurized or forced in any way?

- Do you think that prostitution is a victimless crime?
  
  **Probe:** Why do you say that?

- If only paid for street-level sex:
  
  - Why do you think that you paid for street sex rather than sex with a prostitute in a brothel for example?
  
  - Would you know where you could pay for off-street sex (for example, a massage parlour)?

- Have you ever chatted about prostitution with your mates?
  
  **If yes:** what was said?

- Do you think that prostitution is dangerous for clients?
  
  **If yes:** in what way?

- Do you think that men’s paying for sex is common?
- What percentage of men would you guess pay for sex [+ other knowledge questions]? 

Would you have:
(1) a working prostitute as a girlfriend / or as a wife? PROBE: why/why not and in what circumstances?
(2) an ex-prostitute as girlfriend / as a wife. PROBE: why/why not and in what circumstances?
Attitudes Towards Women

➢ Do you trust women?
   If no: why not?

➢ Do you find the thought of a weak, passive woman more erotic than a strong, powerful woman?
   Probe: Why do you say that?

➢ Do you like to be with women who are adventurous in bed?
   Probe: Why do you say that?

➢ Do you think that society makes it difficult not to see women as objects for sex? Or do you think that men judging women sexually is just a natural reaction for men?

➢ Why do you think that generally women don't pay for sex?

➢ Do you think that there is any truth in the claim that generally, women who get raped tend to sleep around and have a bad reputation?

➢ Do you think that it can sometimes be hard for men not to go too far with a woman who is getting off with a guy and then decides not to go any further?

➢ Have you ever felt violent towards women?
   If yes: Can you explain why?
Sex: Feelings Towards and Experiences of:

BE VERY CAREFUL WITH THIS SECTION: THERE ARE A NUMBER OF QUESTIONS THAT MAY CAUSE OFFENCE IF NOT PITCHED IN THE RIGHT WAY

- It has been said that most men who pay for sex have some sort of sexual addiction.....what do you think about that statement?

- If you wanted to get some help for sex addictions, including visiting prostitutes, would you know where to go and do you think that would you do anything about it?

- Does the thought of many sexual partners appeal to you?

- What of these is more important to you: to stay faithful and have sex with the same person or to have lots of sexual partners?

- Do you often find yourself looking at women and wondering whether or not she is good in bed (‘a good shag’)?
  If yes: Would you say this is ever a problem for you?
  If yes: And why do you say that?

- If you knew that a woman was ‘loose and dirty’ (think about street phrases), would this turn you on, disgust you or not really make any difference?

- Would sex with a woman outside of your own ethnicity be more exciting than sex with a woman from your own ethnicity?

- Do you think that buying sex is like any other commodity and we should be able to have it whenever we want to and can afford it? Is paying for sex any different to buying a Big Mac?
Do you think that most men would pay for sex given the opportunity not to get caught?

_Probe_: Why do you say that?

What does the word pervert mean to you?

_Probe_: Is it appropriate to describe men who pay for sex as perverts? Why/why not?
Pornography

Can I ask if you ever look at pornography?

**If yes:** How often?

Has your attendance at the ‘change’ programme affected the way that you use pornography?

Do you think that pornography played a role in your decision to pay for sex?

Has pornography influenced how you view prostitutes?

Do you worry about your use of pornography?

**If no:** have you ever?

What was behind your decision not to look at pornography?

➢ Does the thought of having sex with a ‘porno star’ turn you on?

*Probe:* Why do you say that?

CLOSE INTERVIEW with de-brief and re-iteration of IC principles.
## Appendix M: SPSS Variable Values and Labels (non collapsed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>birthyear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1988-1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1983-1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1978-1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1973-1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1968-1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1963-1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1958-1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1953-1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1948-1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1900-1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>White British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>White Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>White Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mixed White and Black Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mixed White and Black African</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mixed White and Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mixed Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Asian Bangladeshi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Asian Pakistani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Asian Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Asian other (south)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Asian other (east)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Black African</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Black Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maristat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Married/living with long-term partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Separated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Widowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Single (never married) living with parent/relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Single (never married) living with friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Single (never married) living alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>citylive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nottingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Other East Midlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>West Midlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>North West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>North East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>South West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>South East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HEQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>School leaver with no quals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CSE/O Level/GCSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NVQ/GNVQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A-Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Undergraduate Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Postgraduate Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Other - professional qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other - City &amp; Guilds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other - innocent/not paid for sex/asking for directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Other - not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Other - I was solicited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Other - lack of sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Other - drunk or high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Other - sexual impotence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Other - felt lonely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Other - fell out with wife/partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Other - impulse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Other - curious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Other - She looked attractive but 'test purchase'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18sexlegal</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16sexlegal</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>prosguess</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>501-1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1001-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2001-5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5001-10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10001-15000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15001-20000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20001-25000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25001-35000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35001-45000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45001-55000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55001-65000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65001-75000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>75001-85000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>85001-95000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>95001+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>prosright</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pntrguess</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0-499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>500-999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1000-4999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5000-9999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10000-14999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15000-19999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20000-29999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30000-39999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40000-49999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50000-74999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>75000-99999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100000-149999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>150000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pntrrght</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pnsh16guess</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Caution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Car/licence taken away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ASBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Imprisonment 0-2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Imprisonment 3-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Imprisonment 6-10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Imprisonment 11-15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Imprisonment 16-25 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Life imprisonment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Imprisonment - not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Name and shame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Social stigma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Rehabilitation/Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mental health problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Not sure - but the prostitute should be punished with 5 years in jail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| pnsh16right | 1 | Yes |
|             | 2 | No  |

| pnsh18guess | 1 | Nothing |
|            | 2 | Caution  |
|            | 3 | Fine     |
|            | 4 | Car/licence taken away |
|            | 5 | ASBO     |
|            | 6 | Imprisonment 0-2 years |
|            | 7 | Imprisonment 3-5 years |
|            | 8 | Imprisonment 6-10 years |
|            | 9 | Imprisonment 11-15 years |
|            | 10| Imprisonment 16-25 years |
|            | 11| Life imprisonment |
|            | 12| Imprisonment - not specified |
|            | 13| Social stigma |
|            | 14| Name and shame |
|            | 15| Rehabilitation/Community Service |
|            | 20| Don't know |

| pnsh18right | 1 | Yes |
|             | 2 | No  |

<p>| agepaidsex | 1 | 15-19 |
|           | 2 | 20-24 |
|           | 3 | 25-29 |
|           | 4 | 30-34 |
|           | 5 | 35-39 |
|           | 6 | 40-44 |
|           | 7 | 45-49 |
|           | 8 | 50-54 |
|           | 9 | 55-59 |
|           | 10| 60+  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>howmanypaid</th>
<th>Denied paying/attempting to pay for sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Once</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-5 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6-10 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11-20 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21-30 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Over 30 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Never have</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lasttimepaid</th>
<th>Denied paying/attempting to pay for sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>More than 6 months ago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3-6 months ago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Within the last 3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Not applicable - this was my first time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>uksex</th>
<th>Denied paying/attempting to pay for sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>uksexnum</th>
<th>Denied paying/attempting to pay for sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Once</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-5 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6-10 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11-20 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21-30 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Over 30 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nonuksex</th>
<th>Denied paying/attempting to pay for sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nonuksex1st</th>
<th>Denied paying/attempting to pay for sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>prostprobs</th>
<th>Denied paying/attempting to pay for sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>probMONEY</th>
<th>Denied paying/attempting to pay for sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>probSTD</th>
<th>Denied paying/attempting to pay for sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>probRELAT</th>
<th>Denied paying/attempting to pay for sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>probFAMILY</th>
<th>Denied paying/attempting to pay for sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>probPSY</th>
<th>Denied paying/attempting to pay for sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>probESTEEM</th>
<th>Denied paying/attempting to pay for sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>probROB</th>
<th>Denied paying/attempting to pay for sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>probDRUG</th>
<th>Denied paying/attempting to pay for sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>probABSENT</th>
<th>Denied paying/attempting to pay for sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>probOTHER</th>
<th>Denied paying/attempting to pay for sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>avoidcfdnceA</th>
<th>Denied paying/attempting to pay for sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very easy to avoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Easy to avoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoidcfdnceB</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoidcfdnceC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoidcfdnceD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoidcfdnceE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoidcfdnceF</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoidcfdnceG</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoidcfdnceH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoidcfdnceI</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoidcfdnceJ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stmtagreeA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stmttagreeM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| stmtntruthA | 1 | Very true |
|            | 2 | True |
|            | 3 | Maybe true, maybe untrue |
|            | 4 | Untrue |
|            | 5 | |

| stmtntruthB | 1 | Very true |
|            | 2 | True |
|            | 3 | Maybe true, maybe untrue |
|            | 4 | Untrue |
|            | 5 | |

| stmtntruthC | 1 | Very true |
|            | 2 | True |
|            | 3 | Maybe true, maybe untrue |
|            | 4 | Untrue |
|            | 5 | |

| stmtntruthD | 1 | Very true |
|            | 2 | True |
|            | 3 | Maybe true, maybe untrue |
|            | 4 | Untrue |
|            | 5 | |

| stmtntruthE | 1 | Very true |
|            | 2 | True |
|            | 3 | Maybe true, maybe untrue |
|            | 4 | Untrue |
|            | 5 | |

| stmtntruthF | 1 | Very true |
|            | 2 | True |
|            | 3 | Maybe true, maybe untrue |
|            | 4 | Untrue |
|            | 5 | |

| stmtntruthG | 1 | Very true |
|            | 2 | True |
|            | 3 | Maybe true, maybe untrue |
|            | 4 | Untrue |
|            | 5 | |

| preventVICT | 1 | Yes |
|            | 2 | No |

| preventQOL | 1 | Yes |
|            | 2 | No |

| preventFINE | 1 | Yes |
|            | 2 | No |

<p>| preventROB | 1 | Yes |
|            | 2 | No |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>prevent18YRS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preventJAIL</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preventSTD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preventCJS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preventDRUG</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preventPAPER</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preventCHANGE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preventDRUGOFF</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preventPOL</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preventPIMP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preventBUSI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preventCOMPOL</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preventHIV</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preventARREST</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preventRAPE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preventASSAU</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preventFAMILY</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preventHOUSE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preventVIOL</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>postsexfeel</td>
<td>I felt guilty</td>
<td>I felt sexually satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I felt excited</td>
<td>I felt as though I had done wrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I felt happy</td>
<td>My feelings were no different than prior to paying for sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I felt powerful</td>
<td>Got caught before paying for sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other - drunk or high</td>
<td>Other - police came before I did anything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other - not guilty/shouldn't be here</td>
<td>Other - disappointed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other - not specified

