



CENTRE
FOR
HOUSEHOLD, INCOME, LABOUR AND DEMOGRAPHIC ECONOMICS



Working Papers

What money buys: clients of street sex workers in the US

M. Della Giusta, M. L. Di Tommaso, I. Shima, S. Strøm

Child n. 12/2006

e-mail: de-child@unito.it
Web site: <http://www.child-centre.it>

What money buys: clients of street sex workers in the US¹

by

Marina Della Giusta², Maria Laura Di Tommaso³, Isilda Shima⁴, Steinar Strøm⁵

Abstract

An econometric model that explores the effect of personal characteristics and attitudes of clients on their demand for prostitution is estimated on data from a survey of clients of street sex workers in the US. The results reveal that clients of street sex workers in our sample have two diametrically opposite profiles: one for clients who declared never to have been with a sex worker or to have been only once, whom we label “experimenters”, and one for the more experienced ones that we name “regulars”. The experimenters correspond to a more machist type, with negative views of women, and of sex workers (who are believed to be different from other women but condemned at the same time), and viewing prostitution as a complement to stable relationships. The regulars have more liberal view of women, and of sex workers, the more they dislike control the more they demand, they like variety. Their demand also increases with age and with having a permanent job, which may indicate a positive income effect. These appear to be men who are happy to satisfy their sexual wants through sex workers, which they prefer to relationships. The users of condoms seem to fit the profile of the regulars, whereas the non-users fit that of the experimenters.

JEL classification: C35, D12

Keywords: Demand for sex, ordered logit, factor analysis, US data.

¹ Acknowledgments: We gratefully acknowledge helpful comments and suggestions received by Francesca Bettio and participants at the 2004 Annual Conference of the International Association for Feminist Economics in Oxford, at the workshop “Analysis of migration flows at risk: prostitution and trafficking” Torino 17-17 March 2006. We gratefully acknowledge research funding from the Department of Economics Cagnetti de Martiis (ex-60% research funding 2004) and from MIUR (Italian Ministry of Research and University) under the grant PRIN 2005-2006 “Analysis of migration flows at risk: prostitution and trafficking”. We gratefully acknowledge The Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (a unit within the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan, USA), which provided the data. Data are available and downloadable from:

<http://www.icpsr.umich.edu:8080/ABSTRACTS/02859.xml?format=ICPSR>

The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors.

² University of Reading UK, corresponding author, email: m.dellagiusta@reading.ac.uk

³ University of Turin, Italy

⁴ University of Turin, Italy

⁵ University of Turin, Italy and University of Oslo, Norway

1. Introduction

The social scientific literature on sex work is vast (recent authoritative monographs on the subject are O'Connell Davidson, 1998, and Lim, 1998) and representative of many different views and concerns. A substantial part of the literature on sex work consists of studies of sex work and its relationship with violence, health and drugs problems, and international migration, and is often devoted to investigating the desirability of alternative regulatory regimes and the definition of rights for sex workers (McKeganey and Barnard, 1996; O'Kane, 2002; Thorbek and Pattanaik, 2002; Doezema, 1998; Tiggey et al, 2002). Whereas studies of sex workers are widespread, those who address the demand side of the industry are harder to come by, and wanting to rigorously analyse demand characteristics on the basis of empirical evidence can prove very difficult:

'Presumably, the client has not been studied until very recently because his actions are not perceived as morally reprehensible. A man who buys sex is viewed simply as a "man" doing "what men do" and therefore there is nothing unique or interesting enough about his behaviour to justify research. There is no contradiction between legitimizing the client's activities, and preserving the smokescreen around the paid sex industry, since sex and sexuality are considered "private" matters. And privacy is especially important in the case of purchased sex, a potential source of embarrassment; a visit to a sex worker may be construed as failure to obtain sex by consent or adultery. For this reason, paid sex is considered legitimate, even "natural," but part of a private realm that is best left un-discussed. In the US 16% of men reported buying sex at least once in their lives, and 0.5 % reported doing so at least once a year. In Finland, as in Russia, it was found that 10-13% of men had purchased sex at least once. In Norway, the comparable figure is 11%, in Holland 14%, in Switzerland 19%, in London 7-10%, and in Spain 39%. Figures in the 70% range have been recorded for Cambodia and Thailand, but these, too, appear to be imprecise estimates. In the absence of precise data, the only formula most researchers agree on is that the higher the degree of conservativeness, and the more rigid the social norms regarding the place of women, the higher the demand for paid sex and the thicker the veil of secrecy surrounding it'.

(Ben-Israel and Levenkron, 2005: 13)

Pitts et al (2004) surveyed a sample of 1225 men and women in Australia⁶ and found that 23.4% had paid for sex at least once, and reported paying for sex to satisfy sexual needs (43.8%), because paying for sex is less trouble (36.4%), and because it is entertaining (35.5%). The factors that the authors identified as accounting for 55% of the variance in motivations were ease, engagement and arousal. Significantly, they found that there were not many significant differences between men who had paid for sex and those who had not, except that the clients were on average older, less likely to have university education and to have had a regular partner in the last year.

The motivations of clients in the UK (who were all males and appeared to be representatives of all sectors of society) studied in the course of a programme⁷ on the sex industry presented by Channel 4 appeared to convey the impression that a connection existed between the effort and costs associated with finding a sexual partner who would readily satisfy their sexual preferences, and the straightforward and readily accessible option of prostitution. Thorbek and Pattanaik (2002) draw a sort of “psychological” profile of male sex tourists on the basis of their own descriptions of themselves and accounts of their experiences, which suggests that many of them are finding relationships with others very difficult (either because they don’t have the time or the skills required to meet people) and choose sex tourism as an “easier” alternative, which does not imply any responsibility. As for the views they hold of sex workers, it appears that both sexism and racism mix in determining a very marked distancing, which allows clients to practically ignore and show no interest in the lives and working motivations of the sex workers whose services they buy.

Wider phenomena connected to consumerism and globalisation are also clearly related to this industry, which reflects multiple power structures: Marttila (2003) concludes from her study of Finnish clients ‘the sex business is first and foremost about gendered, economic, social and cultural – global and local – power structures. Structural inequalities, the new information and communication technologies and increase in movement and moving of people have a considerable importance in the expansion of the sex industry as well. Hedonistic need for constant change and new “products” grows demand for “exotic” sex workers and thus sustains international sex trade. Political changes and poverty (and especially feminization of poverty) offer “new bodies” to the market and thus respond to the demand respectively. The demand thus has a major role in sustaining the international sex trade and trafficking in women and girls. This again highlights the importance of drawing

⁶ The sample was taken by distributing a survey to customers of a Sexpo exhibition hold in Melbourne 2001. This is a commercial event hosting a wide range of exhibitors of products associated with sex; of 4.905 respondents, 1225 received a version of the questionnaires with questions on sex workers. Among 1225 respondents , 612 were men and 601 were women.

⁷ Dispatches: Sex on the Street; Channel 4 season Prostitution –The Laws Don’t Work, Channel 4, September 2002

attention to the client and to his position in the global sex trade. Keeping in mind that most of the clients are men, it is also important to study how the hegemony of men is structured and maintained in the context of globalising sex industry' (Marttila, 2003, p.8).

