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ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION

THE INCLUSIVE HUMAN TRAFFICKING CHECKLIST: A DIALECTICAL MEASUREMENT METHODOLOGY

The identification of victims of human trafficking and consequential service provision is characterized by a significant disconnection between the estimated prevalence of this issue and the number of cases identified. The current dissertation introduces the Inclusive Human Trafficking Checklist (IHTC) as a screening measure, evaluates the appropriateness of the instrument, evaluates whether there are differences in assessment based on the participant’s profession, level of knowledge, and training, and assesses if users of the instrument perceive it as useful. A total of 201 participants were asked to rate three vignettes predetermined by experts to qualify as a either human trafficking case or not. The participants were placed in three conditions: business as usual (use of the Rescue and Restore instrument), utilization of the IHTC with and without training. The results revealed a statistically significant level of agreement between the expert’s diagnostic and the application of the IHTC. While there was an improvement in identification in the group with training, the difference was found to have a small effect size. The results also revealed an improvement on identification of cases when utilizing the IHTC. Participants who utilized the IHTC showed an increased ability to identify elements of identity-based vulnerabilities as well as elements of fraud, which according to the results, are distinctive variables in cases of human trafficking. In terms of the perceived utility, the results revealed higher mean scores for the groups utilizing the IHTC when compared to the business as usual condition. These findings suggest that the IHTC improves appropriate identification of cases and that it is perceived as a useful instrument. The application of the IHTC as a counseling and legal instrumentation utilized for conceptualization and intervention of human trafficking cases is discussed as an opportunity for enhancement of victim well-being, engagement and activism.
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Chapter One: Introduction

"They would not call it slavery, but some other name. Slavery has been fruitful in giving herself names ... and it will call itself by yet another name; and you and I and all of us had better wait and see what new form this old monster will assume, in what new skin this old snake will come forth."

Frederick Douglas - (1818 - 1895) Former Slave, Abolitionist Leader

Scope of the Problem

Human trafficking can be described as the modern euphemism for slavery. Slavery is an institutionalized system under which human groups can be traded as property and forced into labor (Brace, 2004). This system became unjustifiable as a legitimate institution after the Second World War when the horrific torture, forced labor and massacre of the Jewish community was unveiled to the world (Panayi, 2005). The vivid images of human suffering paralleled the historical image of slavery creating a collective response, which culminated in the abolition of the institution under the United Nations (UN) Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948). “No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms.” From this point forward, the institution of slavery would be perceived as illegitimate and illegal.

Nearly two centuries after the abolition of the transatlantic slave trade, and 64 years after slavery officially ended, the trade of humans continues throughout the world (Bales, 2000a). Underground and minimally recognized by nations, a new form of labor exploitation victimizes 2.4 million people at any given time (International Labor Organization (ILO), 2012). The collective of stories of humans forced into labor,
servitude and commercial sex provoked a public outcry, which pushed activists, scholars, and policy makers to define and investigate the phenomenon.

Definitions of human trafficking were popularized around the late nineties. At the most basic level, human trafficking was described as the modern form of slavery (Bales, 1999; Hopper, 2004; Logan, 2007). Bales (2000a) elaborated on this notion and described the phenomenon as the systematic exploitation of labor, under which a person is compelled to work for another without any personal benefit or ensured safety. Martha Nussbaum (2000) discussed the issue from a human rights perspective and suggested that human trafficking is the systematic limitation of human capabilities and fundamental humanity.

While these definitions or descriptions underline the ethical and moral stands by which to judge the presence of human trafficking in a person’s life, they fail to define the mechanism by which human trafficking happens or the threshold that makes someone qualify as a trafficking victim. The lack of a clear definition limited the ability of nations to study the phenomena and further assess its prevalence. In the year 2000, two revolutionary documents were signed: The UN Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons (UNPPSPTP) and the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act (TVPA). Both documents provide a working definition for the identification and incidence measurement of human trafficking.

According to the definition given in the UNPPSPTP (2000), trafficking in persons has three fundamental elements: (a) the act: this element defines trafficking as the recruitment, transportation, transfer, harboring or receipt of persons; (b) the means: this element describes the mechanisms that compel an individual to surrender their civil rights
such as threats, use of force, coercion, abduction, fraud, deception, abuse of power or vulnerability, or giving debt bondage; (c) the purpose: this element describes the victim’s exploitability or what can be obtained from the victim. This includes sexual exploitation, forced labor, slavery or similar practices. The TVPA adopted the definition proposed by the UNPPSPTP, but marked a legal distinction between sex and labor trafficking with the intention of protecting minor victims of sex trafficking. It also summarized the means of trafficking someone to three elements (i.e. force, fraud and coercion).

The introduction of the TVPA and the UNPPSPTP definitions ignited a decade of progress toward the eradication of modern-day slavery in the world. The most notable step is perhaps the initiation of international dialogues around the demand and supply of cheap human labor in local and international markets (Danailova-Trainor & Belser, 2006). As a result, countries have been called to investigate their roles as either supplier or receiver countries and take legislative and preventative actions against human trafficking (U.S. DOS Trafficking in Persons Report, 2011).

Legislative protections outlined in the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act (TVPA) of the United States in the year 2000, as well as its Reauthorization Acts (TVPRA’S) in the years 2003, 2005, 2008, and 2013, call individual states to implement state based legislations that address human trafficking prevention, protection, and prosecution (Polaris Project, 2014a). This three-pronged approach is called the Safe Harbor Provision (SHP). The SHP is currently considered a comprehensive, human rights driven conceptualization of the issue and has been utilized as a model in many countries around the world (Tip report, 2013). This style of legislation treats those coerced into participating in commercial sex activities as victims
of crime, even when they have engaged in criminal activity. Remarkably, the TVPA offers these victims access to social and protective services, including medical and mental health care and safe housing. The legislation makes professionals working in human services mandated reporters of human trafficking in minors, it also includes policies regarding professional education for those working in human services, criminal justice or legal professions, outlines expectations regarding prevention, and increased penalties for traffickers. It is important to mention that the SHP includes policies for education and public awareness campaigns; however, it does not ensure funding for the advancement of education programs. Therefore, human trafficking educational programs vary across states based on each state’s funding and technical resources (Polaris Project, 2014c).

While legislative protections have increased, there is a significant disconnection between the estimated prevalence of this issue and the number of cases identified and appropriately processed. For instance, while the TVPA defines children working in sexual or sexualized industries as victims of human trafficking, in the United States only nine states as of spring 2012 had enacted versions of “safe harbor” laws ensuring that teens accused of prostitution are treated as victims and exempted from prosecution (Wright-Clayton, Krugman & Simon, 2013). In the year 2003, 1,400 minors were arrested in the U.S. From the same statistic it was estimated that 14% were younger than 14 years old (Clawson, Dutch, Salomon, & Grace, 2009). This disconnection can be largely explained by the lack of clarity in the definition of this issue and the lack of standardized measurement tools or procedures for systematic screening of victims, data collection, retention, and sharing (Weiner & Hala 2008).
As a result, a variety of interpretations of the human trafficking legislation have lead to widespread mythologies. For instance, the belief that trafficked persons can only be foreign nationals or that human trafficking is essentially a crime that must involve some form of travel, transportation, or movement across state or national borders (Polaris Project, 2012). While there are many trafficking victims who are immigrants and traveling is often used as a method to disorient victims, these are instances of human trafficking and by no means define the full extent of the human trafficking experience. However, the label “trafficking” etymologically implies movement. The nature of the label creates enough distraction and confusion among law enforcement, prosecutors, judges, mental health, and social service practitioners impeding appropriate identification of victims (Clawson, Layne, & Small, 2006). As a consequence, many victims are often ignored, perceived as criminals, or re-victimized when interacting with non-governmental and governmental organizations (Bales, 2000b).

Exposure to coercive control and violence typically manifests in physical and psychological dysfunction. This might serve as a driver for victims to have encounters with courts, criminal justice, mental health, or social services institutions (Clawson & Dutch, 2008). Institutional encounters might increase the likelihood of identification of a given victim if there were institutionalized screening methodologies in place. Some efforts have been made by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2013) in creating probing questions under the Rescue and Restore Campaign to identify human trafficking in a person’s psychosocial history. However, the lack of understanding of the multicultural, multi-systemic and multifaceted nature of human trafficking has obstructed
the development of screening methodologies that provide actual measures of human trafficking.

Identification of victims of human trafficking and consequential service provision is characterized by a significant disconnection between the estimated prevalence of this issue and the number of cases identified (Schich, Goyen, & Mallozzi, 2014). In addition, one of the main barriers in facilitating the identification of victims is the pervasive lack of training available to the public, and to professionals likely to encounter victims. Hence, developing screening methodologies that are theoretically grounded and that demonstrate evidence-based substantiation is a crucial goal in the progress of anti human trafficking practices. The Inclusive Human Trafficking Checklist (IHTC) is a screening instrument with theoretical underpinnings derived from dialectic theory. The goal of this dissertation is to introduce the theoretical conceptualization of this instrument, evaluate the appropriateness of the Inclusive Human Trafficking Checklist (IHTC) as a theoretically grounded methodology that screens for the presence of human trafficking in a person’s life, to compare its performance with traditional forms of human trafficking assessment, to evaluate its performance when considering other factors such as prior human trafficking knowledge, professional background and training, to assess its usefulness as perceived by potential users, and to discuss the instrument’s implications for practice.

**Instrument Theoretical Conceptualization**

This IHTC was developed using classical test theory (CST). CST includes four initial steps (i.e., definition of the domain and facets of the construct being measured and theoretical underpinnings, review of existing literature, qualitative content analysis, use of expert sampling, and quantitative analysis of quality of items) (DeVelis, 1991).
Definition of Domains and Facets of Human Trafficking

Methodology guidelines typically begin by recommending to carefully define the domain and facets of the construct before developing any elements of the assessment instrument (DeVelis, 1991; Haynes, Richard, & Kubany, 1995; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994; Suen, 1990). The study of human trafficking has been characterized as lacking theoretical and methodological frameworks to outline definitions that can be realistically operationalized (Bales, 2007; Logan, Walker, & Hunt, 2009; Reid, 2012). For this reason, a definition based on theoretical frameworks is imperative. The inclusive human trafficking definition proposed in this dissertation is based on the application of Hegelian dialectical method. According to Hegelian methodology, the first step in devising a definition is to contemplate the context in which the phenomenon takes place.

Human trafficking happens within the context of the global workforce. Trafficking in persons only makes sense in a society in which there is a perceived benefit in ensuring a reliable source of cheap labor (Bales, 2000b). The interactions between individuals and the labor economy will elucidate differences between labor arrangements in which people derive personal benefit, and labor arrangements in which people are severely exploited.

By first inspection, human labor can be divided in two groups: valued labor and utilitarian labor (Sen, 1982). In order to ensure that a job is valued, governments establish a threshold of basic liberties and entitlements so that civil members can have an opportunity to explore and capitalize on their innate capabilities (Nussbaum & Sen, 1993). For instance, The Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA, 1938) in the United States ensures that any given worker that enters a civilly recognized labor market can theoretically expect to work eight hours a day, obtain over-time payment for extra hours
worked, and receive at least minimum wage. Basic safety measures such as the use of safety equipment, sexual harassment legislation, and non-discriminatory policies are in place to protect citizens in the workplace from physical, psychological injuries, discrimination or exploitation.

The inclusion of these protections implies that the work of individuals has economical and social value. Labor legislations theoretically should cover all legal jobs. However, the value of a job is capriciously determined by the perceived validity or importance of its social contribution (Dreze & Sen 1995). For instance, individuals employed as attorneys, social workers, bankers, psychologists, mathematicians or any other socially recognized job might feel motivated to enter a lawsuit against their employer after a perceived violation of labor legislations such as sexual harassment. In contrast, a person working in the pornography industry, which is a legal and yet a socially devalued practice, might find much contention in entering a sexual harassment lawsuit in a court of law and consequently, nor feel motivated to act (Clawson & Dutch, 2008).

From this example we can conclude that two conditions must take place for a job to hold value: first, the employee must be covered by legal protections and second, the job must enjoy social validity. It is not a coincidence that human trafficking victims tend to be highly represented in sex, domestic, agricultural and manufacturing industries, which tend to have less comparative social or monetary value than other jobs. Jobs that lack social validity or that happen outside socially validated environments inevitably make people vulnerable to exploitation because culturally, there is not a perceived benefit in protecting the integrity of these laborers (Bales, 2000a).

The phenomenon of human trafficking is the negation of the system of valued
labor. It happens outside civil protection and outside socially validated environments. As part of a parallel economy, it occurs underground, uncontrolled and under-recognized by nations (Bales, 2000b). In this system, people are not treated as ends to their own rights, but as mere means to the sexual or economic benefit of others (Nussbaum, 2000). The work of individuals in this system happens for the sake of utility; the individual typically cannot excerpt real economic or social value from their participation in a given activity (Logan, Walker, & Humnt, 2009; Nussbaum 2000; Sen, 1982).

The experiences of women forced into domestic servitude unveil the problem of utilitarian labor arrangements. Historically, women have performed the bulk of unpaid household work (Armstrong & Armstrong, 2010; Beneria, 1992). Since women’s contributions happen outside a recognized or valued labor arrangement, their experiences within the household are not recognized by labor legislation. Hence, individuals laboring under utilitarian arrangements are forced to operate outside civil labor protections. Women who are trafficked into domestic servitude are often invisible to the public and the legal system because their domestic labor complies with the social expectation related to the domestic labor of women (Ding, 2002). This example epitomizes the dynamic tension that exists between labor that warrants utility and labor that warrants value. The parallelism and contradiction inherent in these systems is represented in the following graph (see figure 1.1).

Valued and utilitarian labor arrangements exist simultaneously within labor markets. The measure of how much an individual is operating at each end of the graph (see figure 1.1) is relative to the universal standard of what is considered fair labor (International Labor Organization (ILO), 1998). In this regard, if individuals are
obtaining remuneration for a given job, but they are simultaneously being mistreated, plus their job is considered immoral in a given social context, these individuals are operating partially on the top and partially on the button of the graph. This means that these individuals are partially operating in fair labor as well as exploitative labor arrangement simultaneously. Conceptually, we could argue that when individuals are operating within the system of valued labor, exponential decreases on civil protections and social validity of their job would push individuals to function in the systems of utilitarian labor (Nussbaum & Sen, 1993). Contrary to this, when individuals are operating in the system of utilitarian labor, exponential increases on civil protections and social validity of their job would push them to function in the system of valued labor. This implies that quantitative changes in either system would invariably lead to qualitative changes in the experience and functioning of individuals (Brennan, 2012; Burnes & By 2012; Hunt, 1979; Nussbaum & Sen, 1993).

**Dialectic Methodology**

Dialectic methodologies can be described as the process of arriving at the truth by the exchange of contradicting arguments. Arriving at truth becomes a process of stating a thesis, developing a contradictory antithesis, and then combining the findings into a coherent synthesis (Hegel, Trans. 1975; Kaufmann, 1966). The basic tenets of dialectical theology are as follows: the thesis is an intellectual proposition that describes the quality of a subject of study. The antithesis is the internal or the environmental conditions that inherently impact the existence of the theses, and the synthesis is the resolution of the conflict that gives way to a new concept (Burbidge, 1995). Two basic principles underline dialectic discourse: expression and differentiation. The first principle looks at
the relationships between a phenomenon and its context. The second one emphasizes the differences of the phenomenon from that context (Ball, 1979). Given the intrinsic relationship between human trafficking and the labor economy, conducting a dialectic analysis of the topic might give way to a more complete conceptualization and definition of human trafficking.

**Operationalization of Dialectic Theory**

According to dialectic theory, the interaction between theses and antithesis can be quantified by utilizing the notion of direct or indirect ratios (for the analysis of human trafficking only direct rations will be considered). Theses, antitheses and synthesis are mathematically and conceptually defined as follows: the theses characterizes the expression of a phenomenon, $x$, the antithesis represents the environmental conditions that determine the presence of the theses, $y$, and the synthesis is the new concept that reconciles the contradiction, $k$. The relationship is summarized in the following equation $k = y / x$ (Kaufmann, 1966).

In this equation, one side of the ratio, $y$, is a certain amount relative to the other side, $x$, which serves as the unit whereby this amount is measured. If $k$ is given, then the value on any one side of the ratio could be any number, and the number on the other side will automatically be determined. Therefore, the first number of the ratio completely loses its independent significance and only functions as a determinate value in relation to the other factor. Hence, the factors in a contradiction must be interdependent. This means that if one factor is ceases to exist, so does the other factor (Kaufmann, 1966). Human trafficking ($k$) is an occurrence that either took place (1) or did not take place (0); therefore, we can conceptualize the experience in a continuum with values ranging
between 0 to 1. Given this, it is possible to hypothesize that the interaction of \( y \) and \( x \) would be correlational in nature.

**Operationalization of Dialectic Theory Applied to Labor Markets**

Martha Nussbaum (2000) defines human trafficking as the systematic restriction of human capability. She suggests that human trafficking is the opposite of fair labor. According to dialectic theory, we should start by analyzing fair labor in our current economical arrangement to have a clear picture of the dialectical contradiction at the polar opposite of human trafficking. Applying the theory, we can start by proposing that humans have inherent marketable capabilities \( (x) \). The degree to which expression of human capabilities can be reinforced is determined by environmental provision of labor support \( (y) \) in the form of civil liberties, entitlements, commensurate pay, fair treatment, etc. When there is a balance between human capabilities and labor support, we can say that valued labor is taking place \( (k) \).

Let us illustrate the equation mathematically: if a given individual had zero capabilities \( (x) \), division over zero is mathematically undefined, meaning that the individual did not have any marketable capabilities for which they can be compensated \( (y) \). Hence, valued labor \( (k) \) could not take place \( (k = y / 0 = undefined) \). A true zero would not be a reasonable assumption in the discussion of human capability. Therefore, this should be considered a theoretical example that supports the existence of the dialectical contradiction and not a practical analysis of human capability. On the other hand, if an individual has any number of marketable human capabilities \( (x) \), but is not compensated \( (y) \) in any way, the individual is not participating in a valued labor \( (k) \) arrangement \( (k = 0 / x = 0) \).
Let us consider the opposite pole of the contradiction or valued labor perfectly matched. Let us suppose that a given individual has three marketable capabilities \( x \) and that these capabilities in the current labor market should equal $80,000 plus other substantial benefits. Let us pretend that this person is indeed being matched \( y = \frac{80,000 + \text{benefits}}{x = 80,000 + \text{benefits}} \). The result indicates the interaction reaches one unit of valued labor. Let us pretend that she developed new interests and received further professional training. Upon graduation, she realizes that her experience is valued at \( y = $100,000 \) plus other substantial benefits. The proportion between inherent capabilities and the job environment is not any longer a perfect unit of valued labor (1.00) but an imperfect (.8). In a truly free and equitable environment, the individual can decide to leave the job in search of another outlet that could support her newly acquired skill, remain in the job and be partially dissatisfied, or restructure the job so that it meets her current capabilities.

The proportion of \( k \) measurement of valued labor should not be perceived as a predictor of the choices that a given individual will make, but rather an indicator of met/unmet or supported/unsupported capabilities. Nonetheless, jobs in valued labor markets tend to mirror a person’s capabilities by rewarding the individual. In this regard, the higher the discrepancy between inherent capability and reward, the lower the level of value of the job. It is important to note that a job can be valued and yet unfairly compensated or valued and fairly compensated. The measure of fairness or unfairness of a job is determined by the individual and societal assessment of how well his or her capabilities are being mirrored by the level of environmental support (Nussbaum, 2000; Nussbaum & Sen, 1993). The decision to remain in a given job, make changes to the job
or leave should stream from a conscientious exercise of self-determination and freedom. This supports the individual’s ability to behave in ways that foster physical and psychological well being, ways that are constructive and congruent with the genuine needs and wants of the free individual (Deci & Ryan, 2002).

The above analysis and mathematical demonstration allows us to conclude that valued labor is an inextricable interaction between environmental support and human capability. In general, an individual’s ability to function in the system of valued labor should promote elements of physical and psychological well-being, and self-determination (Deci & Ryan, 2002, 2008). In the labor economy, not all humans have the ability to exercise freedom and self-determination or explore inherent capabilities. In this system, the individual is reduced to utilitarian functions, or functions that produce benefit for the trafficker such as their sexuality, ability to manufacture or ability to labor. The expectation of what the individual is supposed to produce is not a product of self-determination, but a product of low expectations imposed by others (Bales, 2000a). For this reason, human trafficking victims operate within the system of utilitarian labor.

Given the fundamental limitations in functioning evident in this system, the equation that represents the system of utilitarian labor should be contradictory to the equation of valued labor. In the system of utilitarian labor, the trafficker looks for ways to reduce human capabilities to menial functions. Therefore, what is important to the human trafficker is not human capability, but human vulnerability, given that the vulnerable individual is more susceptible to physical or emotional injury or attack and therefore, more susceptible to relinquish his/her civil rights. At the other end of the equation, the employer who values the work of a given individual looks for ways to
support the individual by providing support (commensurate compensation, fair treatment, and other substantive benefits). Contrary to this, the human trafficker looks for ways to exploit the individual because the individual is perceived as profitable to the trafficker. From this analysis, human trafficking, as an extreme form of utilitarian labor, should be viewed as a function between exploitation and vulnerability.

The relative relationship between these factors is explored in the following equation: Utilitarian labor \( k = \frac{Exploitation \ (y)}{Vulnerability \ (x)} \). This equation also epitomizes the two poles of the dialectical contradiction imbedded in the concept of utilitarian labor. Let us remember that contradictory functions must comply with three conditions: first, the variables chosen should be inextricably related. Second, if one variable ceases to exist, so does the other one, and third, the variables should give way to a new concept, in this case, utilitarian labor (Kaufmann, 1966).

In order to check the mathematical compliance of the factors included equation with the original tenets of dialectic theory, let us explore cases in which either variable (exploitation and vulnerability) are eliminated. When it comes to utilitarian labor, a common argument tends to arise: a vulnerable individual could relinquish compensation by volition. In this case, exploitation would equal zero and the equation would be null \( (0/x=0) \) meaning that the involvement of the individual in a labor activity would not be an act of exploitation, but an act of exercise of personal freedom, which would not enter into the equation of utilitarian labor.

Eliminating vulnerability on the opposite end of the equation is theoretically a difficult task given that all humans are vulnerable to death, illness or loss of social networks and yet not all humans operate in the system of utilitarian labor. In order to
prove the existence of the extreme case, that would dissolve the contradiction between vulnerability and exploitability, we should consider a being that is not vulnerable. For instance, a being that can predict every outcome and has sufficient power to protect him/herself from any type of harm could not be exploited, as he/ she would always be a step ahead of the exploiter. If such a being gave into the desires of the exploitative force, this would have to be an act of volition, which would obliterate the existence of any possible exploitation. In this case, vulnerability would equal zero, division by zero is undefined; therefore utilitarian labor would have not taken place. Obtaining a true zero is not possible when analyzing experiences of utilitarian labor in human beings. However, it is possible to theorize that some humans are more vulnerable than others and therefore, more susceptible to exploitation. If vulnerabilities and exploitabilities were quantifiable we could discover the mathematical proportion or intensity referent to the level of utility excerpted from the individual.

**Operationalization of Dialectic Theory Applied to Human Trafficking**

Human trafficking is an extreme kind of utilitarian labor. Therefore, we must further explore exploitation and vulnerability factors in this particular form of utilitarian labor.

**Exploitability.** Legal definitions of human trafficking agree on the fact that people are exploited (y) through the use of three mechanisms: fraud, force or coercion (TVPA, 2000; UNPPSPTP, 2000). Force is to compel someone by physical, moral, or intellectual means to take a course of action; fraud is the intentional perversion of truth in order to induce another to surrender a legal right, and coercion is the systematic persuasion and manipulation of reality to induce someone to take a course of action (Bales, 2005). While
the legislation considers that the individual can be trafficked through either of these mechanisms of control, I theorize that these mechanisms of control are inherent to the dynamics of trafficking and therefore, likely to be found in all cases. By definition, human trafficking implies the objectification of an individual and the systematic restriction of someone’s inherent capabilities. I also conceptualize that human trafficking is inherently fraudulent given that inhibiting growth or self-expression requires a great degree of force in the form of physical or psychological belittlement, therefore human trafficking is inherently a forceful interaction. Human trafficking also has distinctive elements of fraud. Human trafficking happens in the context of the labor market. When interacting in the labor market, there is a national and international threshold of civil protections established for workers such as having limits to the number of hours spent at work each day, obtaining at least minimum wage, anti-discrimination policies, and protection of minor workers. Any activity below that established threshold of civil protection is inherently fraudulent whether or not the individual enters the labor arrangement consciously or unconsciously. Coercion is also a mechanism of exploitation that is inherent to the trafficking situation because the perpetrator has to necessarily propose that the victim engage in a labor, sexual or service activity as an alternative to prevent bodily or psychological harm. In this regard, making a threat of physical or psychological harm is a forceful behavior, but making the victim believe that these actions can actually take place is a coercive action geared toward manipulating the victim into remaining in the trafficking situation. It is noteworthy that in a person’s history of human trafficking, force, fraud, and coercion are going to be a collection of attitudinal and behavioral events employed by the perpetrator to demean, control, manipulate and/ or
psychologically restrain the victim. Therefore, on the top of the equation exploitability (y) would equal the summation of forceful (y_1), fraudulent (y_2) and coercive (y_3) events that the victim endured through their experience of human trafficking, where the number of incidents ranges from 0 to n (see equation 1). It is important to note that the elements of exploitation in this equation are multiplied. The multiplication of elements represent two important aspects: first, the compounding effect of forceful, fraudulent or coercive actions on a person’s functioning and second, the idea that the three elements inherent to a trafficking situation and need to be present for a case to be considered human trafficking. Hence the development of any trafficking measurement instrumentation needs to consider the broad expression of force, fraud and coercion in a given social environment. This consideration should theoretically increase the sensitivity of a measurement methodology to truly capture human trafficking cases. Should force, fraud and coercion factors reach a null result it would make the full equation equal to zero, meaning that an event of human trafficking did not take place.

\[
y = \sum_{i=0}^{n} y_1 \star \sum_{i=0}^{n} y_2 \star \sum_{i=0}^{n} y_3
\]  

(1)

**Vulnerability.** All humans are vulnerable or susceptible to death, illness or loss of social networks; therefore, vulnerability is a defining aspect of human functioning. Since the self itself is vulnerable, what defines the self makes him/her vulnerable. Psychology offers the notion of identity as a term used to describe an individual's definition of him or herself as a discrete, separate entity (Leary & Tangney, 2003). Destroying someone’s sense of identity is destroying someone’s sense of self. Human trafficking is meant to obliterate the self. From this perspective, two aspects of identity, personal and social, should be considered. Personal identity is concerned with characteristics that make the
individual unique. In this regard, physical and psychological characteristics, and personal role(s) in life are defining personal characteristics (Leary & Tangney, 2003). Social identity, on the other hand, is a person’s sense of who they are based on their group membership(s) (Tajfel, Fraser, & Franciscus Jaspars, 1984). Social identity theory, proposes that the groups which people identity as being a part of, (i.e., social class, family, football team, etc.) give us a sense of belonging to the social world. In addition to this notion, it is pertinent to this discussion to consider that any given culture or group creates unique reactions to different identity categories. Worell and Remer (2003) describe the concept of social locations as identity categories composed of positive and negative characteristics that are constructed by the dominant group in a given societal organization. They conceptualize that social locations exist on a continuum from privileged to oppressed and represent the way in which a culture views and treats groups of individuals and how many individuals view themselves. From their perspective, social identity is the collection of a given individual acknowledged and unacknowledged identification of their intersecting social locations in a given culture.

Attacks to personal or social identity dimensions would be compelling because they would destroy the very essence of an individual. Therefore, vulnerability (X) essentially is the susceptibility to having ones personal and social identity injured or attacked. Therefore, the vulnerability equation will be the summation of susceptibilities of personal identity (x1) multiplied by susceptibilities of social identity (x2) (see equation 3). It is important to note that the social environment in which the person lives determines susceptibilities of social identity. For instance, it is well documented that in our social environment issues of (a) gender, (b) race, (c) sexual orientation, (d) disability, or (e)
socio economic status could impact the level of vulnerability of an individual when the individual inherits a stigmatized social status in any of these categories (Goodman, 2001; Worell, & Remer, 2003). Hence, social identity categories are also compounded according to the number of stigmatized identities that the individual has inherited. Hence social identity \( x_2 \) equals the multiplication of the summation of vulnerability per social identity categories (See equation 2).

\[
x_2 = \left( \sum_{i=0}^{n} a \times \sum_{i=0}^{n} b \ldots \sum_{i=0}^{n} n \right).
\]

(2)

The multiplication of personal \( x_1 \) and social identity \( x_2 \) symbolizes the intersectional and compounding impact of an individual’s social and personal identity on his or her self-concept. Since the factors are multiplied, should any of them reach a null result it would make the full equation equal to zero, meaning that the person is not vulnerable by virtue of his personal or social characteristics, which is improbable in human populations. See equation 3.

\[
X = \sum_{i=0}^{n} x_1 \times \sum_{i=0}^{n} x_2
\]

(3)

When inputting these two equations into the original utilitarian labor equation of (exploitability/ vulnerability), we can conclude the proportion of experienced human trafficking (HT) is the multiplication of force \( y_1 \), fraud \( y_2 \) and coercion \( y_3 \) as forms of exploitation divided by the multiplication of personal \( x_1 \) and social \( x_2 \) identity vulnerabilities (see equation 4).

\[
HT = \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{n} y_1 \times \sum_{i=0}^{n} y_2 \times \sum_{i=0}^{n} y_3}{\sum_{i=0}^{n} x_1 \times \sum_{i=0}^{n} x_2}
\]

(4)
It is noteworthy that in this interaction, the quality of force, fraud, or coercion could be mediated by the person’s personal and social identity susceptibilities. For instance, given the importance of kin in the development of someone’s identity (Leary & Tangney, 2003) making threats to family is an argument that could potentially push anyone into engaging in a human trafficking activity. In the same regard, taking someone’s assistive devise, such as a wheel chair, to force a person to beg for money is an action that would only be compelling for a person with a disability. These examples highlight the importance of understanding the intersections of human trafficking with issues of personal identity as well as other social identities such as gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, SES, and disability.

**Scope of the Dissertation**

The theoretical conceptualization previously described offers possibilities for measuring the presence of human trafficking in a person’s life as a dynamic and dialectic interaction between vulnerability and exploitation. The conceptualization of this interaction as exploitation over vulnerability facilitates the measurement of human trafficking given that it clearly identifies the constructs to be measured. An instrument entitled the Inclusive Human Trafficking Checklist (IHTC) was created based on this dialectical analysis of human trafficking. The purpose of this dissertation is to present and evaluate the validity of a human trafficking methodology measurement that includes facets of vulnerability and exploitations as represented in the socio-cultural context of the United States. The scope of this dissertation is (a) to introduce the IHTC as a screening methodology that evaluates the presence of human trafficking in a person’s psychosocial history, (b) to describe the process of creation of the instrument with theoretical
underpinnings on a dialectical analysis of the phenomenon with basis on an extensive
literature review, (c) to explore whether the IHTC is a valid measure of human trafficking
in two aspects of validity (construct, and criterion), (d) to evaluate if there are differences
in assessment of human trafficking in three experimental conditions (i.e. use of the IHTC
with training, use of the IHTC without training, and use of the traditional Rescue and
Restore assessment procedure), and (e) to assess the instrument’s usefulness or utility.

Research Questions

The overarching goal of this dissertation is to present the IHTC as a methodology
of human trafficking measurement based on a dialectical conceptualization, provide
enough evidence to support that it accurately identifies and quantifies the experience of
human trafficking in a person’s life, as well as explore whether its utilization is perceived
as useful by professionals who assist human trafficking victims. Given that the social
context in which a person operates influences the level of vulnerability that someone
experiences and that this theory and instrument was developed in the United States, the
contributions advanced in this dissertation are only applicable to this social context. To
this end, the research questions are as follows:

1. Is the IHTC an appropriate measure of human trafficking?

2. Does the IHTC capture the breadth and depth of the experience of human
   trafficking conceptualized as the interaction between vulnerability and
   exploitation?

3. Do factors such as experimental conditions (i.e., receiving training or not receiving
   training), and the demographic characteristics of the rater affect the performance
   of the IHTC?
4. Do raters perceive the use of the instrument as useful in understanding and further assisting victims?

**Summary**

Exposure to coercive control and violence typically manifests in physical and psychological dysfunction. This might serve as a driver for victims to have encounters with courts, criminal justice, mental health, or social services institutions (Clawson et al., 2008). Currently, the estimated number of human trafficking victims dramatically exceeds the number of human trafficking victims identified. The lack of identification of victims can be largely explained by different factors some of which are lack of public awareness, lack of training of professionals, limited theoretical understanding of the topic, limited methodologies for measuring and sharing information, as well as limited understanding of how persons with diverse social and personal vulnerabilities are trafficked.

The use of screening methodologies that are grounded in theoretical conceptualizations and that take into consideration the interaction between vulnerability and exploitation might increase opportunities for victims to be identified and benefit from services. Currently, there is a gap in the literature of human trafficking in regards to the operationalization of this interaction. In this dissertation, I hope to introduce the IHTCL as a system of measurement that carefully explores vulnerability and exploitation, which opens up opportunities for multidisciplinary intervention in mental health, human services, criminal justice and legislative fields.
Figure 1.1 Division of Labor

LABOR =

Valued Labor
(Within civil protections and within a socially validated environment)

Utilitarian Labor
(Outside Civil Protections, and Outside a Socially Validated Environments)

Figure X. Description of the most basic division of labor in current markets and the factors associated with each group.
Chapter Two: Literature Review

Identification is recognized as the largest obstacle in accessing relief under the Trafficking in Persons Protection Act (TVPA) (Angel, 2007; Schich, Goyen, & Mallozzi, 2014). The lack of actual information causes much fluctuation in the statistical estimate of the scope of the problem, hence diminishing the capability of legislatures to allocate appropriate funding for professional trainings, as well as allocating funding for social and mental health services provisions for victims. For instance, in the United States since the year 2000, the estimated number of victims trafficked into the country has been modified downwards from 50,000 persons annually to roughly 17,000 (Roby et al., 2008; Seelke & Siskin, 2008). However, the National Human Trafficking Resource Center reported only receiving a total 3,983 entries for potential victims of both labor and sex trafficking (2013a).

When discussing the scope of human trafficking, The International Labor Organization warns readers about the continued lack of reliable national reports based on specialized data collection instruments, which prevents the use of the most usual means to derive estimates (ILO, 2012). Similarly, a statement by the United States Department of State noted that only 2,000 out of 45,000 available T-Visas had been given to immigrant victims and their families between 2000 and January of 2008 (U.S. Department of State, 2009). While this diminishing number may suggest that the original estimates may have been overstated or that the penalties may have reduced the problem, it also points out to the overwhelming number of unidentified victims and the lack of identification methodologies available at the moment.

The TVPA represents an advancement in the legislative understanding of human
trafficking; however, the review of statistics on human trafficking cases shows that the law alone is not facilitating the identification or protection process of the majority of victims (Okech, Morreau, & Benson, 2014). Many victims, as well as professionals, may have limited understanding of human trafficking and are unaware that the laws exist (Irazola et al., 2008; Roby et al., 2008). Also, there are limited resources in screening or providing appropriate protection to victims once they make a report; hence many remain silent or simply unidentified (Irazola et al., 2008, Sigmon, 2008).