13 Reflects/feels

1 I felt guilty
2 I felt sexually satisfied
3 I felt excited
4 I felt as though I had done wrong
5 I felt happy
6 My feelings were no different than prior to paying for sex
7 I felt powerful
8 Got caught before paying for sex
9 Other - depressed
10 Other - drunk or high
11 Other - not guilty/shouldn't be here
12 Other - disappointed
13 Other - not specified

info share

1 Yes
2 No

INFO friend

1 Yes
2 No

INFO brother

1 Yes
2 No

INFO sister

1 Yes
2 No

INFO father

1 Yes
2 No

INFO mother

1 Yes
2 No

INFO coworker

1 Yes
2 No

INFO wife

1 Yes
2 No

INFO male relative

1 Yes
2 No

INFO female relative

1 Yes
2 No

INFO child

1 Yes
2 No

know A

1 Got question answer right
2 Got question answer wrong

know B

1 Got question answer right
2 Got question answer wrong

know C

1 Got question answer right
2 Got question answer wrong

know D

1 Got question answer right
2 Got question answer wrong

know E

1 Got question answer right
2 Got question answer wrong

know F

1 Got question answer right
2 Got question answer wrong

know G

1 Got question answer right
2 Got question answer wrong
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>knowlH</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Got question answer right</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Got question answer wrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Got question answer right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Got question answer wrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>streetfuture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes, I plan to pay street-prostitutes for sexual contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes, but I plan to do it less frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes, but I am working on stopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No plans to, but I might 'slip up' if tempted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No, I will never go to a street-prostitute again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Never paid - not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allsexfuture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes, I plan to pay prostitutes for sexual contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes, but I plan to do it less frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes, but I am working on stopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No plans to, but I might 'slip up' if tempted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No, I will never go to a prostitute again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monthatt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>September 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>October 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>November 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>December 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>January 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>February 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>March 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>April 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>May 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>June 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>July 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>August 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>September 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>October 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>November 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>December 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>January 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>survemtime</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Before Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>After Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cjsconseq</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Criminal Conviction/Record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Draw a line under the episode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Name and shame in local media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I was not guilty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Loss of job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Multi-impact on life - affect job/relationships/psychological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lost family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cautioned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Multi answer 1 - crim conviction, ID in local paper &amp; job implications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Multi-answer 2 - fined and name in paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Loss of self-respect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**changeatt**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Potential impact on me/family. Less concern for street-prostitutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sympathy for working girl, but main reason is fear of being caught again</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Devastating impact for women and girls selling sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hasn't taught me anything that I didn't already know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nothing wrong with paying for sex, but better done off-street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>There are no winners. Men should stop buying, women stop selling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPENconseq**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Psychological - depression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Psychological - low self-esteem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Psychological - anxiety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Psychological - self-labelling as ‘pervert’, ‘sex monster’ etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Increase problems for prostitute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Helping to fund pimps and drug dealers/more drugs on street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Wasting my time and money having to attend ‘Change’ programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Relationship break-down</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A complete disaster from start to finish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Physical - STD Infection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Multi-answer 1 - keeping prostitutes on street, feeding drug problem, catching disease &amp; not protecting family name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Job implications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPENcomments**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very insightful/informative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Keep up the good work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Learnt a lot about myself - want to change my outlook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Don't think street-prostitution can be eliminated or controlled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Confident the course will work and that it should continue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>It is expensive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Just because we are happy to pay for sex, doesn't make us perverts. There is much to be said about the women too</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Prostitutes should be dealt with by means of severe punishments to stop them from re-offending and red light areas safer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Continue the role play &amp; make session more light hearted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>KCPTF tactics are heavy-handed and intimidating - felt like there were no options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Put more CCTV camera's in red light district for number plate recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Prostitution with over-18s should be legalised, but with proper controls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPENprobdeal 1</td>
<td>Need counselling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No more involvement in prostitution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Get a new hobby/change lifestyle to make more varied and/or exciting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Get a long term relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix N: Voucher Incentive Receipt Confirmation

Reducing Demand, Controlling Supply: Evaluating New Street-Level Prostitution Policy Interventions in Nottingham

Voucher Incentive Receipt Confirmation

I can confirm that as a result of my participation in the above research project a voucher payment of £20 has been paid (please tick appropriate voucher scheme):

- Boots
- Wilkos
- WH Smith
- Tesco
- Asda

Signed: _______________________________________

Print name: ____________________________________

Date: _________________________________________
Appendix O

Working girl seeks help to reduce/stabilise drug use and/or exit prostitution

POW
Jericho Road Project
John Storer
Social Services
OSPT

Referral to CDO in OSPT

Assessment with w/girl and CDO

i) Support and advice with relevant changes
ii) Help with accessing and maintaining contact with appropriate services

Drug treatment

Health

GP, POW, GUM, Health Centres, Women’s Advice Centres

Housing

Housing Aid, Hostels, Refuges

Exiting

POW, EET Officer, Job Centre Plus, Double Impact

Benefits/ debt

POW, Welfare advisor, Job Centre Plus

Child Care

Health Centres, Stars, Social Services

Support in harm reduction, drug minimisation, prescribing, treatment, therapies

Treatment for infections, illness, health advice, support for abuse

Temporary housing, permanent accomm, refuge, tenancy support

Confidence building, education, training, employment, maintaining skills, personal and social development

Debt pay down, money management skills, benefits and employment advice

Extra support for child, or contact with children in care (when ready)

APPENDIX O: REFERRAL/ASSESSMENT PROCESS FOR W/GIRLS (COURTESY OF OSPT/CDO)
SECTION 1: THE ESRC’S MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

The ESRC does not seek to impose a detailed model for ethical evaluation and conduct on researchers or research organisations (ROs). But the requirements described here in Section 1 will constitute the minimum standard for a research proposal to be eligible for ESRC funding. Guidance on the ESRC’s minimum requirements now follows:

1. Ethical issues must always be addressed in the proposal
   1.1 Although the ESRC does not require that ethical approval should be secured before submission of a research proposal, all proposals must state whether the applicant considers that ethical approval will be required for their proposed research and why.
   1.1.2 In the first instance, it is the responsibility of the researcher, or research team, guided by their professional disciplinary standards, to decide whether a project is ethically sensitive and should be subject to either a ‘light touch’ review (see para 1.2 below) or full REC approval. Normally, research proposals involving human participants would be reviewed and approved by a REC which has been established and operates in accordance with the principles and guidelines set out in this Research Ethics Framework.
   1.1.3. Grant applications to the ESRC must provide a full statement by the proposers that they have given proper consideration to any ethical matters which the proposal raises. Where an ethics review is yet to be undertaken, this should be stated. Where the proposers regard ethics review as unnecessary, a statement that justifies this view is needed and should be expressed with reference to the exemptions noted below (para 1.3.2.5). Referees will be asked to give special attention to this statement in light of the detailed case made in the full proposal. If referees, or the relevant ESRC Commissioning Panel or Board are not persuaded that ethics approval is not required, the grant may still be supported, but will require subsequent REC approval.

Box 1: Key Terms

‘Research’ is defined as any form of disciplined inquiry that aims to contribute to a body of knowledge or theory.
‘Research ethics’ refers to the moral principles guiding research, from its inception through to completion and publication of results and beyond – for example, the curation of data and physical samples after the research has been published.
A ‘Research Ethics Committee’ (REC) is defined as a multidisciplinary, independent, body charged with reviewing research involving human participants to ensure that their dignity, rights and welfare are protected. The independence of a REC is founded on its membership, on strict rules regarding conflict of interests, and on regular monitoring of and accountability for its decisions.
‘Human participants’ (or subjects) are defined as including living human beings, human beings who have recently died (cadavers, human remains and body parts), embryos and foetuses, human tissue and bodily fluids, and human data and records (such as, but not restricted to medical, genetic, financial, personnel, criminal or administrative records and test results including scholastic achievements).

1.1.4 Normally projects would be expected to start no sooner than three months after the formal notification of funding from the ESRC, to allow for recruitment of staff and ethics approval within the RO. Initial payment of grant will only be made once any necessary REC approval is secured. Approval for minor changes to a project following REC review is delegated to the RO, though the ESRC needs to be informed of any changes made and of the final decision to approve or not.
1.1.5 If review by the REC shows that a project requires major changes which will alter it so much that it can no longer attract ESRC support, no payment will be made. This is likely to be an extremely rare occurrence since the proposal will have already been subject to external peer review which should identify such severe problems. In those cases where it is agreed that ethics review is to be undertaken after an initial period of research, funds will be made available to cover the period through to the completion of the review, and continued funding will be conditional on its success.

1.2 Expedited review
Expedited review of research proposals can occur and is likely to do so for a number of reasons. One is where the potential for risk of harm to participants and others affected by the proposed research is minimal, as confirmed by the ESRC’s peer review of the proposal. The secondary use of some datasets may be uncontroversial and require only light touch, expedited review. Expedited review may also be needed for research projects that have a short lead time and are commissioned in response to a demand of pressing importance.

1.2.1 Institutional policies and procedures for expedited review should include a clear statement that addresses the following issues:
- criteria for identifying research which involves minimal risks (see 1.2.2)
- the sub-committee or chair to which responsibility for reviewing such research has been delegated, and the scope of their authority
- forms and procedures for submitting applications for expedited review
- procedures for reporting decisions to the main institutional REC
- procedures for periodic audit (perhaps annual) of normal and expedited reviews by the main institutional REC.

Chair’s action is likely to be the most common form of expedited review. Other forms of expedited review can include review by sub-committees of an REC and review by a ‘virtual’ committee. These approaches have the advantages of drawing on a wider range of individuals to take part in ethical review and of facilitating swifter review. This may also help ‘demystify’ research ethics review and develop a more sophisticated understanding of the issues amongst those who take part in it.

1.2.2 The following research would normally be considered as involving more than minimal risk:
- research involving vulnerable groups – for example, children and young people, those with a learning disability or cognitive impairment, or individuals in a dependent or unequal relationship
- research involving sensitive topics – for example participants’ sexual behaviour, their illegal or political behaviour, their experience of violence, their abuse or exploitation, their mental health, or their gender or ethnic status
- research involving groups where permission of a gatekeeper is normally required for initial access to members – for example, ethnic or cultural groups, native peoples or indigenous communities
- research involving deception or which is conducted without participants’ full and informed consent at the time the study is carried out
- research involving access to records of personal or confidential information, including genetic or other biological information, concerning identifiable individuals
- research which would induce psychological stress, anxiety or humiliation or cause more than minimal pain
- research involving intrusive interventions – for example, the administration of drugs or other substances, vigorous physical exercise, or techniques such as hypnotherapy. Participants would not encounter such interventions, which may cause them to reveal information which causes concern, in the course of their everyday life.