Women clients are also engaging in sex tourism, as documented both in Thorbek and Pattanaik, and in Sanchez Taylor (2001). The latter in particular offers a more in-depth analysis of North American and Northern European women buying prostitution services of young men in the Caribbean, in what they themselves describe as 'romance holidays'. Responses to her interviews suggest that, on the one hand, the women clients are mostly reluctant to define what they engage in as prostitution, and, on the other, that their ideas about the young men whose service they buy are deeply rooted in racist ideas about black men and black men's sexuality. The theme of inequality appears to be at the core of the relationship: prejudices that allow the stigmatisation of another sex worker as fundamentally "different" and inferior to oneself appear again and again in customers accounts. Thus both men (the vast majority) and women demand prostitution services, and interviews with clients appear to suggest that demand is underpinned by complex ideas of machism and racism which are at play in the exchange of such services, suggesting that aspects of power and control are essential to this transaction (McKeganey and Barnard, 1996; O'Kane, 2002; Thorbek and Pattanaik, 2002, Kern, 2001). As often found in qualitative studies of inequality, these same systems (patriarchy, racism, etc.) provide mechanisms for a partial subversion of the stigmatisation, so that both sex workers and clients tend to describe themselves as in control of the relationship (Chapkis 1997; McKeganey and Barnard, 1996). Several studies also find that clients want to feel mutual dependence and that it is not a pure market transaction. The effects of personal characteristics (personal and family background, self-perception, perceptions of women, sexual preferences), economic factors (education, income, work), as well as attitudes towards risk (health hazard and risk of being caught where prostitution is illegal) are all likely to affect demand. Usually, in the literature is found that the prostitution clients are attracted to the prohibited nature of the encounter, lack of interest in conventional relationships, desire varieties of sex that regular partners do not provide and view sex as a commodity. Their decision to approach to sex worker is influenced by the availability of sex workers, access to money, perceived risk of getting caught or sexual disease.

In this paper we analyse the demand for street sex workers with data from a US survey of clients of street sex workers (Monto, 1999). In the analysis we distinguish between those who are buying sex for the first or second time, here named "experimenters" and the more experienced clients, the "regulars", who have radically opposite profiles. The remainder

of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we present the data set, discussing selection problems. Section 3 includes the econometric modelling of demand for sex with street sex workers. Section 4 discusses the estimates and their implications. Section 5 concludes.

2. Description of the data

The dataset contains background characteristics, attitudes, and reported behaviours of arrested male clients of female street sex workers in four US cities (San Francisco, Portland, Las Vegas, Santa Chiara) over the period 1996-1999 (Monto, 2000).

The data was collected in the context of two client intervention programmes aiming to address the male demand side of prostitution: Portland's Sexual Exploitation Education Project and San Francisco's First Offender Prostitution Program, both aiming at prevention efforts with clients, rather than with sex workers.⁸

Clients who were caught at the moment of paying a street sex worker, were arrested under these programmes; they were, then, asked to participate to an intervention programme in order to re-habilitate them. One of these programs was the San Francisco's First Offender Prostitution Program followed by similar initiatives in Santa Clara and Fresno, California and Las Vegas, Nevada. The intervention program of San Francisco was addressed for those men arrested while trying to hire sex workers. The participation of the arrested clients in this program allowed them to be dismissed by their crime against a 500-dollar fee. The one-day workshop aimed to instruct the arrested clients about the legal, social and health- related consequences of engaging in prostitution and endow them with persuasive reasons to not rehire sex workers. The program considers prostitution as an institution built on violence, sexual exploitation, poverty and misogyny. The Portland program was a 15-hour, weekend workshop administered by an independent organization in cooperation with the District Attorney's Office.

Some of the men participating in the programmes were required to do so as part of their sentence, others had reduced fines or the arrest purged from their records in exchange for their attendance. Arrested clients of street sex workers who accepted to participate to an intervention program compiled a detailed anonymous self-administered questionnaire. Over 80 % of participants completed the questionnaires, resulting in a sample of 1342 individuals.⁹

⁸ The Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (a unit within the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan, USA) provided the data. Data are available and downloadable from: <http://www.icpsr.umich.edu:8080/ABSTRACTS/02859.xml?format=ICPSR>

⁹ Though refusals constituted the largest single category of non-completions, language barriers and late arrivals also accounted for a substantial proportion. Of these 1,342 respondents, 36 from San Francisco and 15 from Las Vegas completed a Spanish-language version of the questionnaire. Completing the English version of the questionnaire were 950 men from San Francisco, 254 from Las Vegas, 77 from Portland, and 10 from Santa Clara. The period is 1996-1999.

The data collection process implies 3 levels of selection:

1. The individuals in the data set are those who were caught. We are not able to check if the arrested clients characteristics are similar or different from those who were not caught. We can speculate on possible correlations between being a regular client and the ability of not being caught but we are not able to measure the possible bias generated by this first selection.
2. The individuals in the data set are those who participate in the re-habilitation programme. We don't have information on those clients who did not participate.
3. The individuals in the data set are those who, being arrested and participating in the re-habilitation program, did complete the questionnaire.

The previous selection levels may introduce a bias in our analysis. Arrested clients could be on average less expert in buying sex from street sex workers than non-arrested clients and therefore they end up in being caught. This bias could lead to underestimate the demand. Moreover arrested clients motives for seeking sex workers could be different from those who were not caught. In this paper we don't deal with selection bias issues and we leave it to future work.

The data contains information about sexual behaviour (number and type of partners, frequency of sex, interest in pornography, age and circumstances of first sexual encounter with a sex worker, sexual acts performed with sex workers, condom use with sex workers), attitudes toward premarital sex, homosexual sex, extramarital sex and sex between adults and children, attitudes towards sex workers, the legality of prostitution and violence against women. Background information about the clients included race, educational level, sexual orientation, marital status, work status, socio-economic status, age, parent's marital status, and history of sexual or physical abuse, military service, relationship history, and sexual preferences.¹⁰

¹⁰ Although the number of working sex workers in the US is difficult to estimate, the Department of Justice arrest statistics for prostitution consistently exceed 100,000 per year (FBI, 1997; Barkan, 1997). These statistics tend to underestimate the number of sex workers who are arrested each year. Prostitution-related activities may be processed under other statutes, such as nuisance laws (San Francisco Task Force on Prostitution, 1996), and arrests of juvenile sex workers may be processed as status offences (Alexander, 1987).

2.1 The characteristics of arrested clients

In this section we compare the sample taken from the Monto data set with a National sample taken from the National Health and Social Life Survey, conducted in 1992 using a nationally representative sample. Table 1 represents the characteristics of the arrested clients, compared with the nationally representative sample provided by The National Health and Social Life Survey, conducted in 1992.¹¹ The National Health and Social Life Survey, conducted in 1992, collected extensive information on United States population aged 18-59 able to complete an interview in English. The survey data were collected by personal interviews and self-administered questionnaires. They provided wide information on the sexual experiences and other social, demographic, attitudinal, and health-related characteristics of adults in the United States, respondents' attitudes toward premarital sex, the appeal of particular sexual practices, levels of satisfaction with particular sexual relationships. The data include also information about race, education, political and religious affiliation and occupation. Overall response rate was 78.6 percent of the 4,369 eligible respondents selected for inclusion in the study. The sample reported in table 1 includes only the non missing values for the male individuals.