The TVPA places much of the responsibility for victim identification on local community members, social service providers, law enforcement personnel, attorneys and other first-line responders. At the same time, the legislation challenges some other existing legislation such as prostitution, or smuggling of immigrants. Without sufficient training or screening supports aimed at understanding the dynamics of trafficking situations, victims are frequently neither recognized nor assisted because at the moment of making a decision about the nature of a case, conflicting legislations might increase the possibility of making errors. For instance, a woman is arrested after engaging in an exchange of sexual services for money. At first sight, this might look as a prostitution case. However, the person might have been exposed to a series of forceful, coercive and fraudulent actions by a trafficker, actions which are invisible to the attending officer at the moment of arrest. In the same fashion, other professionals can make similar assumption. For instance, a youth is ordered by court to enroll in a behavioral modification program due to sexualized behavior. If the clinician does not take into consideration the contextual narrative in which the behavior takes place, the therapy might be focused on correcting the behavior rather than alleviating a series of traumatic
experiences that might explain the behavior (Cecchet & Thoburn, 2014).

It is noteworthy, that processes of social stigmatization might bias the professional perception of who is a criminal and who is a victim. As Cullinan (1998) so poignantly points out in her essay *Vision, Privilege and the Limits of Tolerance*, while those protected by social privilege receive the presumption of innocence and are not likely to be held in suspicion, those not privileged are often seen as guilty until proven innocent and as suspicious or difficult if they complain or contest this treatment. Most victims of human trafficking belong to marginalized groups (i.e., women, LGBT groups, immigrants, ethnic and racial minorities). Hence, it is likely that dynamics of guilty by association might obscure the process of identification, and make people vulnerable to re-victimization.

The theoretical conceptualization proposed in this dissertation views human trafficking as a process of victimization in which the type of exploitation that a victim endures is directly linked to their vulnerability as outlined by the social environment in which they operate. Hence, the instrument is sensitive to power differentials as well as dynamics of subordination and marginalization of specific human groups. This literature review is intended to better understand exploitation dynamics and further explore issues of vulnerability to human trafficking.

Colloquially, the process of introducing a person into human trafficking is referred as “breaking someone down” (Hooper & Hidalgo, 2006). This implies that there is a fundamental expectation of destruction of what constitutes the individual. The psychological concept that describes an individual as a discrete, definable, and recognizable entity is the notion of identity. This concept is conceived as a person's
conception and expression of a collection of distinctive personal characteristic, or shared characteristics by members of a particular social category or group (Weinreich & Saunderson, 2003). Hence, the human trafficking process is inherently a dynamic that should theoretically impact the victim’s concept about his/her own identity. One of the conceptual contributions of this dissertation is the careful exploration of how exploitation in human trafficking cases assumes nuanced forms that are effective in disrupting healthy processes of identity formation and maintenance.

The notion of identity is broad and complex given that several factors intersect in the formation of self-consciousness of any individual. Different aspects of identity from the name someone receives, to her/his life history, educational or occupational background, and the social groups s/he belongs weigh with different relevance on the individual. Different social conditions compel people to attach themselves to aspects of their identity, which may influence their experience of self as marginal or dominant, integrated or segregated, thus fluidly experiencing different groups and self-identifications. These different aspects of identity lead to constructed images often dichotomized between how the individual views her/himself and how others see them (Tracy & Tretheway, 2005, Worrell & Remer, 2003).

**Human Trafficking and Identity Intersectionality**

I met eyes with a 16-year old named Mbali. She was thin, with close cropped hair and a beautiful smile. I offered a packet of crackers.... After wolfing them down, she looked at me and said, "I hate having sex.""..."I have nowhere to sleep unless I find a man," she said. Sometimes I don't have money and food for two days. A man without a condom will pay more, so obviously I say OK because I need
Intersectionality is a helpful concept when analyzing the impact of human trafficking on a person’s identity formation. Intersectionality is a multiple axis concept that is used to describe psychosocial dimensions of hierarchical domination that intersect at junctures of race, class, and gender and then collide to perpetuate discrimination, subjugation, and systemic violence against persons with more than one stigmatized identity. In cases of human trafficking, the notion of intersectionality can assist a process of analyzing practices of segregation as culturally outlined by interlocking hierarchies of sexism, classism, racism, ageism, heterosexism, ableism and patriarchy (Collins, 1998). The example of Mbali epitomizes the nature of this concept. It describes a youth whom by virtue of her age, gender, socioeconomic status, and race becomes entrapped in a system of structural domination in which her experience is qualitatively different than that of persons with less identity based vulnerabilities (Crenshaw, 1989). It is important to note that the notion of intersectionality is often used in the context of exclusion, segregation and domination. However, should structures of domination not exist in a given social organization, perhaps the individual would have an opportunity to experience healthy intersectional identity integration and experience oneself with dignity. This is perhaps why dignity is conceptualized as the core of any human rights advancement (UN declaration of human rights, 1948). With this said, human trafficking is a practice geared toward destroying any kind of human dignity and hence capitalizes on existing cultural segregation practices to destroy the will, worthiness, and sense of self of a victim.

Humans in general operate from the point of view of a single consciousness,
meaning that in our typical interactions, our consciousness is informed by portions of identity that we access according to internal or environmental demands (Bolte Taylor, 2008). For instance, if a person meets someone for the first time, people typically start bringing into consciousness portions of their identity to build an integrated picture of who they are. For instance, one might say “my name is Maria, I am a student of psychology, I come from Colombia”. Hence, it is possible to theorize that one of the natural tendencies of human psychology is to integrate identity-based categories. Opposite to this, dimensions of hierarchical domination are meant to socially separate people into groups with given associated social statuses. Hence, the social impulse in systems of oppression is to separate/segregate. The impact of these practices on the individual must, therefore, be inherently contradictory and exist in a dialectic tension between integration and segregation. Consequently, the higher the number of intersecting vulnerable identities a person has, the higher the possibilities for experiencing stronger identity-based contradictions. For instance, I like being an immigrant, but I have been told I have no rights. Given this analysis, it is important to study the tendencies of domination and subordination in human trafficking, which are expressed as a collection of behavioral and attitudinal actions imposed by a perpetrator on a victim in each identity category. The collection of different processes of subordination is likely to paint the picture of a human trafficking victim.

In human trafficking, domination is described as a collection of forceful, fraudulent and coercive actions perpetrated against a victim at the junction of aspects of their personal and social identity categories. In order to identify victims, it is important to investigate how exploitation is nuanced to affect the individual’s perception of his or her
identities. Given that human trafficking mimics the tendency of oppressive societies to separate and segregate social groups, the tactics used in human trafficking will be studied in each identity category. However, this is not meant to deny that all these portions of identity in a given human intersect with aspects of domination.

**Identity-Based Vulnerability in the Human Trafficking Literature**

This review of the literature observed prior research findings of a total of 44 documents that included studies, literature reviews, book chapters and dissertations on the topic of human trafficking. The literature review was conducted by utilizing qualitative summative content analysis (Patton, 2002; Schilling, 2006). This type of analysis can facilitate the examination of units of meaning, themes and patterns of overt or latent nature. Personal and social identity categories that increase vulnerability to exploitation were observed by looking at the findings of 22 studies. The findings were catalogued in the following categories: (a) personal identity vulnerability (i.e., victims’ personal, psychological and family histories, and environmental characteristics), and (b) social identity vulnerability (i.e., gender, race, immigration status, sexual orientation, disability, and socio economic status). While the review emphasizes differences among the categories, it does not deny the intersectional nature of all these elements of identity in experiences of human trafficking.

**Personal identity vulnerabilities.** Personal identity was conceived as a function of physical and psychological characteristics, personal history, family history, and unique environmental characteristics of the area in which the person formed their identity. Every human being is vulnerable to bodily injury, or physical harm. The infliction of physical harm or the fear that physical harm may occur to them or others should they escape was
recognized as a prevalent practice in human trafficking cases. Across the literature, it was noted that the psychological representations of harm could have the same effects on victims as direct threats or the actual infliction of harm (Logan, 2007).

Conditions of detention, restriction of mobility, cramped or overcrowded confined spaces, solitary confinement, sensory deprivation, including restrictions of food, water, sleep or toilet use, deprivation of social contact, humiliation and verbal abuse, compulsory violation of taboos or religious beliefs, and exposure to chronic stress are common styles of exploitation that were found to have similar effects on victims cross culturally (Hopper & Hidalgo, 2006). Across the literature, it is highlighted that most of these actions are meant to provoke a state of confusion and exhaustion, decrease the ability of the victim to concentrate on details, and induce a state of learned helplessness given that the abuse tends to continue whether the victim cooperates or not. The ultimate goal is to subjugate the will of an individual and induce a sense of destabilization and helplessness to escape or resist.

The dynamics of domination and submission are themes that also happen in larger trafficking rings. For instance, a report by the Florida Coalition on Human Rights (2003) describes large trafficking endeavors in which the traffickers create isolated communities with specific norms and pressures to conform. Hence creating a subculture in which the victim’s perception of norms is destabilized. Traffickers often create a hierarchy within the group so that victims can rise in the ranks through compliance, hence having victims assert control over others while engaging in activities that violate their own sense of moral and ethics.
When looking at the lives of victims who had experienced human trafficking, four studies included psychological vulnerabilities outlining themes such as low self-esteem, presence of psychopathology, and alcohol or drug dependency (Clawson et al., 2009; Dorias, 2005; Dorias & Corriveau, 2009; Estes, Azaola, & Ives, 2005). Nine studies outlined psychosocial and environmental problems that suggest increased risk for being trafficked. Recounts of victim’s personal history included past family violence or abuse in the home, exploitation by family members, single parent household, large family size, caregiver with drug or alcohol addiction, loss of parent, placement in foster care or group homes (in the United States), family conflict, and early exposure or modeling of prostitution by family, peer, or neighbor (Acharya, 2009; Clawson et al., 2009; Curtis et al., 2008, Cobbina & Oselin, 2011; Dorias, 2005; Dorias & Corriveau, 2009; Estes et al., 2005; Kramer & Berg 2003; Saewyc, MacKay, Anderson & Drozda, 2008).

When looking at family history, eight themes emerged in nine studies suggesting increased vulnerability to being trafficked: running away from home, homelessness, history of sexual abuse, curiosity and attraction to fast money, peer involvement in prostitution, involvement in gangs, romantic involvement with a trafficker (Clawson et al, 2009; Curtis et al., 2008; Cobbina & Oselin 2011; Dorias, 2005; Dorias & Corriveau, 2009; Estes et al., 2005; Kramer & Berg, 2003).

The experiences of victims varied according to the social environment in which they lived. For instance, gang association, was mostly reported in urban settings with high visibility of sexual or sexualized markets, and a higher condensation of criminal activity in general (Clawson et al, 2009; Saewyc et al., 2008). In immigrant victims, other environmental vulnerabilities were observed. War, political upheaval, and civil
violence tended to increase poverty, forcing millions of people to migrate within and outside national borders; hence creating a base of millions of disempowered people, vulnerable to exploitation (Bales, 2000b; Hughes 2000, 2004).

Three studies specifically addressed work affiliation. The type of work someone performs and the treatment people receive in the job can increase the level of vulnerability of a given individual. For instance, persons who perform jobs that have a stigmatized status such as sex work might be vulnerable to social censure and therefore also vulnerable to exploitation (Dorias, 2005). This is the case of people who work in sexualized industries as well as those who have been exposed to commercially sexualized environments from an early age (Cobbina & Oselin, 2011; Estes et al. 2005). For a review of findings see Table 2.1.

Social identity vulnerabilities. Social identity is the part of an individual's self-concept derived from perceived membership in a relevant social group (Turner & Oakes, 1986). Worell and Remer (2003) further discussed the idea of social identity by observing the notion of social locations. According to them, social locations and social identities are identity categories that represent the social and individual perceptions of discrete social groups, constructed by a dominant group, in a given social arrangement. These perceptions assign positive or negative characteristics to a group and determine the status of such group ranging from privileged to oppressed. Hence, social identity is the individual perception of social locations.

Age. Thirteen studies identified youthfulness as a significant risk factor among victims (Arnstein, 2014; Clawson, et al., 2009; Cobbina & Oselin, 2011; Curtis et al., 2008; Dorias, 2005; Dorias & Corriveau, 2009; Estes & Weiner, 2001; Estes et al., 2005;
Kramer & Berg. 2003; Saewyc et al., 2008; Shared Hope International, 2009). Typically younger people have less life experience, fewer coping mechanisms, and more fragile social support systems (Cole & Sprang, 2014). Without strong protective factors, the risk for victimization is significantly higher. For instance, the report by Shared Hope International indicates that the average age of entry into prostitution and pornography in the United States is 12 to 14 years old (2009). Additionally, organized crime units also primarily target youth aged 12 and above for sexual exploitation.

As mentioned earlier, a vulnerability theme associated with this population is runaway or homeless status. A youth who leaves his/her place of residence without the permission or knowledge of parents or legal guardians is likely to become a victim of sexual exploitation within 48 hours of leaving their home (Estes & Weiner, 2001; Shared Hope International, 2009). This statistic becomes crucial when considering that between 1.6 and 2.8 million youth run away every year in the United States (Hammer, Finkelhor & Sedlak, 2002).

It is noteworthy, that youthfulness intersects with gender vulnerabilities. Pre-teen or adolescent girls are at higher risk for being trafficked. Often, commercially exploited children had been previously physically and sexually abused (Clawson et al., 2009). WestCare Nevada, a shelter for youth in Las Vegas, reported that 71% of their clients, who had been identified as domestic minor sex trafficking victims, had been sexually abused and 11% had been victims of incest (Kennedy & Pucci, 2007). Most victims view running away as a way to escape profoundly invalidating and abusive environments that they cannot control.

The victimized child who runs away from home is typically seeking protection,
comfort and care. One of the most prevalent fraudulent practices in human trafficking is that of posing as a caretaker, a caring romantic partner, or a protector. A stereotypical human trafficking presentation is that of the trafficker who seduces a vulnerable girl and then moves her gradually into sex trafficking through a perverted relationship characterized by a combination of grooming, later followed by putdowns that make the victim uncertain about her own worthiness, competency and ability to reliably relate to others and finally being subjected to violence. For many of these victims, navigating violent situations is a habitual experience. The process often includes isolation from developmentally normative tasks such as attending school, engaging in any sort of labor advancement outside of the trafficking, or increasing social networks. The intention of these actions is to induce a state of dependency in the victim (Dorias 2005). The Shared Hope International report on child sex trafficking in the United States points out that the average age of a runaway coincides with average age in which a child is recruited into prostitution (2009). It appears as though experiences of childhood sexual abuse set up a perfect stage for a cycle of violence and exploitation. For a review of findings see Table 2.2.

**Gender.** The reports on gender seem to have great variability in their findings. However, there seems to be compelling evidence suggesting that an overwhelming majority of trafficked persons are women (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2010). The International Labor Office (ILO) (2013) reported on available global figures suggesting that 98% of all victims of forced commercial sexual exploitation are women and girls, with 40-50% being minors. The United States Aid for International Development reports that of the 600,000 to 800,000 victims, 80 percent are women and girls, while up to 50
percent are children (2006). Most trafficking is for sexual purposes. For instance, of the 1229 alleged incidents in the US between 2007 and 2008, 83 percent were for commercial sex purposes while only 11 percent were labor trafficking cases, the remainder 6 percent of cases were catalogued as undetermined (U.S. Department of Justice, 2001).

Environments that promote severe gender inequalities can also foster human trafficking. Gender-based violence and the commoditization of females can create psychological and emotional harm that enables traffickers to lure their victims into servitude (Okech, Morreau, & Benson, 2011). The claim of women being overly represented in trafficking cases is supported by extensive research, which highlights the distinct effect of marginalization on the life trajectories of women (e.g. Herman, 1997; Nussbaum, 2000; Reid, 2012; Worell & Remer, 2003). Women’s entrance into the sex industry correlated highly with repeated instances of physical and sexual abuse, which is also a phenomenon that overwhelmingly affects women (Clawson et al., 2009; Cobbina & Oselin, 2011; Curtis et al., 2008). A study that observed the experiences of women in four countries reported rape as an initiation process into trafficking situations (Raymond el al., 2002). In this regard, being a woman is the vulnerability and women’s bodies being susceptible to being sold and abused is the exploitability.

Economic viability and limited opportunities for advancement is s factor of that intersects with the reality of many women (Nussbaum, 2000). In populations of women who are disproportionately affected by poverty, lack access to education, and experience chronic unemployment and discrimination, it is common for traffickers to take immediate
advantage of power differentials and engage in fraudulent techniques to entice victims (Hopper & Hidalgo, 2006).

When looking at the issue globally, most trafficked victims are from countries, which have a high level of gender inequality. Gender inequality creates an ideal environment for traffickers to exploit trafficked victims in destination countries. In countries where women do not have the opportunity to make decisions concerning their economic and political life, women become vulnerable to traffickers, thereby creating a suitable environment for exploitation (Seyhan, 2009).

Another prevalence that highly intersects with gender is the overwhelming representation of females in sex or sexualized industries. When it comes to issues of prostitution, there is an evident split in the analysis of what constitutes prostitution and what constitutes human trafficking. Most of the debate regarding this issue has come from the feminist literature (Reid, 2009). A review of victimization trends in cases of sexual exploitation shows opposing perspectives within the feminist literature (Wilson & Butler, 2014). The “rights approach” perceives prostitution as a form of sexual liberalization and greater control over women's own sexuality, a manifestation of self-determination, with equal players exchanging services for money (Ekberg, 2004). In this regard, a clear distinction is made between prostitution and human trafficking arguing that some women participate in sexualized industries as an exercise of volition and some women are subjugated into this practice. The response to this conceptualization from the “pro sex work advocates”, pointed out the lack of choices for women within the restricted social and economic environment of their lives (Kempadoo, 2001). They argue that the legitimization of prostitution as a labor practice lends dignity to the exercise of sex work.
From this perspective, prostitution turns into trafficking only if the woman is subjected to force and violence. On the other hand, the “abolitionists” sustain that all prostitution is exploitative given the physical, mental, and social exploitation of women's bodies in prostitution. Abolitionists argue that the focus on consent obscures the larger issue of gender inequality that underlies and fuels trafficking and prostitution. Abolitionists highlight that consumers of sex have euphemized prostitution as an occupation, ignoring the tremendous risks associated with an industry that offers no protection to persons involved. Not in many industries are people subjected to rape, bodily injuries, STD’s, force abortions, verbal abuse and social scrutiny. For instance, statistics regarding women in prostitution show that these women have mortality rates 200 times higher than the national average, and are 18 times more likely to be murdered than their non-trafficked counterparts (Potterat et al., 2004).

Abolitionists highlight issues of unequal power relationships, which do not give women a real ability to choose participation in the industry. In the same regard, assuming that engaging in prostitution is a real choice removes responsibility from consumers of sex. Therefore, abolitionists consider that the great majority of women in prostitution are victims of trafficking (Balos, 2004). Furthermore, a unilateral perspective that only considers the woman overly simplifies the complex interactions between consumers of sex, traffickers and victims (Kleemans 2009). Most cases involve intimate relationships in which parents or relatives force children into prostitution, male sexual partners engage in parasitic relationships in which the woman’s prostitution activities become the means to survival, and deceptive romantic partners progressively seduce young girls into
trafficking through processes of grooming that later evolve into a great deal of control and violence.

This debate has pushed the anti-trafficking dialogue to take a closer look at issues of consent. While many women may understand or suspect that they are being recruited for the sex industry, it is impossible to foresee the extent of abuse they are likely to endure at different points of the transaction from traffickers, pimps, and clients, or ensure safety in the financial characteristic of their agreement. Hence, true consent is systematically different from submission. Human trafficking cases are distinctly characterized by processes of forceful, fraudulent and coercive actions that bring another into submission (Kempadoo & Doezma, 1998). Article 3 of the United Nations mandate specifies that the consent of the victim at any stage of the trafficking process is irrelevant (2000). Just as a person cannot legally consent to slavery, neither can a victim consent to trafficking. Therefore, the issue of submission or surrendering of civil rights vs. consent is pivotal in the analysis of women’s over representation in the sex industry.

While being forced into the sex industry is a human trafficking practice widespread in populations of women, other forced practices such as domestic servitude are equally common. In a report about domestic servitude, Clarke remarks that an almost universal feature of domestic work is that it is predominantly performed by women, many of whom are migrants or members of historically marginalized groups (2013). The work is typically performed in private privileged homes with limited visibility, which increases the worker’s vulnerabilities to exploitative practices. Agents recruiting domestic workers become perpetrators of trafficking when they deliberately deceive their clients about the conditions of work or engage in illegal practices of control
(such as the withholding of passports, keeping workers on duty 24 hours each day, capriciously restricting or withholding wages, providing accommodations that lack comfort or privacy), while knowing that such practices will result in the exploitation of their recruits. Similar exploitative practices are observed in other industries such as factory or agricultural work. In the lives of women, pervasive cultural notions that devalue the work of women fuel labor exploitation (Mantouvalou, 2012). This is highlighted when a woman belongs to more than one marginalized group. Therefore, intersectional approaches that examine complex identity vulnerabilities as well as how these vulnerabilities are exploited can elucidate domination practices that sustain the presence of human trafficking. See Table 2.3 for a summary of findings.

**Race.** In the literature review, race was represented in six of the reports. Belonging to a minority group was considered a risk factor for being trafficked. (Curtis et al., 2008; Kramer & Berg, 2003; U.S. Department of State, 2014). One report indicated that 77% of victims in alleged human trafficking incidents reported in the U.S. were people of color (Kyckelhahn, Beck, & Cohen 2008). Two reports of sex trafficking argued that white or light skin individuals were at higher risk due to a greater demand of this quality from Johns in sex trafficking cases (Arcaya, 2010; Reid, 2012). It is important to note that perpetrators capitalize on social notions about ethnic background to demean victims. For instance, the “Natasha trade” is a term commonly used to pejoratively describe human trafficking in women and girls from the Eastern Bloc (Malarek, 2004). One report noted that African American children were more likely to be incarcerated for prostitution in the U.S. than children from other ethnic groups (Clawson et al., 2009).
In their analysis of human trafficking in African American populations Cecchet and Thoburn point out the historical roots of vulnerability (2014). The African American family was systematically fragmented during the time of slavery and continues to be exposed to familial fragmentation today. For instance, the rate of incarceration of African American males is significantly higher than that of white males; there is a lower percentage of dual parent families (Hill, 2009), and higher levels of teen-age pregnancy. These historical and sociological factors outlined above put African American women at a significantly higher risk for forced prostitution, victimization, and criminalization than their Caucasian counterparts (Carter, 2004; Nelson, 1993; Valandra, 2007).

None of the reports had accounts of utilization of racial arguments, or interpersonal discrimination in specific cases. However, the Polaris Project (2014g) collection of victim’s stories does elucidate this style of discrimination. When factors of vulnerability and exploitability are observed, having a racial minority status is exploited by using interpersonal discrimination, micro-aggressions, as well as institutional discrimination. It is noteworthy that racial micro-aggressions correlate with negative self-view and depression (Huynh, 2012). See Table 2.4 for a summary.

**Immigration.** Language, immigration status, and threats to family at country of origin are the most salient vulnerabilities observed in international victims (Reid, 2012). Foreign victims are frequently trafficked into the U.S. by either illegally using legal documents, using false documents, or without inspection of documentation (Schauer & Wheaton, 2006). Foreign victims often enter the U.S. under tourist or student visas (U.S. Department of State, 2011). Traffickers use many tactics to control victims including, taking away legitimate travel and immigration documents, provoking feelings of
incompetency in regards to navigating a new social environment due to language barriers and threatening against family members back in the source country (Schauer & Wheaton, 2006). An aspect that inevitably intersects with the experiences of immigrant victims is the experience of poverty. Lize and Whitaker (2014) highlight fraudulent practices in which workers become trafficking victims by responding to false advertisements, and seeking the help of smugglers to enter the developed countries for the purpose of economic opportunity.

A pilot study done in nine Latin American countries looks at factors such as poverty, society prone to violence, corruption, and gender and age discrimination as significant drivers that sustain the prominence of trafficking (Trujillo, 2004). Lize and Whitaker argue that restrictive migration policies for immigrants in search of unskilled, low-wage work, and demands for illicit services propel the trafficking of persons into the United States. They sustain that the relative passivity of the U.S. government in protecting immigrant workers and enforcing labor laws creates conditions in which employees are able to exploit low-wage workers. Intersections between policy and cultural norms contribute to the overall controllability of workers and ultimately facilitates trafficking practices (2014).

Given the substantial limitations in functioning that not having appropriate documentation imposes on a victim, perpetrators tend to engage in forceful, fraudulent or coercive actions around documentation. For example, a forceful action is the removal of immigration papers, which creates dependency on the perpetrator in making many daily living decisions such as driving, obtaining housing, or employment. A fraudulent example is the prevalence of immigration agencies that promise victims in foreign
countries documentation in desirable destination country. The documentation obtained is typically not official (Acharya, 2010). Three studies identified coercive arguments including threats to stop an immigration process, or threats to report victims to immigration enforcement agencies (Goh, 2009; Hepburn & Simon, 2010; Logan et al., 2009). Language and cultural barriers also appeared to increase dependency on the perpetrators (Logan, 2007; Logan et al., 2009). See Table 2.5 for a summary of findings.

**Sexual orientation.** Endorsing stigmatized sexual identities seemed to increase risk of being sexually exploited with males being more at risk than girls (Dorias, 2005; Dorias & Corriveau, 2009; Estes et al. 2005; Saewyc et al., 2008). The themes present in the literature included perceiving risk in coming out process, being confused about sexual identity, fear of being “out-ed” to family or other supports, and being a victim of prior sexual abuse or prior coercive same sex experiences (Dorias, 2005, Reid, 2012). Perpetrators tend to exploit the victim by making pejorative comments about victim’s sexual orientation and making the victim feel as though trafficking was the only possible lifestyle available to a person who endorses sexual minority status (Dorias, 2005). When looking at this topic internationally, issues of LGBT and immigration statuses intersect showing dynamics of power and subordination; the research suggests that the participation of local LGBT communities in global markets commodifies the sexuality of local residents to colonial powers (Corrales, 2009). For example, along the Mexican–U.S. border, organized trafficking networks actively recruit boys for sex crime rings to meet the demand of U.S. sex tourists (Estes et al., 2005; Reid, 2012).

Endorsing a sexual minority status is an aspect of identity that significantly increases the likelihood of experiencing human trafficking when it intersects with other
aspects of identity such as youthfulness, being a runaway, experiencing homelessness, or having a history of navigating the foster care system. For instance, GLBTQ youth are more likely to run away from home than heterosexual youth; among youth who experience homelessness GLBTQ youth are more likely to stay with a stranger and less likely to stay in a shelter than heterosexual youth. In addition, GLBTQ youth suffer disproportionate hardships when they age out of the foster care system. For instance, 38 percent of GLBTQ youth report not being able to pay their rent in the past year compared to 25 percent of heterosexual youth. GLBTQ youth who age out of the foster care system report high levels of food insecurity with 34 percent of youth reporting that they had been hungry but could not afford food at some point during the past year compared to 14 percent of heterosexual youth (Dworsky, 2013). For a review of findings see Table 2.6.

*Disability.* The stigma and marginalization of persons with disabilities was noted in three studies as predictors of increased vulnerability for exploitation (Clawson et al., 2009; Foster, 2010; U.S. Department of State, 2012). The lack of reasonable accommodation in work and academic settings prevents participation and puts people with disabilities at risk of being trafficked into forced begging, prostitution or other criminal activities (Nowell, 2012). For instance, the number of trafficked children with mild developmental disabilities in prostitution arrangements is six times greater than what is expected within the general population (Clawson et al., 2009). While not much is known about the process of victimization of persons with disabilities, studies in other power-based crimes suggest that this population is often victimized by perpetrators through a process of minimizing participation in mainstream society (Foster, 2010). Perpetrators capitalize on social practices of discrimination by increasing dependency of
the victim on the abuser, and by mirroring social alienation patterns in the form of reducing access to medications, assistive devices or other types of accommodations that facilitate victim’s functioning (Foster, 2010). For a review of findings see Table 2.7

**Socio economic status.** Socio economic status (SES) across ten reports included precarious living conditions as a significant factor in becoming a target of human trafficking. A common theme among reports was the victim’s tendency to overlook fraudulent practices hoping to change their current economic situation (Bales, 1999, 2005; Clawson et al., 2004; Curtis et al., 2008; Dorias, & Corriveau, 2009; Logan, 2007; Logan et. al, 2009; Macy & Graham, 2012; Molland, 2010). For instance, often families that function in precarious living conditions might be compelled to sell their children out of the belief that the child’s life could be better elsewhere (these were observed with more frequency in immigrant victims). Bales (2005) argues that perceiving benefit from child trafficking comes from a place of economical desperation. Under normal economic conditions, these families would most likely not share such a perception.

Economic disenfranchisement seemed to be a compelling theme among most marginalized groups (i.e. sexual minorities, immigrant populations, women, and persons with disabilities) inducing people to make choices that they would not make under equitable economic circumstances (Logan, 2007; Logan et al., 2009; Macy & Graham, 2012; Molland, 2010). Debt bondage appeared to be a prevalent way of deceiving victims into surrounding their freedom (Santana, 2009). For instance, a case reported by the El Paso District Attorney (2011) documented the experience of a woman and her three children, ages 7, 10, and 15 who were trafficked into domestic servitude. The family was smuggled into El Paso through a tunnel under the United States-Mexico border. Once
they arrived in the United States, the victims were forced to cook, clean and maintain the traffickers’ “safe house” for approximately three months purportedly to satisfy the debt they owed to their smugglers in addition to the alleged price of room and board. The original debt was incurred due to a preexisting deprived economic status. The debt bondage capitalized on this situation by creating a system of manipulation in which the victim’s undocumented status, and perceived debt left them no other choice but to work shift after shift in an endless cycle of subjugation (Santana, 2009).

Chronic poverty increases the pressure from family members not to return home without earning even if the victim is trapped in situations of physical and sexual abuse. It is noteworthy, that these expectations are often the result of profound economic limitations. The perception of deception and or exploitation from the victim point of view may vary and it may often not even be seen as such by the victims who may see themselves as being better off than if they had stayed at home or would be ready to endure a finite period of suffering for a better future (Gallagher, 2002). Another factor observed is the victim’s need for goods (i.e. food, clothing, and fashionable name brand items) instead of pay for services (Arnstein, 2014). In four studies, it was noted that lack of access to literacy, school failure or limited schooling were inextricably associated with poverty and increased the vulnerability to experiencing human trafficking (Acharya, 2009; Clawson et al., 2009; Curtis et al., 2008; Kramer & Berg, 2003).

One report claimed that sexually exploited girls come from all social statuses (Flowers 2001). The rational offered by this article was that girls involved in sex trafficking shared disadvantaged histories of social or psychological natures such as history of abuse, exposure to violence in the house, drug abuse or mental health
problems. Experiencing poverty was found to be associated with higher vulnerability to fraud. For a summary of findings, see Table 2.8.

**Summary and Conclusion**

In the 21st century, all humans should have the opportunity to derive meaning from the labor activities they engage in. When operating in valued labor arrangements all persons including those with stigmatized and minority statuses should have an opportunity to capitalize from their identity and engage in activities that they have reason to value, develop normally and flourish (Nussbaum & Sen, 1993). In spite of international efforts to define fair labor, millions of people are trafficked (ILO, 1998).

Human trafficking is a global phenomenon of multicultural and multisystem nature in which intersecting identity based vulnerabilities are systematically exploited (Chung, 2009). Currently, progress in the area has been characterized by a lack of theoretical frameworks to understand the multidimensionality of this topic (Reid, 2012). This lack of theoretical formulations might be a barrier that prevents players (i.e. researchers, policy makers, advocates, service providers, mental health providers and law enforcement) from appreciating the complex social interactions at play in situations of trafficking. The literature review suggests that persons with disadvantaged personal and social identities are vulnerable to human trafficking. It is noteworthy that identity categories interact and intersect with one another and that people may endorse different numbers of identity categories. Since the purpose of human trafficking is to break someone down, perpetrators might be keen on identifying aspects of the overall conglomerate of identities that make the victim susceptible to exploitation.
### Table 2.1

**Literature Review: Personal Identity Vulnerabilities to Human Trafficking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Identity/History c</td>
<td>1. Running away</td>
<td>1. 2. 3. 4. 9. 10. 12. Clawson et al. (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Homelessness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Substance abuse/addiction</td>
<td>2. 4.5. 9. 10. Curtis et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Curiosity and attraction to fast money</td>
<td>1. 2. 4. 7. 8. 9. 10. Dorias (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Involvement in gangs</td>
<td>1. 2. 4. 8. 9. Estes et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Sexual abuse</td>
<td>1. 2. 4. 9. Saewyc et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Desire for love and acceptance</td>
<td>2. 3. Dorias and Corriveau (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Single parent household</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Large family size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Caregiver with history of drug/alcohol abuse or addiction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Loss of parent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Placement in foster care or group homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Family conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Early exposure or modeling of prostitution by family, peer, or neighbor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Living in an area with high criminality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The numbering located under author tab corresponds to the theme outlined under the theme tab.
Table 2.2

Social Identity Vulnerabilities to Human Trafficking: Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Runaway youth</td>
<td>1. Cobbina, and Oselin (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Curtis et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3. Dorias (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Dorias and Corriveau (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. 2. Estes et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3. Hammer, Finkelhor, &amp; Sedlak (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Maxwell and Maxwell (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Saewyc et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. 2. 3. Shared Hope International (2002)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The numbering located under author tab corresponds to the theme outlined under the theme tab.
Table 2.3

**Social Identity Vulnerabilities to Human Trafficking: Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. 2. 3. Okech, Morreau and Benson (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. 3. Potterat et al. (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. 3. Wilson and Butler (2014).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The numbering located under author tab corresponds to the theme outlined under the theme tab.
Table 2.4

Social Identity Vulnerabilities to Human Trafficking: Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Fragmentation of African American families as a historical factor</td>
<td>1. Curtis et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Polaris Project (2014g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Reid (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. 6. Valandra (2007)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The numbering located under author tab corresponds to the theme outlined under the theme tab.
### Table 2.5

**Social Identity Vulnerabilities to Human Trafficking: Immigration Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immigration Status</td>
<td>1. Undocumented or exploited documentation</td>
<td>1. 2. 3. Acharya (2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Cultural barriers</td>
<td>1. 5. Goh (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Threats to family back in country of origin</td>
<td>1. 2. 5. 8. Hepburn and Simon (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Immigration policies</td>
<td>1. 2. Logan et al. (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Experience of poverty at country of origin</td>
<td>1. 2. Reid (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. War or violence at country of origin</td>
<td>1. 2. 4. Schauer and Wheaton (2006)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The numbering located under author tab corresponds to the theme outlined under the theme tab.
Table 2.6

Social Identity Vulnerabilities to Human Trafficking: Sexual Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Confusion about sexual identity.</td>
<td>1. 3. 4. Dorias (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Commodification of LGBTQ sexuality in the sex industry</td>
<td>2. 5 Estes et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Runaway LGBTQ youth</td>
<td>3. 5 Reid (2012)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The numbering located under author tab corresponds to the theme outlined under the theme tab.
**Table 2.7**

*Social Identity Vulnerabilities to Human Trafficking: Disability*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>1. Having an intellectual or developmental disability</td>
<td>1. 2. Clawson et al. (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Having a physical disability</td>
<td>1. 2. Foster (2010)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The numbering located under author tab corresponds to the theme outlined under the theme tab.
Table 2.8

Social Identity Vulnerabilities to Human Trafficking: SES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Illiteracy</td>
<td>1. Clawson, Small,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Debt Bondage</td>
<td>1. 2. 3. 8. Dorias et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Desire to improve socio economic situation</td>
<td>1. 4. 6. Estes et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Logan (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Logan (2009)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The numbering located under author tab corresponds to the theme outlined under the theme tab.
Chapter 3: Instrument Development

Test construction calls for a careful description of the purpose of the test, an exhaustive defining of the constructs being measured and, a thorough process to operationalize constructs. Content validity is a particularly relevant aspect during the initial construction of an instrument. Content validity is the degree to which the items tested fully reflect a given domain’s research contents and theories (Anastasi, 1988; Haynes, Richard, & Kubany, 1995). Representativeness is evidenced by the instrument’s ability to capture the dimensionality of the construct (Lennon, 1956). The construct of interest in this case is human trafficking. The main purpose of this dissertation is to introduce a methodology for measuring the existence of human trafficking in a person’s life. To this end, a dialectical conceptualization and a literature review were developed and explored in Chapters one and chapter two. This chapter describes the history of the instrument and the item development process.