1.3 Approval by a Research Ethics Committee
1.3.1 Research proposals involving human participants must normally be reviewed and approved by a Research Ethics Committee (REC) which has been established and operates in accordance with the standards and guidelines set out in this Research Ethics Framework.

1.3.1.1 Research organisations should ensure that there is a principal REC for their institution and may establish secondary (for example school or department based ones) if they believe that this is required. Where more than one REC is established, the area of responsibility of each should be set out. It would normally be defined by an area of substantive and methodological expertise. There must be clear procedures to establish the relationship between them and to facilitate co-operation and common standards. A university–wide ethics committee might advise on broad strategy for ethics review, and monitor university performance overall, rather than consider applications per se. Wherever they are located, they should meet the requirements of this REF, even at department level if this is where the decision to approve a project is to be taken.

1.3.2 Responsibility for securing ethical review
1.3.2.1 Overall responsibility for ensuring that research is subject to appropriate ethics review and approval lies with the University or research organisation which employs the individual or individuals who conduct the research (but see also 1.14 below on joint research). Although it is expected that a research organisation will establish its own REC or RECs to review research, smaller institutions and those that do not conduct a substantial number of studies involving human participants may make arrangements to secure ethical review by an REC in another institution.
1.3.2.2 The authority of an REC should be delegated through the institution’s usual governance mechanisms. It should report to the appropriate University or organisation authority. In defining an REC’s mandate and authority, the institution should make clear the jurisdiction of an REC and its relationship to other relevant bodies or authorities both within and outside the institution.

1.3.2.3 Institutions are expected to monitor the operation of RECs for which they are responsible, and the decisions they take in relation to social science proposals, according to the standards and guidelines set out here.

1.3.2.4 Ethical approval need not be secured before an application for funding is submitted, as the majority of applications are not funded. The point at which a research project is submitted for review may vary according to the research design (see 1.1.5 above). RECs should be flexible about the timing of such review.

1.3.2.5 Within the definition of research given above, all data collection involving human participants normally requires prior ethical approval with the exception of the following, which are not considered ‘research’: routine audit, performance reviews, quality assurance studies, testing within normal education requirements, service evaluations, polling on current public policy issues, and literary or artistic criticism. While data collected and stored as a record at an individual level is considered ‘human data’, material already in the public domain is not. For example, published biographies, newspaper accounts of an individual’s activities and published minutes of a meeting would not be considered ‘personal data’ requiring ethical review. Nor would interviews broadcast on radio or television or online, and diaries or letters in the public domain.

1.3.2.6 Ethical review may not be required for anonymised records and data sets that exist in the public domain. This includes, for example, datasets available through the Office for National Statistics or the ESRC Data Archive where appropriate permissions have already been obtained and where it is not possible to identify individuals from the information provided. However, data providers are likely to specify their own restrictions on the access to and use of their data. These must be complied with. There may be some circumstances where ethical issues arise with the use of secondary data, as described in para 1.16.4.

1.3.2.7 The administering authority in signing the grant application form will be confirming that it concurs with the applicant’s judgment in regard to ethical review and is prepared to administer any resulting award on the basis specified in the application, carrying out full (possibly iterative) ethical review where necessary.

1.3.2.8 During peer review, referees and other assessors will be asked to comment on the ethical self-assessment in the proposal. If they disagree with the proposed ethical review, this could lead to the rejection of a proposal, or the making of a conditional award based upon their assessment of the necessary ethical review.

1.4 Independence of Research Ethics Committees

1.4.1 Universities and other research organisations are responsible for ensuring that the RECs within their institutions act independently. They must be free from bias and undue influence from the institution in which they are located, from the researchers whose proposals they consider and from the personal or financial interests of their members. To this end, institutions should ensure that RECs include members who are independent of the institution (see 1.5.1), should set out procedures for identifying and dealing with potential conflicts of interests and should regularly monitor the decisions taken.

1.4.2 For the decisions and advice of a REC to be respected, they must be seen to be made impartially. That is, they need to be – and be seen to be – independent. The independence of RECs is founded on their membership, on strict rules regarding conflict of interests and on regular monitoring of and accountability for their decisions.

1.4.3 The need to be independent also has a bearing on where RECs might be located within an institutional structure. Departmental RECs that comprise members from only one discipline or a small number of closely related disciplines may be regarded as too closely aligned with the interests of researchers. Faculty or school RECs are likely to be multidisciplinary and, apart from the requirement for at least one lay member, could include individuals from outside the institution as well as those with the requisite skills and experience to evaluate more complex and ambitious research applications. RECs at University level are also likely to be more broadly based, leaving the work of reviewing applications to RECs in schools or departments and to concentrate on policy matters and oversight of the lower-level RECs.

1.5 Composition of Research Ethics Committees

1.5.1 The membership of a REC is fundamental to ensuring that it has the range of expertise and the breadth of experience necessary to provide competent and rigorous review of the research proposals submitted to it, and to do so from a position that is independent of both the
researchers and the institution in which it is located. Their composition and independence are important in establishing the legitimacy of the opinions which they express and the decisions they make, in the eyes of the community and wider society as well as the performers and funders of research.

1.5.2 RECs should be multidisciplinary and comprised of both men and women. They must include at least one lay member from the local community with no affiliation to the university or research institution in question. There must be members who have broad experience of and expertise in the areas of research regularly reviewed by the REC and who have the confidence and esteem of the research community. At least one member must be knowledgeable in ethics. There must be a chair. RECs would also benefit from including individuals who reflect the ethnic diversity of the local community, users of specialist health, education or social services where these are the focus of research activities, individuals with experience of professional care or counselling and individuals with specific methodological expertise (for example, statistics or qualitative methods) relevant to the research they review.

Taking all of this into account, good practice would suggest that RECs would normally need at least seven members.

1.5.3 An REC may seek advice and assistance from experts outside the committee in considering a research proposal. When this happens, the chair should establish that the experts have no conflict of interest in relation to the proposal.

1.6 Remit and responsibilities of Research Ethics Committees

1.6.1 Institutional RECs are responsible for reviewing all research involving human participants, or drawing on secondary data carrying personal or organisational information (such as corporate data) conducted under their auspices, that is, by individuals employed by the institution. RECs should review research proposals in a way that is independent, competent and timely. In some circumstances RECs may authorise other sub-committees or their chair to conduct reviews on their behalf. These sub-committees and chair will be accountable to the REC and through it to the appropriate institutional authorities for the decisions they make.

1.6.2 The primary role of a REC is to protect the dignity, rights and welfare of research participants. RECs should also give due regard to the consequences of the proposed research for others directly affected by it and to the interests of those who do not take part in the research but who might benefit or suffer from its outcomes in the future. RECs may also want to consider the safety of researchers. Such consideration should refer to the institution’s research governance provisions.

1.7 Procedures for considering and approving research proposals

1.7.1 Institutional RECs should consider each research proposal submitted and may approve it as submitted, approve it subject to meeting specified conditions or reject it on ethical grounds. The decision made for each proposal, and the grounds on which it was made, should be recorded and provided to the researchers, and a copy kept on file with the proposal for a specified minimum period consistent with the institution’s policy on information retention, but in any case extending beyond the lifetime of the project.

1.7.2 Universities and research organisations should establish and publish working procedures and appropriate forms and systems of documentation in relation to the following:

- the dates of REC meetings and the deadlines for submission of applications to be considered at each meeting
- preparation of agendas and distribution of papers to members in advance of meetings and distribution of minutes following meetings
- minimum attendance for a quorum and procedures when meetings are not quorate
- presentation of research proposals and supporting documents

While a basic set of standard information should be required for all research proposals, institutions should consider whether the way it is presented might appropriately vary between RECs, in light of the research they review. Research paradigms differ between disciplines and a ‘one size fits all’ approach is not always appropriate. Application forms and procedures should be kept as brief as possible and could be tailored to the requirements of particular disciplines.

- the point at which research proposals should be submitted for approval

It is inappropriate and wasteful for organisations that fund research to require that ethical approval be secured before an application for funding is submitted, as the majority of applications are not funded. ROs and funding agencies should be flexible about the point at which review by a REC is required. In the majority of cases this will be immediately after notification of funding, but it could also be prior to a pilot study so that participants’ interests are protected; prior to seeking the agreement of potential research sites and gatekeepers so they
can be assured of its good standing; or prior to the main data collection when research instruments have been tested and access to participants agreed. The decision resides initially with the research team. A system of light initial peer review within a department would assist this process and help establish the most appropriate point for ethical scrutiny.

- identifying, documenting and dealing with conflicts of interests
- methods of decision making and recording decisions

Research organisations should make clear and record how they come to their decisions, including whether 'lead reviewers' are designated for each proposal and whether decisions can be made on the basis of a majority view.

- prompt notification of decisions and the reasons for them
- receiving and considering appeals
- monitoring the conduct of research following approval and continuing ethical review
- receiving and considering complaints (see 1.12).

1.8 Application forms and protocols

1.8.1 Research proposals submitted for approval to an REC might be expected to include the following information, though the precise way this is done is left to the discretion of the research organisation:

- aims of the research
- scientific background of the research
- study design
- participants – who (inclusion and exclusion criteria), how many, how potential participants are identified and recruited, vulnerable groups
- methods of data collection
- methods of data analysis
- response to any conditions of use set by secondary data providers
- principal investigator’s summary of potential ethical issues and how they will be addressed
- benefits to research participants or third parties
- risks to participants or third parties
- risks to researchers
- procedures for informed consent – information provided and methods of documenting initial and continuing consent
- expected outcomes, impacts and benefits of research
- dissemination (and feedback to participants where appropriate)
- measures taken to ensure confidentiality, privacy and data protection.

1.9 Criteria for considering research proposals

1.9.1 The ethical principles set out in this REF provide the basis for reviewing research proposals. These principles are to be considered in relation to the nature of the research outlined, the context in which it is undertaken and the accepted ethical norms and practices of the relevant research discipline.

1.9.2 RECs should review research proposals in terms of their ethical probity. This will entail a consideration of the design and proposed conduct of the research. These should be considered in terms of the ethical issues raised (for example, whether the method of recruitment proposed puts undue pressure on individuals to participate) and the way they are addressed. The scholarly or scientific standards of the proposal should be evaluated by appropriate peer review, typically provided by the funding agency as part of the refereeing process. Where the REC queries the scientific or scholarly merit of a proposal, it should seek the advice of an independent researcher with experience and expertise in the research methods and paradigm described in the proposal.