The majority of clients are white (56%), the rest are a mixture of other racial backgrounds including Hispanic and Black African. Respect to the national sample we notice an under-representation of white relative to other ethnic group. Clients are on average better educated respect to the national sample: 71% have at least some college after high school, while at the national level only 35% have at least some college education. The labour force participation is similar to the national sample. On average, clients are slightly older than the national sample and more of them are not married respect to the national sample. They also have unhappier marriages, more sex-partners respect to the national sample and lower frequencies of sex during last 12 months.

**Table 1. Characteristics of arrested clients compared to the National Sample.
(approximately here)**

¹¹ The nationally representative sample data of The National Health and Social Life Survey, conducted in 1992 are provided by Monto (2000) Appendix A.

It is interesting to note that 27% of the sample claimed that they had never had sexual relations with a sex worker (see Table 2).¹² Among married men 25,2% claimed the same thing while among those never married only 16% denied having had sex with sex workers. The most common circumstance of the first encounter with a sex worker was being approached by a sex worker (33%), followed by “they approached the sex worker on their own” (30%), and “a group of buddies set me up” (24%). The most frequent sexual act done with the sex worker was oral sex (54%), followed by vaginal sex (14%). 74% of the sample declared that they always used a condom (for more details see Table 2).

Table 2. Attitudes toward sexual behaviour. (approximately here)

Arrested clients were asked to agree or disagree with 13 statements designed to reflect popular and scholarly understandings of the reasons men seek out sex workers. Many conventional understandings were supported by the results.

Table 3. Motives for seeking sex workers. (approximately here)

From the responses it can be observed that a considerable number of clients appear to be excited by the illicit, risky, or different quality of sex with a sex worker¹³. Findings also suggest that some men pay for sex because they have difficulty becoming involved in relationships. For some of these men prostitution is an attempt not only to have sex, but also to establish intimate relationships with women. Kern (2001) obtains similar results. Among clients, some of the men said that they had the time, energy, or interest also to engage in a conventional relationship with a woman.¹⁴

¹² “Because men in the sample were almost all arrested while propositioning a decoy posing as a sex worker, it is possible that some had never before sought out a sex worker or had not successfully completed the transaction. Men arrested for trying to hire street sex workers appear to be less experienced prostitution clients, with more experienced clients better able to avoid arrest, either due to knowledge of police procedures, familiarity with the sex workers themselves, or participation in off-street prostitution”. (Monto 2000, pg7)

¹³ “Responses suggest that, for some clients, one of the appeals of prostitution is that it invites a self-focused, consumer oriented, conception of sexuality in which one can conveniently meet sexual needs through purchase. Some of the arrested clients report wanting a different kind of sex than their regular partner and liking rough sex, supporting the idea that some men seek out sex workers because they can do things with them that other women might find unpleasant or unacceptable”. (Monto 2000 pg 8)

¹⁴ “Overall, most of the items seem to reflect a sense of entitlement to sex among the respondents. Though their partners may not be interested in a particular type of sex or though they don't have time to be involved in a relationship, they may feel that they have a right to sexual access”. (Monto 2000, pg 8)

The survey included also the analysis of the relationship between prostitution and violence by exploring the “rape myth acceptance”¹⁵ presented in Table 4. This attitude implicitly demonstrates a tendency of violence against women. The response rates presented in Table 4 indicates that the arrested clients do show some attitudes that validate the “rape myth acceptance”. 30% of clients think that provocative dress asks for trouble; 17% think that rape victims have a bad reputation. 23% think that going to home implies willingness to have sex.

Table 4. Rape myth acceptance. (approximately here)

3. An econometric model of demand and of condom use

In what follows, we use two specifications of the demand for prostitution. The first specification is an ordered logit model with four categories of having sex with a sex worker.

Let y_n^* be person n 's demand for having sex with a sex worker during a year. Here this demand is considered as a latent variable. Let x_n be a vector of explanatory variables that affect demand. β is a vector of unknown coefficients. Moreover let ε_n be a random variable. We then have the following demand function for having sex with a sex worker:

$$(1) \quad y_n^* = x_n\beta + \varepsilon_n; n = 1, 2, \dots, N$$

Let y_{nj} be the observation of how many times the clients have had sex with a sex worker during a year, $j=1,2,3,4$, where $j=1$ means that the client has not been with a sex worker before he was observed and arrested, $j=2$ means that the client has been with a sex worker once before, $j=3$ mean that he has had sex with a sex worker more than once, but less than once per month, and $j=4$ if the client has had sex with a sex worker more than once per month. Thus the ordered structure of demand is given by:

$$(2) \quad y_{nj} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if client } n \text{ belongs to category } j; j=1,2,3,4 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

¹⁵ Rape myths are attitudes that have been shown to support sexual violence against women. Rape myths are "prejudicial, stereotyped, or false beliefs about rape, rape victims, and rapists" (Burt, 1980, p. 217) that serve to justify or support sexual violence against women and diminish support for rape victims. They include the idea that women who are raped are in some way responsible for the violence against them, the idea that women often lie about being raped for selfish reasons, and the idea that only sexually promiscuous women are raped.

Let α_j denote the threshold in the ordering of the demand, we then have

$$(3) \quad \begin{cases} y_{n1} = 1 & \text{if } y_n^* \leq \alpha_1 \\ y_{n2} = 1 & \text{if } \alpha_1 < y_n^* \leq \alpha_2 \\ y_{n3} = 1 & \text{if } \alpha_2 < y_n^* \leq \alpha_3 \\ y_{n4} = 1 & \text{if } \alpha_3 < y_n^* \end{cases}$$

The thresholds α_j must satisfy $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \alpha_3$. From (1) and (3) we get

$$(4) \quad P(y_{nj} = 1) = P(\alpha_{j-1} < y_n^* \leq \alpha_j) = P(\alpha_{j-1} - x_n\beta < \varepsilon_n \leq \alpha_j - x_n\beta)$$

We will assume that ε_n is i.i.d. with c.d.f. $P(\varepsilon_n \leq u) = F(u)$. The ε_n -s are assumed to be logistic distributed, with the first moment of the distribution equal to zero and the second moment equal to $\pi^2/3$. Thus

$$(5) \quad F(u) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-u}}$$

Now we can rewrite (4) to yield

$$(6) \quad P(y_{nj} = 1) = F(\alpha_j - x_n\beta) - F(\alpha_{j-1} - x_n\beta)$$

and where the distribution function $F(\cdot)$ is given in (5).

Note that $\sum_{j=1}^4 [P(y_{nj} = 1)] = 1$ so that $P(y_{n4} = 1) = 1 - F(\alpha_3 - x_n\beta)$

The likelihood function of data is:

$$(7) \quad L(\alpha, \beta) = \prod_{n=1}^N \prod_{j=1}^4 [F(\alpha_j - x_n\beta) - F(\alpha_{j-1} - x_n\beta)]^{y_{nj}}$$

The coefficient vectors can then be estimated by maximizing this likelihood (or rather the log likelihood).