History of the Instrument

The development of the IHTC started in 2008 as a response to claims of human trafficking cases discussed at the Bluegrass Immigrant Women Taskforce hosted by the Kentucky Domestic Violence Association. I conducted focus groups with six clinicians from the Bluegrass Rape Crisis Center and two members of the members of the taskforce that included an attorney and a psychologist. The members volunteer at this time to explore themes present in immigrant women’s narratives. It was evident that beyond gender based violence, immigrant women experienced a different type of exploitation that typically included themes such as exploited immigration status, language and cultural barriers, as well as threats to have their loved ones hurt in their country of origin. Based
on the narratives collected at the original focus group, it was evident that exploitation was nuanced by the type of social vulnerability perceived by the perpetrator in the victim.

This idea was later explored in the year 2010. A pilot study was conducted in Bogota Colombia with the help of an organization called Colectivo De Mujeres Jovenes and a grant provided by the University of Kentucky to explore human trafficking themes and trends in this area. A representative from each of the following organizations participated in the pilot study: Centro de Atencion a Victimas de las Violencias y Graves Violaciones a Derechos Humanos (Center of Attention for Victims of Aggravated Violence), Secretaria de Gobierno Distrital (Secretary of district Government), Mujeres Vida y Paz (Women, Life and Peace), Secretaria Distrital de Integracion Social (District Secretary of Social Integration), Programa Regional de Cuidades Seguras y sin Violencia hacia las Mujeres (Regional Program of Safe Cities), Colectivo de Mujeres Jovenes (Young Women’s Collective), Secretaria de Gobierno Referente de Seguridad (Secretary of Government of Safety), Alcaldia Local de Usaquen (Mayor’s Office Usaquen), Hospital Pablo sexto de Bosa (Pablo Sexto Hospital in Bosa), Secretaria de Mujer Generos y Diversidad Sexual (Secretary of Women and Sexual Diversity), Comite Operativo de Mujer y Genero de Usaquen (Operative committee of women and gender, Usaquen), Empresa social del estado (Social Enterprise of the Estate), Hospital de Usaquen (Usaquen Hospital), Casa de Igualdad de Oportunidades para las Mujeres de Usaquen (House of Equality for Women of Usaquen), Mujeres en Condicion de Prostitucion (Women in Prostitution), Centro de Estudio y Analisis en Convivencia y Seguridad Ciudadana (Center for the Study and Analysis of Social Interaction and
Citizen’s Safety), and Policía Metropolitana de Bogotá SIJIN (Metropolitan Police Department of Safety).

The themes apparent in the narratives presented by participants highlighted issues related to the human trafficking experience in Colombia such as the gender, history of sexual or domestic violence, as well as themes that were specific to this area due the active arm conflict. Some of these themes included migration to larger cities with hopes to escape danger, supplying militants with sexual services, forcing women to provide sexual favors with the intention of exiting the war after being displaced from their original environmental settings, using women’s bodies to carry messages of intimidation, and destabilizing families by removing female heads of household. The findings also suggested that exploitation varies according to the social environment in which the victim operates, given that there are different social factors that might contribute to a person’s vulnerability.

While the immigrant women focus group and the pilot study developed in Colombia pointed to the idea that human trafficking exploitation is nuanced based on the social vulnerabilities experienced by the victim in a given social environment, the themes mirrored experiences in specific populations (i.e. immigrant women in the United States, and Colombian women). It was evident that a more exhaustive effort needed to be made in order to understand the breadth and depth of human trafficking in the United States. Therefore, I conducted literature review in the year 2012 with the intention of observing vulnerability and exploitation trends in the United States. At the time, 22 studies were included in the analysis (a more current literature review is found in Chapter two which includes the findings of 44 studies). Following the literature review, a qualitative analysis
was conducted. This analysis reached two distinct facets of human trafficking that intersect to form an experience of human trafficking: vulnerability based exploitation (personal and social identity based vulnerabilities) and methods of exploitation (force, fraud, and coercion). This means that a trafficker tends to identify a particular vulnerability in a victim and exploits it using force, fraud or coercion. The methodology and item development process will be found later in the chapter.

Following the literature review and qualitative analysis, ten members of the Partnership for the Eradication of Human Trafficking, a committee of the United Nations Association New York and Queens Chapters assessed the instrument in regards to its ability to represent vulnerability themes. The group was composed of one political scientist with experience in international women’s rights policy development, two nurses, three mental health clinicians, one attorney, two human trafficking advocates with experience in direct services and program development, one human trafficking legislative lobbyist, one criminal justice analyst, and two human trafficking researchers. Beyond exploring and discussing the items, the group was pivotal in classifying items into methods of exploitation (i.e., force fraud and coercion). This process will also be discussed later in the chapter. As a final step, the members rated the relevance of each item using formalized scaling procedures. A final version of the instrument was then proposed.

Qualitative Analysis

Methodology guidelines typically begin by recommending to carefully define the domain and facets of the construct before developing other elements of the assessment instrument (DeVelis, 1991; Haynes, Richard, and Kubany, 1995; Nunnally & Bernstein,
1994; Suen, 1990). Grounded theory was utilized to establish the domains and facets of human trafficking during item development stages of the Inclusive Human Trafficking Checklist (IHTC) (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Patton, 2002; Schilling, 2006). This theory describes four distinct stages in the qualitative analysis process: coding, drawing concepts, developing categories and developing a hypothesis.

A total of 22 articles were included in the analysis in the year 2012. It is noteworthy that the literature review was enriched later to include current articles published between the year 2012 and 2014. The literature findings were coded and grouped into distinct categories. The total number of codes included 246 units of meaning that were later organized into 60 particular human trafficking themes. The theme codes represented human trafficking experiences in which identity-based vulnerabilities were exploited. I later developed a collection of items based on the literature qualitative analysis. These items appeared to be conceptually congruent with nine facets of vulnerability (i.e., personal characteristics, racial or ethnic background, gender, youthfulness, drug use abuse or dependency, type of work or service the victim provided, immigration status, disability status, sexual orientation, and socio economic status). Therefore, the items were then grouped into these common categories. See Tables 3.1 through 3.6 for a description of codes and themes.

**Facets of Vulnerability**

Based on the literature review and theme analysis, I constructed a total of 60 items, 55 of which were kept and five of which were rejected following a quantitative analysis. This analysis will be discussed later in the chapter. This process was conducted in consultation with the PEHT UNA USA group of experts.
The facets of vulnerability were organized in the following manner: A general section, which included vulnerabilities related to issues of personal characteristics (i.e., physical vulnerabilities, social network/support vulnerabilities). Within the general section sub-facets of race, gender, youthfulness and history of drug use were included. The rationale being that these facets are common to every human being and/or are visible. In other words, every one belongs to a particular ethnic group, and everyone has had the experience of being young. I also included drug use as a facet under the general section because drug use, abuse or dependency is a possible experience across social groups in spite of differences of social status, gender, cultural background, and other demographic variables (U.N. Office of Drugs and Crime, 2012). Other themes that emerged from the analysis of the literature were work, profession, or provision of services, immigration, disability, sexual orientation, and socio economic status. It is important to note that while everyone has a sexual orientation, not everyone belongs to a sexual minority. Furthermore, belonging to a sexual minority is not necessarily visible. Therefore, the forms of exploitation used against this population are fundamentally different than categories in the general section and warrant careful analysis.

**General section.** This section is composed of 26 items. See Table 3.1 for a review of the items, the vulnerability theme associated with the item, and the literature source in which the item was based. The items in this section describe fraudulent, forceful, or coercive experiences that attack a person’s sense of personal identity such as threats to physical or psychological functioning, infliction of injuries or restrictions in mobility. In addition, four facets of vulnerability (i.e., race, gender, youthfulness, and drug use) were addressed in this section. The rationale for including these facets in the
general section is that these aspects of vulnerability are visible or could apply to any human being.

One item addressed race-related abuses. The theme found across the literature of micro-aggressions was the idea of race being used in a pejorative way making the victim feel as though persons from a particular ethnic background could not have access to a life outside of the trafficking situation (Curtis et al., 2008; Kramer & Berg, 2003; Malarek, 2004; Polaris Project, 2014g). Gender was addressed in four items. Gender related items address themes that affect women more than men such as body objectification, and sexual abuse, history of sexual abuse, and having to perform sexual favors while working (Cobbina & Oselin, 2011; Clawson et al., 2009; Estes et al., 2005). However, the items were written in a neutral form should a male endorse having this type of history.

The literature review highlighted youthfulness as a risk factor for becoming a victim of human trafficking. The TVPA also outlines that any person under the age of 18 who is lured into participating in a commercial sex act is a victim of human trafficking (2000). A theme that appeared prevalent in the literature is the idea that young people need developmentally appropriate activities in order to develop normally and gain a sense of agency, the most important being access to education (Acharya, 2009; Clawson et al., 2009). While this remains true in other stages of life, persuasions to abandon educational activities could have a detrimental impact in the development of young people. Limiting opportunities to develop normally could be a strong predictor for someone becoming a human trafficking victim (Dorias, 2005; Dorias & Corriveau, 2009; Macy & Graham, 2012). One item addresses limitations of educational opportunities.

In addition, a widely documented theme is that run away youth are at increased
risk for becoming a victim of human trafficking. A commonly quoted statistic indicates that one out of every three run away teens will be lured into prostitution within 48 hours of leaving home. This means at least 150,000 children will be lured into prostitution each year with ages 12-14 years being the average age of entry into pornography and prostitution in the United States (Smith, Vardaman, & Snow, 2009). Given that run away youth tend to become homeless and experience poverty, this issue was addressed under the socio economic status facet of vulnerability (Dorias et al., 2005; Dorias, & Corriveau, 2009).

Two items addresses history of drug use as vulnerability. These items were included in this section given that everyone could potentially be vulnerable to having a history of drug use, abuse or addiction. A theme that emerged from the literature review is that drug use is often employed by traffickers to manipulate victims by either impeding their ability to fully consent to a particular act, which is an act of force, or threatening to unveil a habit that the victim perceives as immoral, which is an act of coercion (Bales, 2000a; Clawson et al., 2009).

**Work, profession, or provision of services.** This is a seven-item segment applicable to the general population; however, it is highlighted as a separate section. See Table 3.2 for a review of the items, the vulnerability theme associated with the item, and the literature source in which the item was based. The rationale behind this division is that human trafficking cases happen within the labor market; therefore if the victim perceived him/herself as working while the human trafficking event took place, then it would be simpler to prove a case of human trafficking. However, in some cases of human trafficking, the victim does not perceive him or herself as working or providing
services. Such is the case of some domestic workers or mail-order wives (Bales, 2000b). Other sections of the instrument address these types of cases. The themes captured under the work and profession included performing a job that the victim perceives as demeaning, fear that other people would learn about the job they were performing, receiving bad or violent treatment in the job, feeling as though the job they were performing had been misrepresented while being recruited, not getting paid appropriate compensation (Bales, 2000b; Clawson, Small, Go, & Myles, 2003; Cobbina & Oselin, 2011; Curtis et al., 2008, Estes et al., 2005).

**Immigration.** Language and immigration status are the two most salient themes observed in international victims (Reid, 2012). See Table 3.3 for a review of the items, the vulnerability theme associated with the item, and the literature source in which the item was based. Actions mentioned in the literature included the removal of immigration papers, threats to stop an immigration process, or threats to report victims to immigration enforcement agencies, false promises to secure immigration status in a given desirable destination country, perpetrator capitalizing on language barriers to increase alienation (Acharya, 2009; Farrell, McDevitt, & Fahy, 2008, Goh, 2009; Hepburn & Simon, 2010; Logan et al., 2009). Another theme that emerged is victim being vulnerable to exploitation because their country of origin is experiencing significant war, political upheaval, or armed conflict (Bales, 2000a; Hughes, 2000, 2004).

**Disability.** The themes that emerged in the literature regarding disability were removal of assistive devices, manipulation of disability related financial assistance, using the clients disability to obtain financial gain, or inflicting physical disabilities (Clawson et al., 2009; Foster, 2010; U.S. Department of State, 2012). Another form of
victimization typically used against victims with cognitive disabilities is utilizing language that surpasses the victim’s level of comprehension (Clawson et al., 2009). See Table 3.4 for a review of the items, the vulnerability theme associated with the item, and the literature source in which the item was based.

**Sexual orientation.** Endorsing stigmatized sexual identities appears to increase risk of being sexually exploited with males being more at risk than girls (Dorias, 2005; Dorias & Corriveau, 2009; Estes et al. 2005; Saewyc et al., 2008). See Table 3.5 for a review of the items, the vulnerability theme associated with the item, and the literature source in which the item was based.

Three themes emerged from the literature: Perpetrators using devaluation of sexual minority status, threats to “out” the victim to unwanted social network, and exposure to coercive same sex practices (Dorias, 2005).

**Socio Economic Status (SES).** Socio economic status across the literature review included precarious living conditions as a significant factor in becoming a target of human trafficking. See Table 3.6 for a review of the items, the vulnerability theme associated with the item, and the literature source in which the item was based.

Six themes or sub-facets of socio economic status were identified: hope for a change in social status, debt bondage, run away status, victim’s propensity to overlook/smilingly fraudulent practices hoping to change their current economic situation, family willingness to sell a child due to precarious living conditions, and need to exchange work for goods such as food, shelter or merchandize (Bales, 1999, 2005; Clawson, Small, & Myles, 2003; Curtis et al., 2008; Dorias et al., 2005; Dorias, & Corriveau, 2009; Estes et al., 2005; Logan, 2007; Logan et. al, 2009; Macy & Graham, 2012; Molland, 2010).
These sub facets of SES are addressed by seven items included in the screening instrument.

**Facets of Exploitation**

When discussing exploitation, three facets of exploitation are outlined in the legal definitions of human trafficking: fraud, force and coercion (TVPA, 2000; UNPPSPTP, 2000). These factors interact with facets of vulnerability colliding into one single action. For instance, taking away assisting devices is a form of force that intersects with a disability status. This categorization was conducted as a group discussion following the process of item development. The rationale behind this process was that force, fraud and coercion are distinct forms of exploitation that impact the victim in different ways. Furthermore, in the legal system, a case has more chances of moving forward when it complies with the legal definition of human trafficking, which outlines these three elements. It was therefore important to make sure the items complied with the definitions of these three constructs.

Classical test theory recommends the use of expert sampling during the initial production of items (Haynes, Richard, & Kubany, 1995). Experts in the topic of human trafficking were asked to catalogue the items into these three categories. Only persons who were currently working in organizations that dealt with human trafficking as well as other power based crimes and who had at least two years of experience in the area were included in the sample.

A total of 60 items were originally created based on a literature review and in consultation with the previously discussed organizations. Later the working group of the Partnership for the Eradication of Human Trafficking United Nations Association
(PEHT-UNAUSA) \( N = 10 \) revised the instrument.

All groups were provided operational definitions of each facet and a discussion on the nature of the facets followed. Following this, experts were asked to catalogue each item according to the type of exploitation. This process was done as a group discussion. The following is a description of each facet as defined in the literature and group discussion.

**Force.** Force is defined as the “exertion of power to compel or restrain behavior of others” (Kania & Mackey, 1977, p.29). Our current understanding on the impact of force on individuals comes from law enforcement and military literature. The description of force in law enforcement settings is a representation of acceptable or unacceptable levels of force response by officers in reaction to resistance levels by subjects (Terrill, 2003). While the use of force in law enforcement and military settings has a different intention and goal, descriptions of force were used to identify examples of force in human trafficking cases.

Most authors agree on the fact that increases in forceful actions are proportional to the level of resistance of a subject (Terrill, 2003; Walker, 2001). A good metaphor to analyze the characteristics of forceful actions is the idea of force in the physical world. A force in physics is an influence that causes an object to undergo change regarding its movement, direction, or constitution (Feynman, Leighton, & Sands, 2010). In general terms, the level of force needed to move an object at a particular velocity is associated with the mass of the object.

In human trafficking interactions, the objective of imposing forceful actions or attitudes on someone is to achieve a particular behavioral output or restrict a particular
behavioral output. However, reaching a particular behavior output is associated by the physical, psychological, and psychosocial characteristics of the individual. Case in point, a perpetrator’s goal might be to force someone to work 17 hours in a factory making handbags by constantly abusing the victim verbally for not completing a job fast enough. The success of the forceful action is associated with the characteristics of the individual. Someone who is agreeable might finish the work quickly in an effort to stop the negative stimulus. Someone who is antagonistic might rebel, or someone who has active PTSD might freeze. The perpetrator might otherwise be interested in restricting behavioral outputs for instance, physically harming someone for seeking help.

A metaphoric visual of the variables involved in forceful actions is the equation of the line $y = mx + b$, where $x$ is force, $m$ is the individual (who will determine the slope of the line), $y$ is the desired behavioral output and $b$ is the $y$ intercept (which in this case we will consider 0). The slope could give information about the level of compliance of the individual. For instance, an antagonistic person might be subjected to higher intensity of force to reach small desired behavioral outcomes, whereas an agreeable person might need low intensity of force to reach higher desired behavioral outcomes. It is important to note that this is a simplistic example. Beyond psychological or personality variables, psychosocial or physical characteristics may play a role. See Figure 3.1 for a visual representation of forceful actions. I provided the group with the working definition, as well as the metaphoric linear nature of forceful actions. Based on their feedback, I catalogued items that appeared to comply with the definition and description. A total of 15 items were catalogued as examples of force. See Table 3.7 for a review of items.

**Fraud.** Fraud is the intentional perversion of truth in order to induce another to
surrender a legal right. In the United States, common law recognizes the following elements in a fraudulent representation of an existing fact: its materiality or the evidence pointing to the fact that an act of fraud was committed, its falsity, the perpetrator’s knowledge of its falsity, the perpetrator’s intent that it shall be acted upon by the victim; the victim's ignorance of its falsity; the victim's reliance on the truth of the representation, and consequent damages suffered by the victim (Morlan v. Kelly, 2009).

Fraudulent interactions also seem to be described by a linear interaction. The better the quality of the lie the more likely the victim is to believe it (Simon, 1996). This is associated also by the physical, psychological and psychosocial characteristics of the individual. Vulnerabilities of psychosocial nature, cognitive ability, or level of experience in dealing with this type of situation might make an individual more likely to believe in a fraudulent arrangement. Therefore, the metaphor of a linear interaction was used to describe a fraudulent action, which is depicted by the equation of the line \( y_2 = m_2x_2 + b_2 \). Where \( x_2 \) is the fraudulent act, \( m_2 \) is the victim’s characteristics (determining the slope of the line), \( y_2 \) is the behavioral output, and \( b_2 \) is the \( y_2 \) intercept, which we would consider to be 0. For instance, a runaway youth who does not have money to eat might be more likely to believe that they would be working in a restaurant (which in fact was a commercial sex establishment), than a person with a professional background who might be in a difficult financial situation. In this case, the psychosocial situation and the developmental stage of the victim among other factors might be mediating the slope of the interaction (Estes & Weiner, 2001). See Figure 3.2 for a visual representation.

In the first interaction, the youth’s inexperience in dealing with this type of situation in addition to the desperation of being hungry and without money might have increased the
likelihood of a behavioral output (engaging in commercial sex acts). In the second example, the perpetrator might have had to increase the quality of the lie in order to obtain some behavioral output. For instance, the perpetrator might have convinced the victim that he or she was in a legitimate romantic relationship, and later asked the victim to engage in some sort of exploitative labor or service for which the perpetrator received monetary profit. These examples, including the figures, were shared and discussed with the group of experts to increase the likelihood of appropriately identifying items that comply with the definition and the agreed nature of the fraudulent action. See Table 3.8 for a review of items that were decided to be of fraudulent nature.

**Coercion.** Coercion is perhaps the most complex mechanism of exploitation. Measures of coercion, are usually combined with other measures of psychological abuse, are neither comprehensive nor particularly consistent with a working definition. Most studies of coercion include a range of actions from verbal put downs, to physical force, to intimidation (Stark, 2009). However, some of these actions comply also with the definition of force described above. Most conceptualizations of coercion or coercive control come from the literature on interpersonal violence and not specifically from the human trafficking literature. Given that the study of human trafficking requires a more precise distinction among coercion and other mechanisms of exploitation, it is important to include a more rigorous conceptualization and operationalization of this notion.

The working group used the definition of coercion found in regular dictionaries, which define it as the systematic persuasion and manipulation of reality to induce someone to take a course of action. In the discussion of different examples of coercion it was noted that the perpetrator often “manipulates” a decision made by the victim, which
unveils a particular vulnerability and then “suggests” that the victim engages in the desired behavior. For instance, a perpetrator might have promised the victim to provide him or her with a job as a model in a different country and convinces the victim that the immigration status would not be a problem. Upon arrival to the desired destination, the perpetrator starts making arguments that allude to the idea that coming to the desired country without documentation was the victim’s choice, and later threatens the victim to call immigration if they do not engage in commercial sex activity (Bales, 2000a). In this example, there are two steps to the coercive action. First, the perpetrator shifts the blame onto the victim by alluding this was his/her choice and by highlighting his/her vulnerability as an immigrant. Second, the perpetrator makes a forceful threat to call the authorities. Both the manipulation of reality and the imposition of the forceful threat are small enough that they may undermine the victim’s ability to realize that they are being pushed into an unwanted direction. The manipulation of reality appears to be a subtle form of fraud (intentional perversion of truth in order to induce another to surrender a legal right) and the threat appears to be a subtle form of force (exertion of power to compel or restrain behavior of others).

Coercion is then an interaction between an attenuated form of fraud and an attenuated form of force. In the prior discussions about force and fraud, we had identified that both of those interactions were metaphorically characterized by the linear equation in which the higher the level of force or the higher the quality of the fraud, the more likely the victim was going to reach the desired behavioral output. It is important to point out that coercive control models rely on evidence that most battered women who seek help experience coercion as “ongoing” and that the main marker of these assaults is
their frequency or even their “routine” nature rather than their severity, a fact that gives abuse a “cumulative” effect found in no other assault crime (Dutton, Goodman, & Schmidt, 2006; Stark, 2009). Since the nature of coercion includes an interaction of both force and fraud in which the victim starts behaving in the desired way and potentially increasing their affiliation or dependency on the perpetrator, it is possible to theorize that coercion might be represented by characterized by a more complex equation. We chose the equation of exponential growth to graphically represent the potential experience of a victim when exposed to coercion. In this equation, the growth rate of the desired behavioral output is proportional to the interaction of force and fraud over a given period of time \( y = a^x \) where \( y \) is the behavioral output, \( a \) is the characteristics of the individual and \( x \) is the interaction between force and fraud. See Figure 3.3 for a visual description. This might explain why a victim may have one original exchange of sex trafficking, and after a number of years of exposure to coercion, might end up having thirty exchanges of sex trafficking a day.

Often victims of coercion feel confused about their own situation and unfairly assume responsibility for their decisions (Bales, 2000b). Many victims indicate feeling shame and guilt, which are emotional indicators that suggest the victims perceive themselves to having acted wrong, hence finding it difficult to exit the trafficking scheme (Estes, 2001). Hence, the role of coercion is to persuade the client to assume the responsibility for the trafficking event, as well as maintain the victim’s permanence into the trafficking interaction, both of which increase compliance with the traffickers desired behavioral output. Coercion replaces the violation of physical integrity with an emphasis
on violations of “liberty” that entail the deprivation of rights and resources essential to personhood and citizenship (Estes & Weiner, 2001).

Based on the discussion the group catalogued items that appeared to comply with a mechanism of exploitation that described a less direct pattern and included persuasion. Table 3.9 includes the collection of items that the group determined to be of coercive nature.

**Quantitative Methodology**

The characteristics of the instrument were further explored by using formalized scaling procedures (Lynn, 1986). The instrument was judged by ten members of the Partnership for the Eradication of Human Trafficking United Nations Association Queens and New York Chapters in regards to its ability to represent the dimensionality of the construct being measured. In order to achieve this, the expert panel was given the working definitions for the facets of vulnerability and exploitation described above. Then the group of experts was asked to rate each item in regards to their relevance, representativeness, specificity, and clarity using evaluation scales (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

The experts rated the items’ relevance using a five-point Likert Scale method. The ratings ranged from “irrelevant” to “relevant.” After the initial rating, the items in the scale were reviewed for clarity and specificity by the group. Items that scored low on the scale, had unclear semantics, were too vague or were inappropriately classified were amended or deleted to increase the content validity of the questionnaire. Then the items were rated for a second time.

The results were analyzed by calculating the content validity coefficient (V value)
proposed by Aiken (1980). $V_j$ values represent the perceived content validity of each item ($j$) by the collective number of raters ($n$) on a scale of ($c$) number of rating classes. $V$ values are obtained by the calculating summation ($S_j$) of the deviation scores ($d_{ij}$) of a given item ($j$) given a ($n$) number of raters utilizing a Likert scale with ($c$) number of possible scores. Following the formula:

$$d_{ij} = r_{ij} - 1 \quad (j=1...n, \ i=1...n)$$

(4)

$$S_j = \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_{ij}$$

(5)

$$V_j = \frac{S_j}{n(c-1)}$$

(6)

$V$ values fall between 0 and 1. A higher value suggests higher content validity of an item. Items must obtain a score above .69 to effectively reach a standard ($\alpha=.05$). A total of 60 items were rated by 10 raters on a Likert scale with five possible scores. A total of five items scored beneath .69 and were removed from the instrument. A total of 55 items obtained a $V$ score between .77 and .97 indicating that significant standards for content validity have been reached. See results in Table 3.10.

**Quantifying the Existence of Human Trafficking Using the IHTC**

The 55 items included in the instrument represent stereotypical experiences of human trafficking as supported by the current literature on this issue. The instrument provides two types of results: dichotomous and continuous. The dichotomous results represent the presence or absence of human trafficking. In order to conclude that
someone has experienced human trafficking, there must be endorsements on the three facets of human trafficking (i.e., force, fraud, and coercion). These facets must be entered in the following equation of human trafficking conceptualized in Chapter One.

\[
HT = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} y_1 \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{m} y_2 \cdot \sum_{k=1}^{p} y_3}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_1 \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{m} x_2}
\]

According to the formula, exploitability (Y) would equal the summation of forceful (y₁), multiplied by fraudulent (y₂), and coercive (y₃) events that the victim endured through his or her experience of human trafficking. The result of this multiplication is then divided by the level of vulnerability inherently present in the person being assessed. Vulnerability (X) is conceived as the summation of vulnerabilities of personal identity (x₁) multiplied by the summation of vulnerabilities of social identity (x₂). Vulnerabilities of personal and social identity are determined based on the client’s demographic and personal narrative report. Given that all factors are multiplied, the equation becomes null when any of the forceful, fraudulent or coercive factors equal zero. Therefore, any number above zero means that the person experienced human trafficking. A zero result means that the person did not experience human trafficking.

The continuous result represents the degree of experienced human trafficking as an interaction of exploitation and vulnerability as captured by the IHTC. The literature review and expert consultations provide a total of 55 possible items of human trafficking distributed in the following facets of identity related vulnerability: general section (26 items), work profession section (7 items), immigration section (7 items), disability section (5 items), sexual orientation section (3 items), and socio economic status section
The total score (continuous result) is calculated by dividing the number of exploitation items actually endorsed in the client’s history by the number of total possible vulnerability-based items; this result is then multiplied by 100 to obtain a percentage.

The point of this calculation is to assess the percentage of stereotypical human trafficking experiences that apply to a given client taking into account the vulnerability factors that actually apply to them. For instance, someone might be an immigrant, experience poverty, and work in a sexualized industry. Therefore, only the items in the general subscale (which apply to everyone), items in the immigrant, and SES subscales would apply to them, all other sections of the instrument might be irrelevant for this client. It is noteworthy that in the general section, there are items that might apply to a specific victim. For instance, persons with drug abuse, sexual abuse or family violence histories. Should the client not endorse having these types of histories, these items are excluded from the calculation. See Appendix D for a detailed explanation of this calculation.

**Summary**

The IHTC is an instrument that measures human trafficking in a person’s life. This chapter outlined the process of creation of the instrument. In order to develop items that represent the breadth and depth of the experience of human trafficking among United States populations a qualitative analysis based on grounded theory was conducted. Following the initial item creation, a quantitative analysis of item relevance and content validity was conducted utilizing formalized scaling procedures. Items that reached the appropriate level of validity were included in the final instrument, hence increasing the ease and brevity of the instrument.
### Table 3.1

**General Section Item Creation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item (human trafficking experience)</th>
<th>Vulnerability Theme Code</th>
<th>Facet of Vulnerability</th>
<th>Literature Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Perpetrator handles client’s money or makes client’s financial decisions without their consent within a labor arrangement.</td>
<td>- Precarious living conditions - Illiteracy - Low SES - Debt Bondage</td>
<td>Personal Identity/ General</td>
<td>Polaris Project (2013) Rescue and Restore (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Perpetrator kidnapped the client.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.1. Table continued

*General Section Item Creation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item (human trafficking experience)</th>
<th>Vulnerability Theme Code</th>
<th>Facet of Vulnerability</th>
<th>Literature Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7. Perpetrator kidnapped the client or their loved one and later promised to release them upon completion of a particular job. | - Fear of bodily or psychological harm to self  
- Fear of harm to family members  
- Living in an area with high corruption and criminal activity | General | Macy and Graham (2012) |
| 8. Perpetrator threatened to harm or kill client or loved ones if the client refuses to do a job or threatens to escape. | - Fear of bodily or psychological harm  
- Fear of harm to family members | Personal Identity/General | Bales (2000) |
| 9. Perpetrator restricts client’s ability to do normal tasks such as moving, eating or sleeping. | - Fear of bodily or psychological harm | Personal Identity/General | Polaris Project (2013) |
| 10. Perpetrator gets very aggressive over trivial things. | - Fear of bodily or psychological harm  
Polaris Project (2013)  
Rescue and Restore (2013) |
| 11. Perpetrator shoved, slapped, hit the client, or broke client’s things. | - Fear of bodily or psychological harm  
Clawson et al. (2009) |
| 12. Perpetrator made pejorative comments about client’s ethnicity making them feel as though people from their ethnic group could not have other options | - Racial minority status  
- Fragmentation of African American families as a historical factor.  
- Experience with racial remarks to demean a person  
Kramer and Berg (2003)  
Malarek (2004)  
Polaris Project (2013) |
### Table 3.1: Table continued

#### General Section Item Creation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item (human trafficking experience)</th>
<th>Vulnerability Theme Code</th>
<th>Facet of Vulnerability</th>
<th>Literature Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Perpetrator has intimidated client into dropping charges originally laid against them.</td>
<td>- Higher rates of incarceration for minority populations - Undocumented or exploited documentation - Limited education. - Fear of harm to self or others</td>
<td>Personal Identity/ General/ Race</td>
<td>Polaris Project (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Perpetrator threatened to unveil a client’s personal substance abuse habit or other habits that client perceives as imprudent or immoral.</td>
<td>- Substance abuse or addiction. - Caregiver with history of drug/alcohol abuse or addiction.</td>
<td>Personal Identity/ General/ Drug abuse or dependence</td>
<td>Clawson et al. (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Feeling and thinking that his/her ability to survive in every area of their life was dependent on the presence of the perpetrator.</td>
<td>- Low self esteem - Mental health pathologies. - Family violence/abusive home. - History of Exploitation by family member.</td>
<td>Personal Identity/ General</td>
<td>Dorias (2005) Logan (2007)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continues
Table 3.1. Table continued

General Section Item Creation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item (human trafficking experience)</th>
<th>Vulnerability Theme Code</th>
<th>Facet of Vulnerability</th>
<th>Literature Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. Being addressed by the title of the victim’s job such as dishwasher or cook and never being referred to by name.</td>
<td>- Commodification of labor. - Commodification of women’s bodies.</td>
<td>Personal Identity/General</td>
<td>Polaris Project (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Feeling objectified or feeling reduced to a task.</td>
<td>- Commodification of labor. - Commodification of women’s bodies. - Type of work</td>
<td>Personal Identity/General</td>
<td>Clawson et al. (2009)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continues
Table 3.1. Table continued

*General Section Item Creation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item (human trafficking experience)</th>
<th>Vulnerability theme code</th>
<th>Facet of vulnerability</th>
<th>Literature Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. Feeling confused because a family member, a friend, or romantic partner manipulated them into the situation.</td>
<td>- Family conflict - Need for love and acceptance - Family violence/abusive home - Exploitation by family member - Large family size - Precarious living conditions - Debt bondage - Single family household</td>
<td>Personal Identity/ General/ Family history</td>
<td>Lange (2011) Dorias and Corriveau (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Having to perform sexual favors, or provide services or labor for the perpetrator against their will.</td>
<td>- Commodification of women’s bodies. - Type of work</td>
<td>Personal Identity/ General/ Gender</td>
<td>Bales (2000) Estes et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Disclosing a history of trauma to the perpetrator that later was used to manipulate the client.</td>
<td>- Family violence - Loss of parent - Placement in foster care, group home</td>
<td>Personal Identity/ General/ Family history</td>
<td>Cobbina and Oselin (2011) Estes, et al. (2005) Clawson et al. (2009)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.2

Work, Profession, or Provision of Services Item Creation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Vulnerability Theme Code</th>
<th>Facet of Vulnerability</th>
<th>Literature Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28. Perpetrator threatened to “out client” with family members about the type of job, activity, or service that client engaged in. (Screen for issues of job status, subservient jobs, sex work)</td>
<td>- Type of work/ stigmatized work</td>
<td>Social Identity/ Work Profession/ SES</td>
<td>Dorias (2005) Polaris Project (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Perpetrator forced client to do a job that client felt was physically hard for them to do and disregarded client’s need to rest or take a break.</td>
<td>- Fear of bodily/ psychological harm</td>
<td>Social Identity/ Work Profession/ SES</td>
<td>Bales (2000) Rescue and Restore(2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Client was originally recruited for a job that appeared legitimate, but later realized the job was not legitimate or did not exist.</td>
<td>- Precarious living conditions - Desire to improve socio-economic situation.</td>
<td>Social Identity/ Work Profession</td>
<td>Bales (2000) Curtis et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 3.2. Table continued**