1.9.3 Members of RECs should also be familiar with a range of philosophical approaches to research ethics and with the different perspectives they bring to individual research proposals. Where more than one perspective or ethical principle applies to a specific case, clear ethical reasoning will be required and debate should be encouraged. Good ethical review requires sensitivity to the context in which a research study will be conducted and good ethical reasoning requires careful thought and consideration.

1.9.4 The knowledge and expectations that members of RECs bring to the ethical review of research proposals are fundamental to the way they review proposals. This is particularly clear in qualitative research where it may be impossible or undesirable to meet the standard requirements for ethical approval, for example, to obtain signed consent forms from each respondent.

1.10 Institutional support for Research Ethics Committees

1.10.1 Universities and or research organisations should provide the REC or RECs for which they are responsible with the necessary resources to carry out their responsibilities efficiently,
effectively and independently. This includes, at a minimum, appropriate training for the members in the ethical, legal and scientific dimensions of the research that their REC reviews; adequate administrative and clerical support, and adequate resources, including recognition in workload planning and the allocation of academic responsibilities, to carry out reviews with due care and attention and to attend meetings of the REC. Any additional resourcing for these requirements should fall within a research organisation’s internal budget. However, it should be remembered that the additional costs incurred in carrying out ethical review specifically for ESRC-funded research are eligible costs under the arrangements for Research Councils to meet a proportion of the full economic costs of research.

1.10.2 Successful implementation of the REF will rely in large part on the degree to which individual research organisations are able to build appropriate structures and create a culture that recognises the central place ethics review occupies in good research practice. Ethics training will play a central role in this process. Such training should be on-going and become an integral part of research practice, given the changing ethics environment.

1.10.3 Many institutions already have ethics training programmes in place, organised either at university level or through devolved structures such as department or faculty-based programmes. However, successful REF implementation requires the development over time of agreed minimum standards of training and competence, which may be achieved through programmes at institutional, faculty, departmental, or research centre or unit level.

1.10.4 The aim of this training should be to build confidence in individual abilities to recognise the need for ethics scrutiny with regard to social science research; to understand the institution’s requirements and procedures for review; and to understand how to access additional help, both internal and external to the research organisation. In practical terms, training requirements are likely to include:

- training for individual researchers
- training for members of local and institution-wide RECs, including lay members
- training for postgraduate students in local ethics review requirements (in addition to any more general ethics training)
- training for undergraduate students whose projects may require ethics review.

1.10.5 Research Organisations should build a programme of support and provide resources to aid staff in understanding and implementing the REF, whether as individual researchers or as members of a local or university-wide review body responsible for implementation or compliance. The nature of such resources is likely to depend on the size of the organisation and the research it conducts. They might include:

- web-based resources such as flow-charts or algorithms to help identify whether a proposed study requires ethics review, and the steps that must be taken to gain ethics approval, whether according to the REF or some other framework
- an Ethics Review Handbook that states the institution’s standards and expectations with regard to the REF, and how staff can ensure they comply with them. This could form part of a larger document covering other ethics review frameworks as well
- training as mentioned above.

1.11 Procedures for institutional monitoring should be in place

1.11.1 Universities and other research organisations would be expected to establish and publish working procedures for monitoring research.

1.11.2 Where a study design is emergent, the REC should agree procedures for continuing ethical review (for example through a Project Advisory Group) with the researchers as a condition of approval. Where the study design is largely fixed in advance, procedures for reporting any unforeseen events that might challenge the ethical conduct of the research or which might provide the grounds for discontinuing the study to the REC or a designated sub-committee should be agreed with the researchers as a condition of approval.

1.11.3 Where an REC or a designated sub-committee considers that a monitoring report has raised significant concerns about the ethical conduct of the study, it should request a full and detailed account of the research for full ethical review by the main institutional REC.

1.11.4 Where an REC or designated sub-committee considers that a study is being conducted in a way which is not in accord with the conditions of its approval or in a way which does not protect the rights, dignity and welfare of research participants, it should consider withdrawal of its approval and require that the research be suspended or discontinued. ESRC must be informed of this decision and reserves the right to recoup its grant funding, pending further investigation, in extreme cases of research misconduct.

1.11.5 Institutions should also monitor the operation of RECs for which they are responsible, and the decisions they take, in relation to the standards and guidelines set out in this Research
Ethics Framework. Regular monitoring of RECs as part of research governance procedures is fundamental to demonstrating the independence and quality of the decision they take. This would normally take the form of annual reports on their membership, procedures and decisions, and periodic detailed audit of a sample of reviews.

1.12 Complaints procedures should be in place
1.12.1 Research organisations must have mechanisms for receiving and addressing complaints or expressions of concern about the conduct of research carried out under their auspices. Such complaints would normally be regarded as allegations of academic misconduct and would appropriately be addressed through the institution’s procedures for dealing with such allegations.

1.12.2 Rules and procedures for identifying and dealing with potential conflicts of interest are crucial to maintaining independence in the way an REC reviews applications. Potential conflicts of interest include, for example, conflicts between the interests of a research organisation, or a part of one, and those of a researcher making an application to the REC; conflicts between the private interests of a member of the Committee and the interests of a researcher making an application to the REC; and conflicts between the interests of the researcher and the interests of the research participants. Fundamental to dealing with each of these situations is the principle of prior disclosure of potential conflicts of interest and withdrawal from discussion and decision-making.

1.12.3 Where a decision has gone against a proposal or has required significant revisions to its conduct, the principal investigator should have the right to request that the Committee or Sub-committee reconsider its decision, or to appeal to the main university or institutional REC. Where the decision under appeal was made by the main institutional REC, an Appeal Committee should be constituted. It could be appropriate for institutions to make arrangements to act as Appeal Committees for one another.

1.13 Arrangements should be made for research students
1.13.1 The ESRC wants social scientists to engage with ethical issues from the start of their research careers. Universities must ensure that social science postgraduate training programmes incorporate the range of issues addressed in this Framework. Specialist training should also be considered for research supervisors.

1.13.2 Universities and research organisations should establish procedures specifically for reviewing research projects undertaken by undergraduate students and students on taught postgraduate courses. Student research poses particular challenges in relation to ethical review because of the large numbers, short timescales and limited scope of the projects involved. Student projects are carried out primarily as educational exercises rather than to generate new theoretical or empirical insights and this should be taken into account in reviewing the content, though not the ethics, of the study.

It should be made clear to potential research participants that the study is a student project.

1.13.3 While the same high ethical standards should be expected in student research, the process of ethical review may be more appropriately managed at department level and overseen by research supervisors. This does not lessen the requirement for universities to ensure that students are not exposed to undue risk in conducting their research. A case could be made for considering student research through a particular form of expedited review. Undergraduate and taught postgraduate research might be reviewed by multidisciplinary committees with a proportion of the members from outside the school or faculty but within the University. As student projects are not externally funded individually, there is less of a conflict of interests within the University.

1.13.4 The ESRC already provides Postgraduate Training Guidelines through its Training and Development Board, available at www.esrcsocietytoday.ac.uk. These Guidelines include reference to training in ethical and legal matters (section D2.4). Universities should ensure that training programmes that they provide incorporate the range of issues addressed in the main Framework document so that students embrace an ethics culture from the start of their research careers.

1.14 Arrangements should be made for multi-funder and multi-performer projects
1.14.1 Multifunded research: If the ESRC is one among a number of funders of a project, the REF guidelines must be drawn to the attention of all proposed funders prior to a submission for funding. Research organisations engaged in collaborative research may agree to use the services of one of their RECs to review a joint project on behalf of all participants.
Jointly funded research may involve the ESRC in partnership with other Research Councils, business, other public sector organisations, research charities or the voluntary sector. It may also be international. A third category is research funded under a European Union Framework programme and involving research teams from different EU member states. In this case, there may be conflicting national review procedures. In each of these three cases, the question arises: what ethics review requirements will apply to the research?

If the ESRC is one of the funders of the research, compliance with the REF is required. In order to request ESRC funding it will be necessary to have an agreement with the other funders that the proposed study will comply with the REF. This requirement should be drawn to the attention of other proposed funders prior to submission for funding. In many cases, such agreement could be achieved by the research being conducted in a REF compliant research organisation. If this is not the case, written agreement that the research will be subject to REF requirements will be necessary.

Multiperformer research: Research involving participants from more than one institution creates complications for formal ethical review procedures. In order to minimise bureaucracy and avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts, universities and research organisations should consider agreeing arrangements for accepting one another’s decisions following formal ethical review. Each institution would retain formal responsibility for overseeing the ethical review of research conducted under its auspices but would accept the decisions made by the REC of the institution where the Principal Investigator is based. Each institution would need to be satisfied that the research proposal has been properly scrutinised by the principal investigator’s main institutional REC and that regular monitoring of the conduct of the research was taking place and was promptly reported to all institutions involved.

Research may be carried out in a number of contexts ranging from a university to a Voluntary and Community Sector organisation, a private sector consultancy or an ‘unattached’ freelance researcher. This may present specific problems for REF compliance. For example, a researcher may propose to collect, use or store data in a manner that has not been approved by a recognised review process.

Researchers not based in academic institutions may be relatively isolated in their work and not enjoy the institutional support available to academic researchers. Freelance researchers and non-academic employing organisations may not have the capacity and resources to support independent review. Also, researchers in such organisations or alone are perhaps less likely to undergo ethics training than their academic colleagues.

If the research in question is funded by the ESRC, it must comply with the requirements of the REF. Freelance researchers, or Research Organisations without their own procedures for independent review, must arrange for ESRC funded research to be submitted to an ethics review procedure that complies with REF requirements.

Where research is to be conducted outside the UK, Research Organisations should require researchers to establish whether local ethical review is required by the host country, and if not, how the principles of the REF can be followed in developing and undertaking the research. There are a number of considerations here: inequities in regard to access to research resources, political and cultural consideration with regard to professional training and oversight, and considerable differences in power between the researcher and the researched. Moreover, research ethics in developing regions raises issues about what is meant by ethics, and therefore how we conceptualise notions of rights (consent, choice, volition, self-determination, etc) and the handling of personal data: in an international context where data handling may not be subject to the UK Data Protection Act. These issues need to be borne in mind in regard to specific schemes involving international collaboration such as the ESRC/DFID programme.