In order to calculate the marginal effects, we note that from (6) we get:

$$(8) \quad \frac{\partial P(y_{nj} = 1)}{\partial x_n} = \left[\frac{\partial F(\alpha_{j-1} - x_n \beta)}{\partial x_n} - \frac{\partial F(\alpha_j - x_n \beta)}{\partial x_n} \right] \beta; \text{ for } j=1,2,3,4$$

From (5) and (8) we then have

$$(9) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{\partial P(y_{n1} = 1)}{\partial x_n} = -F(\alpha_1 - x_n \beta)[1 - F(\alpha_1 - x_n \beta)]\beta \\ \frac{\partial P(y_{n2} = 1)}{\partial x_n} = \{F(\alpha_1 - x_n \beta)[1 - F(\alpha_1 - x_n \beta)] - F(\alpha_2 - x_n \beta)[1 - F(\alpha_2 - x_n \beta)]\}\beta \\ \frac{\partial P(y_{n3} = 1)}{\partial x_n} = \{F(\alpha_2 - x_n \beta)[1 - F(\alpha_2 - x_n \beta)] - F(\alpha_3 - x_n \beta)[1 - F(\alpha_3 - x_n \beta)]\}\beta \\ \frac{\partial P(y_{n4} = 1)}{\partial x_n} = \{F(\alpha_3 - x_n \beta)[1 - F(\alpha_3 - x_n \beta)]\}\beta \end{array} \right.$$

We notice that the first and last marginal effects have an opposite sign. The terms in braces can be positive or negative.

In the second specification of demand we model the probability of being a “regular” client. Let U_{nj} be the utility for client n of being j -type of client. When $j=1$, the client is a “regular” client and when $j=0$ he is an “experimenter”. We will assume that U_{nj} is given by

$$(10) \quad U_{nj} = x_n \gamma_j + \varepsilon_{nj}; j = 0, 1; n = 1, 2, \dots, N$$

The vector x_n is the same as in the ordered logit presented above, except that it includes 1 to allow for a constant, and γ_j is a vector of alternative specific coefficients. By assuming that ε_{nj} is extreme value distributed (the double exponential distribution) with zero expectation and a constant variance, and by assuming utility maximization we get the following probability for being a “regular” customer:

$$(11) \quad P(U_{n1} \geq U_{n0}) = \frac{\exp(\sum_{k=0}^K \gamma_{1k} x_{nk})}{\exp(\sum_{k=0}^K \gamma_{0k} x_{nk}) + \exp(\sum_{k=0}^K \gamma_{1k} x_{nk})} = \frac{\exp(\sum_{k=0}^K \gamma_k x_{nk})}{1 + \exp(\sum_{k=0}^K \gamma_k x_{nk})}$$

where

$$\gamma_k = \gamma_{1k} - \gamma_{0k}, \text{ and } x_{n0} = 1.$$

Let $y_{ni}=1$ if the individual has chosen to be a regular customer, and equal to zero otherwise, and let $\varphi_{ni}(\sum_k \gamma_k x_{nk})$ be the choice probability in (9). Then the likelihood of the data,

$$(12) \quad L(\gamma) = \prod_{n=1}^N [\varphi_{ni}(\sum_{k=0}^K \gamma_k x_{nk})]^{y_{ni}} [1 - \varphi_{ni}(\sum_{k=0}^K \gamma_k x_{nk})]^{1-y_{ni}}$$

The coefficients $\gamma_k, k=0,1,\dots,K$ are estimated by maximizing this likelihood (or rather the log-likelihood).

Apart from the demand for prostitution we also estimate the demand for condom use in order to analyse the peculiarity of clients' behaviour with respect to this aspect. It would be important to analyse how the determinants of the demand for sex with sex workers respond with respect to the demand for condom use. Condom use is almost always negotiated directly between the interested client and the street sex workers. Therefore, the client who requires the use of condoms, signals that he has a more risk adverse attitude to approach the sex workers for sex. The choice probability of using condom follows from a similar utility maximizing procedure, with an additive random utility model, as the one that led to the likelihood in (12).

4. Empirical estimates.

4.1 Factor Analysis

The data contains a large number of variables. To see whether it was possible to reduce the number of variables, we performed a factor analysis with the purpose of uncovering a possible latent structure of these variables in the data set. The choice of the number of factors is based on the number of eigenvalues of pattern/correlation matrix, which is the covariance matrix of the standardized variables¹⁶, which are greater than 1. Eigenvalues for a certain factor measures the variance in all the variables, which are grouped into that factor. The ratio of eigenvalues is the ratio of explanatory importance of the factors with respect to the variables. A low eigenvalue poorly explains the variance of the variable. Thus the correlation between indicators and factors is characterized by large loadings above 0.5, moderate loadings between 0.3 and 0.5 and small loadings below 0.3. In our case we have considered only loadings > 0.45 .

¹⁶ Every standardized variable has a variance of 1 and if we would define this variable to be a factor, it accounts for a common variance of at least 1. Therefore the argument is that a common factor is only substantially relevant if it explains a common variance of more than 1. In PCA, each component explains a variance equal to the corresponding eigenvalue of the correlation matrix and hence relevant components correspond to eigenvalue larger than one (Wansbeek 2000).

Over 80 % of the participants completed the questionnaires constructing a sample of 1342 observations. In the factor analysis, of 100 variables, we have excluded those variables which have a percentage of missing values more than 22% and missing demographic variables. The process provided 6 factors, as the number of eigenvalues exceeding 1 is 6. The factor loadings for these 6 factors can be seen in Table 5 and the descriptive statistics of the variables used in the factor analysis is given in Tables A5 .

Table 5. The results of the factor analysis. (approximately here)

The first factor, “against gender violence” is a predictor of violent sexuality. It might indicate that one of the motivations when clients approach the sex workers is the attraction to violence, which can be satisfied through buying sex with sex workers, if found to be a significant factor in explaining demand. The higher the score for this factor, the less gender violent is the client.

The second factor named “against sex work” can be taken to indicate both relatively liberal views, and also a commodified prospective toward sex work. There is an intensive debate in the literature regarding the sexual commodification. The higher this factor, the more the client is against prostitution.

The third factor is “sex workers are not different and dislike their job”. This factor contains also the idea that sex workers are different to other women in that they like men and sex more, and they like sex rougher; it can also be used as an indicator for justifying sex commodification and avoids the intrinsic feeling of treating of sex as commodity. The higher this factor score, the less the clients think that sex workers are different and like their job.

The fourth factor “like relationships” captures the fact that some respondents prefer prostitution to relationships and find the latter burdensome, so they interact with individuals who can respond to their needs without demanding intimate relationships. The higher this factor, the more the clients like relationships and related responsibilities.

Factor five, “variety dislike”, captures the view that prostitution forms part of sex consumption, and can for example serve to satisfy those sexual appetites that the regular partner is unwilling to satisfy¹⁷, or the desire for variety of sexual partners.

¹⁷ “The desire to “have a variety of sexual partners” and “be in control during sex,” and the need to “have sex immediately when I am aroused” all point to this kind of self-focused sexuality that Blanchard (1994) calls “McSex” in his popular expose on “young johns.” According to one man he interviewed “it’s like going to McDonalds; most people are looking for a good quick cheap meal. It’s satisfying, it’s greasy, and then you get the hell out of there.” Paying for sex because of the desire to have sex with women with particular physical attributes, a motivation described by McKeganey (1994), also reflects a conception of sex as a commodity”. (Monto 2000, pg 34).