*Work, Profession, or Provision of Services Item Creation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Vulnerability theme code</th>
<th>Facet of Vulnerability</th>
<th>Literature Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32. Thinking that they were entering a romantic relationship/marriage, and later realizing that they were being used by their romantic partner in commercial sex acts or in other labor arrangements.</td>
<td>- Desire for love and acceptance</td>
<td>Social Identity/ Work, Profession</td>
<td>Lange (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Perpetrator promised to compensate the client for performing a particular job or service, and after the job was completed, they refused to pay.</td>
<td>- Desire to improve socio-economic situation.</td>
<td>Social Identity/ Work, Profession</td>
<td>Logan (2007). Logan (2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Vulnerability Theme code</td>
<td>Facet of Vulnerability</td>
<td>Literature Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Perpetrator threatened to call authorities or cancel immigration proceedings if client did not work or decided to leave.</td>
<td>- Undocumented or exploited documentation - Immigration policies</td>
<td>Immigrant/Documentation</td>
<td>Reid (2012) Farrell, McDevitt, and Fahy (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Perpetrator originally recruited the victim at their home country promising they would secure immigration documentation for the victim; this promise never came true in the destination country.</td>
<td>- Undocumented or exploited documentation - Immigration policies</td>
<td>Immigrant/Documentation</td>
<td>Acharya (2010) Farrell, McDevitt, and Fahy (2008) Reid (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Perpetrator retained client’s passport or documentation.</td>
<td>- Cultural barriers</td>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>Reid (2012)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.4

Disability Item Creation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Vulnerability Theme Code</th>
<th>Facet of Vulnerability</th>
<th>Literature Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41. Perpetrator has taken away assistive devices such as crutches, hearing aids, wheel chair, or medication.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Perpetrator withheld client’s paychecks, financial assistance, or social security check stating that client cannot manage money or cannot physically cash the check.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Perpetrator discussed the job or services in a confusing way and then told the client they “just would not be able to understand.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Learning that the perpetrator uses client’s disability to obtain financial gain.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Perpetrator has inflicted physical disabilities on client.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Having a physical disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Segregation from mainstream society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Having an intellectual or developmental disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Segregation from mainstream society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Having a physical disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Fear of bodily harm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disability/ SES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Polaris project (2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. DOS (2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.5

Sexual Orientation Item Creation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Vulnerability Theme Code</th>
<th>Facet of Vulnerability</th>
<th>Literature Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 46. Perpetrator humiliated client regarding client’s sexual orientation. | - Sexual minority status.  
- Experience of heterosexist remarks | Sexual orientation       | Dorias (2005)           |
| 47. Perpetrator has threatened to disclose client’s sexual orientation to client’s family or loved ones if they did not do their job. | - Fear of being “outed”  
- Confusion about sexual identity  
- Runaway LGBTQ youth. | Sexual orientation/SES   | Dorias (2005)  
Reid (2012) |
| 48. They disclosed to the perpetrator confusion about their sexual orientation, which was then used by the perpetrator to manipulate the client into engaging in same sex commercial sex acts. | - Confusion about sexual identity  
- Commodification of LGBTQ sexuality in the sex industry | Sexual orientation | Saewyc et al. (2008)  
Dorias (2005)  
Dorias and Corriveau (2009)  
Estes et al. (2005) |
**Table 3.6**

**Socio Economic Status Item Creation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Vulnerability Theme Code</th>
<th>Facet of Vulnerability</th>
<th>Literature Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 49. Perpetrator falsely lead the client into thinking that engaging in a particular job, activity, or service was going to have a significant impact on client’s economic situation. | - Desire to improve socio economic situation.  
- Low SES/poverty  
- Limited schooling | SES | Curtis et al. (2008)  
Dorias et al. (2005)  
Dorias and Corriveau (2009)  
Estes et al. (2005)  
Logan (2007)  
Logan et al. (2009)  
Macy and Graham (2012)  
Molland (2010) |
| 50. Being told by perpetrator that the client had to pay back an acquired debt for transportation, food, housing, clothing, immigration petition, etc., by engaging in some type of work or service. | - Debt Bondage | SES/Immigration | Bales (1999, 2005)  
Clawson, Small, & Myles (2003)  
Santana (2009) |
| 51. The perpetrator convinced the client’s family that he/she would be better off elsewhere due to the family’s precarious living situation. | - Precarious living conditions.  
- Desire to improve SES/ poverty | SES/Immigration | Bales (2005) |
| 52. Coming to the conclusion that their debt was never going to be paid. | - Debt bondage  
- Desire to improve SES/ poverty | SES | Bales (1999, 2005)  
Clawson, Small, & Myles (2003)  
Santana (2009) |
### Table 3.6. Table continued

**Socio Economic Status Item Creation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Vulnerability Theme Code</th>
<th>Facet of vulnerability</th>
<th>Literature source in which the item was based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53. Agreeing to work for a particular amount, and later feeling cheated by the amount of money they got paid after unexplained discounts (these discounts must exceed those mandated by the law such as taxes or social security).</td>
<td>- Desire to improve SES</td>
<td>Social Identity/ Low SES</td>
<td>Logan et. Al (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Being a runaway minor or having little family support as a child, and being lured into sex work or any other type of service.</td>
<td>- Runaway youth - Precarious living conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dorias et al. (2005) Dorias and Corriveau (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Being paid with goods such as food, shelter or merchandize in exchange for work or sexual favors.</td>
<td>- Desire to improve SES</td>
<td></td>
<td>Estes and Weiner (2001) Estes et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.7

Catalogue of Forceful Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of item</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Force</td>
<td>1. Feeling humiliated by the way the perpetrator treated them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Perpetrator kidnapped the client.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Perpetrator restricted client’s ability to do normal tasks such as moving, eating or sleeping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Perpetrator would get very aggressive over trivial things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Perpetrator shoved, slapped, hit, or broke client’s things. (Circle all that apply)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Perpetrator made pejorative comments about client’s ethnicity making them feel as though people from their ethnic group could not have other options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20. Being addressed by the title of their job such as dishwasher or cook, and was never referred to by name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23. Feeling objectified or feeling reduced to a task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25. Having to perform sexual favors against their will, or provide services or labor for the perpetrator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29. Perpetrator forced client to do a job that client felt was physically hard for them to do and disregarded client’s need to rest or take a break.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30. Perpetrator abused client verbally or physically for not completing a job, activity, or service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38. Perpetrator retained client’s passport or documentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41. Perpetrator has taken away assistive devices such as crutches, hearing aids, wheel chair, or medication to prevent client from having contact with other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45. Perpetrator inflicted physical disabilities on client.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46. Perpetrator humiliated client regarding client’s sexual orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of item</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>4. Perpetrator handles client’s money or makes client’s financial decisions without their consent within a labor arrangement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18. Learning that the perpetrator sold or bought them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22. Perpetrator changed their name or identity to perform a job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31. Client was originally recruited for a job that appeared legitimate but later realized the job was not legitimate or did not exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32. Thinking that they were entering a romantic relationship/marriage and later realizing that they were being used by their romantic partner in commercial sex acts or in other labor arrangements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33. Perpetrator promised to compensate the client for performing a particular job or service and after the job was completed they refused to pay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35. Perpetrator originally recruited the victim at their home country promising they would secure immigration documentation for the victim, this promise never came true in the destination country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42. Perpetrator withheld client’s paychecks, financial assistance, or social security check stating that client cannot manage money or cannot physically cash the check.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43. Perpetrator discussed the job or services in a confusing way and then told the client “they just would not be able to understand.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44. Learning that the perpetrator uses client’s disability to obtain financial gain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49. Perpetrator falsely lead the client into thinking that engaging in a particular job, activity, or service was going to have a significant impact on client’s economic situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50. Being told by perpetrator that they had to pay back an acquired debt for transportation, food, housing, clothing, immigration petition, bail out of jail, etc., by engaging in some type of work or service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52. Coming to the conclusion that their debt was never going to be paid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53. Agreeing to work for a particular amount, and later feeling cheated by the amount of money they got paid after unexplained discounts. (These discounts must exceed those mandated by the law such as taxes or social security).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55. Being paid with goods such as food, shelter or merchandize in exchange for work or sexual favors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Catalogue Coercive Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of item</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td>2. Perpetrator exerted pressure over what client did, who client saw,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>talked to, went to, or where client worked without using physical force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Having lost friends because perpetrator prevents client from contacting them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Perpetrator aggressively influences client’s decision of dropping out of school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Perpetrator kidnapped the client or their loved one and later promised to release them upon completion of a particular job. (Circle all that apply)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Perpetrator threatened to harm, or kill client or client’s loved ones if the client refuses to do the job or escapes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Perpetrator encouraged distrust in authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Perpetrator has intimidated client into dropping charges originally laid against them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Perpetrator induced or forced client into taking drugs, and later controlled drug access pending on client completion of a job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. Perpetrator threatened to unveil a client’s personal substance abuse habit or other habits that client perceives as imprudent or immoral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. Feeling and thinking that their ability to survive in every area of their life was dependent on the presence of perpetrator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21. Disclosing to their perpetrator private information about their family history (such as having a family history of abuse, neglect, or alcoholism), which later was used to manipulate the client.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24. Feeling confused because a family member, a friend, or romantic partner manipulated them into the situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26. Disclosing a history of trauma to the perpetrator that later was used to manipulate the client.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27. Perpetrator persuaded client to perform a job, activity, or service that client perceives as immoral or that devalues client as a person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28. Perpetrator threatened to “out client” with family members about the type of job, activity, or service that the client engaged in. (Screen for issues of job status, subservient jobs, sex work).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34. Perpetrator threatened to call authorities or cancel immigration proceedings if client did not work or decided to leave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36. Perpetrator made client feel helpless and dependent on the perpetrator for not speaking English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37. Perpetrator threatens client to send them back to a country were there is an active war or an armed conflict.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continues
### Catalogue Coercive Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of item</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td>39. Perpetrator made the client feel incapable of assimilating to the demands of a new environment (for example, doing errands, speaking the language, using public transportation, looking for a doctor).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40. Perpetrator made statements such as “immigrants are not welcome in this country” to make the client feel less safe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47. Perpetrator has threatened to disclose client’s sexual orientation to clients’ family or loved ones if they do not do their job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48. They disclosed to the perpetrator confusion about their sexual orientation, which was then used by the perpetrator to manipulate the client into engaging in same sex commercial sex acts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51. The perpetrator convinced the client’s family that he/she would be better off elsewhere due to their precarious living situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54. Being a runaway minor or having little family support as a child and being lured into sex work or any other type of service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.10

Content Validity Coefficient (V Values)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>V value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Feeling humiliated by the way they were treated by the perpetrator.</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Perpetrator exerted pressure over what client did, who client saw,</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talked to, went to, or where client worked without using physical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>force.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Having lost friends because perpetrator prevents client from</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contacting them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Perpetrator handles client’s money or makes client’s financial</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decisions without their consent within a labor arrangement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Perpetrator aggressively influences client’s important decisions.</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For example, dropping out of school or not attending doctor’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appointments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Perpetrator kidnapped the client.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Perpetrator kidnapped the client or their loved one, and later</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promised to release them upon completion of a particular job.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Perpetrator threatened to harm, or kill client or client’s loved</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ones if the client refuses to do the job or escapes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Perpetrator restricts client’s ability to do normal tasks such as</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moving, eating or sleeping.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Perpetrator gets very aggressive over trivial things.</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Perpetrator shoved, slapped, hit the client, or broke client’s</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>things.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Perpetrator made pejorative comments about client’s ethnicity</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>making them feel as though people from their ethnic group could</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not have other options.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Perpetrator encouraged distrust in authorities.</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Perpetrator has intimidated client into dropping charges originally</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laid against them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Perpetrator induced or forced client into taking drugs, and later</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>controlled drug access pending on client completion of a job.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Perpetrator threatened to unveil a client’s personal substance</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abuse habit or other habits that client perceives as imprudent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or immoral.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Feeling and thinking that their ability to survive in every area</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of their life was dependent on the presence of perpetrator.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Learning that the perpetrator sold them or bought them.</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Being sexually abused while in the job.</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Being addressed by the title of their job such as dishwasher or</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cook and never being referred to by name.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Disclosing to their perpetrator private information about their</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family history (such as having a family history of abuse, neglect,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drug abuse or alcoholism), which later was used to manipulate the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>client.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Perpetrator changed their name or identity to perform a job.</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Feeling objectified or feeling reduced to a task.</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Continues
Table 3.10 Table continued

*Content Validity Coefficient (V Values)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>V value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. Feeling confused because a family member, a friend, or romantic partner manipulated them into the situation.</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Having to perform sexual favors against their will, or provide services or labor for the perpetrator.</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Disclosing a history of trauma to the perpetrator that later was used to manipulate the client</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Perpetrator persuaded client to perform a job, activity, or service that client perceives as immoral or that devalues client as a person.</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Perpetrator threatened to “out client” with family members about the type of job, activity, or service that client engaged in. (Screen for issues of job status, subservient jobs, sex work)</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Perpetrator forced client to do a job that client felt was physically hard for them to do and disregarded client’s need to rest or take a break.</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Perpetrator abused client verbally or physically for not completing a job, activity, or service.</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Client was originally recruited for a job that appeared legitimate, but later realized the job was not legitimate or did not exist.</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Thinking that they were entering a romantic relationship and later realizing that they were being used by their romantic partner in commercial sex acts or in other labor arrangements.</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Perpetrator promised to compensate the client for performing a particular job or service, and after the job was completed they refused to pay.</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Perpetrator threatened to call authorities or cancel immigration proceedings if client did not work or decided to leave.</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Perpetrator originally recruited the victim at their home country promising they would secure immigration documentation for the victim; this promise never came true in the destination country.</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Perpetrator made client feel helpless and dependent on the perpetrator for not speaking English.</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Perpetrator threatens client to send them back to a country were there is an active war or an armed conflict.</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Perpetrator retained client’s passport or documentation.</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Perpetrator made the client feel incapable of assimilating to the demands of a new environment (for example, doing errands, using public transportation, looking for a doctor).</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Perpetrator made statements such as “immigrants are not welcome in this country” to make the client feel less safe.</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continues
Table 3.10. Table continued

Content Validity Coefficient (V Values)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>V value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40. Perpetrator made statements such as “immigrants are not welcome in this country” to make the client feel less safe.</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Perpetrator has taken away assistive devices such as crutches, hearing aids, wheel chair, or medication to prevent client from having contact with other people.</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Perpetrator withheld client’s paychecks, financial assistance, or social security check stating that client cannot manage money or cannot physically cash the check.</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Perpetrator discussed the job or services in a confusing way and then told the client they “just would not be able to understand.”</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Learning that the perpetrator uses client’s disability to obtain financial gain.</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Perpetrator has inflicted physical disabilities on client.</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Perpetrator humiliated client regarding client’s sexual orientation.</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Perpetrator has threatened to disclose client’s sexual orientation to client’s family or loved ones if they do not do their job.</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. They disclosed to the perpetrator confusion about their sexual orientation, which was then used by the perpetrator to manipulate the client into engaging in same sex commercial sex acts.</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Perpetrator falsely lead the client into thinking that engaging in a particular job, activity, or service was going to have a significant impact on client’s economic situation.</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Being told by perpetrator that they had to pay back an acquired debt for transportation, food, housing, clothing, immigration petition, bail out of jail, etc., by engaging in some type of work or service.</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. The perpetrator convinced the client’s family that he/she would be better off elsewhere due to their precarious living situation.</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Coming to the conclusion that their debt was never going to be paid.</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Agreeing to work for a particular amount, and later feeling cheated by the amount of money they got paid after unexplained discounts. (These discounts must exceed those mandated by the law such as taxes or social security).</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Being a runaway minor or having little family support as a child, and being lured into sex work or any other type of service.</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Being paid with goods such as food, shelter or merchandize in exchange for work or sexual favors.</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continues
Table 3.10. Table continued

Content Validity Coefficient (V Values)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>V value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rejected Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Perpetrator told client that learning another language was not something that client was capable of doing.</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Client’s sexual orientation was exploited in a commercial sex act, which client did not anticipate having to engage in.</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Being promised to obtain a product that implies status.</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Client endorses being kidnapped and having to engage sexual activity against their will, or provide services or labor for the trafficker</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Client endorses feeling invisible</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.1  Dynamic of Force

Figure X. Visual description of the slope of the line in three different victims when force is used in human trafficking situations
Figure 3.2 Dynamic of Fraud

Figure X. Visual description of the slope of the line of two different victims when fraud is used in human trafficking situations.
Figure 3.3 Dynamic of Coercion

Figure X. Visual representation of the exponential effect of the use of coercion on a person.
Chapter Four: Methodology

The pervasive need to correctly identify victims of human trafficking across the nation calls for the introduction of screening methodologies that demonstrate theoretical as well as evidenced-based substantiation. The main purpose of this dissertation was to evaluate the appropriateness of the Inclusive Human Trafficking Checklist (IHTC) as a measure of human trafficking, and to evaluate if the exploitation subscales of the IHTC capture the breadth and depth of the experience of human trafficking conceptualized as the interaction between vulnerability and exploitation.

A systemic barrier to identifying victims of human trafficking is the lack of resources to support training initiatives on victim screening and identification (TVPA, 2013). For this reason, another important purpose of this dissertation was to assess the performance of the IHTC screening methodology with and without training, as well as to investigate if other demographic factors influence the performance of the instrument. Finally, this dissertation hoped to evaluate if potential users perceive the IHTC as useful. In order to investigate these questions, this chapter will (a) describe the research methodology of this study, (b) explain the sample selection, (c) describe the procedure used in administering the study materials and collecting the data, and (d) provide an explanation of the statistical procedures used to analyze the data.

Rationale for Research Approach

An experimental design was conceptualized as central in determining whether or not the IHTC is an appropriate measure of human trafficking and if obtaining training would influence the performance of raters in analyzing cases. Experimental designs are considered the most rigorous in quantitative research. This perception is often rooted in
the idea that experimental designs offer the strongest internal validity. In other words, experimental designs tend to minimize systemic errors or bias (Trochim, 2000). Given that internal validity is at the center of all inferences of the form “if X, then Y”, using an experimental design was a good approach to explore questions such as “if using the IHTC would assist raters in correctly identifying victims”, which is a question that shares a similar structure.

The study was conceptualized as a between group experimental design with three distinct experimental levels (i.e., business as usual, use of the IHTC with training and use of the IHTC without training). All groups analyzed three vignettes and were asked to diagnose the presence or absence of human trafficking in each one. The first vignette was a classic case of labor trafficking, the second was a complex case of sex trafficking, and the third was a case of domestic violence with forceful and coercive factors. All groups were provided with a demographic questionnaire, which was later used to investigate if other factors such as the level of human trafficking knowledge of the raters as well as the rater’s professional affiliation influenced their assessment. One third of the sample was evenly divided in two groups. The first group (control group) analyzed the vignettes using the Rescue and Restore questionnaire. This form of assessment is currently the most popular human trafficking screening methodology (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2014). The second group utilized the IHTC to analyze the vignettes, but did not receive any training or instruction on its use. The last group composed of two thirds of the sample utilized the IHTC and received training in its application, interpretation and implications for providing further assistance to the victim. The rational for the uneven division of the sample was driven by theoretical and logistic
considerations. Firstly, from a social justice perspective, it was important that the majority of participants benefit from the training, given that this was one of the few benefits that attracted people to participate. Recruitment of participants for conditions without training and business as usual conditions was more challenging. Secondly, a consultation with a statistics expert indicated that the uneven distribution of the sample would not compromise the results of the study. Therefore, the decision was to divide the sample in this manner to increase participation in the group that utilized the IHTC with training. Participants were randomly assigned to the different groups. Participants in all groups provided utility descriptors that were later used to assess the perceived usefulness of the screening methodologies across experimental conditions.

The independent variables observed in this experiment were the experimental conditions in which the raters were placed, the level of human trafficking knowledge and the professional affiliation of each rater. The dependent variables were the correct or incorrect diagnostic classification of three vignettes. (i.e., this is a case of human trafficking or this is not a case of human trafficking). Raters reached this classification using the dichotomous results of the Rescue and Restore questionnaire and the IHTC, as well as a continuous score of experienced human trafficking provided only by the IHTC. An additional dependent variable was the utility score that each rater assigned to the instrument they utilized across experimental conditions.

**Research Settings and Context**

Given the complexity of the issue of human trafficking as well as the diversity of systems that are affected by it, the determination of where and how to specifically conduct this research was conceptualized applying an ecological model which looks at
the context from the macro to immediate micro system (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). In terms of the macro context, an overall overview of the legislative landscape in the states in which the study was conducted was explored, and later the organizations in which the study was conducted as well as the specific criteria utilized to run the study was described.

Following the introduction of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act (TVPA) in the year 2000 at the federal level, as well as its Reauthorization Act (TVPRA) in the years 2003, 2005, 2008, and 2013, individual states have been called to implement state based legislations that address a three-pronged approach that includes prevention, protection, and prosecution (Polaris Project, 2014a). In spite of these efforts, the national approach to combat human trafficking has been characterized by significant discrepancies across states. For instance, while Missouri has anti-labor and sex trafficking provisions, Colorado only has labor trafficking provisions (Polaris Project b, 2014). These differences might trickle down to the civil society of each state in issues such as awareness, prevention and preparedness to identify, treat and protect victims. For the purposes of this study, it was evidently important to choose states that are comparable in legislative or policy criteria.

States that adopt safe harbor provisions to address human trafficking are currently considered the most comprehensive, human rights driven conceptualization of the issue available at the moment (U.S. Department of State, 2014). The safe harbor provision treats those coerced into participating in commercial sex activities as victims of crime, even when they have engaged in criminal activity. Remarkably, the TVPA offers these victims access to social and protective services, including medical and mental health care
and safe housing. The safe harbor provision is particularly important when assessing the experience of children in sex or sexualized industries. Children who have been forced, coerced, or fraudulently induced to engage in commercial sex or sexualized activities are considered under this provision as victims of abuse. States without this provision commonly consider prostitution as is illegal. Therefore, child victims are currently at higher risk of being prosecuted as criminals and without access to child specialized services. Currently 18 states have enacted statutes providing some measure of the Safe Harbor protection and meet the federal requirements to be considered a safe harbor state (i.e., Arkansas, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Tennessee, Vermont, and Washington). It is noteworthy that these statutes vary in scope and implementation across states. See Figure 4.1.

The purpose of this dissertation was originally to test the appropriateness of the Inclusive Human Trafficking Checklist as a methodology of human trafficking measurement across the United States. However, the study was tested in New York and Kentucky due to issues of accessibility to the principal investigator. New York and Kentucky share the commonality that they are both Safe Harbor states. In New York the provision was signed in 2008 with proposal artifact update in 2014, and in Kentucky the provision was signed in 2013 (Kentucky Legislative Research Commission, 2014; New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services, 2014). Both states outline the need to provide training so that victims, advocates and law enforcement officers, and professionals in helping occupations so that they may better recognize signs of human and child trafficking seek help and or intervene (Polaris, 2014c).
This contextual framework is an important consideration for the purposes of this dissertation because it helps define a population of interest. Establishing a sampling frame is traditionally a recommended step in the process of selecting a sample from a defined population in order to increase the likelihood of accurately representing that population (Fink, 2003). Given that legislative shifts are typically a result of increased public awareness and civil advocacy, the fact that both states have safe harbor legislations might provide a similar baseline in terms of human trafficking awareness and knowledge. This might be helpful in the analysis of comparable data. The results obtained are also more likely to be generalizable to populations with similar characteristics. In addition, state endorsement of the TVPA 2013 Safe Harbor provision is a trend likely to be replicated across the United States. This increases the relevance and applicability of the study.

A total of 18 sessions were offered to participants, three of them were conducted in New York and fifteen of them in Kentucky. The sessions were offered at universities, community training centers, or training rooms at a specific organization. In order to ensure similar conditions for each session criteria was established: a request was made for participating organizations to have at least two rooms available to conduct the study. Persons assigned to the business as usual and without training conditions were placed in one room. Persons in the with-training condition were invited into a separate room. One of the rooms needed to be equipped with a computer and audiovisual equipment in order to project the power point presentation. This was done in order to preserve the experimental nature of the study. See Table 4.1 for a full description of participants by site.
Sample Selection

The Safe Harbor federal provision has increased the level of public awareness around human trafficking. In spite of the progress, insufficient professional training in legal, educational, forensic, health, or mental health settings prevails across the United States. This increases the risk for victims to be wrongly prosecuted or provided with inappropriate treatment (Reid, 2012). Given the pervasive lack of awareness regarding this crime and the fact that most victims navigate either human services or criminal justice organizations, the population of interest in this study was that of practitioners or future practitioners in training with human services or criminal justice backgrounds.

According to the Department of Labor National Occupational Employment and Wages Report (2014), 1,901,730 persons are employed in community and social services occupations and 4,299,390 persons are employed in criminal justice and legal occupations for a total of 6,201,120 eligible participants in the United States. Given that the relatively small fluctuation of jobs available in these sectors in the past ten years, this is the closest estimate, in terms of the population of interest. It is noteworthy, that while this number does not include students enrolled in programs with these professional backgrounds, these students will at some point be placed in available jobs which are represented in the estimate. In order to estimate a sample representative of this population, the University of Iowa Java Applet Computer software was utilized. The program estimated that a randomized sample of 600 persons at the 95% confidence level and with a confidence interval of +4 and – 4 would be necessary (Lenth, 2009).

Random sampling of the entire population would be ideal way to obtain a representative sample (Gay & Airasian, 2000). However, the population of interest in
In this study, 550 invitations to participate in the study were sent via e-mail. A sample of professionals and professionals in training likely to encounter human trafficking victims \( N = 201 \) from Kentucky and New York ultimately and participated and was used to evaluate the psychometric properties of the Inclusive Human Trafficking Checklist (IHTC). A total of 38 raters participated in the business as usual condition, 44 in the condition without training, and 119 in the condition with training. See Table 4.2 for a summary.

Participants were asked to fill out a demographic questionnaire \( n=196 \), and a utility questionnaire \( n=191 \) and three vignettes \( n=592 \). In the business as usual condition the participants filled out \( n=38 \) protocols for vignette number one, \( n=38 \) for vignette number two and \( n=36 \) for vignette number three for a total number of \( n=112 \) protocols for this condition. In the condition without training, participants filled out \( n=45 \) protocols for vignette one, \( n=44 \) protocols for vignette two and \( n=41 \) for vignette number three for a total number of \( n=130 \) protocols for this condition. Finally, in the condition with training participants filled out \( n=117 \) protocols for vignette one, \( n=117 \) for vignette two and \( n=116 \) for vignette number three for a total number of 350 protocols for this condition. See Table 4.2 for a summary.
Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

Out of the 201 participants, a total of 196 participants filled out the demographic questionnaire. The majority of participants were female, 82.2%, $n=165$, and 15.8%, $n=31$ were male. The participants represented diverse ethnic backgrounds with high representation from persons of Caucasian descent 76.9%, $n=143$; 11.8% African American, $n=22$; 7.5% Latino (a)/ Hispanic, $n=14$; 2.2% Bi-racial, $n=4$; .5% Middle Eastern, $n=1$; .5% Asian, $n=1$ and .5% Native American $n=1$; 6.5% preferred not to respond, $n=13$. The mean age of the sample was 30.7 years of age, $SD = 10.8$, ranging from 20 to 61 years of age. See Figures 4.2 and 4.3 for a visual representation of gender and age distributions respectively.

The agencies represented in the sample included students from the Department of Criminal Justice and Family and Consumer Services at Eastern Kentucky University, $n = 17$; undergraduate students from the Department of Peace and Social Justice Studies at Berea College, $n = 20$; counselor-advocates from Green House 17 in Lexington, $n = 5$; students from the undergraduate and graduate programs in the Department of Educational, School, and Counseling Psychology at the University of Kentucky; Social Work and Sociology Departments at the University of Kentucky, $n = 34$ of the total number of students sixteen were graduate students from the University of Kentucky counseling psychology program and the remainder 18 were undergraduates from other programs at the same university; attorneys from Legal Aid of the Bluegrass, $n = 6$; victim specialists from the FBI, $n = 1$; attorneys from the Kentucky Association of Sexual Assault Programs, $n = 1$; social justice advocates from the International YMCA New York, $n = 5$; crisis counselors or therapists from The Bluegrass Rape Crisis Center.
including staff and volunteers, \( n = 22 \); counselors from The Women’s Crisis Center Moorhead Kentucky, \( n = 6 \); counselors/advocates associated with the Kentucky Domestic Violence Association, \( n = 26 \); counselors from Aids Volunteers (AVOL), \( n = 9 \); Women’s Crisis Center in Louisville, \( n = 2 \); Frankfort Court Advocate, \( n = 1 \); Berea Police Department, \( n = 1 \); therapists from Children’s Village Multi-Systemic Therapy Program; New York, \( n = 14 \); legal advocates from the Manhattan Community Court, \( n = 12 \), policy analyst from the Cabinet for Health and Family Services Kentucky, \( n = 2 \); counselors/advocates from the Women’s Crisis Center Maysville Kentucky, \( n = 8 \); counselors/advocates from All God’s Children, \( n = 2 \); counselors/advocates from Ramey Step, \( n = 2 \), and counselors/advocates from Sunrise Children Mount Washington, \( n = 2 \).

The professional affiliation consisted of 76.9\%, \( n = 153 \) of participants identifying their professional background as human service oriented and 21.6\%, \( n = 43 \) of participants identifying their profession as criminal justice or legally oriented. While only 196 participants filled out the demographic questionnaire and a total of 201 participated in the study, we deduced that the remaining five participants were professionals with human services background based on the site they participated in.

The level of knowledge about human trafficking ranged from zero to five 1\%, \( n = 2 \), of participants rated their knowledge as zero, meaning that participant did not have any prior knowledge about human trafficking; 26\%, \( n = 51 \) of the participants rated their level of knowledge as one, meaning that they learned about the topic through the media or public awareness campaigns; 33.7\%, \( n = 66 \) of the participants endorsed a level of knowledge of two, meaning that they had attended at least one professional training about human trafficking provided by a university or formal organization; 28.1\%, \( n = 55 \) of the
participant’s rated their level of knowledge as three, meaning that they had volunteered, worked, or belonged to a social justice organization that works on the topic of human trafficking; 10.2%, $n = 20$ of the participants rated their level of knowledge as four, meaning that the participant had actually worked providing direct or advocacy services to victims of human trafficking; and 1%, $n = 2$ of the participants rated their level of knowledge as five meaning that the participant was a consultant on human trafficking. See Figure 4.4. for a summary.

Given that this was a convenience sample, it is important to note differences that may not represent the target population. For instance, females were over represented in the sample 82.2%, $n = 165$, and 15.8%, $n = 31$ respectively. The sample was also characterized by having higher representation from participants with human services over criminal justice or legal backgrounds 76.9%, $n = 153$ and 21.6%, $n = 43$, respectively. One of the variables that was included in the analysis was professional background. This variable was observed because human trafficking victims are likely to interact with these professional sectors. Therefore, it was important to analyze if professionals in human services or criminal justice sectors differed in identification patterns.

**Data Collection Methods**

This section describes the participant recruitment process, the informed consent process as well as the research procedures.

**Participant’s recruitment.** Participants were recruited by invitation. The invitations were distributed via e-mail using the databases provided by the Partnership for the Eradication Of Human Trafficking United Nations Association of the United States, the Kentucky Domestic Violence Association, the Kentucky Association of Sexual
Assault Programs, as well as the University of Kentucky Counseling Psychology and Social Work list serves. The invitations sent through the United Nations Association and the Kentucky Association of Sexual Assault Programs were sent to professionals working in social or criminal justice services. Some specific invitations were made via faculty to students in the Counseling Psychology program at the University of Kentucky. The principal investigator went to two classrooms in the Sociology department to recruit participants. There were also individual invitations to the Eastern Kentucky University Department of Criminal Justice and the Berea College Social Justice group. Participants were recruited using promotional tools such as flyers, verbal, and e-mail announcements, as well as phone invitations.

Participants were asked to contact the principal investigator. Upon initial participant response, the participants were placed in a particular experimental condition through random sampling. Participants were assigned to conditions utilizing a phone application called Research Randomizer (Urbaniak & Plous, 2013). This application generates random numbers to assign participants to experimental conditions. For a review of training sites as well as experimental distributions see Table 20.

**Informed consent process.** Participants were provided with informed consent forms at the beginning of the session. The forms were read to participants and given in paper form. Further questions were addressed as needed. Participants were explained the procedures and were told they could decline their participation at any time without consequences. Participants were also told they were not required to provide information such as their name or personal history in any of the written materials. Participants signed a consent form, which was stored separately from any tests or other written materials to
Research procedures. Participants were invited to attend a session at a convenient community facility in New York City or Kentucky according to their place of residence. Informed consent procedures were provided to participants at the beginning of session. Participants were given a number and were randomly selected to attend a particular group. The first and second groups were invited into a different room. The first group received the Rescue and Restore assessment instrument and the human trafficking vignettes. Practitioners were asked to identify the type of crime that had been committed against the victim and were asked to fill out the utility questionnaire. Group two received the Inclusive Human Trafficking Checklist, the human trafficking vignettes and the utility questionnaire. Group three received a one hour training on human trafficking and were asked to use the Inclusive Human trafficking Check List as well as the human trafficking vignettes and the utility questionnaire. Participants were given the option to discontinue answering the questions if they experienced discomfort.

Materials

Vignettes. The three vignettes were the independent criterion against which the diagnostic classification was made. These vignettes were predetermined by the board of the Partnership for the Eradication of Human trafficking (PEHT) United Nations Association of the USA Queens Chapter to describe a human trafficking case with labor implications, a complex human trafficking case with sex trafficking implications and a domestic violence case. The first vignette includes a case of labor trafficking in which vulnerabilities related to personal identity, immigration status, disability and socioeconomic status were present. This case was based on highly publicized operation
in Southern California through which possibly hundreds of Mexican immigrants with disabilities were smuggled across the border, and then taken to New York City where they were held in virtual slavery and forced to peddle trinkets on the subways (Purdum, 1997). See Vignette 1 in Appendix B.

The second vignette described a local sex trafficking case in which vulnerabilities related to personal identity, socioeconomic status and sexual orientation and race were present. This vignette was based on reports of a prosecuted case processed in the Hartford, Connecticut area. The defendants recruited young, vulnerable girls and women and marketed them to perform sexual acts with men in exchange for money. Ten defendants were prosecuted in connection with this case (U.S. v. Paris et al, 2006). See Vignette 2 in Appendix B. The third vignette was not a case of human trafficking. It described a case of domestic violence this vignette was based on a story from Cultural Alert Counseling (2013). See Vignette 3 in Appendix B for a review.