Researchers and their employing organisations should avoid duplication of ethics review, especially in regard to research that may fall under the rubric of other ethical frameworks such as the Department of Health’s Research Governance Framework. Researchers must submit proposals either to their institution’s REC or to a Department of Health Local or Multi-site Research Ethics Committee L(M)REC as appropriate. The ESRC does not require both bodies to be involved. The appropriate body will be determined by the issues raised by the research, the nature of the data to be obtained and the population of respondents to be included in the study. This will apply to both single-discipline and interdisciplinary research where social and biomedical scientists are working together.
1.16 Legal and data requirements must be met

1.16.1 Research organizations (RO) must comply with legislative requirements and with the requirements of data providers. Privacy, health and safety, and intellectual property are especially likely to arise as ethical concerns in research, but all legal requirements must be met. In addition, careful consideration is needed in regard to the ethical implications that might be associated with use of secondary data (see 1.16.4 over the page). Even where formal ethical review is not required, good research practice requires adherence to professional codes of practice and compliance with the Data Protection Act (DPA).

1.16.2 ROs should ensure that appropriate practical arrangements are in place to maintain the integrity and security of research data. Clear direction should be provided on where responsibilities reside in all these areas. Researchers may not realise the threat to data integrity and security presented by routinely used collection and storage methods, such as computer files on hard drives and similar devices, portable computing equipment and memory, email, and databases. Periodic audit of data storage arrangements at all levels is likely to be necessary to ensure compliance with both legal obligations and good research practice. Regular staff training is another avenue for ensuring appropriate practice.

1.16.3 UK Data Protection Act 1998

1.16.3.1 It is important that those undertaking research be aware that most of the Data Protection Principles embodied in the DPA apply to their work. Social science research often involves the processing of sensitive personal data. Researchers should be aware that the processing of any information relating to an identifiable living individual constitutes ‘personal data processing’ and is subject to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998, including the eight data protection Principles, summarised as follows.

1.16.3.2 Data must be obtained for a specified and lawful purpose; and shall not be processed in any manner incompatible with that purpose; shall be adequate, relevant and not excessive for those purposes; shall be kept up to date; and kept for no longer than is necessary for that purpose; be processed in accordance with the data subject's rights; be kept safe from unauthorised access, accidental loss or destruction; and shall not be transferred to a country outside the European Economic Area unless that country has equivalent levels of protection for personal data.

1.16.3.3 However, there are certain exemptions in Section 33 of the Act relating to the processing of data for research. The provisions of the DPA also do not apply if complete anonymisation of data is undertaken. However, organisations and individual researchers should be aware that data ‘stripping’ to remove personal identifiers, and the concept of anonymisation itself, are often problematic. Careful consideration is advised before using this as a basis for exemption.

1.16.3.4 Under the Act, ‘data’ includes any information: stored in a form capable of being processed by computer or other automatic equipment; recorded in any form for later processing by computer or other automatic equipment (such as information collected from registration forms or CCTV pictures); or stored as part of a relevant filing system or intended to be included in one in the future, including card files or filing cabinets structured by name, address or other identifier.

1.16.3.5 A number of additional points require consideration when assessing compliance, including:

- Circumstances where international research collaborations may involve transfer of personal data overseas. Data may not be transferred to countries outside the EEA unless that country has adequate data protection regulations, or the explicit consent of the data subject has been obtained, or there is an appropriate contract with the recipient of the data, specifying appropriate data protection requirements that must be upheld. In most cases, the only safe option will be to ensure that subjects give explicit consent for overseas transfer during data collection.

- Where the purposes of data processing for research are not necessarily determined at the time the data is obtained. For example, information on the outcome of operations might later be used for research into the effectiveness of medical procedures. The DPA requires that personal data may only be processed for one or more specified and lawful purposes, which would exclude such processing of personal data if it had not been specified at the point of collection. However, the Act provides specific exemptions for data processing for research, the definition of which includes historical and statistical analysis. These are not blanket exemptions and institutions and researchers must be aware of where and when they apply.

- The criteria for these exemptions differ where sensitive personal data is processed. The definition of this term and the circumstances where it applies require careful consideration. Issues here include explicit consent, duties of confidentiality (such as apply to medical
professionals), and the analysis of racial or ethnic origins for equal opportunities monitoring. The Data Protection (Processing of Sensitive Personal Data) Order 2000 permits sensitive data processing which ‘is in the substantial public interest and is necessary for research purposes and does not support measures with respect to the particular data subject except with their specific consent nor cause or be likely to cause substantial damage and distress’.

1.16.3.6 Only a brief outline of the issues has been provided here. Responsibility for both interpretation and compliance resides with research organisations themselves. Additional resources recommended for academic institutions include reviews by Davies (2002) at: http://www.bathspa.ac.uk/schools/graduate-school/data-protection/research-data-protectionact.pdf and material produced by the University of Lancaster: http://www.dpa.lancs.ac.uk/approved/research.htm

Other useful resources include: Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC): http://www.jisc.ac.uk/pub99/sm09_data_prot.html and the University Of Essex http://www2.essex.ac.uk/dataprotection/data.htm

Comprehensive guidance on the law can be found at: http://www.dataprotection.gov.uk/

1.16.3.7 Work with vulnerable populations: Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) Disclosures

In certain cases, research that involves vulnerable people may require CRB Disclosures (see http://www.disclosure.gov.uk/). The CRB offers organisations a means to check the background of researchers to ensure that they do not have a history that would make them unsuitable for work involving children and vulnerable adults. Requests for CRB Disclosures and the level of disclosure requested must balance the need to prevent unsuitable people from working in sensitive areas against the risk of discrimination against ex-offenders who have become rehabilitated. The responsibility for ensuring that applicants are suitable to work with such groups ultimately rests with individual employers. In some cases other individuals (such as a head teacher or social services manager) may be better placed to provide information on necessary disclosures. Arrangements must be in place to ensure that any disclosure information obtained by a research organisation in the course of ethics review procedures is kept in accordance with the DPA. For further details, see the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974, the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974 (Exceptions Order 1975) and BPS Guidelines for Minimum Standards of Ethical Approval in Psychological Research.

1.16.4 Secondary data sources

1.16.4.1 Secondary use of datasets needs to be given careful consideration by both the researcher and the REC, especially with regard to presumed consent and the potential risk of disclosure of sensitive information. This applies to the user of data and also to the researcher who originates it. Researchers who collect the data initially should be aware that ESRC expects that others will also use it, so consent should be obtained on this basis and the original researcher must take into account of the long-term use and preservation of data. Further advice on securing consent for secondary use, as well as exemplar consent forms, are available at the ESRC Data Archive web site (www.data-archive.ac.uk).

1.16.4.2 Secondary data falls into three categories:

i) The first includes data which is not sensitive and where there is minimum risk of disclosure of the identity of individuals. It may be used without ethical clearance.

ii) Second is data protected by legislation, such as census data. Here, the data producer has a strong interest in how researchers will access the data, and may control access to it. This data may only be available via ‘safe settings’.

iii) A third category, such as NCDS, includes data where the inclusion of a birth date makes disclosure possible, perhaps via a link to other datasets. This means that such data is ethically sensitive.

1.16.4.3 A data provider (such as ESDS or the ONS) may also have stringent requirements and restrictions relating to access and use of secondary data that must be followed. Legal and data supplier access requirements on secondary use of datasets must be complied with, including provisions relating to presumed consent and potential risk of disclosure of sensitive information. Data suppliers such as the ESDS or ONS should be consulted on their requirements.

1.16.4.4 The fact that an original piece of research has gone through ethical review for its collection does not rule out ethical issues arising over its secondary use. For example, archiving data with the ESDS might of itself make disclosure more likely. Issues include being able, for example, to download NCDS data to a CD Rom and wrongly allowing others (such as one’s students) to use it without the rights to do so.

1.16.4.5 There are also specific ethical issues relating to large-scale surveys, such as the Millennium cohort study, where social and other health or medical data is secured. An REC should consider issues such as the relation between opting in and out of the study and consent,
data security of named files and data and the anonymisation of individual respondents. It should ensure that proposals involving third parties such as polling companies contracted to secure data will do so according to the ethical principles set out here. These organisations often operate according to codes of practice developed by bodies such as the Market Research Society, www.mrs.org.uk.

1.16.5 There may in the future be an increasing likelihood of researchers accessing datasets through the technology being developed in e-social science where the issue of anonymity is compounded by debate over ownership and control of data. Moreover, this question will require especial consideration in the future because of the use by social scientists of data held in public or private biobanks inasmuch as the initial consent to deposit may not have presumed this form of access.
Appendix Q: British Society of Criminology Code of Ethics

British Society of Criminology
Code of Ethics for Researchers in the Field of Criminology

*Please see footnote if you wish to contact someone for advice.

The purpose of this Code is to offer some guidance to researchers in the field of criminology in keeping with the aims of the Society to value and promote the highest ethical standards in criminological research. The Code of Practice is intended to promote and support good practice. Members should read the Code in the light of any other Professional Ethical Guidelines or Codes of Practice to which they are subject, including those issued by individual academic institutions and by the ESRC (see Further Information section below).

The guidelines do not provide a prescription for the resolution of choices or dilemmas surrounding professional conduct in specific circumstances. They provide a framework of principles to assist the choices and decisions which have to be made also with regard to the principles, values and interests of all those involved in a particular situation. Membership of the British Society of Criminology is taken to imply acceptance of these general principles and the need to be aware of ethical issues and issues regarding professional conduct that may arise in people's work.

The British Society of Criminology's general principle is that researchers should ensure that research is undertaken to the highest possible methodological standard and the highest quality in order that maximum possible knowledge and benefits accrue to society.

1. General Responsibilities

Researchers in the field of criminology should endeavour to:

i) advance knowledge about criminological issues;

ii) identify and seek to ameliorate factors which restrict the development of their professional competence and integrity;

iii) seek appropriate experience or training to improve their professional competence, and identify and deal with any factors which threaten to restrict their professional integrity;

iv) refrain from laying claim, directly or indirectly, to expertise in areas of criminology which they do not have;

v) take all reasonable steps to ensure that their qualifications, capabilities or views are not misrepresented by others;

vi) correct any misrepresentations and adopt the highest standards in all their professional relationships with institutions and colleagues whatever their status;
vii) respect their various responsibilities as outlined in the rest of this document; 
viii) keep up to date with ethical and methodological issues in the field, for example by
reading research monographs and participating in training events (see Further
Information section below);

ix) check the reliability of their sources of information, in particular when using the
internet.

2. Responsibilities of Researchers Towards the Discipline of Criminology

Researchers have a general duty to promote the advancement and dissemination of
knowledge, to protect intellectual and professional freedom, and therefore to promote a
working environment and professional relationships conducive to these. More
specifically, researchers should promote free and independent inquiry into
criminological matters and unrestricted dissemination of criminological knowledge. As
part of this, researchers should endeavour to avoid contractual conditions that limit
academic integrity or freedom. Researchers should endeavour to ensure that the
methodology employed and the research findings are open for discussion and peer
review.