The higher this factor, the less the clients like variety. The sixth factor “Relationship troubles” reflects the actual relationship status of respondents. The higher the factor, the less intact and more troubled is the relationship life of the client.

4.2 Empirical estimation and results

We have used as dependent variable in the ordered logit model, the frequency of encounters with a sex worker during last year (Table A2 in the Appendix). We consider 4 categories $j=1,2,3,4$. Where $j=1$ means that the client has not been with a sex worker before he was observed and arrested, $j=2$ means that the client has been with a sex worker once before, $j=3$ mean that he has had sex with a sex worker more than once, but less than once per month, and $j=4$ if the client has had sex with a sex worker more than once per month.

As far as the probability of being a regular clients is concerned, our second model, the dependent variable (see Table A3 in the Appendix) is defined equal 1 if the clients has been more than once with a sex worker over last year (categories 3 and 4 in the first model). The dependent variable is equal 0 if the clients has been only once or never with a sex worker (categories 1 and 2 in the first model).

The probability of using a condom (see Table A3 in the Appendix) is defined equal 1 if the client use more than once and often the condom; it is defined equal 0 if the clients use never or seldom the condom.

The vector x_n of explanatory variables that affect demand in the first model includes the following variables: the 6 factors defined in the previous paragraph, the working status of the client, his educational level, his age, his occupation, his race, his marital status, a variable about disliking control (see Table A4 and A5 for definitions and descriptive statistics). The dataset does not contain information regarding the level of earnings, and hence we use some of the personal characteristics as explanatory variables to proxy the income level.

The variable “dislike control” is defined in Table A4. It takes the value of 1 if clients agree strongly with the statement that they like control during sex. It takes the value of 2 if they agree somehow, value of 3 if they disagree somehow and value equal 4 if they disagree. The higher the value for this value, the more individuals dislike control.

The vector x_n of explanatory variables for the second and the third model are the same as for the first model but they also include an intercept.

Table 6 contains the estimation results for both the ordered logit for the demand of sex work, the logit for being a regular client and the probability of using a condom.

Table 6. Estimation results. (approximately here)

The ordered logit results imply that demand for having sex with street sex workers, in terms of frequency per year, is the same across education levels (this variable is not significantly different from 0), it is higher among full-time worker than individuals working less hours (this could be due to an income effect), and non-white individuals demand more than white individuals (this could be an effect related to the particular segment of the sex industry our sample is drawn from, or to the unobserved biases in the sample). Married individuals demand less than non-married.

The variable control dislike is very significant and the positive sign implies that the more individuals dislike control, the more they demand sex work; in other words the more they like control, the less they demand.

Demand in our sample is increasing with the age of the client. In another specification of the model¹⁸, we have also added the age when first with a prostitute. We wanted to test the hypothesis that the younger a client starts to visit sex workers, the higher the frequency: a sort of addiction effect. Nevertheless we found that the variable was not significantly different from zero so we rejected the hypothesis of an addiction effect.

The positive sign for the coefficient of factor 1 “against gender violence” implies that the higher this variable, i.e. the more the clients dislike violence, the more they demand. In other words the more the clients like gender violence the less they demand. The more the clients are against prostitution the less they demand (negative sign of factor 2 and significant at 10%). The more they think that sex workers are not different and dislike their job the more they demand (positive sign of Factor 3 and significant at 5%). The parameter for Factor 4 “Like relationships” is negative and strongly significant (1%) and it implies that the more the clients like to be in a relationship with its responsibilities, the less they demand. Factor 5 “Variety dislike” shows that the more they like variety in sex life, the more they demand street prostitution (significant at 1%). Factor 6 “Relationship troubles” is not significant.

The results are somewhat mixed compared to prior expectations, but as demonstrated in Table 7, the overall results for the ordered logit in Table 6 shadow for differences in behaviour across individuals with little experience with sex workers (named

“experimenters”) and those with more experience (named “regulars”). In Table 7, we distinguish between four groups of clients. The first two are those who declared to have never had sex with sex workers before or only once before: the “experimenters” (48% of respondents). Clients in the two last groups are named “regulars” because they declare having had sex with street sex workers at least more than one time, but less than once a month (3rd group) or 1 to 3 times a month (4th group), overall these are just over 52% of respondents. Table 7 gives the impact on demand of marginal changes in the explanatory variables, the marginal effects, within each group. As noted above the marginal effects in an ordered logit for the first and the last category must have opposite sign. The signs for the middle categories are free to vary. In our case, category 1 and 2 show the same pattern of behaviour and the 3rd and 4th show the same pattern but with opposite sign respect to category 1 and 2.

Table 7. Marginal effects in the ordered logit. (approximately here)

The “experimenters” demand more street prostitution the less they work, more if they are white opposed to non-white, more the younger they are and more the more they like to have control when having sex. The “regulars” characteristics are quite the opposite.

With respect to the interpretation of the factors from Table 7 we can see the following: the more the experimenters are against gender violence the less they demand street prostitution (i.e. they demand more, the more gender violent they are). The more the experimenters are against prostitution, the more they demand; the more they think that the sex workers dislike their job and are not different from other women, the less they demand; the more they like relationships and responsibilities the more they demand, and the less they like variety in their sex life, the more they demand. For the regulars all of these effects are reversed.

Thus the experimenters correspond to a more machist type, with negative views of women, of prostitution, and of sex workers (who are believed to be different from other women but condemned at the same time), and viewing street prostitution as a complement to stable relationships. The regulars have more liberal views of women, of prostitution and of sex workers, the more they dislike control the more they demand, they like variety. Their demand also increases with age and with having a permanent job, which may indicate a positive income effect. These appear to be men who are happy to satisfy their sexual wants through prostitution, which they prefer to relationships.

¹⁸ Available from the authors on request.

In Table 6 we also give the estimates of the probability of being a “regular” client as opposed to being an “experimenter”. Comparing these results with the marginal effects for the “regulars” derived from the ordered logit given in Table 6, we observe that the results are quite similar, which is a further confirmation of the conclusions drawn above. In Table 6 we also report the estimates from the use of condoms, which is a measure of risk aversion on the part of the client. Concentrating on the significant parameters¹⁹ we note that the probability of using condoms is higher among the non-white compared to the white respondents. The probability of using condoms is higher among those who are opposed to gender violence relative to those who are not, and the probability of using condom is higher the more they favour prostitution and the less they like variety. It is also interesting to note that among those with a good relationship the probability of using a condom is lower than among those with a broken relationship. Thus the users of condoms seem to fit the profile of the regulars, whereas the non users fit that of the experimenters.

5. Implications and conclusions

We estimate an econometric model that explores the effects of personal characteristics and attitude of clients on their demand for prostitution. First, we analyse responses to attitudinal questions through factor analysis and we find that the responses group in factors that include the propensity to gender violence, views on prostitution, views on sex workers, on relationships (in relation to prostitution), and preference for variety of sexual relationships. We use these and respondents’ personal characteristics to analyse the demand for street prostitution and find that there appear to be two distinct groups of clients, whose personal characteristics and attitudes are radically opposite: experimenters, to whom street prostitution is a complement to stable relationships, and who hold negative views of women, of prostitution, and of sex workers; and regulars, who hold more liberal views, like variety and find relationships a burden, and for whom paid sex is a commodity and a normal good whose demand increases with income.