**Demographic questionnaire.** Additional information was collected with the use of a demographic questionnaire. See Appendix C. Participants were asked a total of seven demographic questions (i.e., gender, age, ethnicity, professional background, level of knowledge about human trafficking and highest degree achieved). The level of knowledge about human trafficking was operationalized using a five point Likert-type scale with zero meaning the participant does not have prior knowledge of human trafficking, one meaning the participant’s knowledge is minimal and comes mainly from the media, two meaning that the participant attended at least one professional training about human trafficking provided by a university or formal organization, three meaning that the participant has worked, volunteered or belonged to an organization that works on
the topic, four meaning that the participant has provided direct or advocacy services to a victim of human trafficking, and five meaning that the participant is perceived as a consultant, has given lectures or trainings on the topic, has lead human trafficking organizations or programs, or has served as a consultant on specific cases. The rationale for collecting information on these variables was that the results on the assessment of human trafficking could be associated with differences in these variables; for instance, level of experience or knowledge about human trafficking could have an impact on the participant’s ability to identify human trafficking independent from the use of the instrument and, therefore, bias the results.

**Rescue and Restore Instrument.** The Rescue and Restore screening instrument is the standard assessment procedure proposed by Rescue and Restore, Department of Health and Human Services of the United States (2013). This is an 11-item questionnaire composed of closed and open-ended questions that helps practitioners from multidisciplinary backgrounds identify potential victims. The questions in this instrument were originally written in first person. Given that the participants administered the test based on a vignette, the instrument was amended to the third person. While this instrument is the most commonly used methodology to screen for victims there is no available literature that looks at its effectiveness or implementation. The National Human Trafficking Resource Center, which is associated with this campaign, reported receiving 31,945 phone calls, 1,488 e-mails, 1,669 online tip forms, and 787 SMS threads from January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2013. Only 293 of these phone calls were related to crisis situations with actual victims. They report that 67 callers utilized the Rescue and Restore campaign to make an assessment. However, there is no available
information as to the follow up of the phone call or an assessment of the validity of the human trafficking claim made by the caller. In addition, there is no available information regarding the specific Rescue and Restore Material utilized by the caller (National Human Trafficking Resource Center, 2013a). See Appendix D.

**Inclusive Human Trafficking Checklist.** The Inclusive Human Trafficking Checklist is an instrument composed of 55 items that allows practitioners to screen for the presence of human trafficking in a person’s history in a non-intrusive way. This instrument evaluates evidence of exploitation in the form of force, fraud and coercion as it is manifested in six subscales (i.e., general, work profession, immigrant, individuals with disabilities, sexual orientation, and socio economic status). The instrument measures the interaction between vulnerability and exploitation present in a person’s psychosocial history. See Appendix E.

**Utility questionnaire.** The utility questionnaire proposed by First et al. (2004) is a six-item instrument that addresses: (a) an instrument’s value in communicating among practitioners, patients, families, attorneys, administrators and stake holders; (b) the instrument’s implementation characteristics in specific practice, including its goodness of fit, its ease of use, and feasibility; and (c) its usefulness in case conceptualization, intervention selection and management decision making. See Appendix D for a review.

**Human trafficking presentation.** The participants experienced a power point presentation that outlined the concept of human trafficking, its historical underpinnings, the acknowledgement of human trafficking as a prevalent dehumanizing practice by the UN Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons (UNPPSPTP) and the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act (TVPA), a theoretical overview
of the Inclusive Human Trafficking model, a review of the Inclusive Human Trafficking Checklist (IHTC) administration and scoring, as well as an overview of its implications for practice. See Appendix E for a review.

Data Analysis Methods

**Preliminary analysis.** Preliminary descriptive statistics were reported. This report included number of participants, their gender, age, ethnicity professional background, their level of knowledge about human trafficking and their highest educational degree achieved.

**Main analysis.** The analysis of this data was aimed at answering the original research question (a) if the Inclusive Human Trafficking Checklist (IHTC) is an appropriate measure of human trafficking, (b) if the exploitation subscales of the IHTC captures the breadth and depth of the experience of human trafficking conceptualized as the interaction between vulnerability and exploitation, (c) if there are differences in assessment of human trafficking based on the participant’s profession, level of human trafficking knowledge, and whether or not they received training on the use of the instrument; and finally, and (d) whether potential users perceive the instrument as useful.

The first two questions are concerned with issues of validity. (i.e., whether the Inclusive Human Trafficking Checklist (IHTC) accurately identifies human trafficking, and whether the exploitation subscales of the IHTC capture the breadth and depth of the experience of human trafficking conceptualized as the interaction between vulnerability and exploitation) were addressed taking into consideration tenets of Classical Test Theory (CTT). Classical test theory is primarily concerned with the consistency or
reliability of a test takers score (Petscher & Schatschneider, 2012). Following a process of content validation, which was outlined in Chapter II, the next step was to explore the instrument’s criterion validity or the degree of consistency between the results of the IHTC and the results of the experts’ evaluation of three vignettes. In addition, comparisons of across subscales were also conducted. To this end, Pearson’s product moment correlation matrices, specificity and sensitivity, and Kappa measure of agreement analyses were utilized.

In addition to evaluating traditional psychometric properties such as the instrument’s validity as outlined by classical test theory, it was important to evaluate if other independent variables such as demographic characteristics or participation in a given experimental condition influenced the rater’s assessment of human trafficking. This analysis was based on generalizability (G) theory. G theory assumes that in order to obtain a true score, it is important to account for different sources or facets of error in a test score. In this regard, G theory looks at variability on sources of error (i.e., business as usual, utilization of the IHTC with and without training, level of knowledge about human trafficking and professional background) (Chiu, 2001). In order to analyze this information, independent sample t tests as well as logistic regression analyses were utilized to explore the impact of other independent variables such as the experimental condition in which the raters participated in, their professional background and their level of knowledge about human trafficking. Finally, the rater’s perception of the utility or usefulness of utilizing a given instrument as evaluated across experimental conditions utilizing a between groups analysis of variance (ANOVA).

**Criterion validity analysis of the IHTC.** Criterion-related validity evaluates the
relationship between a test score and an outcome, or the results of an assessment that measures the same construct. Criterion validity is demonstrated when the test in question, correlates with suitable criterion measures. Criterion validity takes two forms: an assessment shows predictive or concurrent validity when it correlates with other measures of the same construct. On the other hand, an assessment shows discriminant validity when it does not correlate with assessments that measure unrelated constructs (DeVellis, 1991). In this case, the criterion used to draw a comparison were the experts’ ratings of the three vignettes (two of which were predetermined to be cases of human trafficking and one of which was predetermined to be not a case of human trafficking but rather a case of domestic violence). The assessments used across conditions (i.e., the Rescue and Restore Questionnaire and the IHTC) reach dichotomous results, meaning that they determine whether a given individual has experienced human trafficking (yes) or that the experience of the person does not qualify as a human trafficking case (no). In order to draw the comparison, the determination that a given case was human trafficking was coded as (1) and the assessment that a given case was not human trafficking was coded as (0). Given that both the criterion and the independent variable were dichotomous, a The Phi Coefficient ($\phi$) was used to determine the resulting correlation between the two variables.

In addition, the IHTC also provides a continuous score, which represent the degree of experienced human trafficking based on an interaction between a person’s vulnerability and stereotypical forms of exploitation. The continuous results of the three vignettes were compared with the dichotomous expert assessment and were analyzed using a Point-Biserial Correlations $r_{pb}$ (DeVellis, 1991).
**Specificity and sensitivity.** Sensitivity and specificity are statistical measures of the performance of a binary classification test. In the present study, predetermined vignettes that describe either cases of human trafficking or domestic violence are the criterion against which this classification is made. Sensitivity measures the proportion of actual positives, which are correctly identified. The sensitivity of the IHTC was measured as the percentage of human trafficking cases that were correctly identified. Specificity on the other hand, measures the proportion of actual negatives, which are correctly identified. In this particular study, the measure of specificity was dictated by the appropriate recognition of cases that are not human trafficking (domestic violence case). In order to determine the degree of sensitivity and specificity of the IHTC, information about false positives (type I errors) and false negatives (Type II errors) were also reported.

To calculate the percentage of sensitivity of human trafficking identification the number of positive test results for the correctly identified human trafficking cases were divided by the total cases identified as human trafficking multiplied by 100. (Sensitivity = number of true positives / (number of true positives + number of false negatives) x 100). Specificity was estimated by calculating the number of non-human trafficking cases correctly identified and dividing this number by the total number of cases identified as non-human trafficking, multiplied by 100. (Specificity = number of true negatives / (number of true negatives + number of false negative) x 100). The results were reported for the three conditions (i.e., business as usual, and use of the IHTC with and without training).
**Kappa measure of agreement.** Kappa measure of agreement is a statistic typically used to determine the level of consistency of two different diagnostic tests (a newly developed measure compared with a traditional diagnostic methodology) (Carletta, 1996). This methodology was used to compare the results of the three vignettes, where vignette classification was predetermined by experts, and the results of the IHTC across two conditions (i.e., the use of the IHTC with training, and the use of the IHTC without training). The same analysis was utilized to examine the assessment of the three vignettes in the business as usual condition, which is the use of the Rescue and Restore screening instrument.

**Impact of independent variables on human trafficking assessment.** An important aspect to consider when examining the appropriateness of this measure is the potential impact of other independent variables such as the experimental condition the raters participated in, their professional background and their level of knowledge about human trafficking. It is important to note that the IHTC produces two types of outcomes, a dichotomous diagnostic outcome (i.e., human trafficking or not human trafficking) and a continuous outcome, which represents the level of human trafficking exploitation excerpted from an individual based on their existing vulnerabilities. Due to the nature of the data, a logistic regression, as well as descriptive statistics were utilized to analyze the dichotomous data.

**Logistic regression.** Logistic regression allows researchers to assess how well a set of independent variables predicts or explains a categorical or dichotomous dependent variable. Logistic regression analysis provides an indication of the relative importance of each independent variable or interactions among independent variables in explaining the
outcome of the dependent variable. In other words, the model gives an indication of the percentage of variability in the dependent variable explained by the independent variable (Harrell, 2001). This analysis was considered pertinent in examining the dichotomous outcome of the IHTC and the Rescue and Restore Questionnaire.

In this particular study different variables considered were the participant’s level of knowledge about human trafficking, their professional background (human services or criminal justice) as well as the experimental level in which they participated (i.e., business as usual, use of the IHTC without training and use if the IHTC with training) and finally, the vignette used. Prior to conducting the analysis all discrete variables were dummy coded. The dichotomous results obtained from the IHTC as well as the Rescue and Restore questionnaire were rated as inaccurate, which was coded as (0), and accurate, which was coded as (1).

**Analysis of covariance.** Three separate 2 X 2 between-groups analysis of covariance were conducted to compare the effectiveness of two different experimental conditions (with training or without training) in identifying human trafficking for professionals with a criminal justice or human services backgrounds. The dependent variable was the total human trafficking score as measured by the IHTC for each vignette, the independent variables consisted of the experimental condition, the rater’s professional background and the scores on human trafficking knowledge as measured by the human trafficking knowledge questionnaire, which was administered prior to the participants completing the protocols. This score was utilized as a covariate in this analysis.
**Vulnerability and exploitation subscales.** One of the main hypotheses of this measurement model is that the level of experienced human trafficking stems from an interaction between an individual’s personal and social vulnerabilities and the exploitation exerted by the trafficker from these vulnerabilities. Therefore, the instrument calculates the level of experienced human trafficking by looking at instances of exploitation (force, fraud and coercion) as a continuous score in six subscales: the general subscales, which applies to all persons and addresses issues of personal vulnerabilities, and five subscales which address issues of socially imposed vulnerabilities (i.e., work/profession, immigration, disability, sexual orientation, and socio economic status). In order to assess if there were differences across vignettes in identification of expressions of exploitation in persons belonging to different personal and social vulnerabilities across vignettes and across experimental conditions (i.e., with or without training) a one-way-between groups multivariate analysis of variance was performed. In addition to exploring distribution differences in the sample, Pearson product moment correlation matrices were utilized to examine if these subscales reflect the unique types of exploitation used against victim’s specific identity related vulnerabilities characterized in each vignette.

**Multivariate analysis of vulnerability subscales.** A one-way-between groups multivariate analysis of variance was performed to assess if there were differences across vignettes in identification of expressions of human trafficking in persons belonging to different marginalized statuses. The six subscales of the IHTC (i.e., general, work/profession, immigration, disability, sexual orientation and socio economic status) were used as independent variables.
**Multivariate analysis of exploitation subscales.** A power-based crime qualifies as a case of human trafficking when force, fraud and/or coercion are used as means of exploitation. Given that human trafficking happens within the context of labor, and that laboring without obtaining appropriate remuneration or personal benefit is a violation of an individual’s civil rights by national and international standards, it is conceptualized that human trafficking is inherently a fraudulent action. Even if an individual willingly engages in labor activities under exploitative conditions, this activity is fraudulent as the trafficker is violating the convened standard of human treatment. Consequently, cases that do not have endorsements in the fraud subscale are not considered by this measurement methodology a case of human trafficking. Vignettes one and two described cases of human trafficking, therefore it was expected to find endorsements in the force, fraud and coercion subscales. Vignette number three was not a case of human trafficking; therefore it was expected to find endorsements in the force and coercion subscales, but not in the fraud subscale.

In order to assess if there were differences across vignettes in identifying force fraud or coercion, a one-way between groups multivariate analysis of variance was performed. The three subscales of the IHTC (i.e., force, fraud, and coercion) were used as dependent variables. The condition in which the raters participated in was used as the independent variable.

**Utility analysis.** An important objective of this validation study was to assess the degree to which practitioners perceive the IHTC as useful when compared to traditional assessment methodologies and whether there are significant differences of mean scores of the utility scores among the three experimental conditions (i.e., business as usual, use of
the IHTC with training, and use of the IHTC without training). In order to answer these questions, a one way between groups analysis of variance ANOVA was conducted. Effect sizes (eta squared) were reported to further explore differences in mean scores for all groups (Cohen, 1988).

**Issues of Trustworthiness**

Establishing trustworthiness criteria involves evaluating the degree of methodological rigor utilized in the development of a study (Morrow, 2005). The criteria utilized to establish the trustworthiness of this study includes issues of credibility, consistency, neutrality and applicability.

**Credibility.** In its most basic form, credibility refers to the degree that the results of a study are believable. In quantitative research, protecting the internal validity of a study is central to the credibility of findings. This means that the researcher makes an effort to control or account for extraneous variables that may compete with the independent variable in explaining the outcome of a study (Morrow, 2005). In this study, efforts to control extraneous variables were conducted in addressing instrumentation, treatment replication, and experimenter and subject effects.

In terms of instrumentation, four instruments were utilized in the development of this study (i.e., Demographic questionnaire, the Rescue and Restore Questionnaire, and the Inclusive Human Trafficking Checklist). All instruments utilized underwent a period of academic review and approval both by the academic committee supervising this dissertation as well as the members of the board of the Partnership for the Eradication of Human Trafficking. The demographic questionnaire explored variables associated with the demographic nature of the sample (i.e., gender, age, ethnicity, professional
background, level of knowledge about human trafficking and highest degree achieved). These questions were asked with the intention of observing if these demographic categories had an impact in the results. Later in the analysis phase, differences between participants with human services versus criminal justice backgrounds were analyzed. In addition, differences in responses based on the participants’ level of knowledge were also observed.

In terms of instrumentation that directly measure human trafficking efforts were advanced to ensure that the instrumentation was intended to measure the construct in question. The Rescue and Restore questionnaire is a widely used assessment procedure proposed by Rescue and Restore, Department of Health and Human Services of the United States. While this instrument has not undergone a validation process, it is the most common assessment utilized and it has facilitated the identification of victims (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2014). The IHTC underwent a process of content validation prior to its application in the current study (see Chapter Three). In accordance with classical test theory, the instrument was informed by a comprehensive literature review on the topic as well as a quantitative content analysis using formalized scaling procedures (Lynn, 1986). Finally, the utility questionnaire was based on and instrumentation proposed by First et al. (2004). This instrument has been widely used in determining the practical usefulness of instrumentation of psychosocial nature.

In terms of treatment replication, a total of 18 sessions were offered to participants. In order to ensure similar conditions for each session a criteria was established: we asked of participating organization to have at least two rooms available to conduct the study. Persons assigned to the business as usual and without training
conditions were placed in one room. Persons in the with-training condition were invited into a separate room. This was done in order to preserve the experimental nature of the study. The second room needed to be equipped with a computer, video and audio equipment in order to project a power point presentation. In order to minimize experimenter effects all the 18 presentations were conducted by the principal investigator and were outlined in a Power Point presentation. In terms of subject effects a criteria for participation was established in order to increase comparability in the sample. All participants in this study were either practitioners or practitioners in training in the areas of human services or criminal justice likely to encounter human trafficking victims. Participants were also above 18 years old.

**Consistency.** In quantitative studies reliability is the psychometric most commonly observed to demonstrate the consistency of a given study (Aiken, 1980). This study was inherently designed to look at measured of agreement among participants. All participants in the study were exposed to the same three vignettes and asked to determine if they qualified as human trafficking cases or not. Given that reliability is at core of any validity question, a design that ensured an observation of the instrument’s reliability was central in the development of this project.

**Neutrality.** Neutrality or the degree to which the study is not altered by researcher’s bias (Morrow, 2005). In this study, neutrality was demonstrated through the methodology of measurements, data collection, and data analysis described throughout this chapter. In addition, issues of confirmability were taken into consideration. To ensure that other researchers can corroborate the results obtained in this study, two steps
were taken: all protocols collected during the study were kept, and audit trail that includes raw data was electronically recorded.

**Applicability.** Typically applicability of a study in quantitative research is demonstrated when a study shows external validity. External validity is conceived as the extent to which the results of a study can be generalized to other contexts (Mitchell & Jolley, 2001). Given the IHTC is in a stage of development in which its external validity has not yet been tested it is unknown if the instrument will generalize to other settings or populations. Therefore, notions of transferability were observed. Transferability is a methodology utilized in qualitative research to assess the degree to which the results of a study can be generalized to other settings. Researchers typically provide a thorough description of the research context is provided. So that users can make informed decisions about the application of the findings (Elliott, Fischer, & Rennie, 1999). In the case of this dissertation, a thorough description of the research context, which included the legislative guidelines for practice for practitioners with criminal justice or human services backgrounds in Kentucky and New York was provided earlier in this chapter. In addition a description of the participating agencies, the sites in which it was conducted, the participants, as well as the procedures used to collect data were also described. This should provide future users of the instrument with enough information to determine if the IHTC can be applicable to their specific context.

**Summary**

In order to assess the appropriateness of the IHTC as a measure of human trafficking an experimental design was outlined. The study was conducted in Kentucky and New York, which are both states that share similar human trafficking legislations.
Participants were placed in three experimental conditions (i.e., business as usual, use of the IHTC with training, and use of the IHTC without training). Later they were asked to filled out a demographic questionnaire, and determine the type of crime experienced by a victim in three distinct vignettes. The business as usual condition utilized the Rescue and Restore questionnaire to analyze the nature of the vignettes, the condition without training analyzed the vignettes utilizing the IHTC, and the condition with training analyzed the vignettes utilizing the IHTC following a training session. All participants were asked to fill out a demographic questionnaire and a utility scale. An extensive statistical analysis was performed to assess the criterion validity of the instrument as well as the influence of independent variables on the results (i.e. level of knowledge, and professional background).
Table 4.1

Distribution of Participants by Site and Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Id</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Business as Usual</th>
<th>Without Training</th>
<th>With Training</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>KDVA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>KDVA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>KDVA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>KDVA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>BRCC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>BRCC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>AVOL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Legal Aid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Morehead</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>EKU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Berea</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Manhattan Community Court</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Children’s Village New York</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>International YMCA New York</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2

Distribution of Protocols per Vignette and Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Business as Usual</th>
<th>Without training</th>
<th>With training</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vignette one</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette two</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette three</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.1 Acknowledgement of the Human Trafficking Safe Harbor Provision by State

Figure X. Description of acknowledgment of the Human Trafficking Safe Harbor Provision by state.
Figure 4.2 Gender Distribution of the Study Sample

Figure X. Percentage of participants gender distribution
Figure 4.3 Age Distribution of the Study Sample

Figure X. Percentage of participants age distribution
Figure 4.4  Participant Level of Knowledge

Figure X. Percentages of participant’s level of knowledge
Chapter Five: Results

The purpose of this analysis is to evaluate (a) if the Inclusive Human Trafficking Checklist (IHTC) is a valid measure of human trafficking, (b) if there are differences in the identification of human trafficking based on the participant’s profession, level of human trafficking knowledge, and whether or not they received training on the use of the instrument; (c) if the exploitation subscales of the IHTC captures the breadth and depth of the experience of human trafficking conceptualized as the interaction between vulnerability and exploitation, and finally, (d) if users of the instrument perceived it as useful.

Criterion Validity of IHTC

Criterion validity is demonstrated when the test in question produces similar results as suitable established criterion measures. In this case, the expert raters categorization of three vignettes, two of which were cases of human trafficking and one of which is a case of domestic violence, was used as the criterion measure. The dependent variable was the results of the raters’ assessments of the vignettes in three experimental conditions (i.e., use of the IHTC with training, use of the IHTC without training, and the business as usual condition or use of the Rescue and Restore questionnaire). Given that both the criterion and the independent variable were dichotomous, meaning that experts and raters assessed each vignette as either a case of human trafficking or not, a Phi Coefficient ($\phi$) was used to determine the resulting correlation between criterion and dependent variables. Unfortunately, there was little variability amongst the groups to calculate a correlation. In the condition with training, a total of 350 protocols were completed with a total of 349 correctly identified. In the
condition without training, a total 130 protocols were completed and 123 were correctly identified. Finally, in the business as usual condition, a total of 112 protocols were completed, 82 of them were correctly categorized and 30 of them were incorrectly categorized. Given the accuracy in results and hence, the insufficient variability to obtain a valid correlation, an analysis of specificity and sensitivity as well as kappa measure of agreement across raters was conducted.

**Sensitivity and specificity.** Sensitivity and specificity are statistical measures of the performance of a binary classification test. Sensitivity measures the proportion of actual positives, which are correctly identified. Specificity, on the other hand, measures the proportion of negatives, which are correctly identified. These measures also provide information about false positives (type I errors) and false negatives (type II errors).

The analysis was performed first in each experimental condition (i.e., with training, without training, and business as usual). The raters in the condition with training filled out a total of 350 protocols, correctly identifying 234 true positive cases, 115 true negative cases, and incorrectly identifying one false positive, no false negatives were observed. The sensitivity and specificity levels for this condition were that of 100% and 99% respectively. For the condition without training, a total of 130 protocols were analyzed. The raters identified 82 true positive cases of human trafficking, 41 true negative cases and incorrectly identified seven false positives, there were no false negatives identified. This results reached a sensitivity level of 100% and a specificity level of 85%. Overall, the results of the IHTC performance of the instrument across the condition with and without training (n= 480) revealed a total of 316 true positive results, eight false positives, 156 true negatives and zero false negatives reaching a sensitivity
level of 100% and a specificity level of 94%. The raters in the business as usual condition, characterized by the use of the Rescue and Restore Questionnaire, analyzed a total of 112 protocols. The results revealed 46 true positive cases identified, 36 true negatives, zero false positives and 30 false negatives, reaching a sensitivity level of 60% and a specificity level of 100%. The combined results of conditions with and without training when compared to the business as usual condition suggest that the IHTC increases the possibilities of correctly identifying victims by demonstrating higher sensitivity, but has lower ability to discriminate false positives by demonstrating lower levels of specificity. However, the condition with training was able to maintain the same level of specify while improving sensitivity. See Table 5.1 for a summary of findings.

Kappa measure of agreement. The Kappa measure of agreement is a statistic typically used to determine the level of agreement of two different categorization tests. This methodology was used to compare the results of the three vignettes, which diagnostic was predetermined by experts, and the results of the IHTC across two conditions (i.e., the use of the IHTC with training, and the use of the IHTC without training). The results revealed a statistically significant level of agreement between the experts’ categorization and the IHTC across the 480 protocols that were analyzed, $K=0.93, p < .001$. This means that the IHTC reaches a level of agreement of 93% with the criterion variable controlling for chance alone.

The same analysis was utilized to examine the assessment of the three vignettes in the business as usual condition, which is the use of the Rescue and Restore screening instrument. The results revealed a statistically significant level of agreement between the expert’s diagnostic and the rescue and restore across 112 protocols, $K=0.53, p < .001$. 
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This means that the Rescue and Restore questionnaire reaches a level of agreement of 53% with the criterion variable controlling for chance alone. It is noteworthy that while the results were statistically significant, this methodology correctly identifies 53% of cases which is a substantial difference from the 93% of cases correctly identified by the IHTCL. See Tables 5.2 and 5.3 for a full review of these findings.

**Impact of Other Factors on Human Trafficking Assessment**

An important aspect to consider when examining the validity of this measure is the potential impact of other independent variables such as the experimental condition in which the raters participated, their professional background and their level of knowledge about human trafficking. It is important to note that the IHTC produces two types of outcomes: a dichotomous diagnostic outcome (i.e., human trafficking, or not human trafficking) and a continuous outcome, which represents the level of human trafficking exploitation excerpted from an individual based on their existing vulnerabilities. Due to the nature of the data, a logistic regression, as well as descriptive statistics were utilized to analyze the dichotomous data. Independent samples $t$-tests were conducted on the continuous score obtained from the instrument.

**Impact of independent variables on the IHTC dichotomous results.** A Direct logistic regression was performed to assess the impact of a number of factors (i.e., vignette, experimental condition, professional background, knowledge of human trafficking) on the likelihood of participants to accurately identify cases of human trafficking. However, due to the lack of variability in the sample in vignettes one and two and the limited variability in vignette three, the analysis was inconclusive. Descriptive information regarding frequency distributions of the data can be found in Table 5.4.
Impact of experimental condition on the continuous score of the IHTC. In order to assess whether there were differences in assessment of human trafficking based on the experimental condition, the raters participated in (i.e., with or without training) a set of three independent samples $t$-tests were conducted. These analyses were performed because the instrument provides a continuous score of experienced human trafficking that cannot be examined through the logistic regression analysis. For vignette one, there were no significant differences in scores for raters participating in the condition with training $M$=51.77, $SD$=11.70 when compared to raters in the condition without training $M$ = 50.09, $SD$ = 10.48; $t$ (158) = 0.82, $p$ = .413. The magnitude of mean differences = 1.68, 95%; CI: -2.36 to 5.71, was very small, Cohen’s $d$= 0.15. The results revealed a statistically significant increase in IHTC scores on the second vignette for raters that participated in the condition with training, $M$=62.81, $SD$=8.74, than the condition without training, $M$=57.8, $SD$=9.94; $t$ (156)= 3.05, $p$=0.03 (two tailed). The magnitude of mean differences = 5.01, 95%; CI: 1.76 to 8.26 was medium, Cohen’s $d$= 0.54. It is noteworthy, that the second vignette described a more complex case of human trafficking. The analysis for vignette three showed no significant differences in scores for raters participating in the condition with training $M$=2.09, $SD$=8.84 when compared to raters in the condition without training $M$ = 1.06, $SD$ = 6.68; $t$ (158) = 0.70, $p$ = 0.48. The magnitude of mean differences = 1.38, 95%; CI: -1.86 to 3.91 was very small, Cohen’s $d$=0.13. See Tables 5.5. for a full review of this analysis for all vignettes.

**Analysis of covariance among independent variables.** Three separate 2 X 2 between-groups analysis of covariance were conducted to compare the effectiveness of two different experimental conditions (with training or without training) in identifying
human trafficking for professionals with a criminal justice or human services backgrounds. Knowledge was the covariate evaluated. The dependent variable was the total human trafficking score as measured by the IHTC for each vignette, the independent variables consisted of the experimental condition, the rater’s professional background and the scores on human trafficking knowledge as measured by the human trafficking knowledge questionnaire, which was administered prior to the participants completing the protocols. This score was utilized as a covariate in this analysis.

Preliminary checks were conducted to ensure that there was no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, homogeneity of regression slopes, and reliable measurement of the covariate. After adjusting for total IHTC scores for vignettes one, two and three, there were no significant interaction between effects $F (1, 151) = .293, p = .589 > .001$, $F (1, 150) = .021, p = .88$, and $F (1, 148) = 1.07, p = .303$, respectively. These results suggest that persons with a law enforcement or human services background do not respond differently based on the conditions in which they were placed. For vignette one there was a statistically significant main effect between knowledge and the total score of the IHTCL $F (1, 151) = 13.72, p < .001$. However, the effect size, partial eta squared value of .083 is considered a small effect size. There was also a statistically significant main effect for vignette two $F (1, 151) = 7.637, p < .01$. However the value for the effect size, partial eta squared = .048 is considered small. There were no statistically significant findings for vignette three. For a review of with and without training condition means of vignette one, two and three as a function of professional background see Figures 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3. For a review of the analysis of covariance of IHTC scores table as a function of experimental condition and professional background
with prior knowledge about human trafficking as a covariate for vignettes one, two and three see Tables 5.7 through 5.9.

**Vulnerability and Exploitation Subscales**

One of the main hypotheses of this measurement model is that the level of experienced human trafficking stems from an interaction between an individual’s personal and social vulnerabilities and the exploitation exerted by the trafficker from these vulnerabilities. Therefore, the instrument calculates the level of experienced human trafficking by looking for instances of exploitation (force, fraud and coercion) in six subscales: the general subscales, which applies to all persons and addresses issues of personal vulnerabilities, and five subscales which address issues of socially imposed vulnerabilities (i.e., work/profession, immigration, disability, sexual orientation, and socio economic status). In order to assess if there were differences across vignettes in identification of expressions of exploitation in persons belonging to different personal and social vulnerabilities across vignettes and across experimental conditions (i.e., with or without training), a one-way between groups multivariate analysis of variance was performed. In addition to the evaluation of distribution differences in the sample, Pearson product moment correlation matrices were utilized to examine if these subscales reflect the unique types of exploitation used against victims’ specific identity related vulnerabilities characterized in each vignette, and if the identification of these vulnerabilities was associated with the experimental condition raters participated in, their professional affiliation (i.e., human services or criminal justice), and their level of prior human trafficking knowledge.
The first vignette described the human trafficking experience of a man whose social identities included being male, immigrant from Central America, who is employed selling trinkets in the subway, having a physical disability, and experiencing poverty. Therefore, we expected raters to consider issues of vulnerability included in the general, work profession, immigration, and socio economic status subscales. The second vignette describes a 16-year-old African American female, who is a run-away youth, with a family background of negligence and violence, who has developed a drug addiction, and works in the sex industry, who is exploring her lesbian sexual identity, and who lives in poverty. Therefore, we expected rater endorsements to be represented in the general, work profession, sexual orientation, and socioeconomic subscales. It is noteworthy that the general subscale addresses issues related to race, history of violence and negligence and the SES subscale addresses issues related to run away status and youth homelessness. The third vignette describes a heterosexual woman who works, but experiences economic control by her husband, domestic violence as well as low socio economic status. Therefore, we expected endorsements in the general, work profession and SES subscales. It is important to note that while there were endorsements on these subscales, the case did not meet the requirements to be considered a human trafficking case.

Analysis of vulnerability subscales. A one-way between groups multivariate analysis of variance was performed to assess if there were differences across vignettes in identification of expressions of human trafficking in persons belonging to different marginalized statuses. The six subscales of the IHTC (i.e., general, work/profession, immigration, disability, sexual orientation and socio economic status) were used as dependent variables; the independent variable was the vignettes. Preliminary assumption
testing was conducted to check for normality, linearity, univariate and multivariate outliers, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, and multicollinearity. The data violated the assumption of homogeneity of variance increasing possibilities for type I errors. In order to correct for this, the statistical level of significance was set at .01 as opposed to the conventional .05. There was a statistically significant difference among vignettes one, two and three on the combined dependent variables. $F(6, 472) = 835.866, p = .000$ Wilks’ = .007. Each vignette represented a victim with different identity related vulnerabilities and different experiences of exploitation. The statistical significant differences captured in the analysis suggest that raters were able to appreciate these differences across vignettes.

When the results of the dependent variables were considered separately, there were statistically significant differences among vignettes for the general subscale $F(2,472) = 856.95, p = .000$, partial $\eta^2 = .785$, with vignette one, two and three having mean scores of 43.12, 61.49 and 22.74 respectively. Given that the case described in vignette two was a more complex case of human trafficking with a higher level of incidents of exploitation, these results appear to capture the intensity of exploitation for each vignette. The immigration subscale also showed statistically significant differences $F(2,472) = 953.57, p = .000$, partial $\eta^2 = .803$, with mean scores of 47.98 for vignette one, 0.73 for vignette two and .00 for vignette three. Vignette one described a case of a foreign national and vignette two described a case of a victim with Puerto Rican descent, vignette three was a US national and not a case of human trafficking. The findings under the immigration subscale reflect the descriptions given in the vignettes. Similarly the disability scale showed statistically significant differences $F(2,472) = 733.90, p = .000$,
partial $\eta^2 = .758$, with mean scores of 52.43, 5.03, and .00 for vignettes one two and three respectively. Given that vignette one had clear evidence of disability related exploitation and vignette two evidence of drug addiction, which some mental health practitioners conceptualize as a disability, the results seem to mirror the experiences of disability related exploitation described in the vignettes. In addition, the sexual orientation subscale $F(2,472) = 2988.46, p = .000$, partial $\eta^2 = .927$, with mean scores of 0.43, 88.39 and 0.00 for vignettes one, two and three respectively. Vignette two had clear evidence of sexual orientation related exploitation, therefore the results seem to capture the description of the vignettes. Finally, there was also a statistically significant difference in the economic status subscale $F(2,472) = 922.54, p = .000$, partial $\eta^2 = .797$ with mean scores of 60.71, 50.97 and .0062 for vignettes one, two and three, respectively. Vignette one had clear evidence of socioeconomic status related exploitation, and vignette two had suggestive evidence of socioeconomic status related exploitation, and vignette three was not a case of human trafficking. The statistically significant difference appears to reflect the descriptions given in the vignettes. See means and standard deviations of vulnerability subscales in Table 5.10.

**Exploitation subscale correlations.** The relationships among force, fraud, and coercion scores as measured by the IHTC exploitation subscales were explored across the three vignettes using Pearson product moment correlation coefficients. The purpose of this analysis was to explore the direction and magnitude of association between these variables in order to determine if indeed raters were able to identify styles of exploitation within different exploitation categories relevant to the victims described in each vignette. Find the means and standard deviations of exploitation subscales in Table 5.11.
**Force.** The relationships among scores in the force subscale of the IHTC across the three vignettes were explored using a Pearson product moment correlation coefficient and reported in a correlation matrix. There were also statistically significant associations between the scores on the force subscale between vignettes one and two, \( r = .569, p < .001 \), and vignette one and three, \( r = .210, p < .01 \). These results suggest that the three vignettes shared elements of force. See Table 5.12 for a full view at the correlation matrix for this subscale.

**Fraud.** A Pearson product moment correlation matrix was used to evaluate the relationships among scores in the fraud subscale of the IHTC across the three vignettes. There was a statistically significant association between vignette number one and two in the fraud subscale, \( r = .277, p < .001 \). Both of these vignettes were cases of human trafficking; therefore, theoretically they should share endorsements in this subscale. Vignette three was not a case of human trafficking; therefore, fraud was not noted in the vignette. There were no statistically significant associations between vignette one and three or two and three. See the correlation matrix for this subscale in Table 5.13.