3. Researchers' Responsibilities to Colleagues

Researchers should:

i) recognise fully the contribution to the research of junior colleagues and avoid
exploitation of them. (For example, reports and publications emanating from research
should follow the convention of listing contributors in alphabetical order unless one has
contributed more than the other(s));

ii) actively promote the professional development of research staff by ensuring that staff
receive the appropriate training and support and protection in research environments
which may jeopardise their physical and/or emotional well-being;

iii) not claim work of others as their own; the use of others' ideas and research materials
should be cited at all times, whatever their status and regardless of the status of the ideas
or materials (e.g. even if in draft form);

iv) promote equal opportunity in all aspects of their professional work and actively seek
to avoid discriminatory behaviour. This includes a moral obligation to challenge
stereotypes and negative attitudes based on prejudice. It also includes an obligation to
avoid over-generalising on the basis of limited data, and to beware of the dangers of
failing to reflect the experience of certain groups, or contributing to the over-
researching of certain groups within the population.

4. Researchers' Responsibilities towards Research Participants

Researchers should:

i) recognise that they have a responsibility to ensure that the physical, social and
psychological well-being of an individual participating in research is not adversely
affected by participation in the research. Researchers should strive to protect the rights
of those they study, their interests, sensitivities and privacy. Researchers should consider carefully the possibility that the research experience may be a disturbing one, particularly for those who are vulnerable by virtue of factors such as age, social status, or powerlessness and should seek to minimise such disturbances. Researchers should also consider whether or not it is appropriate to offer information about support services (e.g. leaflets about relevant self-help groups);

ii) be sympathetic to the constraints on organisations participating in research and not inhibit their functioning by imposing any unnecessary burdens on them;

iii) base research on the freely given informed consent of those studied in all but exceptional circumstances. (Exceptional in this context relates to exceptional importance of the topic rather than difficulty of gaining access). Informed consent implies a responsibility on the part of the researchers to explain as fully as possible, and in terms meaningful to participants, what the research is about, who is undertaking and financing it, why it is being undertaken, and how any research findings are to be disseminated. Researchers should also make clear that participants have the right to refuse permission or withdraw from involvement in research whenever and for whatever reason they wish. Participants' consent should be informed, voluntary and continuing, and researchers need to check that this is the case. Research participants have the right to withdraw from the research at any time and for any reason without adverse consequences. Research participants should be informed about how far they will be afforded anonymity and confidentiality. Researchers should pay special attention to these matters when participation is sought from children, young, or vulnerable people, including consideration of the need for additional consent from an adult responsible for the child at the time participation is sought. It is not considered appropriate to assume that penal and care institutions can give informed consent on research on young people's behalf. The young people themselves must be consulted. Furthermore, researchers should give regard for issues of child protection and make provision for the disclosure of abuse. Researchers should consider the possibility of discussing research findings with participants and those who are the subject of the research;

iv) where there is a likelihood that identifiable data may be shared with other researchers, the potential uses to which the data might be put should be discussed with research participants. Research participants should be informed if data are likely to be placed in archives, including computer archives. Researchers should not breach the 'duty of confidentiality' and not pass on identifiable data to third parties without participants' consent. Researchers should also note that they should work within the confines of current legislation over such matters as intellectual property (including copyright, trademark, patents), privacy and confidentiality, data protection and human rights. Offers of confidentiality may sometimes be overridden by law: researchers should therefore consider the circumstances in which they might be required to divulge information to legal or other authorities, and make such circumstances clear to participants when seeking their informed consent;

v) researchers should be aware, when conducting research via the Internet, of the particular problems that may arise when engaging in this medium. Researchers should not only be aware of the relevant areas of law in the jurisdictions that they cover but they should also be aware of the rules of conduct of their Internet Service Provider (including JANET - Joint Academic Network). When conducting Internet research, the researcher should be aware of the boundaries between the public and the private domains, and also any legal and cultural differences across jurisdictions. Where
research might prejudice the legitimate rights of respondents, researchers should obtain informed consent from them, honour assurances of confidentiality, and ensure the security of data transmission. They should exercise particular care and consideration when engaging with children and vulnerable people in Internet research;

vi) researchers should be aware of the additional difficulties that can occur when undertaking comparative or cross-national research, involving different jurisdictions where codes of practice are likely to differ.

5. Relationships with Sponsors

Researchers should:

i) seek to maintain good relationships with all funding and professional agencies in order to achieve the aim of advancing knowledge about criminological issues and to avoid bringing the wider criminological community into disrepute with these agencies. In particular, researchers should seek to avoid damaging confrontations with funding agencies and the participants of research which may reduce research possibilities for other researchers;

ii) seek to clarify in advance the respective obligations of funders and researchers and their institutions and encourage written agreements wherever possible. They should recognise their obligations to funders whether contractually defined or only the subject of informal or unwritten agreements. They should attempt to complete research projects to the best of their ability within contractual or unwritten agreements. Researchers have a responsibility to notify the sponsor/funder of any proposed departure from the terms of reference;

iii) seek to avoid contractual/financial arrangements which emphasise speed and economy at the expense of good quality research and they should seek to avoid restrictions on their freedom to disseminate research findings. In turn, it is hoped that funding bodies/sponsors will recognise that intellectual and professional freedom is of paramount importance and that they will seek to ensure that the dissemination of research findings is not unnecessarily delayed or obstructed because of considerations unrelated to the quality of the research.

6. Further Information

When considering ethical issues members of the Society engaged in criminological research may find useful the detailed guidance on the Data Protection Act, Internet research and research involving children and young people formulated by the Market Research Society, www.marketresearch.org.uk

The Social Research Association (SRA) has produced: A Code of Practice for the Safety of Social Researchers and the SRA's Ethical Guidelines contain an extensive bibliography of papers and reports on ethics in social research.

For further information on codes of ethics, data sharing, confidentiality, risk and trust profiles for individuals using public service data sources, and privacy and self-disclosure, please see: Losing Data, Keeping Trust by Arild Foss which is available at the following web address and is hosted by the ESRC.
ESRC website at: www.esrcsocietytoday.ac.uk

The EU Code of Ethics for Socio-Economic Research can be accessed at:
www.respectproject.org/ethics/guideines.php

Other national societies' codes of ethics can be accessed as follows:
Australian and New Zealand Society of Criminology.
www.anzsoc.org/society/codeOfEthics.html

7. Frequently Asked Questions

Note: these FAQs are intended to provoke thought and debate: the answers given are not to be taken as definitive.

Q1: "One of my interviewees in prison has told me about getting away with various offences. He told me he is in prison for three burglaries, but there are several other offences that the police don't know about. What should I do?"
A1: It should have been made clear to participants in the research at the outset what the limits of confidentiality for those involved in the study were: see sections 4iii and 4iv of the Code of Ethics. Research in sensitive settings such as prisons is particularly likely to throw up issues of this kind.

Q2: "I've been doing some focus group discussions with school children about their views on crime and punishment. In a small group of ten year olds one day, they started talking about a man called John who gives them sweets at the gate of the school. There was a lot of hushing and shushing and exchanged glances at this point, and it became clear that I was being told something I wasn't meant to hear because of their parents. What should I do?"
A2: The welfare of vulnerable participants in research, such as children, overrides other concerns. See sections 4i and 4iii of the Code of Ethics. Research with children should only be undertaken by people who have themselves been cleared for the purpose by the Criminal Records Bureau. If research uncovers suspected child abuse, this must be disclosed to the proper authorities for investigation. In this case, the suspicion is vague but valid: the researcher should inform a senior staff member at the school of what was said.

Q3: "I've got piles of interview data for my PhD but nowhere to keep the material. I share an office with five others and have two drawers in a filing cabinet but they key has been lost. What am I meant to do with all the data, and does my department have an obligation to help me?"
A3: PhD students should receive proper training on data protection and universities should make appropriate provision for confidential storage of data (see sections 1iii, 1viii, 4i and 4iv of the Code of Ethics).

Q4: "I've just interviewed someone who was very depressed, and I'm worried that they may harm themselves."
A4: Where criminologists undertake research on sensitive topics, they may need to consider providing information about sources of appropriate support to research participants who may become distressed by the research encounter (see section 4i of the
Code of Ethics). However, whether it is appropriate to disclose information about potential self harm by research participants to third parties is a complex issue, and the decision will depend upon the circumstances of the case. It cannot be assumed that the person concerned would want their mental condition discussed with third parties.

Q5: "I'm a junior member of a large research group. I wrote the literature review for an article which the head of the group has submitted to a journal, but he has submitted it only under his own name. What can I do?"

If the senior researcher is a member of BSC, he is covered by this Code of Ethics. If not, the junior team member is in a very vulnerable position. If the matter cannot be resolved by informal discussion, the junior person needs independent advice in order to decide whether it is in her/his interests to pursue the matter formally (see sections 3i and 3iii of the Code of Ethics).

The BSC Code of Ethics was revised by Colin Dunnighan, Loraine Gelsthorpe, Mike Rowe, Azrini Wahidin, Brian Williams (Chair) and Kate Williams, February 2006. We also wish to acknowledge the help of Mark Israel.

The Ethics Committee of the British Society of Criminology currently includes: Mark Israel (Flinders University), Jo Phoenix (Durham University), Azrini Wahidin (Queens University Belfast), Anthony Goodman (Middlesex University) and is chaired by Loraine Gelsthorpe (University of Cambridge). Members of the Committee offer an advisory service to all members of the BSC regarding ethical issues. Notwithstanding members' commitments to any other professional and institutional codes of practice, the Committee also serves to review and comment upon research proposals. We are particularly keen to assist postgraduate students in this regard.

Contact Details:

BSC Office

February 2006
Appendix R: OSPT Punter Report 2008 [Text Only]

Profile of Punters Users in Nottingham 2008

Introduction
During 2008, the On-Street Prostitution Team dealt with 131 men who used / abused street prostitutes in Nottingham. This includes kerb crawlers and foot punters, including three on pedal cycles. For this reason, I’ve used the term ‘Punters’ rather than kerb crawlers, as this seems more inclusive and the word ‘client’ seems to legitimise the activities. I see no difference in a man who drives into the area looking for a prostitute when compared to one who walks into the area. In some ways, the foot punters have a greater effect on the local community, because a kerb crawler will pick a prostitute up in his car and drive away, whereas the foot punter will have sex in someone’s front garden or the alleyway at the side of their house and this is where they will discard any used condom for local children to find the next day.