The experimenters demand more sex the more they like to have control while the regulars do the opposite. This suggest the need to explicitly incorporate this variable when modelling demand for prostitution, and also to further test with empirical evidence whether

control in sex is related to perception of control in other areas of a clients' life. This seems particularly important in order to understand whether it is possible to test empirically the idea put forward in several papers that demand for prostitution is related to the construction of male identity (Marttila, 2003; Garofalo, 2002). In this sense, it would also be interesting to see which factors are at play in women's demand for male prostitution services.

Moreover, we note that risk aversion is also correlated to our two clients' profiles, with experimenters being more risk loving and regulars more risk averse.

Notwithstanding the selection bias problems presented by our data, our results appear to be in line with those of other studies. Furthermore, our evidence also confirms that the demand for prostitution is a phenomenon with multifaceted characteristics which need to be properly investigated and understood when designing regulation for this sector. This is particularly relevant since regulation is overwhelmingly concerned with supply-side considerations, and failure to understand the demand side of this phenomenon is likely to generate ineffective policy outcomes.

Bibliography

Aggleton Peter Ed. (1998), "Men who sell sex" London: UCL Press.

Alexander, Priscilla (1987). Prostitution: A difficult issue for feminists. In F. Delacoste & P. Alexander (Eds.), *Sex Work: Writings by Women in the Sex industry*. Pittsburgh, PA: Cleis Press

Barkan, Steven E. (1997). *Criminology: A Sociological Understanding*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Ben-Israel, Hanny and Numi Levenkron (2005) "The Missing Factor: Clients of Trafficked Women in Israel's Sex Industry", unpublished manuscript, Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

Blanchard, K. "Young Johns" *Mademoiselle* 100(5), 1994.

Boyle, Fran M., Shirley Glennon, Jake M. Najman, Gavin Turrell, John S. Western, and Carole Wood (1997). *The sex industry: A survey of sex workers in Queensland, Australia* Ashgate: Aldershot.

Burt, Martha R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 38: 1217-230.

Cameron, Samuel (2002), *The economics of Sin*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

¹⁹ We note that the distribution of the dependent variable is such that the percentage of 0, i.e. clients who use the condom never and seldom is only 5.6%.

Cameron S., Alan Collins, and Neill Thew (1999), "Prostitution services: an exploratory empirical analysis", *Applied Economics* 31: 1523-1529.

Cameron, S., and Alan Collins (2003), "Estimates of a Model of Male Participation in the Market for Female Heterosexual Prostitution Services", *European Journal of Law and Economics*, vol 16, no.3, pp.271-288.

Chapkis, Wendy (1997) "Live Sex Acts: women performing erotic labour", Routledge: New York.

Collins, Alan. Ed. 2004. Sex and the City, *Urban Studies*, vol 41, no.9.

Doezema, Jo (1998), "Forced to Choose. Beyond the Voluntary v. Forced Prostitution Dichotomy", in Kempadoo, K., Doezema J., *Global Sex Workers. Rights, Resistance, and Redefinition*, Routledge, New York – London

Edlund, Lena and Evelyn Korn (2002), "An Economic Theory of Prostitution", *Journal of Political Economy*: Vol 110, No 1.

FBI. (1997) *Uniform Crime Report*. US GPO

Garofalo, Giulia (2002) "Towards an economic theory of prostitution", mimeo.

Gertler, Paul et al (2003) "Risky Business: the Market for unprotected commercial sex", mimeo Cornell University.

Kern, Roger M. (2000), "Prostitute Client Profiles: Indicators of Motivations for prostitution Use", mimeo Eastern Michigan university.

Lim, Lin Lean (1998) "The sex sector: the economic and social bases of prostitution in Southeast Asia." Geneva: International Labour Office.

Marttila, Anne-Maria (2003) "Consuming Sex: Finnish Male Clients and Russian and Baltic Prostitution". Presented at Gender and Power in the New Europe, the 5th European Feminist Research Conference August 20-24, 2003 Lund University, Sweden.

McKeganey, Neil and Marina Barnard (1996) "*Sex work on the streets: sex workers and their clients*", Buckingham: Open University Press.

Moffatt, Peter.G, and Simon A. Peters (2001), "The pricing of Personal Services", mimeo, Royal Economic Society in Durham.

Monto, Martin A. (2000) "Clients of street sex workers in Portland, Oregon, San Francisco and Santa Clara, California, and Las Vegas, Nevada 1996-1999", University of Portland. Ann Arbor: MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research.

Monto, Martin, (2000) "Why Men Seek out Prostitutes," in R.Weitzer (ed.), *Sex for Sale: Prostitution, Pornography, and the Sex Industry*, New York: Routledge.

Monto, Martin (2004), "Female Prostitution, Customers, and Violence," *Violence Against Women*: (10) 160–168.

Nussbaum, Martha (1998), "Whether from reason or prejudice: taking money for bodily services", *Journal of legal studies* XXVII, n.2, part2.

O'Connell Davidson J. (2002), "The rights and wrongs of prostitution" *Hypathia* 17(2) Spring.

O'Connell Davidson J.(1998), "*Prostitution Power and Freedom*", Polity Press, 1998.

O'Kane, Maggie 2002. *Prostitution: The Laws Don't Work*, Channel 4 Documentary, UK.

Pitts, Marian K., Anthony M.A. Smith, Mary O'Brien, and Sebastian Misson (2004), "Who pays for sex and why? An analysis of social and motivational factors associated with male clients of sex workers", *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 33 (4): 353-358.

Sanchez Taylor, J. (2001), "Dollars are a Girls' Best Friend? Female Tourists' Sexual Behaviour in the Caribbean", *Sociology*, Vol. 35, No. 3, pp.749-764. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Sanders, Teela (2005), " It's just acting: sex workers' strategies for capitalizing on sexuality" *Gender, work and organization* 12 (4): 319-324.

San Francisco Task Force on Prostitution. (1996). Final Report. San Francisco: The Task Force.

Sharpe, Karen (1998) " Red light, blue light: sex workers, punters and the police", Aldershot: Ashgate.

Thorbek, Susanne and Bandana Pattanaik, Eds. (2002). *Transnational Prostitution: Changing Global Patterns*, London: Zed Books.

Tiggey, May, Alex Harocopos, and Michael Hough M (2000) "For love or money: pimps and the management of sex work", London: Home Office, Policing and Reducing Crime Unit.

Wansbeek, Tom, and Erik Meijer, E. (2000). *Measurement error and latent variables in econometrics*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Table 1. Characteristics of arrested clients.