**Coercion.** The relationships among scores in the coercion subscale of the IHTC across the three vignettes were observed using a person product moment correlation matrix. There was also a statistically significant positive correlation between the coercion scores of vignettes one and two, \( r = .191, p < .05 \). Similarly, Vignettes one two and three showed a statistically significant positive correlation, \( r = .242, p < .01 \). This means that raters identified coercive actions across the three vignettes. See the full correlation matrix in Table 5.14.
Clinical Utility

A one-way, between groups analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the impact of participating in one of the three experimental conditions (i.e., business as usual, the use of IHTC without training, and the use of the IHTC with training) on the perceived utility of the RR instrument compared to the IHTC. There was a statistically significant difference at the $p < .05$ level in utility scores for the three groups: $F(2,188)=40.62$ $p =.003$. The actual difference in mean scores between the groups was large. $\eta^2 = .34$. Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated the mean score for group IHTC without training ($M= 4.03, SD=.72$) was significantly larger than the business as usual condition ($M=3.02, SD=.92$). Similarly, the group mean utility score for the IHTC group with training ($M= 4.307, SD=.63$) was significantly larger than the business as usual condition. There were no significant differences in mean scores between groups that utilized the IHTC with or without training. See Tables 5.15 and 5.16 to find descriptive statistical data as well as the multiple comparisons as well as Figure 5.4 for a view of the clinical utility mean plot.
Table 5.1

Specificity and Sensitivity across Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Sensitivity and Specificity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>True positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Training IHTC, n=350</td>
<td>n=234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>True Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Training IHTC, n=130</td>
<td>n=82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>True Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined with and without training IHTC, n=473</td>
<td>n=317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>True Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business as usual RR, n=112</td>
<td>n=46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>True Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.2

*Kappa Measure of Agreement for the IHTC in Two Conditions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure of Agreement</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Asymp. Std. Error(^a)</th>
<th>Approx. T(^b)</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kappa</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>20.115</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.3

*Kappa Measure of Agreement Business as Usual Condition*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure of Agreement</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Asymp. Std. Error</th>
<th>Approx. T</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kappa</td>
<td>.534</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>6.330</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.4

*Frequency Distributions for Correct Classification of Human Trafficking the of the IHTC*

**Dichotomous Results**

**Frequency Table Vignette # 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Without Training</th>
<th>With Training</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>Correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Frequency Table Vignette # 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Without Training</th>
<th>With Training</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>Correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Frequency Vignette # 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Without Training</th>
<th>With Training</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>Correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.5

Group Differences for IHTC Scores between Groups With or Without Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vignettes</th>
<th>M With Training</th>
<th>SD With Training</th>
<th>M Without Training</th>
<th>SD Without Training</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Cohen’s D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>51.77</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>50.09</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>62.81</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>57.80</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. p = 0.01 level of statistical significance*
Table 5.6

With and Without Training Mean Scores and Standard Deviations as a Function of Professional Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vignette 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With Training</td>
<td>With Training</td>
<td>Without Training</td>
<td>Without Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human services</td>
<td>52.33</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>49.85</td>
<td>10.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>52.33</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>50.51</td>
<td>9.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With Training</td>
<td>With Training</td>
<td>Without Training</td>
<td>Without Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human services</td>
<td>62.85</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>57.55</td>
<td>10.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>63.52</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>57.27</td>
<td>9.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With Training</td>
<td>With Training</td>
<td>Without Training</td>
<td>Without Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human services</td>
<td>25.09</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>22.20</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>25.36</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>25.48</td>
<td>9.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.7

Analysis of Covariance of IHTC Scores as a Function of Experimental Condition and Professional Background with Prior Knowledge about Human Trafficking as a Covariate for Vignette 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>1415.372&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>353.843</td>
<td>3.944</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>43318.181</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43318.181</td>
<td>482.845</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>1231.203</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1231.203</td>
<td>13.724</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>54.275</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54.275</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition * Profession</td>
<td>26.254</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.254</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>13546.876</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>89.714</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>433211.162</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>14962.249</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. α = 0.01 level of statistical significance
Table 5.8

Analysis of Covariance of IHTC Scores as a Function of Experimental Condition and Professional Background with Prior Knowledge about Human Trafficking as a Covariate for Vignette 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>1001.306a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>250.326</td>
<td>3.027</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>74056.550</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74056.550</td>
<td>895.520</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>81.708</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81.708</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>631.555</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>631.555</td>
<td>7.637</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition * Profession</td>
<td>1.756</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.756</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.884</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>12404.511</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>82.697</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>601665.765</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>13405.817</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. α = 0.01 level of statistical significance
Table 5.9

Analysis of Covariance of IHTC Scores as a Function of Experimental Condition and Professional Background with Prior Knowledge about Human Trafficking as a Covariate for Vignette 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. α</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>316.941*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>79.235</td>
<td>1.482</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>10915.189</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10915.189</td>
<td>204.103</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>94.955</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94.955</td>
<td>1.776</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>29.661</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.661</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>37.823</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37.823</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition * Profession</td>
<td>57.021</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57.021</td>
<td>1.066</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>7914.872</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>53.479</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100710.059</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>8231.813</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. α = 0.01 level of statistical significance
Table 5.10

**Descriptive Statistics of Vulnerability Subscales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Vignette 1</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 1</td>
<td>Vignette 1</td>
<td>43.1213</td>
<td>8.05604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vignette 2</td>
<td>61.4888</td>
<td>9.44135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vignette 3</td>
<td>22.7425</td>
<td>7.37809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vignette 1</td>
<td>56.3187</td>
<td>14.89400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 2</td>
<td>Vignette 2</td>
<td>56.8664</td>
<td>14.51312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vignette 3</td>
<td>3.1943</td>
<td>6.77163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vignette 1</td>
<td>47.9853</td>
<td>19.12838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 2</td>
<td>Vignette 2</td>
<td>.7373</td>
<td>3.17088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vignette 3</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vignette 1</td>
<td>52.4359</td>
<td>19.97973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 2</td>
<td>Vignette 2</td>
<td>5.0323</td>
<td>11.97260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vignette 3</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vignette 1</td>
<td>.4274</td>
<td>3.76206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 2</td>
<td>Vignette 2</td>
<td>88.3871</td>
<td>19.95433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vignette 3</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vignette 1</td>
<td>60.7143</td>
<td>16.43909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.11

Exploitation Subscale Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ForceV1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Training</td>
<td>59.6748</td>
<td>11.92115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Training</td>
<td>63.2778</td>
<td>13.77411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FraudV1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Training</td>
<td>81.4634</td>
<td>20.31760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Training</td>
<td>80.0000</td>
<td>20.94410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoercionV1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Training</td>
<td>36.9512</td>
<td>10.59941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Training</td>
<td>39.4583</td>
<td>13.46948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ForceV2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Training</td>
<td>284.2402</td>
<td>81.53395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Training</td>
<td>303.5256</td>
<td>103.61136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FraudV2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Training</td>
<td>42.7938</td>
<td>14.83294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Training</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
<td>15.04675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoercionV2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Training</td>
<td>66.6239</td>
<td>16.45988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Training</td>
<td>70.7456</td>
<td>14.43869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ForceV3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Training</td>
<td>29.2683</td>
<td>13.11302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Training</td>
<td>31.5000</td>
<td>13.19855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FraudV3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Training</td>
<td>.3049</td>
<td>1.95217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Training</td>
<td>.9375</td>
<td>4.02281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoercionV3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Training</td>
<td>22.5610</td>
<td>8.98376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Training</td>
<td>26.1111</td>
<td>9.95633</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.12

*Force Subscale Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vignette 1</th>
<th>Vignette 2</th>
<th>Vignette 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.569**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>.569**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>.210**</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* **Coefficients are significant at $\alpha < .01$ level of significance*
Table 5.13

*Fraud Subscale Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Vignette 1</th>
<th>Vignette 2</th>
<th>Vignette 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 1</td>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.277**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 2</td>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>.277**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 3</td>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* **Coefficients are significant at $\alpha < .01$ level of significance*
Table 5.14

Coercion Subscale Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Vignette 1</th>
<th>Vignette 2</th>
<th>Vignette 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.191*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>.191*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Coefficients are significant at $\alpha < .05$ level of significance.
Table 5.15

Clinical Utility Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Mean</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without training</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.0375</td>
<td>.72451</td>
<td>.11455</td>
<td>3.8058</td>
<td>.11455</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2692</td>
<td>.2530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With training</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4.3807</td>
<td>.63998</td>
<td>.05994</td>
<td>4.2620</td>
<td>.05994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4995</td>
<td>.05994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business as usual</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.0288</td>
<td>.92373</td>
<td>.15186</td>
<td>2.7208</td>
<td>.15186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3368</td>
<td>.15186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>4.0469</td>
<td>.88415</td>
<td>.06397</td>
<td>3.9208</td>
<td>.06397</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1731</td>
<td>.06397</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.16

Clinical Utility Multiple Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Condition</th>
<th>(J) Condition</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Without training</td>
<td>With training</td>
<td>-.34320*</td>
<td>.13232</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-.6558</td>
<td>-.0306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business as usual</td>
<td>1.00867*</td>
<td>.16424</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.6207</td>
<td>1.3967</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Without training</td>
<td>.34320*</td>
<td>.13232</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.0306</td>
<td>.6558</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With training</td>
<td>Business as usual</td>
<td>1.35187*</td>
<td>.13624</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.0300</td>
<td>1.6737</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business as usual</td>
<td>Without training</td>
<td>-1.00867*</td>
<td>.16424</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-1.3967</td>
<td>-.6207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With training</td>
<td>-1.35187*</td>
<td>.13624</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-1.6737</td>
<td>-1.0300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Sig. = 0.05 level of statistical significance
Figure 5.1  Estimated marginal means Vignette 1

Figure X. Estimated marginal means Vignette 1. Covariates appearing in the model were evaluated at the following values: Knowledge= 2.14
Figure 5.2 Estimate marginal means Vignette 2.

Figure X. Estimated marginal means Vignette 2. Covariates appearing in the model were evaluated at the following values: Knowledge= 2.1484
Figure 5.3 Estimate marginal means Vignette 3.

Figure X. Estimated marginal means Vignette 2. Covariates appearing in the model were evaluated at the following values: Knowledge = 2.14
Figure 5.4 Utility mean plot across conditions.

Figure X. Description of participants perceived usefulness of the instrument across the three conditions on a scale of zero to five.
Chapter Six: Discussion

Identification of victims of human trafficking and consequential service provision is characterized by a significant disconnection between the estimated prevalence of this issue and the number of cases identified (Schich, Goyen, & Mallozzi, 2014). Hence, developing screening methodologies that are theoretically grounded and that demonstrate evidence-based substantiation is a crucial goal in the progress of anti human trafficking scholarship. The goal of this dissertation was to evaluate the appropriateness of the Inclusive Human trafficking checklist (IHTC) as a theoretically grounded methodology that screens for the presence of human trafficking in a person’s life, to compare its performance with traditional forms of human trafficking assessment, to evaluate its performance when considering other factors such as prior human trafficking knowledge, professional background and training, and to assess its usefulness as perceived by potential users.

This study attained the primary goal by demonstrating statistically significant higher levels of rater accuracy and agreement when comparing their IHTC assessment scores to an external criterion, which was the expert raters’ categorization of three vignettes, two of which were cases of human trafficking and one of which was a case of domestic violence. This suggests that the instrument can be accurately and reliably utilized in the assessment of human trafficking.

When comparing the performance of the IHTC with traditional forms of human trafficking assessment such as the Rescue and Restore (RR) basic screening tool, the instrument increased accurate identification by 40% as evidenced by the obtained Kappa measure of agreement, which in this case, was used to assess the level of agreement.
between the results of IHTC and the RR when compared with the expert rater categorization of the vignettes. This suggests that utilizing the IHTC in the assessment of cases can potentially improve appropriate identification. When looking at the performance of the instrument in the experimental conditions with or without training it was noted that training tends to increase specificity by reducing the potential for a type I error, or identification of false positives. However, both condition with and without training maintained significant levels of sensitivity meaning that they were able to accurately identify cases of human trafficking. In addition, the results did not show significant differences in identification of cases when considering professional background, or level of knowledge suggesting that professional with human services and criminal justice backgrounds come to similar conclusions regarding cases when utilizing the IHTC. Finally, the results reveled a statistically significant level of perceived usefulness. This suggest that the raters perceived the instrument as helpful in terms of ease of use of the instrument, conceptualizing human trafficking as the presenting problem, formulating interventions, and communicating the presence of human trafficking with clients and other professionals.

When looking at internal construction, the instrument was organized taking into consideration the nuanced ways in which identity vulnerabilities influences the type of exploitation that a victim might endure. Therefore, six identity vulnerability subscales were outlined. The hypothesis is that by using the instrument, raters would be equipped to distinguish identity-based exploitation and record it in the vulnerability subscales as a response to the analysis of three vignettes. Vignette one described an immigrant man with physical disabilities, and who experienced poverty. The second vignette described an
African American youth, who had a marginalized work status by being involved in the sex industry, who endorsed a sexual minority status, and who experienced poverty. Vignette three was a case of domestic violence of a woman whose race is not indicated and middle class as her socio economic status. Hence, vignette 1 and 2 and 3 did not overlap on identity categories such as immigration, sexual orientation, and disability. The results showed statistically significant differences among vignettes one, two and three on the combined dependent variables for each subscale. The statistically significant differences captured in the analysis suggest that raters were able to appreciate these differences across vignettes. For instance, the immigration subscale showed statistically significant differences for vignette one, two and vignette three with mean scores of 47.98, 0.73 and .00 for vignettes one, two and three. Vignette one described a case of a foreign national and vignette two described a case of an African American victim, vignette three was a US national and not a case of human trafficking. The findings under the immigration subscale reflect the descriptions given in the vignettes. Similarly the disability subscale showed statistically significant differences with vignette with mean scores of 52.43, 5.03, and .00 for vignettes one, two and three, respectively. Given that vignette one had clear evidence of disability related exploitation and vignette two evidence of drug addiction, which some practitioners conceptualize as a disability, the results seem to mirror the experiences of disability related exploitation described in the vignettes. In addition, the sexual orientation subscale showed statistically significant results with means of 0.43, 88.39 and .00 for vignettes one, two and three respectively. Vignette number two had clear evidence of sexual orientation related exploitation, therefore the results seem to capture the description of the vignettes. Finally, there was
also a statistically significant difference in the economic status subscales with mean scores of 60.71, 50.97 and .0062 for vignettes one, two and three respectively. Vignette one had clear evidence of socioeconomic status related exploitation and vignette two had suggestive evidence of socioeconomic status related exploitation, vignette three was not a case of human trafficking. The statistically significant difference appears to reflect the descriptions given in the vignettes. Since the vulnerability subscales are conceptually different, meaning that they measure different types of identity-based exploitation (i.e., personal identity vulnerabilities, type of work or profession, gender, age, immigration, disability, sexual orientation and socioeconomic status), the results suggest appropriate discriminant and convergent validity, which in turn supports the construct validity of the instrument.

Similarly, the force and coercion subscales correlated highly between vignettes one and two and three. Both human trafficking and domestic violence cases can have elements of force and coercion. However, cases of human trafficking have distinctive elements of fraud given that the context in which trafficking takes place in the labor market. When interacting in the labor market, there is a national and international threshold of civil protections established for workers such as having limits to the number of hours spent at work each day, obtaining at least minimum wage, antidiscrimination policies, and protection of minor workers. Any activity below that established threshold of civil protection is inherently fraudulent even if the individual enters the labor arrangement consciously or unconsciously. The IHTC was conceptualized taking into account this distinction. The results support the theoretical suggestion that trafficking is inherently a fraudulent activity hence differentiating it from other types of power-based
crimes. When looking at the exploitation subscales the results revealed a statistically
significant association between vignette number one and two in the fraud subscale, \( r = .277, p < .01 \). Both of these vignettes were cases of human trafficking; therefore,
theoretically they should share endorsements in this subscale. Vignette three was a case of domestic violence. The vignette depicted elements of interpersonal deception. For instance, at the beginning of vignette, the perpetrator is depicted as a fair and interesting person and at the end he is depicted as a controlling and abusive man. However, these interactions happened in the context of an interpersonal relationship in which the victim was not interacting with the perpetrator in matters that involved work, labor, or services. Therefore, fraud as conceptualized by the IHTC was not noted in the vignette. There were no statistically significant associations between vignette one and three or two and three under the fraud subscale. In fact, these correlations were approaching the zero result with a correlation of .059 between vignettes one and three and .026 between vignettes two and three.

**Predicting Human Trafficking**

The Inclusive Human Trafficking methodology was created as a response to theoretical gaps in the study of this phenomenon that have prevented the development of screening methodologies at local levels (Bales, 2007; Logan, Walker, & Hunt, 2009; Reid, 2012). The literature on this topic consistently identifies issues that make people, communities and societies vulnerable to human trafficking. For instance, Bales (2007) identifies government corruption, young populations, food production, population pressure and conflict, and social unrest as factors that increase likelihood of human trafficking in a given country. Theorist such as Reid (2012) proposes a life course
perspective model of understanding sex trafficking in which victimization is understood as a harmful social control processes based on victim’s vulnerabilities such as victim’s origin, gender, need for love and acceptance, limited social capital, as well as citizenship status, language or cultural barriers for foreign nationals. Many other theorists look at victim vulnerability as predictors of potential trafficking. For instance, Ray (2008) looks at structural factors that create vulnerability identifying family poverty, low level of education, child marriage, domestic violence, marital breakdown/widowhood and social stigmatization as prevalent across human trafficking cases. Theorists who investigate human trafficking dynamics in particular populations such as LBTQ groups point out the role of social marginalization in the process of human trafficking victimization (Dorias, 2005; Dorias and Corriveau, 2009; Estes et al. 2005; Saewyc et al., 2008).

Most of the studies on human trafficking focus either on environmental drivers that sustain the existence of human trafficking or on victim’s vulnerability to being trafficked. While there is much value in understanding these dynamics, the interaction between the exploiter and the victim is often ignored, leaving an important gap in the understanding of human trafficking. One of the theoretical contributions the IHTC makes, is introducing the idea that human trafficking is a complex collection of events of exploitative nature that subjugate a human being by virtue of the systematic abuse of their identity based vulnerabilities. The expression of exploitation varies according to the saliency and potential for capitalization of a given vulnerability. For instance, the interaction between vulnerability and exploitation is the theoretical factor that explains the experience of a homosexually identified youth who is coerced into engaging in a sexualized industry following a threat of being “outed to their parents if they don’t
comply”, or the undocumented immigrant who acquiesces to labor without remuneration after being threatened with immigration. In both cases, an identity-based vulnerability becomes salient to both the perpetrator and the victim because it is supported by common experiences of persons with similar identities in the victims’ social environment. This gives the perpetrator a sense of advantage over the victim, gives the victim a reasonable assessment of potential harm, and a good reason for acquiescing to the traffickers demands. Both of these examples are nuanced forms of force typical in the exploitation of sexual minorities as well as the exploitation of immigrants. From this perspective, human trafficking is a phenomenon that capitalizes on existing societal biases against persons with particular identity-based vulnerabilities. It is noteworthy that these forms of force are psychological assessments of specific sociological conditions that the perpetrator and the victim make at any given time. Breaking apart these interactions require a complex understanding of the environment in which the trafficking event is taking place, as well as an acute sensitivity on the rater’s part to issues of psychological subordination and oppression. The IHTC is hence, an instrument conceptualized to document these types of interactions as reported by the current literature. Exploitation in the form of force, fraud and coercion is explored in six subscales: the general subscales, which applies to all persons and addresses issues of personal vulnerabilities, and five subscales which address issues of socially imposed vulnerabilities (i.e., work/profession, immigration, disability, sexual orientation, and socio economic status). The findings, which revealed increased sensitivity on the raters part to issues of identity-based exploitation are discussed in light of the literature of identity intersectionality theory.

The classical theory of identity intersectionality proposed by Crenshaw (1989)
acknowledges the societal tendency to catalog people in specific categories such as
gender, race, class, ability, sexual orientation and it suggests that these categories become
axes of identity that interact in multiple and simultaneous levels, hence reinforcing
systematic injustice. Systemic injustice does not happen just by virtue of people
belonging to a particular identity category but rather by virtue of societal systems of
oppression such as racism, sexism, classism, ableism and homophobia, which subordinate
people in these identity categories to having less access to valuable societal resources.
These systems of oppression also interact with one another at different levels.

Other theorists suggest that the individual perception of one’s identity
intersections is biased by the overall societal assessment of such person’s worthiness.
From this perspective, when exploitation is imposed over a given individual member of
intersecting subordinate groups it is likely that the individual accepts such oppression as
what is normative or expected in a given society. Likewise, when a given social
organization supports oppressive practices, its members tend to excuse behaviors that are
congruent with the perception of worthlessness of a given individual based on the
intersection of their subordinated identity categories (McCall, 2005). Human trafficking
represents an extreme version of these social dynamics. For instance, one of the most
astonishing issues regarding human trafficking victims is that in spite of suffering
significant trauma and exploitation by the hands of a third party, they often do not self-
identify as victims (Saewyc et al., 2008). In the same regard, typically perpetrators do
not perceive their actions as inflictions upon someone’s liberties. It is well documented
that in cases of domestic servitude in which victims have been brought from other
countries, the perpetrators often perceive that instead of victimizing a person they are
improving their quality of life (National Human Trafficking Resource Center, 2013b).

The Inclusive Human Trafficking Model introduces a methodology to evaluate the dialectic tension that exists between someone’s intersecting identity-based vulnerabilities and the level of exploitation excerpted from these vulnerabilities. The formula utilized to quantify the events that produced a complex experience of human trafficking account not only for the persons propensity to being trafficked or their intersecting vulnerabilities but also the intersecting exploitative actions imposed by a third party in order to subordinate that person’s civil liberties for personal gain. The results of the study suggest that by virtue of utilizing the instrument raters were able to appreciate notions of identity based oppression that are often ignored when analyzing cases. For instance, the first vignette described the human trafficking experience of a man whose social identities included being male, immigrant from Central America, who is employed selling trinkets in the subway, having a physical disability, and experiencing poverty. Raters demonstrated an ability to consider issues of vulnerability and exploitation included in the general, work profession, immigration, and socio economic status subscales. The second vignette describes a 16-year-old African American female, who is a runaway youth, with a family background of negligence and violence, who has developed a drug addiction, and works in the sex industry, who is exploring her lesbian sexual identity, and who lives in poverty. Similarly, raters were able to identify issues of vulnerability and exploitation as evidenced by their endorsements in the general, sexual orientation, and socioeconomic subscales. It is noteworthy that the general subscale addresses issues related to race, history of violence and negligence and the SES subscale addresses issues related to runaway status and youth homelessness. In regards to the third
case, raters were able to distinguish that while there were vulnerabilities the style of exploitation was not congruent with the human trafficking definition with only eight raters out of 199 identifying a false positive.

The importance of this finding is highlighted by the fact that the nuanced way in which subordinate groups are exploited by means of micro aggression, psychological coercion, domination, and violence is often invisible to the eyes of privileged groups (Goodman, 2001). Professionals operating in criminal and human services settings such as police departments, attorneys' offices, child protective organizations, customs enforcement agencies, and mental health clinics typically make the assessment of who qualifies as a victim. The interaction between professional and victim is inherently power based giving the professional a great deal of privilege in making substantial decisions about the victim’s experience. For instance, a study conducted by Gozdziak (2010) describes how child victims of human trafficking who are apprehended by U.S Customs and Border Protection officers are often not identified as victims even though they have been screened for human trafficking in accordance to the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 and 2013. It has also been highly reported that persons entrapped in human trafficking settings tend to belong to subordinate groups (Clawson et al., 2009; Cobbina & Oselin, 2011; Curtis et al., 2008; Dorias, 2005; Dorias & Corriveau, 2009; Estes et al., 2005; Kramer & Berg, 2003; Saewyc et al., 2008). This suggests that without a contextual framework to analyze issues of vulnerability and exploitation, it is very possible that human trafficking experiences would remain invisible to professionals, institutions, and the public. The IHTC provides practitioners with a framework by which to understand and dissect subordinate identity based exploitation.
The raters who participated in this study demonstrated an ability to identify elements of trafficking for subordinate populations. This suggests that the IHTC can be helpful in closing the gap between practitioners and victims.

**Training**

Training of human trafficking has been identified as a significant goal in the Federal Strategic Action Plan on Services for Victims of Human Trafficking in the United States 2013-2017 (U.S. Department of State, 2014). Since the drafting of the Trafficking in Persons Prevention Act in the year 2000 all 50 states and the District of Columbia have criminalized human trafficking and 29 states have legislative provisions that either encourage or mandate human trafficking training for first responders. However, the mandates on training vary greatly from state to state in terms of funding allocation, type of professionals considered as first responders and focus of training (Polaris Project, 2014b). For instance, most states encourage training of law enforcement officers, whoever these training are not often expanded to those who may serve victims such as mental health professionals or those who prosecute trafficking cases. Given the different legislative mandates regarding training, an important goal of this dissertation was to investigate the performance of the screening instrument in two experimental conditions (i.e., with and without training). The rationale behind this goal was to expand opportunities for reliable victim identification to first responders, social service providers, mental health professionals, crime investigators, and prosecutors of trafficking cases should opportunities for training not be available.

The IHTC provides two types of output, a dichotomous score which basically categorizes cases into human trafficking or not human trafficking cases as well as a
continues variable which quantifies the level of human trafficking exploitation excerpted from a person’s identity based vulnerabilities, therefore, the results of both types of outcomes were evaluated in the experimental conditions with and without training. The results of the dichotomous outcome revealed that the IHTC performed equally well in terms of its sensitivity or the ability of the instrument to categorize actual positives that are correctly identified. However, the condition with training improved the performance of the instrument in terms of its specificity, or proportion of negatives that are correctly identified from 85% to 99%. Should the instrument be applied without training there would be higher possibilities of obtaining type I errors or obtaining false positives. In terms of the continuous output of the IHTC, the results revealed that there were no statistical differences between the conditions with and without training for vignette one and three. There was a statistical significant increase in IHTC scores on the second vignette for raters that participated in the condition with training, resulting in a medium effect size. The results of the condition with training for the continuous variable suggest that raters in this condition demonstrated higher sensitivity to issues of intersectionality of vulnerable identities and were able to identify more forms of exploitation on the second vignette than those in the condition without training. It is noteworthy that the second vignette described a more complex case of human trafficking. The results of the continuous variable suggest that while using the instrument delivers appropriate identification and facilitates raters’ appraisal of issues of vulnerability-based exploitation, training does increase the ability of rater’s to be sensitive to this kind of exploitation.
Clinical Utility

When discussing the ethics of assessment development and implementation, Bersoff (2008) asks two important questions. First, does the test measure its intended purpose and produces consistent results? Second, should the test be used for its intended purpose in the intended way? He then reflects upon these questions and concludes that the first question can be addressed by traditional validity and reliability measures. The second, however, is an ethical question. The answer requires a careful justification and analysis of potential social, professional, and personal consequences. Solving the issue of reliability and validity for the first question might not be a satisfactory way to answer the second question. Clinical utility is a novel psychometric parameter that might be closer in solving Bersoff’s second question.

Utility is a term ubiquitously used in many fields as a synonym for usefulness. Therefore, demonstrating utility for a given measure suggests that the measure is useful in actual practice (Lesko, Zineh, & Huang, 2010). Beyond usefulness, utility is often associated with notions of worthiness and benefit (Smart, 2006). Worthiness denotes an intervention’s degree of importance in determining further decisions, and benefit denotes the degree to which an intervention promotes well-being. It is noteworthy that usefulness, worthiness, and benefit are all aspects of ethical clinical behavior (Bersoff, 2008). Hence, clinical utility might just be an ethical “thermometer” when making decisions about the introduction of a new intervention into clinical practice.

Human trafficking is a crime that infringes on any notion of ethical practice in which a person has been systematically denied real opportunity for fundamental humanity. Therefore, any intervention imposed on a victim should ensure not only
appropriate psychometric construction, but most importantly appropriate ethical construction. Human trafficking is both a criminal and a traumatic experience, therefore instrumentation designed for identification of victims should provide opportunities for humanity restoration in legal, health, and mental health aspects of functioning. Hence, the demonstrated utility of the IHTC should be multi systemic in nature.

The model of utility utilized in this dissertation hoped to capture potential users perception of the instruments usefulness, worthiness, and benefit to the client. The utility of the IHTC was measured utilizing a model proposed by First (2004) which evaluates: (a) the instrument’s value in communicating among practitioners, patients, families, attorneys, administrators and stake holders; (b) the instrument’s implementation characteristics in clinical practice, including its goodness of fit, its ease of use, and feasibility; and (c) its usefulness in case conceptualization, intervention selection, and clinical or management decision making. The instrument’s utility was observed across the three experimental conditions in which included participants with human services and criminal justice backgrounds. The results revealed a statistically significant difference in the mean score for group without training from the business as usual condition with much larger mean utility score for the group with training. Similarly, the group mean utility score for the group with training was significantly higher than the business as usual condition. This suggests that raters who utilized the IHTC perceived that the instrument had a higher level of utility than those who utilized the RR instrument in the business as usual condition.

**Implications for Practice**

Human trafficking as the modern form of slavery epitomizes the denial of
fundamental humanity. This crime trespasses the limits of what we as a universal civil society have convened as the minimum threshold of civil liberties that any individual should enjoy when entering a labor arrangement (Nussbaum & Sen, 1993). This minimum threshold of civil liberties is what we commonly call fair labor. The dialectic conceptualization of human trafficking proposed in this dissertation invites us to look at the dynamics and ultimate goal of human trafficking and compare them to those of fair labor. The goal of this comparison is to have a clear image of what we consider fair human survival and to appreciate the contrasting experiences of persons entrapped in human trafficking situations. The IHTC systematically identifies the processed by which identity based vulnerabilities were exploited. The identification of these exploited vulnerabilities represents the first step in establishing a comparison between the history of a client who experiences human trafficking, and what we consider fair labor.

In order to understand the impact of human trafficking on someone’s functioning it is pivotal to review the dialectic tension that exists between human trafficking and fair labor. Human trafficking is the systematic restriction of human capability and the polar opposite of fair labor. The point of human trafficking is to reduce an individual to a basic task. Therefore, what is important for the trafficker is not human capability but rather human vulnerability. For instance, a young girl is induced into the sex industry by means of significant psychologically and physically abuse. On the opposite end, when people work in fair environments, they obtain rewards for the expression of their human capability this rewards often come in the form of appropriate education, fair treatment, social status and remuneration. For instance, a young girl who throughout childhood demonstrates a keen ability in math and by means of substantial education and labor
opportunities with remuneration flourishes into an economist.

The IHTC only considers people that operate in exploitative labor arrangements. However, the dialectic conceptualization utilized in the development of this instrument calls for an exploration of the opposite of this, which is fair labor. The idea behind this, is that the ultimate goal of any human trafficking intervention should be to mobilize victims to experience fair environments.

In Fair labor environments support the individual’s ability to behave in ways that foster physical and psychological well-being, ways that are constructive and congruent with the genuine needs and wants of the free individual, hence giving relative access to a sense of self-determination (Deci & Ryan, 2002). On the other hand, human trafficking alters an individual’s sense of their own humanity disrupting meaningful opportunities for physical and psychological development. It is important to note that, the same individual can operate in either system. Therefore, the notable differences in functioning might due to the individual psychologically confronting different realities. For instance, when an individual is operating in a utilitarian human trafficking system his/her reality will tend to become that of an interaction between vulnerability and exploitation. Conversely, when the same person operates in a fair environment his/her reality will tend to become that of an interaction between human capability and environmental support. Hence the same individual can assume different states of being characterized by differences in developmental paths, physical and psychological functioning.

In our current labor economy, not all humans have the ability to exercise freedom, self-determination or explore inherent capabilities. In human trafficking systems, the individual is reduced to a utilitarian function that is their sexuality, ability to manufacture
or ability to labor. The expectation of what the individual is supposed to produce is not a product of self-determination, but a product of low expectations imposed by others (Bales, 2000a). Therefore, the overarching goal of any intervention for human trafficking victims should be that of mobilizing someone to transition from a utilitarian reality to a fair one.

The ability to help someone transition from a utilitarian reality to a fair one may greatly depend on access to reliable victim identification methodologies. Given the criminal and traumatic nature of human trafficking, reclaiming and restoring the life of a victim may require strong coordination and collaboration among those who serve victims and those who investigate and prosecute trafficking cases (U.S. Department of State 2014). The IHTC was designed to facilitate victim identification and service provision. The results of the current study suggest that the utilization of the IHTC can strengthen victim identification practices; hence, mobilizing opportunities for intervention across crime victim services, mental health, legal and law enforcement institutions.

**Implications for mental health professionals.** In psychology, criteria-based classifications have become part of the conceptual framework of the discipline itself. Most classifications are concerned with issues of symptomatology and diagnoses (Mullins-Sweatt & Widiger, 2006, 2009). Critics of this approach indicate that being concerned only with diagnostics could be mechanistic and reductionistic without a complete psycho-social evaluation. However, formalized etiological evaluation instruments are highly unpopular among practitioners (Bertelsen, 1999). Comprehensive clinical evaluations in cases of human trafficking should work at two separate levels: one, the initial, diagnostic level with traditional diagnostic systems followed by the
nosological level with the use of the trafficking checklist. The latest one provides practitioners with an evaluation of specific environmental experiences that might be driving and/or sustaining the symptoms and influencing course and outcome of treatment. Based on this, the IHTC should demonstrate clinical utility in allowing practitioners to obtain a more comprehensive etiological inventory of human trafficking experiences that might assist them in conceptualization, diagnosis, intervention, and reporting.

**Etiological and pathogenic inventory recommendations.** Understanding human trafficking as potentially pathogenic experience in someone’s life can be crucial in conceptualizing cases. An etiological and pathogenic conceptualization can be reached through a process of contextualization of the client’s presentation. The IHTC provides critical information that can help the clinician contextualize the symptoms, hence producing richer conceptualizations and opportunities for intervention. Processes of contextualization tend to help the victims and clinicians better understand the environment in which the symptoms evolved. Bringing up awareness to the victim about their psychological reactions to imposed overwhelming environment situations, could potentially reduce the level of guilt and shame that is often reported in human trafficking cases (Abas et al., 2013; Worrell & Remer, 2003).

In the process of conceptualization, it is important to take several factors into consideration: the social context in which the human trafficking event took place, the identity based vulnerabilities that the client may inherently hold by virtue of operating in a given social environment, the developmental process of the victim at the time of the trafficking experience as well as at the time of intervention. Three psychological theories feminist, social control, and ecological theories support this approach because they
provide an understanding of the underlying relationship between social status, processes of subordination, client resilience, as well as the impact of contextual forces on development (Abes, Jones, & McEwen, 2007; Becker, 1974; Bronfenbrenner, 1986; Farley & Kelly, 2000; Worrell & Remer, 2003). From these perspectives, awareness rising becomes pivotal in recovering from a human trafficking experience. The clinician must strive to understand the background of the person in terms of demographic categorizations, place of origin, immigration process, culture, belief and processes of acculturation as these factors apply to their individual clients.