We have the benefit of around five years of data now to draw comparisons over a longer period of time, giving consideration to seasonal variations and the impact that the team and their partners have had.

In order to put these totals into some kind of perspective, it is worth doing a few sums first. In early 2004, I would estimate that there would have been anything up to 20 or 30 women prostituting themselves on the streets of Nottingham in any one day. Each of these would have dealt with anything up to 10 men each. Taking the average of these estimates, this gives around 250 sexual acts performed on the streets of Nottingham by prostitutes every day. I do not think that this is any exaggeration and these are probably underestimates, but I should stress that they are only estimates and no-one has possession of the true figure. This would equate to 1750 sexual acts a week, or 7750 a month or over 90000 a year. There are very few men who will go onto the streets looking for a prostitute more than once a month, so we started with an initial target in the region of tens of thousands of men to deter from soliciting women in the streets of Nottingham.

As the partnership work has progressed, we have seen the number of women involved in prostitution in Nottingham fall considerably and we are starting to see a reduction in the number of men cruising the area either looking for, or looking at, these women.
In 2004, we saw almost 75% of the men we dealt with were white British. In 2005, the percentage of men who were white British had fallen dramatically to 58%. This has remained fairly constant ever since.

The number of Polish men has increased steadily over the four years to 7% in 2007 and this continued into 2008. This probably reflects an increase in the population of Poles in Nottingham. Interestingly, whilst we are seeing Polish families moving into the smaller towns and rural areas of Nottinghamshire, there is a predominance of lone males in the city. This is possibly due to the different reasons for moving to England in the first place, in that most of the lone males in the city are in the building trade or similar and have come here to make some money and intend on returning to Poland. Most of the families apparently plan on staying and building a longer-term future in this country.

The second highest group of males has consistently been from the Pakistani community. Comparing this with the ethnicity of females involved in prostitution, there are no Pakistani (or any other Asian ethnicity) women involved in prostitution on the streets of Nottingham.

**Age Group**

The graph below shows that 2008 produced a similar shape graph to that of previous years, with a slight increase in those males in their late teens. The predominant age group continues to be the 26 to 30 years age range.

**Occupation**

In 2004 and 2005, the most prominent group were the semi-skilled workers, which includes plumbers, electricians, builders etc, many of whom travel and work from their vehicles, providing both the opportunity and the temptation to become involved in street prostitution. In 2006, for the first time the largest group were the unemployed. This has continued to be the case in 2007 and 2008, although the unskilled workers such as labourers and factory workers has risen over the years to equal this. There are many possible reasons for this, such as having more time on their hands as well as feelings of discontent. Another factor may also be that we have seen the prices charged by street prostitutes falling over the period, possibly making it more affordable to someone on a small income.

**Method**

In this category, I am primarily concerned with the mode of transport that the men have used to get into the vice area in order to solicit a woman. Where a man has driven to the area and parked his vehicle up before approaching the woman on foot, I have treated this as kerb crawling from the original vehicle (as does the legislation under section 1 Sexual Offences Act 1985).
It should come as no surprise that the majority of men pick up a woman in their car. What is particularly noticeable however, is the steady increase in the numbers of foot punters, which accounted for over a quarter of all of the men caught in 2006. This fell slightly in 2007 and 2008, but still amounts to about a quarter. One possible explanation for this is that men who have received a letter from the task force about cruising have left their cars at home and walked. There does not seem to be any correlation, however, with the list of recipients of letters and the men subsequently caught picking up a prostitute on foot and we have no anecdotal evidence to support this.

It is more likely that we have simply got better at catching foot punters as this is much harder than catching men in vehicles. There may be some link to the increase in the numbers of men who are unemployed and those who walk into the area.

**Home Address**

The percentage of men caught who live within the conurbation of Nottingham has steadily increased over the three and a half years to 70% in 2007 which has continued into 2008 at 68%. This does not mean that more men from Nottingham are now picking up prostitutes. What does reflect is that the proportion of the men caught who come from outside of the city is falling. We are clearly not being seen as a place for sex tourism. We have caught men from Derbyshire and Lincolnshire who have travelled here specifically to find a street sex worker. This probably reflects the fact that Lincoln does not have a street sex scene and Derby’s is much smaller than Nottingham’s. The variety of men from other locations have all been in the city for other reasons such as business, visiting family or, more commonly, here for a function such as a stag party.

We have spent some time making contacts with our counterparts in Derby, Leicester and Northampton, to exchange information and intelligence to ensure that we are identifying those men who will travel between the cities.

Over the period of 2004 to 2006, we saw that NG5 and NG8 steadily decreased whilst NG3 and NG7 steadily rose. This trend did not seem to carry on into 2007, which reversed some of these tends.

Over the five years we have seen a shift from Mapperley Road towards Forest Road East. There are a number of possible reasons for this. The local community in Mapperley are far more likely to challenge a prostitute or a punter than they are in the Arboretum area, largely because the latter consists of a predominantly student population. Traditionally, the street vice area in Nottingham has centred around Forest Road East and the Forest Recreation Site (probably since the 1940s). Several factors affected this, the main one being the building of the Nottingham tram system, which closed Forest Road for several months and made both kerb crawling and loitering difficult. This had the result of pushing the problem across Mansfield Road and onto Mapperley Road. The tram system has been operational for a few years now and we may be seeing a settling back into the traditional patterns. The task force divide their time as fairly as possible across the whole area and respond to hotspot areas, so it is unlikely that we have contributed to this.
Conclusion

This is a detailed and lengthy document, but it does provide a lot of useful information for focussing patrols and resources. Some changing trends from the previous years have been identified and these need to be monitored over the coming year.

[ANON]
On-Street Prostitution Team
August 2009
Appendix S: Punter Informed Consent Form – Six Month Follow-up

Consent Form Information

Description of Study:

I am undertaking research based at Nottingham Trent University (NTU) as part of a postgraduate research degree. The research will look at the impact of policies operating within Nottingham that attempt to:

- Reduce re-offending amongst ‘kerb-crawlers’,
- Stop men paying for sex in the first place and
- Help with exiting for street-level ‘prostitutes’

An organization called the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) is funding me throughout the research, but apart from that connection I am working independently. I intend to present the key findings of the study, although the exact format and dates has yet to be decided. If you are interested in receiving these key findings, then copies can be made available – on request - on completion of the project.

Project Participation: What Will You Need To Do?

To participate in the research, all you need do is complete and sign the consent form at the back of this document. It is expected that interviews will last up to an hour and, with permission, all interviews will be tape-recorded. We want to know how your experiences of prostitution have shaped what you think about the world around you (and vice versa). Your contribution is crucial to achieving the aims of the project because it will help (a) establish the effect that polices designed to ‘tackle’ street-level prostitution have had on you and (b) find out ways in which policy could be improved moving forward.

Are There Any Risks to You?

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary; you can refuse to answer any questions that you are uncomfortable with, or to end your participation in the study at any time. All NTU staff involved in this project are obliged to sign a guarantee to protect your information. Your answers are completely anonymous and there is no way for anybody else to connect you with anything that you say in the interview. If you were to disclose that you had used prostitutes or engaged in any minor crime since the ‘Change’ course, then this information will not be disclosed to the police or anybody else, in any format that could possibly identify you. Please note, however, that there is one important proviso to this anonymity policy – I am obliged to pass on to the police any disclosure of a serious crime, such as child abuse or sexual assault.

---

1 Which consists of myself and my three University supervisors
Vouchers

As a thank you for your contribution to the research, we would like to offer you a £20 voucher redeemable at either Boots, HMV or Nottingham Victoria Centre (NVC).

Project Contacts: Who Can You Contact for More Information and Post Interview Support?

If you have questions about the study or about your rights as a participant, please ask NTU staff at any time throughout the interview. We realize that talking about sensitive issues, such as prostitution, can be distressing for many people. If you need somebody to talk to as a result of the things that we have talked about today, then please contact myself (Paul Hamilton) on [ANON] in the first instance.

You may keep this form for your records.

Thank you for your cooperation.

---

4 It is expected that you will have chosen your retail store voucher prior to the interview session – this will ensure that your voucher can be given to you on the day, rather than forwarded on at a later date.
Reducing demand, controlling supply: evaluating new street-level prostitution policy interventions in Nottingham

Consent Form

This consent form is to check that you are happy with the information that you have received so far, that you are aware of your rights as a participant and to confirm that you wish to take part in the study.

Please tick as appropriate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Have you been made aware of the research topic?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Have you had the opportunity to discuss the research with the researcher?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you understand that you are free to refuse to answer any questions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you understand that you are free to withdraw from the research at any time?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you understand that the researcher will use all information confidentially* and anonymously?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are you happy for the interview to be tape-recorded?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do you agree to take part in this study?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In the event of any disclosure of a serious crime, such as child abuse or assault etc, will be passed to the police

Signed: ________________________________

Print name: ________________________________

Date: ________________________________
Table 1t: ‘Prostitution Usage’ (‘veterans’) by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many times have you paid for sex?</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 21 times</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1u: HEQ by Employment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment status of those with/without qualifications</th>
<th>Employed f/t %</th>
<th>Unemployed %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G)CSE/O-Level</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G)NVQ</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-level</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate (including PostGraduate)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other quals</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1v: Do you think that it should it be legal for someone over 18 years old to get paid for sex if they choose to do so?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of respondent</th>
<th>Before Session</th>
<th>After Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British/Irish</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single 1</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single 2</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single 3</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution ‘Usage’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novice (1-5)</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate (6-20)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran (21+)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2v: Do you think that it should it be legal for someone between 16-17 years old to get paid for sex if they choose to do so?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of respondent</th>
<th>Before Session</th>
<th>After Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British/Irish</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single 1</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single 2</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single 3</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate (incl. PostGrad)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution ‘Usage’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novice (1-5)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate (6-20)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran (21+)</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1w: How strongly respondents agree with pre-defined statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Before Session (Strongly Agree)</th>
<th>After Session (Strongly Agree)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street-prostitution doesn’t really harm anybody</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the police should go after the men that buy sex and leave the prostitutes alone</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be ok if my daughter grew up to be a street-prostitute</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that generally street-prostitutes enjoy sex with ‘kind’ punters</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most street-prostitutes make a lot of money</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally, women are street-prostitutes because they want to be. No-one forces them; it’s their choice</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex is better with a street-prostitute than it is in a relationship</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There’s nothing wrong with paying for sex – it’s what most men do</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street-prostitutes are victims of pimps</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally, men need sex more than women do</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As long as a man’s wife doesn’t find out, sex with a street-prostitute can help to save a marriage</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying for sex in a brothel/massage parlour is more acceptable than paying for sex with a street-prostitute</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution will always be with us and the best thing we can do is to legalise it</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix X: Mean Scores associated with selected ‘Confidence Avoidance’ Statements
[Change Programme respondents – selected socio-demographic variables]