Variable description	Responses of arrested clients	National sample
Race		
White	57.7%	84.6%
Black or African American	5.2%	10.6%
Other	37.2%	4.8%
Observations Total	1313= 100%	1463=100%
Education		
Didn't graduate high school	10.5%	12.1%
Graduated high school	18.4%	52.3%
College aft high school	36.3%	6.9%
Received bachelor's	24.2%	18.8%
Received a masters	10.7%	9.9%
Observations Total	1329= 100%	1460= 100%
Labor force Status		
Working Full time	82.9%	77.1%
Working Part time	5.9%	8.1%
In school	2.2%	3.3%
Unemployed/laid off	4.4%	5.4%
Other	4.6%	6.1%
Observations Total	1275= 100%	1463= 100%
Average age of arrested clients (mean = 38 min=18 and max=84)		
Age 18-25	12.7%	14.4%
Age 26-35	33.1%	31.6%
Age 36-45	31.1%	31.2%
Age >46	23.2%	22.8%
Observations Total	1248= 100%	1463= 100%
Marital Status		
Married	42.2%	55.8%
Widowed	1.6%	0.8%
Divorced	14.9%	11.9%
Separated	6.4%	2.4%
Never Married	34.9%	29.1%
Observations Total	1328= 100%	1463= 100%
Marriage description		
Very happy	37.9%	59.7%
Pretty happy	40.3%	37.9%
Not too happy	21.8%	2.4%
Observations Total	528= 100%	809= 100%
Sex partners last year		
0 partners	9.9%	10.1%
1 partner	37.6%	70.9%
2 partners	16.7%	8.2%
3 -4 partners	17.0%	7.4%
more than 5 partners	18.8%	3.4%
Observations Total	1315= 100%	1349= 100%
Frequency of sex during last 12 months		
Not at all	10.3%	9%
Once or twice	9.1%	6.4%
Once a month	15.3%	10.9%
3 times per month	21.3%	18.5%
Once a week	19.2%	21.7%
2-3 times per week	17.7%	25.1%
More than 3 time per week	7.2%	8.4%
Observations Total	1268= 100%	1317= 100%

Table 2. Attitudes toward sexual behaviour.

Variable description	Responses of arrested clients
Circumstances when 1st with sex worker	
Were approached by sex workers	32.7%
They approached the sex workers on their own.	29.7%
A group of buddies set them up	23.9%
Other	5.1%
Family member or relatives set them up	4.5%
Brothel	2.9%
Military	1.2%
Total observations	1040=100%
Mostly done with a sex worker	
Oral sex	53.6%
Vaginal sex	14.4%
Checked more than 2 acts	17.8%
Half and half	10.5%
Other	3.7%
Total observations	911=100%
Condom use with sex workers	
Always use it	74.2%
Often	11.7%
Sometimes	7.1%
Never use it	4.2%
Seldom	2.8%
Total observations	1024=100%
Watch videos	
Never	36.6%
Less than once a month	34.2%
1 to a few times a month	19.2%
1 to few times a week	6.9%
Everyday	2.9%
Several times a day	0.2%
Total observations	1311=100%
Sex with prostitute during last 12 months	
Never	26.8%
Only one time	26.7%
More than 1 time but less than once per month	34.6%
1 to 3 times per month	9.3%
Once or 2 times per week	1.7%
3-4 times per week	0.4%
5 or more times per week	0.5%
Total observations	1054=100%

Table 3. Motives for seeking sex workers.

	Agree Strongly and Agree somewhat in percent	Disagree Strongly and disagree somewhat in percent	Total In percent	Total observations
Difficulty-meeting women who are not nude dancers or prostitutes	23	77	100	1244
Think most women find me unattractive physically	24	76	100	1248
Want different kind of sex than regular partner	41	59	100	1237
Shy and awkward when try to meet a woman	41	59	100	1246
Have sex with a prostitute than have a onventional relationship with a woman	18	82	100	1244
Excited by the idea of approaching a prostitute	43	57	100	1244
Don't have the time for a conventional relationship	32	68	100	1239
I don't want the responsibilities of a conventional relationship	28	72	100	1233
Like to have a variety of sexual partners	41	59	100	1244
Like to be in control when I'm having sex	42	58	100	1232
Like to be with a woman who likes to get nasty	52	48	100	1230
Need to have sex immediately when aroused	31	69	100	1235
Like rough hard sex	19	81	100	1233

Table 4. Rape myth acceptance.

Variables	Agree and Somewhat agree	Disagree and Somewhat disagree	Total observations
Stuck-up woman deserve a lessons	7%	93%	1200=100%
Women hitchhiking get what they deserve.	9%	91%	1203=100%
Provocative dress asks for trouble	30%	70%	1223=100%
Rape victims have bad reputation	17%	83%	1200=100%
Forced sex after necking's woman fault	16%	84%	1197=100%
Going to home implies willing to have sex	23%	77%	1218=100%

Table 5. The results of the factor analysis.

Factors	Eigenvalues	Variables
Factor1 'Against gender violence'	0.5305	var 1.1 forced sex after necking's woman's fault
	0.5462	var 1.2 women hitchhiking deserve rape
	0.5814	var 1.3 stuck-up women deserve a lesson
	0.6778	var 1.4 sex fun if woman fights
	0.5036	var 1.5 some women like being smacked
	0.6396	var 1.6 want sex more when angry
Factor2 'Against sex work'	-0.6296	var 2.1 prostitution creates problems
	-0.6586	var 2.2 cops should crack down on prostitution
	0.7296	var 2.3 prostitution not wrong
	0.6644	var 2.4 should legalize prostitution
	0.5323	var 2.5 should decriminalize prostitution
Factor3 'Sex workers are not different and dislike their jobs'	0.5301	var 3.1 sex workers like sex more
	0.4821	var 3.2 sex workers like sex rougher
	0.5765	var 3.3 sex workers enjoy work
	0.5483	var 3.4 sex workers like men
Factor4 'Like Relationship'	0.4988	var 4.1 prefer prostitution to relationship
	0.7108	var 4.2 no time for relationship
	0.6952	var 4.3 don't want relationship responsibilities
Factor5 'Variety dislike'	0.4599	var 5.1 exited by approaching sex workers
	0.5134	var 5.2 like to have a variety of partners
	0.4755	var 5.3 like woman who gets nasty
Factor6 'Relationship troubles'	0.4833	var 6.1 serious trouble with partner
	0.7355	var 6.2 separated from partner
	0.6250	var 6.3 broke up with partner

Table 6. Estimation results.

Variables	Ordered Logit	Logit: Probability of being a "regular" client	Logit: Probability of using condom
Education =1 college or more; =0 otherwise	0.160 (0.194)	0.067 (0.243)	0.067 (0.474)
Work status =1 Full time; =0 otherwise	0.655** (0.281)	0.656* (0.347)	0.476 (0.564)
Race =1 if non white; =0 white	0.491*** (0.186)	0.201 (0.226)	1.121** (0.576)
Job =1executives/business managers; =0 otherwise	-0.125 (0.170)	-0.151 (0.209)	-0.023 (0.415)
Marriage =1 married; =0 otherwise	-0.312* (0.173)	-0.118 (0.213)	0.090 (0.412)
Control dislike	0.276*** (0.096)	0.220* (0.118)	-0.062 (0.234)
Age	0.017* (0.009)	0.030*** (0.011)	-0.031 (0.020)
Factor1 'againstg ender violence'	0.181* (0.108)	0.274** (0.136)	0.464* (0.259)
Factor2 'against prostitution'	-0.159* (0.094)	-0.199* (0.112)	-0.400* (0.222)
Factor3 'sex workers not different and dislike their job'	0.198** (0.101)	0.200* (0.124)	-0.102 (0.242)
Factor4 'like relationships'	-0.536*** (0.112)	-0.641*** (0.137)	-0.351 (0.266)
Factor5 'variety dislike'	-0.968*** (0.121)	-1.031*** (0.151)	0.692*** (0.281)
Factor6 'relationship troubles '	-0.026 (0.109)	0.006 (0.137)	0.482* (0.293)
Threshold α_1	0.788 (0.550)		
Threshold α_2	2.233*** (0.559)		
Threshold α_3	4.452*** (0.580)		
Constant		-2.501*** (0.692)	3.643*** (1.339)
# of observations	582	582	570
Mcfaddens rho	0.14	0.18	0.71