While the clinician may initiate efforts toward appreciating the client’s background, the understanding of how the contextual framework influenced a given trafficking experience may be an elusive and extensive endeavor. For instance, clinicians might generally have understanding of how poverty can place someone at risk of experiencing human trafficking. However, not have a specific understanding of how poverty was actually used as an argument to influence someone’s psychological functioning in a situation of human trafficking. The IHTC was conceptualized under the premise that perpetrators tend to capitalize on existing patterns of oppression already existing in a given society. Utilizing already existing arguments is an effective way to make their exploitative actions credible to the victim. The IHTC can help the clinician understand how exploitation was actually expressed in a client’s history. Hence, making contextual concepts more concrete and digestible in the therapeutic process. The instrument may also assist in elucidating specific areas for intervention that may deepen the understanding of the client of his or her own reactions to a process of victimization. For instance, the social environment’s role in the sex trafficking experience of a woman
may be directly related economic environments in which women experience a great deal of economic instability. Women are more likely anywhere in the world to experience economic vulnerability due to a deficit in sustainable career option, lack of educational opportunities, unfair reductions remuneration, lack of access to credit lines, among others (Farley & Kelly, 2000). While this is the context in which a given human trafficking experience might have taken place, these concepts might be too vague in terms of understanding how they actually played a role in the human trafficking experience of an individual client. However, exploring how the perpetrator controlled the client by preventing them to access their resources, deterred the client from accessing education, and convinced the client that the sex industry was the only option for the client might be a more attainable place to start making connections from individual experiences to contextual patters. This information is captured by the IHTC. A careful exploration of the subscales under socio economic status might ignite a process of awareness rising for the client. It is important to note that contextualization requires a great deal of psychoeducation both about human trafficking as well as the context in which the trafficking event took place (Arnstein, 2014).

The IHTC provides clinician with an analysis of how identity-based vulnerabilities were systematically exploited by the perpetrator, which is captured in the scores obtained in the vulnerability subscales. These scores can help the clinician further reflect upon how those axis of identity are typically treated in the social context in which the trafficking took place as well as explore the client’s experiences throughout their life. This might ignite a comprehensive understanding of how the client constructed notions of identity, self-concept, self-reference, interpersonal and social connectedness, safety, and
finally how these notions affect their current functioning. It is important to consider individual or cultural factors that contributed to their resiliency and survival (Hardy, Compton, & McPhatter, 2013).

*Conceptualization recommendations.* From a dialectic perspective, potential psychological dysfunction and help seeking behaviors in cases of human trafficking streams from the tension between the current state of affairs in a person’s life and their unrealized or subordinated human potential. Psychological health streams from the client being able to honor and develop that potential. It is important to consider that prior, during, and after the human trafficking event, all victims experienced a constant process of interaction with themselves, others and their environment. Hence, psychological dysfunction streams from invalidating processes of environmental, interpersonal and/or intrapersonal nature (Linehan, 1993). The role of a psychologist should be to help victims identify the nature, and the location of the problem, the sources of strength and reliance of the victim and induce movement toward change. The IHTC can assist clinicians conceptualize the nature and location of the problem. For instance, an immigrant victim might describe an experience of trafficking in which their behavioral repertoire was significantly reduced (i.e., could not get out of the house without the traffickers permission, was not permitted to socialize, was abused every time they tried to do something outside of the trafficker’s rules, and was deterred from exploring their environment by creating fear of immigration or language barriers). In this example, the psychologist might realize that some of these experiences are captured in the general and immigration sections of the IHTC. In addition, the psychologist might note that the victim relates to him/her with a great deal of dependency (i.e., defers decision making on
the clinician), and also might notice that the victim sees him/herself as worthless, holds a negative perspective about being an immigrant, sees themselves as incompetent to engage in everyday activities, and holds tremendous guilt for being in the United States. In this case, endorsements in particular subscales of the IHTC might elucidate areas of work, as it is evident that the processes of interaction with him/herself, with others and with his/her environment during the trafficking experience were highly invalidating. In considering this example, it is important to mention that the IHTC is not designed to dictate particular psychological responses to the events that took place, but rather offer areas of exploration for the practitioner.

**Diagnostic recommendations.** Psychology has historically been responsive to the demands of social justice movements. As social justice enters the psychological discourse, the scientific understanding of human functioning reflects the impact of the social context on individuals. For instance, the study of combat neurosis or its modern terminology, Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) progressively entered the psychological rhetoric after the First and Second World Wars. The study of PTSD was punctuated by the rise of the antiwar movement after the Vietnam War. The integration of traumatized soldiers into civil life provoked social tensions that threatened the collective functioning of individuals. The response from mental health fields brought public awareness to the experience of war and shifted the interpretation of neurosis form a personal deficit on the soldier’s part, to a reasonable response to violent exposure that warranted treatment. In the same regard, the effects of violence against women were not salient to the field of psychology until the women’s movement in the early seventies, when notions of social oppression legitimized sexual and domestic violence as possible
and rather prevalent traumatic experiences that threatened women’s psychological health
and wellbeing (Herman, 1997).

In recent years, psychologists have confronted the notion of modern day slavery
or its contemporary euphemism, human trafficking. As part of the global labor economy,
millions of humans are forced into labor, servitude and commercial sex. The
acknowledgement of this phenomenon, as an external experience that may affect the
internal psychological functioning of an individual, forces clinicians to consider aspects
of trauma into their diagnosis of victims (Hopper & Hidalgo, 2006).

PTSD is commonly known as the diagnostic that observes the impact of trauma
on the psychological functioning of individuals. Our current Diagnostic Manual Fifth
Edition (DSM V; American Psychiatric Association, 2013) criteria for PTSD include a
history of exposure to a traumatic event and symptoms from each of four symptom
clusters: intrusion, avoidance, negative alterations in cognitions and mood, and
alterations in arousal and reactivity. The sixth criterion concerns duration of symptoms
(at least one month); the seventh assesses functioning; and, the eighth criterion clarifies
symptoms as not attributable to a substance or co-occurring medical condition.

While there is a diagnostic that describes symptoms typically presented by
persons who have experienced trauma, there might be substantial differences in
presentation according to the type of trauma that an individual endured. These nuances
might not be captured in the DSM V diagnostic criteria. For instance, while victims of
power based crimes such as human trafficking, domestic violence or sexual abuse tend to
experience a great deal of guilt and shame, victims of natural disasters or motor accidents
might not experience their trauma in the same manner. In addition, not all human
trafficking victims may present with PTSD symptoms. Many might meet criteria for a variety of other diagnosis such as depression, somatic disorders, dissociation, and psychosis among others. Therefore, human trafficking experiences require for clinicians to include broader diagnostic considerations.

In general terms, a diagnosis is a process of identification of the nature of a problem by examination of its symptoms. The IHTC is conceptualized as the systematic exploitation of identity based vulnerabilities through the use of three specific mechanism of exploitation (force, fraud and coercion). Therefore, the diagnostic impact of human trafficking on a person’s life should include an assessment of how the experience affected the healthy expression of the victim’s intersecting identities, as well as an assessment of how the use of force, fraud and coercion impacted the client’s functioning. The IHTC can assist the practitioner conceptualize the impact of human trafficking on a person’s life by exploring its subscales. The instrument has two types of subscales: identity based, and mechanism of control subscales look at dynamics of exploitation (i.e., force, fraud, and coercion).

Use of the identity based subscales recommendations. Trauma is a non-normative experience that is emotionally painful and distressing, and that overwhelms a person’s ability to cope. “Traumatic events are extraordinary, not because they occur rarely, but rather because they overwhelm the ordinary human adaptations to life” (Herman, 1997). It is widely reported in the trauma literature that after a traumatic experience, some persons might develop reactions in the form of intrusions, flashbacks, triggers, all of which are often activated when an ambiguous stimulus evokes the original
Beyond injuries of physical nature, an effective way to destroy a victim’s sense of self is by attacking who “they are”. In psychology, “who someone is” is abstracted in the notion of identity. Identity is the collection of personal and social characteristics that make an individual definable and recognizable (Weinreich, 1986; Weinreich & Saunderson, 2003). Based on what we know about the psychological dynamics of trauma, it is possible to theorize that when the object used to inflict trauma upon someone is their own identity, then ambiguous stimuli that evoke notions of identity could perhaps produce intrusions, triggers and flashbacks, which in turn, further traumatize the individual by creating a conflicting relationship with a portion of their own identity. Operating with a stigmatized or fractured sense of self has significant functional implications (Briere, 1995). Therefore, revising potential dysfunction in areas of self reference, self worth, locus of control and identify formation could be pivotal drivers in symptomatology presentation such as anxious arousal, depression, anger/irritability, intrusive experiences, defensive avoidance, and dissociation among others. The IHTC could be useful in terms of revising the specific identity based injuries that the victim endured, evaluating how the victim psychologically either externalized or internalized such injuries, and assessing if the victim is coping or is experiencing psychopathology. For instance, a victim who experienced immigration based exploitation characterized by language alienation and immigration threats might externalize the process of victimization and experience dysregulated anger outbursts when exposed to immigration related stimulus such as filling out paper work or talking to an immigration attorney. On the other hand, someone might internalize the exploitation process and develop a sense of
excessive guilt and shame for being an immigrant even if they arrived to the United States on the account of the trafficking experience. Similarly, a victim with a physical disability who has been victimized by removing their wheel chair might develop an internalized hostile relationship with their own disability. Every time someone touches their wheelchair, it may remind them of the abuse and evoke negative cognitions regarding their disability. The person may refuse to get out of bed or be placed in their wheelchair and may feel as though having a disability is a terrible burden. On the other hand, a victim who externalizes the impact of the event might get hostile and emotionally dysregulated by the same stimulus (someone touching their wheelchair). Hence, elevations on identity based scales should alert clinicians to explore the client’s perception of their intersecting identities, their sense of self worth, the degree to which the human trafficking event distorted the client’s experience of their intersecting identities, the level of internalization or externalization of the trauma, the content of the intrusions, and the objects of avoidance, among others.

*Use of the mechanism of exploitation subscales recommendations.* Human trafficking is the pervasive violation of persons’ sense of self-determination and free will. It negates aspects of functioning that are associated with motivation and psychological health. The legal definition of human trafficking identifies force, fraud and coercion as the mechanism by which exploitation is delivered (TVPA, 200). Therefore it is important to further explore the impact of force, fraud and coercion on the psychological functioning of trafficking victims. While these three factors have been described throughout the literature, there has been little research on their psychological impact on victims (Hopper & Hidalgo, 2006). However, we can infer the impact of these
mechanisms of exploitation by exploring the dialectic tension that exists between
dynamics of exploitation and self-determination. The IHTC collects and quantifies the
dynamics of exploitation endured by a victim in the force, fraud, and coercion subscales.
Hence, the instrument can be helpful in assisting clinicians collect information to further
understand the impact of these mechanisms of control on a person’s sense of self
determination.

The dialectic conceptualization proposed in this dissertation call us to consider the
dialectic tension that exists between fair labor markets and exploitative labor markets.
From this perspective, the expression of self-determination is mitigated through the use
of exploitation (i.e., force, fraud and coercion). Self Determination Theory (SDT) studies
aspects of human motivation believed to be universal that propel people to seek activities
that are congruent with their genuine desires (Deci & Ryan, 2002). SDT posits three
needs: autonomy, competence, and relatedness as experiential nutrients essential for well-
being and self-determination (Kennon & Gunz, 2009). According to this theory, the
possession of these character strengths propels individuals to pursue a particular activity
because this activity is congruent with their inherent capabilities. For the individual, the
exercise of a particular capability is interesting and satisfying for its own sake, without
any external influence and interference.

The need for autonomy is defined as the need to actively participate in
determining own behavior and experience one’s actions as result of autonomous choice
without external interference. In cases of human trafficking, the use of force inherently
mitigates someone’s sense of autonomy. Force is often used to suppress undesired
behaviors, direct and control desired ones, and break an individual’s sense of worthiness.
For instance, many sex trafficking victims experienced “traumatic sexualization.” This term is used to describe the cognitive conclusion of many victims who often view themselves as sexual objects following experiences of chronic sexual abuse. In this case, force in the form of chronic sexual abuse is used to direct and control a behavior that will later be expected of the victim on the regular basis. The literature on this topic shows that children who have experienced traumatic sexualization tend to display sexual knowledge and behavior that are inappropriate for their level of development. The commodification of children as objects for adult sexual gratification can impair their sense of self-worth and autonomy even into adulthood. The cognitive distortion of one’s worth and one’s lack of options is an imposition on the victim by the perpetrator. This imposition forfeits any possibility for a different life, hence suppressing the expression of any behavior outside of sexual exploitation (Browne & Finkelhor, 1986). Likewise, it is well reported that perpetrators control the victims’ autonomy over their own bodies: forcing them to dress in sexually provocative manners, or leaving them undressed for quick customer access. Often conducing physical punishment for behaviors outside of this expectation (Bucardo, et al., 2004; Kristof & WuDunn, 2009). In this case, the use of force is meant to suppress behaviors outside of the expectation, direct and control desired behaviors, and break the victim’s sense of self-worth given the level of stigma and shame associated with sexualized behavior. Other compelling examples included in the literature show how the deprivation of basic needs and constant belittlement may serve to disorient victims, diminish their sense of self-worth, induce exhaustion and debility, instill fear, helplessness and despair impairing the individual from envisioning a life outside of the trafficking situation (Hopper & Hidalgo, 2006). As a common
denominator, the use of physical or psychological force is often evident in the attempts of
the perpetrator to inhibit any sense of autonomy. The IHTC records instances of force.
Therefore, escalations on the force subscale should alert the clinician to inspect the
degree to which the trafficking experience affected the victim’s sense of autonomy
outside the trafficking situation. In other words, the clinician should assess the degree to
which the victim can identify their genuine desires and participates in determining their
behaviors.

The need for competence is defined as the need to experience oneself as capable
and competent in controlling the environment and being able to reliably predict
outcomes. By definition, fraud is the intentional perversion of truth in order to induce
another to surrender a legal right. An individual who operates in a false endeavor cannot
really exercise control over his/her environment or reliably predict outcomes. Hence,
fraud is a dynamic that potentially mitigates someone’s sense of competence. Victims
are frequently lured by false promises of a lucrative job, stability, safety, education, or a
loving relationship (Polaris Project, 2014a). Human trafficking is intrinsically fraudulent
because we as a society have established a minimal threshold of liberties, protections and
entitlements that should theoretically cover all civil members. Therefore, operations that
do not honor this threshold and practice labor violations such as no wages or sub-poverty
wages, no benefits, no labor relations, lack of protection of human physical integrity, debt
bondage, restrictions of mobility are inherently fraudulent even if a given civil member
agrees to the arrangement. For instance, traffickers lure poverty-stricken females with
false promises of high-paying jobs as house cleaners, housemaids, nannies, cooks, and
models. Some pimps or traffickers promise assurances of marriage or get-rich-quick
schemes for their families and home villages. Many times, drugs are forcefully induced to facilitate kidnapping. The traffickers typically charge victims illicit border-crossing fees, slip the victims across borders and then smuggle them by vans to brothel "safe houses." They, however, are anything but "safe." By the time the victims realize they have been duped, it is too late for them to escape. Once inside the United States, the entrapped women and girls are forced into prostitution, pornography, and other forms of sexual exploitation under the most distressing conditions (Polaris Project, 2014g).

The psychological consequence of these practices is that victims tend to question their ability to trust themselves in current or future endeavors. For instance, victims who fall for false promise of a loving relationship while being lured into the sex trafficking industry, what is now colloquially known as the “boyfriend scam,” tend to experience difficulty trusting their ability to choose future safe interpersonal relationships, and could develop symptoms such as anxiety, engagement in risky behaviors, numbness, and depression among others. This type of experience is captured by the IHTC under item 32 of the general subscale. Endorsement of this item can alert the clinician to explore the victim’s current interpersonal style of relating.

Another example is the experience of debt bondage. The victim's weekly living expenses are deducted from any small credits that may be applied through his or her labor, leaving the victim always in greater debt. Typically the trafficker intentionally sets up a situation in which the victim would never be able to pay back the debt creating a psychological sense of exhaustion, inferiority and dependency in which the victim feels as though they are out of control of their destiny. The IHTC captures these types of experiences under the socioeconomic and fraud subscales. Elevations under these
subscales in the IHTC should alert the clinician to explore the degree to which the victim experiences her/himself as capable and competent in controlling their environment and their ability to reliably predict outcomes different areas of functioning (e.g., interpersonal, family, community, employment, and education). The careful exploration of the impact of human trafficking on a person’s sense of competence can help the clinician and the client identify goals for therapy and develop interventions.

Finally, the need for relatedness is defined as the universal desire to interact, be connected to, and experience caring for others, experience authentic kinship with others and to experience satisfaction in participation and involvement with the social world (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Human trafficking is an experience that mitigates a person’s ability to relate to others at different levels: interpersonal, group and social interactions. Across levels, human trafficking is characterized not by dynamics of egalitarian or fair relatedness but rather by dynamics of domination and submission. The mechanism of coercion epitomizes dynamics of psychological domination and submission. The IHTC records potential instances of coercion in the victims process of victimization. Coercion is the systematic persuasion and manipulation of reality to induce someone to take a course of action. The perpetrator often “manipulates” a decision made by the victim, which unveils a particular vulnerability and then “suggests” that the victim engages in the desired behavior. For instance, in vignette number two, the perpetrator presents himself as interested in a romantic relationship, then he introduces her to drugs, invites her to move in with him, knowing that she is a runaway teen. Later he argues that her stay is costing him too much money. He sets up a situation in which he invites friends over and they pay for her services as a sex worker and later forces her to
find customers alluding that she has chosen this kind of life and knowing that she has nowhere to go and that now she is addicted to substances. In this example, there are two steps to the coercive action. First, the perpetrator presents himself as a benevolent person who is interested in her wellbeing and then shifts the blame into the victim by eluding this was her choice and by highlighting her vulnerability as a drug addicted teen age runaway. Both the manipulation of reality and the imposition of the forceful threat are small enough that they may undermine the victim’s ability to realize that they are being pushed into an unwanted direction. It is well documented in the power based trauma literature that most victims experience a great deal of guilt and shame (Abas et al., 2013). Most often, the behaviors desired by the perpetrator such as working in commercial sex or working without documentation are proscribed in the current social arrangement. Hence, the dynamic of coercion systematically shifts the responsibility of induction into a given behavior to the victim making them assume feelings of guilt and ignoring the responsibility of the perpetrator. This systematic shift could have tremendous implications in interpersonal and social life domains.

Interpersonally, human trafficking perpetrators tend to inflict a great deal of control, isolation, monopolization, and indoctrination of victim’s relational and behavioral patterns. For instance, most literature on human trafficking concur on reports of perpetrators limiting contact with meaningful support systems such as family or friends, and limiting outside involvement through processes of control of communication outlets, constant surveillance of interactions that might threatened the permanency of the victim in the trafficking situation, use of threats and violence (Hopper, 2009). Given that human psychology is associative by nature, it is safe to conceptualize that relationships
outside of what is permitted by the trafficker could be associated by the victim with punishment, violence and manipulation. The emotional consequences are often fear, guilt, shame and even anger. Even talking to a clinician might trigger these emotions.

Socially victims are often pushed to operate in criminal environments. Therefore, considerations regarding the way that members of this society establish a healthy relationship with the legal system are imperative in this discussion. The multicultural education literature outlines the presumptions of innocence as a factor of personal functioning that our legal system theoretically grants to all individuals in the United States (Cullinan, 1998). The presumption of innocence refers to the lack of legal/social guilt of an individual, with respect to a given situation. In this sense, individuals who are innocent of infringing the law are deserving of all civil rights provided by a state, government or society. Contrary to this, only those who are guilty are restricted in their exercise of civil rights. Even though the presumption of innocence is legally granted to all individuals in the United States, this presumption does not transfer cleanly to the cultural environment. When something goes wrong, typically members of subordinate groups are looked at as the source of the problem and blamed for infringing the law. Historically human trafficking victims have historically been treated as criminals. Therefore, therefore the way in which the legal environment views the victim mimics the way in which the perpetrator blamed the victim and the way in which the victim was indoctrinated in viewing him/herself.

The IHTC records instances of coercion. Elevations on the coercion subscale should alert the clinician to explore feelings of guilt and shame as these feelings could have a tremendous impact in the way in which the victim relates interpersonally and
socially. In addition, understanding the process of coercion from an etiologically perspective, in other words, understanding the events that made the victim believe that they were making a real choice while in fact they were being manipulated, could have a tremendous impact in his or her recovery and their ability to advocate in a system that tends to reinforce guilt and shame.

**Treatment planning recommendations.** Defining overarching goals and developing interventions that propel psychological and behavioral changes in the client are the main characteristics of any treatment plan. According to the dialectical conceptualization explored in this dissertation, the treatment plan for cases of human trafficking becomes the collection of interventions geared toward moving the client from the self-reductionist end of the contradiction (exploitative labor) toward the self-expanding end of contradiction (fair labor). We conceptualized that human trafficking is the interaction between vulnerability and exploitation and that fair labor is the interaction between human capability and environmental support. Hence, the overarching goal of this methodology is restoring the client’s view and experience of self as a vulnerable being to viewing and experiencing oneself as a worthy, and capable one. This should theoretically be achieved through a process of supportive actions that provide corrective experiences for the client.

When discussing vulnerability, the main theoretical conceptualization offered by this model is the idea that human trafficking is a complex collection of events of exploitative nature that subjugate a human being by virtue of the systematic abuse of their identity based vulnerabilities. It is important to note that an identity-based category becomes a vulnerability when there is potential for exploitation or if the victim operates
in an exploitative environment. However, in fair environment a person’s identity may very well be the very thing that composes their human potential. Therefore, an important aspect to include in a treatment plan is first to assess how the experience of trafficking affected a victim’s believes about their identity and facilitate a process of helping a victim internalize positive meaning about their identity.

Given that identity based stigmatization in human trafficking situations is a social weigh imposed on an individual and not truly what inherently defines the individual, solidifying a healthy sense of identity offers opportunities for psychological health and flourishing. The role of the clinician is to create dissonance between the experiences of exploitation outlined in by the IHTC vulnerability based subscales and the potential for positive identity formation. Understanding positive identity formation as a process characterized by fluid stages might help the client increase tolerance in the client’s pursue of a fuller and more fulfilling intrapersonal relationship with portions of their identity.

In regards to identity, an important component of psychological health and well-being may be associated with claiming a sense of identity and understanding how this identity contributes to creating a life characterized by satisfaction, well-being, and flourishing. This process may have special significance when an individual claims a minority or stigmatized identity. While a stigmatized identity may contribute to the stress experienced by an individual, it may also lead to experiences that provide opportunities for creating additional or unique meanings or personal growth (Almario, Riggle, Rostosky, & Alcalde, 2013; Riggle & Rostosky, 2012). Numerous theorists have supported the idea that people can derive positive meaning from stigmatized identities. For instance, most models of racial and cultural identity development highlight stages of
resistance and immersion in which the individual withdraws from dominant culture to delve into his or her own racial or ethnic exploration in the effort to define a new identity. This developmental theory also describes a processes of introspection in which the individual actively seeks to integrate the redefined identity into the dominant culture without compromising aspects of his or her own intersection of identities (Atkinson, Morten, & Sue, 1993). Similarly, Cass’s Model of Sexual Orientation Formation highlights identity synthesis as the latest stage of development in which the individual integrates their sexual identity as part of their holistic identity, assimilates into dominant culture with a secure and positive self-concept (1979). Social identity development models underline issues of intersecting identities describing the process of identity development as a fluid and dynamic process in which the individual experiences an ongoing construction of identities while acknowledging the influence of changing contexts on the experience of identity development (Abes, Jones & McEwen, 2007).

In addition to issues of identity, the dialectical conceptualization presented in this dissertation also points out the contradicting tension between exploitation vs. environmental support. While exploitative experiences have the potential for negatively affecting a person’s sense of worthiness, autonomy and relatedness through force, fraud and coercion, supportive and validating experiences nurture these very aspects, which are considered cross-cultural cornerstones of human functioning (Deci & Ryan, 2002). Therefore, the treatment plan should include opportunities to have corrective experiences that can help a given individual build essential nutrients necessary for successfully navigating supportive environments. The therapeutic implementation of corrective experiences places much weigh on aspects such as therapeutic alliance, therapist holding
a nonjudgmental attitude toward the client, empathy, and compassion building.

A corrective supportive experience inevitably challenges the client’s prior history as well as the psychological adaptations the client made to cope with the exploitative experience, given that the psychological approach the client used to function in an exploitative environment is likely to be ineffective when functioning in a supportive one. Hence, the corrective experience is bound to create conflict and cognitive, emotional and behavioral dissonance (Festinger, 1962). For instance, hiding away from an authority figure following a thought of potential danger, accompanied by intense fear might be adaptive when dealing with a trafficker. However, it might be a dissonant reaction when dealing with an authority figure such as a manager in a fair labor arrangement. Endorsements in the IHTC that suggest exploitation should point the clinician into further investigating the psychological adaptation the client used to cope with the exploitative instance(s).

In terms of treatment planning it is important to acknowledge that people navigate exploitative as well as fair environments all the time. For instance, some of our relationships are supportive and others are unsupportive, some of our jobs are fair and others are unfair, some of our educational activities are fulfilling and others are fruitless. Life requires a great deal of psychological flexibility to deal with exploitation or invalidation vs. support or sustenance. As pointed by Linehan (1993), dialectic thinking is a psychological compromise that requires the ability to transcend polarities and to see reality as complex and multifaceted, to entertain contradictory needs, contradictory points of view and to unite them and integrate them.

From a dialectic perspective, a corrective experience can truly facilitate change if
the clinician can embrace the idea that what we classically know as psychopathology could be an adaptive response in the face of a profoundly oppressive experience. As well as understand that the client’s dissonant responses may carry certain degree of wisdom given that in life, s/he is bound to experience invalidation, unfairness, and disapproval. Therefore, the role of the psychologist is to understand the function of the psychopathology, increase the client’s awareness in regards to the appropriateness of the response in a given situation, increase the client’s response repertoire so that they can successfully appreciate and navigate exploitative vs. validating experiences, and gain skills to be capable of successfully having experiences characterized by support, validation and approval.

It is important to incorporate interventions that dialectically fluctuate from validation to challenging. For instance, developing hyper alertness might be a protective psychological adaptation that can be helpful in anticipating danger, or experiencing dissociation might be a psychological adaptation that can help the client escape while being trapped. Validating through this type of reframing can allow clients better understand the function of their disorder and appreciate how the experience of human trafficking might have contributed to their emotional difficulties. This process of acceptance and validation can open opportunities to recognize the strength and resilience of the client’s psychological process. However, this alone does not produce change. Conflict on the other hand sparks possibilities for psychological movement. Therefore, introducing the idea that successfully navigating validating environments require a different state of mind and set of skills might open opportunities for response enhancement. For instance, introducing the idea that a supportive relationship needs a
great deal of trust in order for it to work, might be a transcendental shift for someone whose psychological experiences have adapted to fraudulent and manipulative environments (Atkinson et al., 1997; Brown, 1994, Comas-Diaz & Greene, 1994; Helms & Cook, 1999). The therapeutic process of validation while challenging should theoretically help the client experience him or herself as an individual worthy of a dignifying therapeutic experience, capable of bringing about personal growth, and able to engage relational experiences in which there are opportunities for dialogue and reciprocity.

**Documenting and reporting recommendations.** As opposed to current methods of victim identification, the IHTC offers a structured way to help practitioners interpret the results. Instead of simply asking questions and assuming that responses will be interpreted correctly, the instrument provides practitioners with a systematized way by which they can identify the three aspects of exploitation outlined in the human trafficking definition (i.e., force fraud, and coercion), therefore the clinician can safely conclude presence of human trafficking as evidenced by any number of endorsements in each one of these subscales. This is meaningful given that human trafficking is an experience that warrants clinical attention and can be recorded under DSM V V codes. Victims under the age of 18 might qualify for V codes that relate to child abuse and neglect. It is noteworthy that states that have Safe Harbor human trafficking legislations stipulate that mental health practitioners are mandated reporters of suspected child trafficking (U.S. Department of State, 2014). Hence, appropriate human trafficking diagnostic is pivotal in regards to becoming compliant to the demands of evolving legislations in addition to the ethical responsibilities associated with the issue. Adult victims of human trafficking can
also qualify for a DSM V V code diagnostic under the adult abuse codes. Those who have experienced identity based exploitation as evidenced by any given number of endorsements under the identity based subscales can also qualify for a V code diagnosis under problems related to the social environment such as acculturation difficulties, social exclusion or rejection or adverse discrimination (American Psychiatric Association, 2013).

When documenting, it is important to consider that restoring the life of a human trafficking victim usually requires multidisciplinary collaboration. Hence, mental health records are often utilized to support criminal court proceedings, civil remediation or social services investigations at state and federal levels. Appropriate documentation can facilitate proceedings such as access to legal immigration status, recovery of unpaid wages, housing, health services and other forms of protection interventions, ensuring the client a humane threshold of rights and entitlements that can be as therapeutic as other forms of clinical intervention.

**Implications for the criminal justice system.** The Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA, 2000) (a) mandates that victims of human trafficking are not criminally punished for crimes committed as a result of their victimization; (b) calls for provision of medical and mental health care; (c) grants victims rights to protection and safety; and (d) gives victims the right to pursue criminal charges against their trafficker, civil remedies for pain and suffering, as well as restitution of wages. Foreign national victims are allowed to apply for an adjustment of their immigration status by obtaining a T visa; once the victim has received the T visa, they have the right to be certified for benefits such as those received by a refugee.
In order to become eligible for benefits, an investigation must take place. This requires the collaboration of law enforcement, medical and mental health professionals, attorneys, and case managers. The multidisciplinary nature of this issue calls for a significant level of agreement among professionals regarding the experience of a victim. Failure to adequately assess the presence of human trafficking in a person’s life can significantly limit the victim’s access to services. The IHTC hopes to assist multidisciplinary human trafficking teams in their analysis and conceptualization of cases.

From a criminal justice perspective, increasing the level of identification of victims ensures that victims are not criminalized for crimes committed under coercive conditions and increases the prosecution of traffickers. Utilizing the instrument can enhance officer’s confidence in their assessment of human trafficking as well as elucidate possible areas of investigation. It is important to note that human trafficking is typically a tangible occurrence, but rather a process of victimization in which forceful, coercive and fraudulent forms of exploitation were used against a victim. In this regard, utilizing the specific items endorsed by the victim can be helpful in terms of being able to investigate specific instances of human trafficking that paint a full picture of the exploitative process.

From a legal perspective, the instrument can be used to support allegations of trafficking in criminal and civil courts as well as support T visa petitions. In addition, the instrument can be used in the defense of victims that are being prosecuted for crimes committed while in a situation of trafficking offering a conceptualization that shifts the defendant from a criminal to a victim. This is particularly important when working with
youth who are convicted with prostitution changes. Collecting collateral information among law enforcement, social services and attorneys might increase the level of congruence among professionals by sharing similar conceptualizations.

Policy implications. According to the dialectical conceptualization explored in this dissertation, human trafficking can only be eradicated by affecting the context in which the phenomenon takes place. Human trafficking happens within the context of the global workforce. The interactions between individuals and the labor economy elucidate differences between labor arrangements in which people derive personal benefit, and labor arrangements in which people are severely exploited. Hence, two types of labor exist in dialectic tension: valued and utilitarian labor. The measure of how much an individual is operating at each end of the continuum between these two types of labor arrangements is relative to the universal standard of what is considered fair labor (International Labor Organization, 1998). When individuals are operating in the system of utilitarian labor, exponential increases on civil protections and social validity of their job would push them to function in the system of valued labor (Brennan, 2012; Burnes & By 2012; Hunt, 1979; Nussbaum & Sen, 1993).

From this analysis we can conclude that the eradication of human trafficking can only take place by drafting effective policies that provide civil protections to the populations being affected and by increasing awareness about the human cost associated with widespread prevalence of this issue in minority populations such as women, racial minorities, immigrants, persons with disabilities, person living in poverty and LBGTQ populations. Beyond increasing civil protections, implementing policies that elevate the status and quality of life of marginalized groups are also necessary in order to decrease
human trafficking risk. However, these strategies cannot be drafted or implemented without an actual picture of how human trafficking is manifested in our society. The IHTC offers a theoretical conceptualization that looks at styles of victimization in marginalized groups. Given that up to now, there is no standardized measurement tools or procedures for victim identification that document the experiences of trafficking victims from marginalized groups it is virtually impossible to established policies to effectively combat human trafficking (Weiner & Hala, 2008). The utilization of the IHTC can be a vehicle for systematic data collection, retention and sharing.

Recommendations from previous research have called for effective identification of trafficking victims (Gallagher & Holmes, 2008). Utilizing a theoretically and evidenced based screening instrument to improve and standardize data collection across these systems is critical to understanding the prevalence, characteristics and trends of human trafficking (Farrell & McDevitt, 2008). This instrument can be used to inform activism practices and bring about dialogues of social change that take into consideration the social status of persons who experience human trafficking.

**Limitations**

The introduction of the IHTC as a screening methodology of human trafficking that evaluates aspects of exploitation excerpted from identity-based vulnerabilities, offers a new perspective in the analysis of human trafficking. While the instrument demonstrated appropriate theoretical and empirical substantiation suggesting soundness in terms of construct validity, accuracy, reliability and utility, its evidenced based substantiation was done based on vignettes and not actual cases. This poses limitations given that there are facets of validity that have not yet been addressed. For instance, an important area of
study that could contribute to the predictive validity of the instrument is to look at
whether or not a victim engaged in help seeking behaviors or if the victim actually
received human trafficking services following screening with the IHTC. Other areas of
study that might enrich predictive validity of the instrument is to evaluate the impact of
utilizing the IHTC on court proceedings results, civil remediation results, and mental
health treatment outcomes. In this regards, the assessments of the trajectory of current
cases as well as archival reviews of the trajectory of prior cases can inform predictive
validity and postdictive validity. Future studies might benefit from longitudinal and
retrospective study designs might be pertinent to evaluate issues of predictive validity. In
addition the use of vignettes limited the amount of variability of the results. This
prohibited certain analyses to be conducted such as assessing the impact of a number of
factors (i.e., experimental condition, professional background, knowledge of human
trafficking) on the likelihood of participants to accurately identify cases of human
trafficking via logistic regression. Studying the performance of the instrument with real
cases might increase the variability of results in the sample, hence increasing
opportunities to perform this kind of analysis.

Another limitation was associated with the lack of other available instrumentation
that measures the same construct. At the moment this instrument was developed, there
was no available instrumentation that had undergone an evidenced based validation
process. Therefore, criterion (concurrent and discriminate) validity was used by
establishing a comparison between the results obtained by the IHTC and the assessment
of reputable experts. During last July the VERA Institute of Justice (2014) published a
screening instrument meant to be used by law enforcement that measures human
trafficking. Future studies involving the validity of the IHTCL might benefit from evaluating the comparative results of both instruments.