Table 1x: How confident do you feel that you would be able to avoid going to street-prostitute in the following circumstances – by MARITAL STATUS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marr’d</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep’ted</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div’ced</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single 1</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single 2</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single 3</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| When I really want sex | Before 1.74 | 2.46 | 1.50 | 2.00 | 1.43 | 1.79 |
| When I am high or drunk | After 1.58 | 1.46 | 1.62 | 1.53 | 1.50 | 1.22 |
| When I feel lonely | Before 2.22 | 2.38 | 2.64 | 1.38 | 1.50 | 1.43 |
| When the risk of being caught seems low | After 1.46 | 1.69 | 1.55 | 2.07 | 1.50 | 1.83 |
| When some risk of being caught | Before 1.35 | 1.23 | 1.18 | 1.13 | 1.29 | 1.47 |
| When I am solicited by a street-prostitute | After 1.04 | 1.38 | 1.18 | 1.13 | 1.14 | 1.00 |
| When opportunity presents itself | Before 2.39 | 2.08 | 2.10 | 2.19 | 1.29 | 1.79 |
| After 1.25 | 2.38 | 1.73 | 1.40 | 1.36 | 1.50 |
| When the risk of being caught seems low | Before 1.96 | 2.62 | 2.00 | 2.06 | 2.07 | 2.00 |
| When some risk of being caught | After 1.25 | 2.32 | 1.64 | 1.33 | 1.04 | 1.72 |

| AMS | -29% | -17% | -14% | -11% | -2% | -12% | -29% |

AMS (% Change)
Table 2x: How confident do you feel that you would be able to avoid going to street-prostitute in the following circumstances – by PROSTITUTION USAGE?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How confident do you feel that you would be able to avoid going to street-prostitutes in the following circumstances</th>
<th>Prostitution Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novice (1-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I really want sex</td>
<td>Before 1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After 1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I am high or drunk</td>
<td>Before 1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After 1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I feel lonely</td>
<td>Before 1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After 1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the risk of being caught seems low</td>
<td>Before 1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After 1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When some risk of being caught</td>
<td>Before 1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After 1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I am solicited by a street-prostitute</td>
<td>Before 1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After 1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When opportunity presents itself</td>
<td>Before 2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After 1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMS (%) Change</td>
<td>Before 1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After 1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMS (% Change)</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How confident do you feel that you would be able to avoid going to street-prostitute in the following circumstances</td>
<td>Mean Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I really want sex</td>
<td>Before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I am high or drunk</td>
<td>Before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I feel lonely</td>
<td>Before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the risk of being caught seems low</td>
<td>Before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When some risk of being caught</td>
<td>Before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I am solicited by a street-prostitute</td>
<td>Before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When opportunity presents itself</td>
<td>Before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| AMS (%) Change | -18% | -9% |
## Table 1y: Of the following statements, which [if any] are most likely to prevent you visiting street-prostitutes in the future (Tick maximum of THREE boxes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevention Factor</th>
<th>Before Session</th>
<th>After Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very likely I will have to pay a fine</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely I will be robbed by a street-prostitute</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely I will go to jail</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely I will be arrested</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely I will have to face other criminal justice consequences (including losing my driving licence)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely I will be caught by the police</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely that my name will be in the local paper</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My only punishment would be to have to anonymously re-attend the 'Change' re-education programme</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely that I would be offered drugs by a street-prostitute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely that my family or friends would find out</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely that someone in the community would turn me in to the police</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant risk of being infected with HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant risk of being infected with a STD</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing that street-prostitutes are victimised by pimps</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing that street-prostitutes are victimised by punters</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing that street-prostitutes are often victims of rape</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing that street-prostitutes are often assaulted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing that street-prostitutes are often drug addicts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing that house prices suffer in the neighbourhoods where street-prostitution is present</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONTINUED OVERLEAF
Table 2y: Of the following statements, which [if any] are most likely to prevent you visiting street-prostitutes in the future – most popular answers (top 3) [by socio-demographic grouping]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very likely I will have to face other criminal justice consequences (including losing my driving licence)</td>
<td>25-34 year olds (30%) Separated (46%) A-Level (27%) Graduate (39%)</td>
<td>25-34 year olds (38%) 35-44 year olds (37%) 45-59 year olds (27%) Separated (54%) Divorced (55%) Single 1 (29%) Single 2 (29%) Single 3 (28%) Employed f/t (32%) Unemployed (39%) White British/Irish (33%) South Asian (31%) Novice (33%) Intermediate (27%) Veteran (33%) No quals (32%) (G)CSE/O-Level (32%) A-Level (40%) Graduate (53%)</td>
<td>25-34 year olds (38%) 35-44 year olds (37%) 45-59 year olds (27%) Separated (54%) Divorced (55%) Single 1 (29%) Single 2 (29%) Single 3 (28%) Employed f/t (32%) Unemployed (39%) White British/Irish (33%) South Asian (31%) Novice (33%) Intermediate (27%) Veteran (33%) No quals (32%) (G)CSE/O-Level (32%) A-Level (40%) Graduate (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely I will be caught by the police</td>
<td>16-24 year olds (30%) 45-59 year olds (32%) Married (32%) Unemployed (31%) South Asian (25%) Intermediate (40%) A-Level (40%)</td>
<td>16-24 year olds (56%) 25-34 year olds (31%) 45-59 year olds (36%) Married (21%) Separated (54%) Divorced (36%) Single 1 (35%) South Asian (44%) Novice (33%) (G)CSE/O-Level (28%) (G)NVQ (41%) A-level (40%)</td>
<td>16-24 year olds (56%) 25-34 year olds (31%) 45-59 year olds (36%) Married (21%) Separated (54%) Divorced (36%) Single 1 (35%) South Asian (44%) Novice (33%) (G)CSE/O-Level (28%) (G)NVQ (41%) A-level (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely that my name will be in the local paper</td>
<td>Single 1 (24%) Single 2 (29%)</td>
<td>35-44 year olds (30%) Married (21%) Separated (39%) Divorced (36%) Unemployed (46%) South Asian (31%) Veteran (33%) Graduate (35%)</td>
<td>35-44 year olds (30%) Married (21%) Separated (39%) Divorced (36%) Unemployed (46%) South Asian (31%) Veteran (33%) Graduate (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely that my family or friends would find out</td>
<td>35-44 year olds (27%) Married (29%) Separated (39%) Divorced (27%) White British/Irish (22%) South Asian (51%) Veteran (33%) A-Level (33%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant risk of being infected with HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>16-24 year olds (30%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>16-24 year olds</td>
<td>25-34 year olds</td>
<td>35-44 year olds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant risk of being infected with a STD</td>
<td></td>
<td>25-34 year olds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-24 year olds</td>
<td></td>
<td>45-59 year olds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-24 year olds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing that street-prostitutes are victimised by men who have sex with them</td>
<td>Divorced (27%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Married (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No quals (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing that street-prostitutes are often drug addicts</td>
<td>35-44 year olds</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployed (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No quals (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(G)NVQ (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing that drugs and violence are associated with street-prostitution</td>
<td>Single 3 (32%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely that the street-prostitute is under the age of 18 years old</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Categories excluded where no socio-demographic group ranks the variable in their top 3/4 responses.
### Appendix Z: Respondents Open-ended comments about Change Programme

#### Table 1z: Any comments about the Change course [Open ended]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very insightful/informative</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep up the good work</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learnt a lot about myself – want to change my outlook</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t think street-prostitution can be eliminated or controlled</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident the course will work and that it should continue</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is expensive</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just because we are happy to pay for sex, doesn’t make us perverts. There is much to be said about the women too</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitutes should be dealt with by means of severe punishments to stop them from re-offending and ‘red light’ areas safer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue the role play &amp; make the session more light hearted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSPT tactics are heavy-handed and intimidating – felt like there were no options</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put more CCTV camera’s in ‘red light’ district for number plate recognition</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution with over-18s should be legalised, but with proper controls</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix AA: Main attitude towards prostitution (post programme) CROSSTAB with future prostitution usage plans [Change Programme respondents – ALL]

**Table 1aa: Which statement best describes your attitude towards prostitution (cross-tabulated with ‘do you plan to go to prostitutes in the future’ variables)?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you plan to pay street-prostitutes in the future?</th>
<th>The devastating impact that paying for street-level sex will have for my family and me. I am less concerned about the street-prostitutes.</th>
<th>Sympathy for any girl/woman involved in street-prostitution, but fear of being caught again is the main reason I will not pay for sex in the future.</th>
<th>Devastating impact of street-prostitution for the girls/women involved and this is the main reason that I will try to never pay for street-level sex again.</th>
<th>Nothing necessarily wrong with paying for sex, but it better to visit massage parlours/brothels than pay for sex from street-prostitutes.</th>
<th>No winners in street-prostitution. Men should stop buying street-level sex and we should try to stop women selling street-level sex.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES – PLAN STOP</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO – SLIP UP</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL*</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you plan to pay other prostitutes in the future?</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES – PLAN STOP</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO – SLIP UP</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL*</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rounded
Appendix BB: Change Programme Respondents open-ended responses to question: what have been the consequences of paying a street-prostitute for sexual contact?

**Table 1bb: On reflection, what have been the consequences of paying a street-prostitute for sexual contact [Open-ended]?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consequence</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological – depression</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological – low self-esteem</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological – anxiety</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological – self-labelling as ‘pervert’, ‘sex monster’ etc</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase problems for prostitute</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping to fund pimps and drug dealers/more drugs on street</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasting my time and money having to attend Change Programme</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship break-down</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A complete disaster from start to finish</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical – STD Infection</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-answer 1 – keeping prostitutes on street, feeding drug problem, catching disease &amp; not protecting family name</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job implications</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1cc: Socio-demographic characteristics of Change and Non-Change recidivist arrestee's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Change Programme recidivist numbers (post OSPT involvement)</th>
<th>Non-Change Programme recidivist numbers (post OSPT involvement)</th>
<th>Non-Change Programme recidivist numbers (ALL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black British/Caribbean</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Home address</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Mids (excl. Notts)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other UK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How first offence with OSPT dealt with</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charge</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caution</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused charge</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warned</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recidivism rate (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1% (N=5)</td>
<td>3% (N=11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>