Standard errors in parentheses. (Blank: Not significant. ***:Significant at $\leq 1\%$, **: Significant at $\leq 5\%$, *:Significant $\leq 10\%$)

Table 7: Marginal effects in the ordered logit

Variables	Never with sex workers	Once with sex workers	More than 1 time but less than once per month	1 to 3 times per month
Education =1 college or more; =0 otherwise	-0.0269 (0.033)	-0.012 (0.014)	0.027 (0.033)	0.012 (0.014)
Work status =1 Full time; =0 otherwise	-0.123** (0.059)	-0.033*** (0.008)	0.113** (0.048)	0.0429*** (0.015)
Race =1 if non white;=0 white	-0.077*** (0.028)	-0.044** (0.018)	0.079*** (0.029)	0.0425** (0.017)
Job =1executives/business managers =0 otherwise	0.02 (0.028)	0.01 (0.014)	-0.02 (0.028)	-0.010 (0.013)
Marriage =1 married; 0 otherwise	0.051* (0.0287)	0.026* (0.015)	-0.052* (0.029)	-0.025* (0.014)
Control Dislike	-0.045*** (0.016)	-0.023*** (0.008)	0.046*** (0.017)	0.022*** (0.008)
Age	-0.002** (0.002)	-0.001* (0.0008)	0.002* (0.0015)	0.001* (0.0007)
Factor1 'Against gender violence'	-0.029* (0.018)	-0.015* (0.0094)	0.030* (0.018)	0.014* (0.0088)
Factor2 'Against prostitution'	0.026* (0.015)	0.013* (0.0083)	-0.026* (0.015)	-0.012* (0.0077)
Factor3 'Sex workers not different and dislike their job'	-0.032** (0.016)	-0.016* (0.009)	0.033** (0.0172)	0.016* (0.0083)
Factor4 'Like Relationships'	0.088*** (0.0186)	0.045*** (0.011)	-0.09*** (0.020)	-0.043*** (0.009)
Factor5 'Variety dislike'	0.159*** (0.02)	0.085*** (0.015)	-0.162*** (0.024)	-0.078*** (0.012)
Factor6 'Relationship troubles'	0.004 (0.017)	0.002 (0.009)	-0.004 (0.018)	-0.002 (0.008)

Standard errors in brackets. (Blank: non significant, *: significant at 10%, **: 5%, ***: 1%).

Appendix

Table A1. Dependent variable for the ordered logit

Frequency of sex with sex worker during last year .	No of Obs 582 Frequency per cent
=1 never	25.4
=2 once	27.0
=3 more than 1 but less than once per month	35.0
=4 1 to 3 times per month	12.5

Table A2. (1) Dependent variable for the probability of being a regular client; (2) Dependent variable for the probability of using a condom.

(1) Frequency of sex with sex worker during last year.	No. of Obs 582 Frequency per cent	(2) Condom Use	No of Obs 570 Frequency Per cent
=1 if more than once with a sex worker in the last year	52.4	=1 use more than once and often the condom	94.4
=0 if never or once with a sex worker last year	47.6	=0 use condom never and seldom	5.6

Table A3. Control like

Do you like control during sex?	Total observations = 582 Frequency per cent
=1 if agree strongly	10.3
= 2 if agree somewhat	30.1
=3 if disagree somewhat	35.4
=4 if disagree strongly	24.2

Table A4. Descriptive statistics of the variables of the sample used for estimation in table 6

Variable	Mean	St. dev	Min	Max	obs
Education:=1 college or more, =0 otherwise	0.7457	0.435	0	1	582
Work status =1 Full time, =0 otherwise	0.907	0.290	0	1	582
Race: =1 if non white, =0 white	0.355	0.4791	0	1	582
Job:=1 executives/ managers, =0 otherwise	0.4329	0.495	0	1	582
Marriage :=1 married, =0 otherwise	0.482	0.500	0	1	582
Control dislike	2.735	0.941	1	4	582
Age	39	10.009	18	76	582
Factor1 'Against gender violence'	0.035	0.8693	-5.488	1.154	582
Factor2 'Against prostitution'	0.011	0.929	-2.264	2.189	582
Factor3 'Sex workers not different and dislike their job'	0.0006	0.885	-3.0865	2.5491	582
Factor4 'Like relationships'	0.0077	0.8919	-2.623	1.667	582
Factor5 'Variety dislike'	-0.020	0.856	-2.424	2.490	582
Factor6 'Relationship troubles '	0.004	0.834	-1.385	4.129	582

Table A5. Descriptive statistics of the variables used in the factor analysis.

		Agree strongly =1	Agree somewhat =2	Disagree somewhat =3	Disagree strongly =4	Total %	Total obs
Factor1	var 1.1 forced sex after necking's woman's fault	3,26	10,48	23,02	63,23	100	582
	var 1.2 women hitchhiking deserve rape	2,23	4,81	14,43	78,52	100	582
	var 1.3 stuck-up women deserve a lesson	2,41	3,26	8,25	86,08	100	582
	var 1.4 sex fun if woman fights	1,55	4,12	11,68	82,65	100	582
	var 1.5 some women like being smacked	3,09	18,38	25,95	52,58	100	582
	var 1.6 want sex more when angry	1,72	4,64	9,79	83,85	100	582
Factor2	var 2.1 prostitution creates problems	15,46	25,77	29,55	29,21	100	582
	var 2.2 cops should crack down on prostitution	13,06	26,12	26,12	34,71	100	582
	var 2.3 prostitution not wrong	17,35	34,02	30,76	17,87	100	582
	var 2.4 should legalize prostitution	41,24	33,33	12,03	13,4	100	582
	var 2.5 should decriminalize prostitution	39,18	32,47	17,01	11,34	100	582
Factor 3	var 3.1 sex workers like sex more	4,3	15,64	34,19	45,88	100	582
	var 3.2 sex workers like sex rougher	2,58	15,54	32,99	51,89	100	582
	var 3.3 sex workers enjoy work	2,75	22,85	47,77	26,63	100	582
	var 3.4 sex workers like men	5,84	34,36	42,44	17,35	100	582
Factor4	var 4.1 prefer prostitution to relationship	6,19	15,98	21,31	56,53	100	582
	var 4.2 no time for relationship	13,06	22,16	18,21	46,56	100	582
	var 4.3 don't want relationship responsibilities	12,71	17,7	17,53	52,06	100	582
Factor5	var 5.1 exited by approaching sex workers	12,89	38,14	24,05	24,91	100	582
	var 5.2 like to have a variety of partners	14,78	35,57	19,93	29,73	100	582
	var 5.3 like woman who gets nasty	22,68	35,4	19,42	22,51	100	582
		Yes=1	no =0	Total %	Total obs		
Factor 6	var 6.1 serious trouble with partner	32,99	67,01	100	582		
	var 6.2 separated from partner	20,79	79,21	100	582		
	var 6.3 broke up with partner	20,1	97,9	100	582		