**Conclusion**

While much progress has been made in terms of increasing human trafficking awareness, theoretical analysis and legislative protections, there is a significant disconnection between the estimated prevalence of this issue and the number of cases identified and appropriately processed. The pervasive misunderstanding of how human trafficking exploitation is expressed in systems that socially support the pervasive alienation and subordination of particular human groups might explain some of this disconnection. The IHTC is a human trafficking screening model that takes into account aspects of exploitation excerpted from identity-based vulnerabilities. The instrument demonstrated appropriate theoretical and empirical substantiation suggesting soundness in terms of construct validity, accuracy, reliability and utility. Its implementation might have a significant impact in identifying and restoring the impact of human trafficking on a person’s life from multidisciplinary perspectives by systematically highlighting instances of exploitation that together construct an experience of human trafficking. The effort advanced in this dissertation was geared toward reframing the systemic tendency to criminalize and pathologize victims as they navigate criminal justice and social service institutions. When addressing an individual victim, it seems as though our systems are more interested in determining problems with the victim and often ignore the systemic and endemic factors that have led to their current presentation. If today we are quick to wonder what is wrong with someone, it might perhaps be more fruitful to wonder what has happened to someone. The etiological understanding of human trafficking can
perhaps elucidate deeper answers as to the nature of exploitation and its impact on human functioning.
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We will ask you to complete a demographic questionnaire that only includes your age, gender, ethnicity, level of knowledge about human trafficking, and years of practicing in the field. You will be asked to review three vignettes and apply an assessment instrument to the vignettes. You will also be asked to use a utility measure. You may receive instruction on how to assess for human trafficking. At the end, we will ask some open-ended questions regarding your opinion of the process. Some participants might be chosen to complete a follow-up questionnaire two weeks after your original participation. If you are chosen we will ask you to attend a second meeting and complete a similar questionnaire. Your paper work will be marked with a five digit number. We will give you this number, which you should bring for the second meeting.
WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS?
To the best of our knowledge, the things you will be doing have no more risk of harm than you would experience in everyday life.

This study will not ask for any personal information except for your gender, age, ethnicity, knowledge of human trafficking, and number of years working in the field. However, the issue of human trafficking might be an uncomfortable, upsetting or stressful for some people. You can interrupt your participation at any point. You can also seek debriefing from the principal investigator. This means that you can discuss your reactions to the process with the principal investigator and obtain further information.

WILL YOU BENEFIT FROM TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?
You will not get any personal benefit from taking part in this study. Your willingness to take part, however, may, in the future, help society as a whole better understand this research topic.

DO YOU HAVE TO TAKE PART IN THE STUDY?
If you decide to take part in the study, it should be because you really want to volunteer. You will not lose any benefits or rights you would normally have if you choose not to volunteer. You can stop at any time during the study and still keep the benefits and rights you had before volunteering.

IF YOU DON’T WANT TO TAKE PART IN THE STUDY, ARE THERE OTHER CHOICES?
If you do not want to be in the study, there are no other choices except not to take part in the study.

WHAT WILL IT COST YOU TO PARTICIPATE?
You may have to pay for the cost of getting to the study site.

WILL YOU RECEIVE ANY REWARDS FOR TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?
You will not receive any rewards or payment for taking part in the study.

WHO WILL SEE THE INFORMATION THAT YOU GIVE?
The written materials that you fill out will be confidential. We will keep private all research records that identify you to the extent allowed by law. However, there are some circumstances in which we have to show your information to other people. We might be required to show information, which identifies you to people who need to make sure we have done the research correctly; these would be people from organizations such as the University of Kentucky. Your information will be combined with information from other people taking part in the study. When we write about the study or share it with other researchers, we will write about the combined information we have gathered. There will be no possible way to be personally identified in these written materials. We may publish the results of this study; however, the information will not be linked to any particular participant.

CAN YOUR TAKING PART IN THE STUDY END EARLY?
If you decide to take part in the study you still have the right to decide at any time that you no longer want to continue. You will not be treated differently if you decide to stop taking part in the study.

The individuals conducting the study may need to withdraw you from the study. This may occur if you are not able to follow the directions they give you, if they find that your presence in the study is more risk than benefit to you.

WHAT IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS, SUGGESTIONS, CONCERNS, OR COMPLAINTS?
Before you decide whether to accept to take part in the study, please ask any questions that might come to mind now. If you have any further questions, suggestions, concerns, or complaints about the study, you can contact the investigator, Marla Almario at 859 9488438. If you have any questions about your rights as a
volunteer in this research, contact the staff in the Office of Research Integrity at the University of Kentucky at 859-257-9428 or toll free at 1-866-400-9428. We will give you a signed copy of this consent form to take with you. If your question suggestion or complaint was not addressed properly please contact the study supervisor Dr. Pam Remer by phone at (859) 257-4158 or by email at premr@email.uky.edu.

Signature of person agreeing to take part in the study   Date

Printed name of person agreeing to take part in the study

Name of [authorized] person obtaining informed consent   Date
Appendix B

Vignettes

Vignette 1. (Disability, immigration and SES)

In the year 2001, fifty persons from Central and South America with diverse disabilities (deafness, muteness, and other kinds of physical disabilities) were taken to New York City for the purpose of labor. The operation was centered in New York City and Chicago and similar rings were uncovered in Texas and California. An American agency reportedly recruited people with disabilities who lived in impoverished communities and offered them assistance finding jobs and starting new lives in the U.S. They offered them opportunities for obtaining a work visa and indicated they would get paid a significant amount of money working in the subways in the U.S. Juan was one of the persons who signed up for what he thought was a better future. He had a physical disability and needed a wheelchair he also had a speech impediment. His family was very poor and barely had money to eat. He was desperate to leave home.

Juan was brought to the US hidden in a cardboard box through the Mexican border all the way to Southern California, and later transported to New York City. Juan reported that soon after arriving in the US, the dream of working was quickly squashed. He was forced to live in a dirty, cramped apartment with twenty people and work 18 hours a day peddling trinkets in the subways. The bosses would come in the morning about 5:00 AM and wake him up together with everyone else. They would have coffee and nothing else. Then, they would split the group into smaller groups. The bosses would give him the merchandize in the morning and he would have to sell it and account for every item throughout the day. The bosses would come around and check on him every
two hours. He was supposed to report at a convened location. One day, Juan was not able to make it on time. Upon arrival to the house, he was severely beaten.

At night time, Juan would be given dinner, the bosses would convene a group meeting and claim their profits every night. If anything were missing, they would physically abuse whoever was responsible. Juan lived in terror. The bosses would talk about the “rules” every night. Every night there was a new rule. First, they were prohibited from talking to the police. They were reminded they were “illegal immigrants” and that the police would deport them or arrest them. This was typically followed by pejorative comments about Latinos. Then, their identifications were removed and kept by one of the bosses. They did not have permission to contact their families via phone. If they did, the bosses were present during the conversation.

Besides the “rules” the bosses would make announcements every night during the meeting. One day, they read the family information of every member of the group, and told them that if any of them got out of line, they would hurt their families back home. The next day, the bosses would announce that if any one left, they would start picking a random member of the group and beat them to death. Juan was short of money one of these nights. As a punishment, he was taken to the subway the next day without merchandize; they sat him on the floor and took his wheel chair with them. He was given a bucket to beg for money and collect what was missing. He could not move all day long. He had so many injuries from this punishment that he was in pain for days. He was not given medicine.

Juan reported that the only good day was payday. Every week, they would pay the employees except that the pay was significantly reduced because there were discounts for
rent, food, and transportation. In addition, each worker was charged $5000 dollars for being brought into the U.S. At the end of every week, Juan did not even have $100 left. He knew that with that amount of money he would never be able to pay back the debt or leave the bosses. One day, Juan and another friend got fed up and decided to go to the police.

Vignette 2

Louisa grew up in Hartford, Connecticut with her mother and two younger sisters. At the time of this incident, Louisa’s mother had been laid off and was unable to find another job. Around the same time, her mother’s boyfriend moved in with the family. Louisa’s new stepfather physically and psychologically abused her mother. Louisa begged her mother to end the relationship and threatened her mother to leave if she wouldn’t. After a year in this situation, Louisa began to find refuge on the streets. One day at a neighborhood party, she met a very charming young man. His name was Eric and he flattered her with compliments and seemed genuinely interested in her. Eric had an apartment a couple of blocks from Louisa’s house and invited her to stay with him until her family situation was resolved. Louisa became romantically involved with Eric and moved into his apartment. She was happy about finding love and security in Eric.

After a couple of weeks living with Eric, he started pushing Louisa to drop out of high school, claiming that she could start earning money soon with his help. Eric invited Louisa to experiment with crack cocaine and told her that it would enable her to relax. The drugs allowed her to suppress the guilt she carried from leaving her sisters in a dangerous environment. Louisa became addicted to the drugs very quickly and Eric kept supplying her with them. Two months after Louisa moved in with Eric, he told her that she would
have to pay for rent and for the drugs he had been supplying her. He claimed that her
drug use had bankrupted him. Louisa felt bad that her presence had had such a negative
impact on Eric’s life. Eric would always remind her of the abusive situation at home and
how he was trying to help her. Louisa actively started to look for ways to make money.

The upcoming weekend Eric invited a couple friends to the apartment. They all
used drugs and drank alcohol. Eric told Louisa to join him in the bedroom, and once
there, he told her that his friend would pay 100 dollars to have sex with her. Louisa was
so high that she had difficulty comprehending what Eric asked from her. When Eric did
not receive a response from Louisa, he told her that she had to do it if she wanted to stay
in his apartment. When Louisa woke up the next day, she had been beaten and physically
hurt the night before, but she could not totally remember what had happened. She saw
Eric counting money in the living room and realized that Eric had forced her to have sex
with the men for money. She asked him if that was her money and he just laughed.

A couple of days later Eric brought another girl home called Ashley. Louisa
started getting closer to Ashley and suddenly they were also romantically involved. Eric
realized this was happening. The next night, he made them perform same sex activities in
front of his costumers. Louisa had feelings for Ashley and felt responsible and humiliated
for having exposed their romance. She wanted to go home to her mother, but knew her
mom would be scandalized. Eric told her that if she would leave, he would tell her
mother and family that she was a prostitute, a lesbian and a drug addict. Louisa felt
ashamed and terrified about her family finding out and agreed to stay with Eric. He kept
supplying her with heavy drugs only if she was willing to have sex with different men for
money. After three months being forced to sell her body, Louisa tried to run away. Eric
caught her in the stairs to his apartment he threatened to send pictures of her to her family, he also beat her and called her dirty names in regards to her being a black girl. Louisa thought about contacting the police, but was told no one would believe “a stupid prostitute”. He also threatened to hurt her sisters if she did anything.

One night, Eric forced Louisa to go out on the streets to find customers. A man that agreed to pay her for sex showed to be an undercover policeman. Louisa was taken in for questioning. Since she was concerned that Eric would hurt her sisters, she did not tell the police, or the psychologist who interviewed her that she was forced into selling sex. She was embarrassed because she felt as though she put herself in the situation by trusting Eric and leaving her family. She was frightened, but put on a tough front. At the age of 16, Louisa was convicted for prostitution. She is currently serving a six-month sentence in juvenile detention.

**Vignette 3. Domestic Violence Case**

Alex

Alex and her husband Tom were high school sweethearts. Tom had a love for politics, sports, life, and he knew exactly where he was going. Alex described the first eight years of their marriage as perfect. He worked as a realtor and she was going to college to become a nurse. Alex always felt Tom was somewhat controlling. He would be often jealous for reasons she could not understand and liked to know how Alex spent her free time, and money. However, Alex did not feel as though his control was really preventing her from living her life. Some time into the marriage Tom started drinking. Alex noted he was acting different. Everything changed after that first hit. Alex married Tom out of love and thought that he also loved her. Just in a very possessive way. At
first, Alex took Tom’s behavior as total love and protection for her. For example, he would some times disapprove of some of her friends and would get upset if he knew she was spending time with them. Alex would rationalize this and find mistakes in her friends to the point that one-day, she found herself alone. This is when she realized his behavior was not normal. With time, he became more and more controlling and would be upset if she did not discuss with him her every action, her every move, even going to the bathroom. He was a wonderful father to her children, but he was unbelievably mean to her. Any little thing would upset him. Sometimes he would scream, sometimes he would hit her.

One night Tom took Alex behind an abandoned warehouse; there, he beat her because he was jealous that she could be seeing someone else. She thought she would die there. Alex finally convinced him that if he hurt her, their three kids would be homeless, and he would be in prison. Alex wanted to do everything she possibly could to keep her family together. She often excused Tom’s behavior in front of the children, saying that he was stressed. She also suggested they see a marriage counselor, but Tom did not see any problems with the relationship and often blamed Alex for everything. When she finally decided to leave, Alex wanted to think, she had given her marriage her all. Alex did everything she could and realized that it was not enough. Alex knew she had to go when she realized the message she was sending to her children about abuse.

After a horrible beating one night, she went to a local hospital and the police and an advocate met her there. She felt supported. Their assistance got her to a point of believing that she could make it on her own. She could be a single mom with three kids knowing that it’s possible to go on with her life.
Appendix C
Demographic Information

Gender ______________________

Age __________________________

Ethnicity ____________________

Profession____________________

Knowledge of Human Trafficking  (rate a number that represents your knowledge form 0- 5 with 0 being no knowledge and 5 being an expert)

0 1 2 3 4 5

0. I do not know what human trafficking is.
1. My knowledge about human trafficking is minimal and mainly comes from the media.
2. I have attended, at least, one professional training about human trafficking provided by a university or formal organization.
3. I work, volunteer or belong to a social justice organization that has worked on the topic of human trafficking
4. I have provided direct or advocacy services to a victim of human trafficking
5. I am perceived as a consultant on human trafficking (I have given lectures and trainings on the topic, lead human trafficking organizations or programs, or served as a consultant on specific cases).

Highest degree achieved (circle one)

Some College, Bachelor, Master, Doctorate

Number of years practicing your profession

224
Appendix D

Rescue and Restore Screening Instrument

1. Can the client leave their job or situation if they want?

2. Can the client come and go as they please?

3. Has the client been threatened if they try to leave?

4. Have the client been physically harmed in any way?

5. What are the client’s working or living conditions like?

6. Where does the client sleep and eat?

7. Does the client sleep in a bed, on a cot, or on the floor?

8. Has the client ever been deprived of food, water, sleep or medical care?

9. Does the client have to ask permission to eat, sleep or go to the bathroom?

10. Are there locks on the client’s doors and windows so that they cannot get out?

11. Has anyone threatened the client’s family?

12. Has the client’s identification or documentation been taken away?

13. Is anyone forcing the client to do anything that they do not want to do?

Conclusion,

How would you label the experience of this person?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Appendix E

Inclusive Human Trafficking Checklist

Inclusive Human Trafficking Checklist (IHTC)

Developed By Maria Almarlo MS. Special recognition given to Bree Pearsall for support and consultation on the development of this scale as well as the Partnership for the Eradication of Human trafficking United Nations Association of the United States.

This screening tool is copyrighted as intellectual property of Maria Almarlo. Please do not reproduce or distribute without contacting the author at maria.almarlo@gmail.com.

The Inclusive Human Trafficking Checklist is an instrument that allows you to screen victims of human trafficking in a non-intrusive way. In order to use this instrument, the practitioner will listen to a client’s story and check items that appear to be present in the story.

1. The instrument explores elements of human trafficking exploitation. This concept is defined as the act of utilizing someone for the purposes of labor, sexual or other service benefit such as domestic work, child care, or elderly care. In order to measure human trafficking, exploitation three major constructs are observed: force, fraud and coercion. To conclude that someone has been a victim of human trafficking, elements of these three constructs must be collected. However, there are two qualifiers that might excuse the presence of the previous constructs: if the victim is under 18 and has been involved in any form of sex work, or servitude, the practitioner can conclude the person has been a victim of human trafficking. Other forms of labor involving people under 18 might be appropriate for further inspection.

2. This checklist is sensitive to elements of human trafficking that are related to a person’s identity. Issues of identity related vulnerability are measured based on the way a person might self-identify. That is gender, immigration history, disability, profession, sexual orientation, and socio-economic status and other individual descriptors such as personal characteristics and/or affiliation to family. This is relevant because exploitation might look different for different social groups. For instance, taking away an assistive device or wheelchair is an example of force that is only relevant to a person with a disability.

3. The instrument consists of two types of items: attitudinal and behavioral. The attitudinal items screen for victim’s perception of perpetrator’s negative and hostile state of mind used to demean, manipulate and/or psychologically restrain the victim. The behavioral items screen for actions taken by the perpetrator used to demean, manipulate and restrain the victim.
Instructions

Step I. Gather information on issues of the client’s personal identity. (The practitioner must gather data only on those areas of identity that the client feels comfortable sharing)

Step II. Gather information about the client's history. Start by asking open ended questions (what, how) and follow up with close ended (yes/no) questions.

Step III. Mark with an X all the items that appear to be present in the client’s story. The instrument is organized in sections: general, work/profession, immigrant, persons with disabilities, sexual orientation, and socio-economic status. Skip sections that do not apply to the client you are working with. There are items on topics of ethnic or racial discrimination, gender, and past trauma experiences imbedded in the general section. These categories should be used with every client.

Step IV. Quantify your findings. Utilizing a grid, draw an x or circle over the item number the client has endorsed. Count the number of endorsements vertically and horizontally as indicated in the grid. The columns give you the total of fraud force and coercion experienced by the client. The rows give you the total number of force, fraud and coercion experienced in each identity category endorsed by the client. If you have a finding of zero in the force, fraud or coercion categories, you can stop the analysis and conclude that this is not a case of human trafficking with the exception of minors under the age of 18 who were involved in commercial sex acts.

Step V. Graph your findings. Utilize graph #1 to display total endorsements. Draw a bar for the number of endorsements in each construct (force, fraud, coercion). Utilize graph #2 to display endorsements of force fraud and coercion in each identity category by using the colors indicated.

Step VI. Indicator of combined exploitability. The last step gives you a correlation between vulnerability and exploitability for each individual client. In order to get this number write the total endorsements indicated under each identity subcategory and divide it by the total number of possible endorsements. The same process is outlined for each individual vulnerability sub-scale.

Instrument

Step I
Gather information on issues of the client’s personal identity. (The practitioner must gather data only on those areas of identity that the client feels comfortable sharing)

Gender ________________________________ ________________________________

Age ________________________________________________________________

Educational Level ____________________________________________________

Sexual Orientation ____________________________________________________
Step II
Gather information about the client's history. Start by asking open-ended questions (what, how) and follow up with close-ended (yes/no) questions. The following are some opening probing questions that might allude to a story:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Force</th>
<th>Fraud</th>
<th>Coercion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can you leave your job or situation if you want?</td>
<td>How did you find out about the job?</td>
<td>Can you tell me about what your working conditions are like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you come and go as you please?</td>
<td>How did you meet your boss?</td>
<td>Can you tell me about what your living conditions are like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you been threatened about what would happen if you left?</td>
<td>How did you meet your husband?</td>
<td>Where do you sleep and eat?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you been physically harmed in any way?</td>
<td>What were you told about the job you would be doing?</td>
<td>Do you sleep in a bed, a cot, or the floor?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has anyone threatened your family?</td>
<td>Did you sign a contract for your job?</td>
<td>Do you have to ask permissions to eat, sleep, or go to the bathroom?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is anyone forcing you to do anything you don't want to do?</td>
<td>Have you been paid for your work?</td>
<td>Has your identification or documentation been taken from you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there locks on your doors or windows so you can't get out?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Have you been able to communicate with your family?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you feel would happen if you left your job?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever been deprived of food, water, sleep, or medical care?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step III
Mark with an X all the items that appear to be present in the client's story. The instrument is organized in sections: general, work/profession, immigrant, persons with disabilities,
sexual orientation, and socio-economic status. Skip sections that do not apply to the client you are working with.

**General**

**Client endorses:**

- 1. Feeling humiliated by the way they were treated by the perpetrator. (Force)
- 2. Perpetrator exerted pressure over what client did, who client saw, talked to, went to, or where client worked without using physical force. (Coercion)
- 3. Having lost friends because perpetrator prevents client from contacting them. (Coercion)
- 4. Perpetrator handles client’s money or makes client’s financial decisions without their consent within a labor arrangement. (Fraud)
- 5. Perpetrator aggressively influences client’s decision of dropping out of school. (Coercion)
- 6. Perpetrator kidnapped the client. (Force)
- 7. Perpetrator kidnapped the client or their loved one and later promised to release them upon completion of a particular job. (Coercion)
- 8. Perpetrator threatened to harm, or kill client, or client’s loved ones if the client refuses to do the job or escapes. (Coercion)
- 9. Perpetrator restricted client’s ability to do normal tasks such as moving, eating or sleeping. (circle all that apply). (Force)
- 10. Perpetrator would get very aggressive over trivial things. (Force)
- 11. Perpetrator shoved, slapped, hit the client, or broke client’s things. (Circle all that apply). (Force)
- 12. Perpetrator made pejorative comments about client’s ethnicity making them feel as though people from their ethnic group could not have other options. (Force)
- 13. Perpetrator encouraged distrust in authorities. (Coercion)
- 14. Perpetrator has intimidated client into dropping charges originally laid against them. (Coercion)
- 15. Perpetrator induced or forced client into taking drugs, and later controlled drug access pending on client completion of a job. (Coercion)
☐ 16. Perpetrator threatened to unveil a client’s personal substance abuse habit or other habits that client perceives as imprudent or immoral. (Coercion)

☐ 17. Feeling and thinking his/her ability to survive in every area of their life was dependent on the presence of perpetrator. (Coercion)

☐ 18. Learning that the perpetrator sold or bought them. (This includes selling or buying sexualized photos or videos that were not intended for commercial use) (Fraud)

☐ 19. Being sexually abused while in the job or while providing a service. (Force)

☐ 20. Being addressed by the title of their job such as dishwasher or cook and never being referred to by name. (Force)

☐ 21. Disclosing to their perpetrator private information about their family history (such as having a family history of abuse, neglect, drug abuse or alcoholism), which later was used to manipulate the client. (Coercion)

☐ 22. Perpetrator persuaded him/her to change their name or identity to perform a job. (Fraud)

☐ 23. Feeling objectified or feeling reduced to a task. (Force)

☐ 24. Feeling confused because a family member, a friend, or romantic partner manipulated them into the situation. (Coercion)

☐ 25. Having to perform sexual favors, or provide services or labor for the perpetrator against their will. (Force)

☐ 26. Disclosing a history of trauma to the perpetrator that later was used to manipulate the client. (Coercion)

Work/profession/Services:

Client endorses:

☐ 27. Perpetrator persuaded client to perform a job, activity, or service that client perceives as immoral or that devalues client as a person. (Coercion)

☐ 28. Perpetrator threatened to “out client” with family members about the type of job, activity, or service that client engaged in. (Screen for issues of job status, subservient jobs, sex work) (Coercion)

☐ 29. Perpetrator forced client to do a job that client felt was physically hard for them to do and disregarded client’s need to rest or take a break. (Force)
30. Perpetrator abused client verbally or physically for not completing a job, activity, or service. (Force)

31. Client was originally recruited for a job that appeared legitimate, but later realized the job was not legitimate or did not exist. (Fraud)

32. Thinking that they were entering a romantic relationship/marriage and later realizing that they were being used by their romantic partner in commercial sex acts or in other labor arrangements. (Fraud)

33. Perpetrator promised to compensate the client for performing a particular job or service, and after the job was completed, they refused to pay. (Fraud)

Immigrant

Client endorses:

34. Perpetrator threatened to call authorities or cancel immigration proceedings if client did not work or decided to leave. (Coercion)

35. Perpetrator originally recruited the victim at their home country promising they would secure immigration documentation for the victim; this promise never came true in the destination country. (Fraud)

36. Perpetrator made client feel helpless and dependent on the perpetrator for not speaking English. (Coercion)

37. Perpetrator threatens client to send them back to a country where there is an active war or an armed conflict. (Coercion)

38. Perpetrator retained client’s passport or documentation. (Force)

39. Perpetrator made the client feel incapable of assimilating to the demands of a new environment (for example, doing errands, speaking the language, using public transportation, looking for a doctor). (Coercion)

40. Perpetrator made statements such as “immigrants are not welcome in this country” to make the client feel less safe. (Coercion)

Individuals With Disabilities

Client endorses:

41. Perpetrator has taken away assistive devices such as crutches, hearing aids, wheelchair, or medication. (Force)
42. Perpetrator withheld client’s paychecks, financial assistance, or social security check stating that client cannot manage money or cannot physically cash the check. (Fraud)

43. Perpetrator discussed the job or services in a confusing way and then told the client he/she “just would not be able to understand”. (Fraud)

44. Learning that the perpetrator uses client’s disability to obtain financial gain. (Fraud)

45. Perpetrator has inflicted physical disabilities on client. (Force)

Sexual Orientation
This portion of the tool should be used by first assessing the level of comfort or discomfort that the individual indicates in relationship to their sexual orientation.

Client endorses:

46. Perpetrator humiliated client regarding clients’ sexual orientation. (Force)

47. Perpetrator has threatened to disclose client’s sexual orientation to clients’ family or loved ones if they do not do their job. (Coercion)

48. Client disclosed to the perpetrator confusion about his/her sexual orientation, which was then used by the perpetrator to manipulate the client into engaging in same sex commercial sex acts. (Coercion)

Socio-Economic Status
Client endorses:

49. Perpetrator falsely lead the client into thinking that engaging in a particular job, activity, or service was going to have a significant impact on client’s economic situation. (Fraud)

50. Being told by perpetrator that he/she had to pay back an acquired debt for transportation, food, housing, clothing, immigration petition, bail out of jail, etc., by engaging in some type of work or service. (Fraud)

51. The perpetrator convinced the client’s family that he/she would be better off elsewhere due to the family’s precarious living situation. (Coercion)

52. Coming to the conclusion that his/her debt was never going to be paid. (Fraud)
53. Agreeing to work for a particular amount, and later feeling cheated by the amount of money he/she got paid after unexplained discounts (these discounts must exceed those mandated by the law such as taxes or social security). (Fraud)

54. Being a runaway minor or having little family support as a child, and being lured into sex work or any other type of service. (Coercion)

55. Being paid with goods such as food, shelter or merchandise in exchange for work or sexual favors. (Fraud)
**Step IV**

Quantify your findings utilizing a grid, draw an x or circle over the item number the client has endorsed. Count the number of endorsements vertically and horizontally as indicated in the grid. The columns give you the total of fraud force and coercion experienced by the client. The rows give you the total number of force fraud and coercion experienced in each identity category endorsed by the client.

The total number of endorsements could be up to 55 if the client self-identifies in each category. However, the total number of endorsements are not relevant to the conclusion of suspected trafficking because not every client is going to self-identify in terms of all the categories previously discussed. Identifying specific category items becomes relevant when assessing the impact of a particular endorsement on the client's level of distress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Force</th>
<th>Fraud</th>
<th>Coercion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force</td>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 19, 20, 23, 25,</td>
<td>4, 18, 22</td>
<td>2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 24, 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/ Profession</td>
<td>Work/ Profession</td>
<td>Work/ Profession</td>
<td>Work/ Profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force</td>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29, 30</td>
<td>31, 32, 33</td>
<td>27, 28,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>Immigrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force</td>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38,</td>
<td>34,</td>
<td>35, 36, 37, 39, 40,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force</td>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41, 45</td>
<td>42, 44</td>
<td>43,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force</td>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>47, 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>SES</td>
<td>SES</td>
<td>SES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force</td>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49, 50, 52, 53, 55</td>
<td>51, 54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploitation</td>
<td>Exploitation</td>
<td>Exploitation</td>
<td>Exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force</td>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Force</td>
<td>Total Fraud</td>
<td>Total Coercion</td>
<td>Total Number of Endorsements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minor:
If the victim is under eighteen and has been involved in any form of sex labor they might qualify as a victim of human trafficking.

Step V
In order to determine if someone qualifies as a victim of human trafficking, look at the totals for fraud force and coercion in the previous chart. If you find a zero in any of these categories, you can conclude the case does not qualify as a case of trafficking. If you find any number different than zero the client qualifies as a victim and you should proceed with the analysis.

Graph your findings, Utilize graph #1 to display total endorsements. Draw a bar for the number of endorsements in each construct (force, fraud, coercion). Utilize graph # 2 to display endorsements of force, fraud and coercion in each identity category by using the colors indicated.

**Graph I Force, Fraud and Coercion Endorsements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Force</th>
<th>Fraud</th>
<th>Coercion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Graph II identity Based Endorsements**
These graphs provide practitioners with a visual of the intensity of the abusive experience, which could have significant relevance in terms of the intervention to be used. It is expected that endorsements of particular items might have clinical significance in terms of the client’s proclivity to react emotionally to ambiguous situations that evoke memories of the abuse. The memories may include the content of the endorsements in this instrument. For consultation on specific cases please contact the developer of the tool. The use of force, fraud, and coercion are expressed differently according to the way someone self identifies. Force, fraud and coercion are mechanisms that attach someone’s perception of personal rights and entitlements.

Total:

X X

Force X Fraud X Coercion, If you get a 0 in any score you can conclude this is not a case of human trafficking with the exception of victims younger than 18.

Step VI.
Indicator of strength of the correlation between vulnerability and exploitability. The last step gives you a correlation between vulnerability and exploitability for each individual client. In order to get this number write the total endorsements indicated under each identity subcategory and divide it by the total number of possible endorsements.
General number of endorsements _______/26 x 100=

Note:
1. If the client did not disclose having a history of trauma, subtract one from the total of potential endorsements.
2. If the client does not disclose having a history in the family of neglect, abuse, or alcoholism, subtract one from the total of potential endorsements.
3. If the client does not disclose having a history of drug or alcohol abuse or addiction subtract, one from the total of potential endorsements.

Work/ Professions number of endorsements _______/7 x 100=

Immigration number of endorsements _______/7 x 100=

Disability number of endorsements _______/5 x 100=

Sexual orientation number of endorsements _______/3 x 100=

Socio-economic status number of endorsements _______/7 x 100=

Total number of items endorsed _______

Total Score
In the following chart circle the number of identity categories that apply to the client. Add the total number of possible endorsements for each and write the number in the total number of potential endorsements. (The general section is applied to all clients)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible categories</th>
<th>Number of potential items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/ Profession</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio Economic Status</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Potential Endorsements (see note)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note:
1. If the client did not disclose having a history of trauma, subtract one from the total of potential endorsements.
2. If the client does not disclose having a history in the family of neglect, abuse, or alcoholism, subtract one from the total of potential endorsements.
3. If the client does not disclose having a history of drug or alcohol abuse or addiction, subtract one from the total of potential endorsements.
4. If the client does not disclose having a history of running away from home, subtract one from the total number of endorsements.

Total Score

Total number of endorsed items / Total number of potential endorsements × 100 = ________ . This represents the percentage of human trafficking exploitation excerpted from the person's vulnerabilities.

Based on your assessment
How would you label the experience of this person?

What interventions would you use to help this person?

What aspects of the story show:

Force:

Fraud:

Coercion:

Implications of findings
Identifying a victim of human trafficking could have a tremendous impact on the client's ability to emancipate and recover. Victims are eligible for legal and medical advocacy, as well as mental health services. The use of this instrument can assist law enforcement in investigating cases. It can assist attorneys in categorizing and analyzing instances of fraud,
fraud and coercion, which can then be used to support a human trafficking claim in a court of law. It can also assist mental health practitioners in recognizing the link between a client’s presenting problems and their experienced human trafficking trauma. This instrument can also be used in identifying the origin of the client’s distress, and devise interventions geared toward restoring the client’s notions of their identity or personhood. If you conclude that someone is a victim of human trafficking after utilizing this instrument please call or text the National Human Trafficking Resource Center for further assistance.

1888-373-7888
# Appendix F

## Utility Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility Questionnaire</th>
<th>From M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Based upon First et al. (2004) description of six components of utility.]</td>
<td>1 = not at all; 2 = slightly; 3 = moderately; 4 = very; 5 = extremely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Human Trafficking

**Act**
- Recruitment
- Harboring
- Transportation
- Provision
- Obtaining of a person

**Means**
- Force
- Fraud
- Coercion

**Purpose**
- Commercial sex act
- Involuntary servitude
- Forced labor
- Peonage
- Debt bondage
- Slavery
Vulnerability and Exploitability

- Women
- Ethnicity/Immigrants
- Runaway Youth
- Persons with Disabilities
- Poverty/lack of options
- Substance abuse
- History of Trauma
Exploitative (happens outside civil protections) (outside a socially validated environment)

Fair (within civil protections) (within a socially validated environment)
Main Dialectical Conceptualization

Utilitarian Labor

Exploitation

______________
Vulnerability

Fair Labor

Support

______________
Human Capability

Human trafficking:
Exploitation: Force, fraud coercion
Vulnerability: Identity (general, work profession, immigration, disability sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, SES)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The purpose of exploitative environments is to restrict and brake down a person’s sense of self and potential and reduce them to a particular task by exploiting individual’s vulnerabilities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of fair environments is to protect and foster the social contribution of individual to the labor force through compensation and fair treatment which reinforce intellectual or personal growth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Human Trafficking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exploitability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vulnerability**
Vulnerability is the susceptibility to physical or emotional injury or attack.

**Self-Identity**
Social Identity: Groups we belong to. Gender, ethnicity, disability, socio economic status, sexual orientation.

Personal Identity: is derived from personal characteristics and individual relationships.
Human Trafficking

Exploitation
A persistent social relationship in which a person with a desired capability or characteristic is being mistreated or unfairly used for the benefit of others.

Mechanism of exploitation

• Force: To compel by physical, moral, or intellectual means
• Fraud: is the intentional perversion of truth in order to induce another to surrender a legal right.
• Coercion: Tactics used to persuade someone to take a course of action.
Identity and Exploitation

**Behavioral and psychological impact of exploitation:**
The mechanisms used to exploit an individual are fraud, force and coercion. They are designed to break someone’s sense of social and personal identity down. The expression of these mechanisms differs according to the way the individual self identifies.

**Example: Disability**
If an abuser wants to take away assistive devices such as wheelchairs or crutches might force a person with physical disabilities to stay in a particular place. This person will be denied the right of mobility. This however, would not be compelling for someone who does not have a disability. If the intention of the perpetrator was to restrict mobility, the perpetrator would be successful in inducing the desired behavior on the victim.
Step I
Gather information on issues of the client's personal identity: (The practitioner must data only on those nebulae of identity that the client feels comfortable sharing)
Gender ___________________________ Female
Age ___________________________ 20
Educational Level ___________________________ unknown
Sexual Orientation ___________________________ unknown
Race/Ethnicity ___________________________ unknown
Religious or Spiritual Orientation ___________________________ unknown
Socio-economic Status ___________________________ unknown
Nationality ___________________________ unknown
Primary/ Secondary Language ___________________________ unknown
Client endorses:

☐ 1. Feeling humiliated by the way they were treated by the perpetrator. (Force)

☐ 2. Perpetrator exerted pressure over what client did, who client saw, talked to, went to, or where client worked without using physical force. (Circle all that apply). (Coercion)

☐ 3. Having lost friends because perpetrator prevents client from contacting them. (Coercion)

☐ 4. Perpetrator handles client’s money or makes client’s financial decisions without their consent. (Fraud)

☐ 5. Perpetrator aggressively influences client’s decision of dropping out of school. (Coercion)

☐ 6. Perpetrator kidnapped the client. (Force)
Step III Mark X on each item that appear to be present in the vignette.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mark X</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mark X</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Client endorses:

- 1. Feeling humiliated by the way
- 2. Perpetrator exerted pressure or where client worked without using
- 3. Having lost friends because pec (Coercion)
- 4. Perpetrator handles client’s mc consent. (Fraud)
- 5. Perpetrator aggressively influe (Coercion)
- 6. Perpetrator kidnapped the cli
when assessing the impact of a particular endorsement on the client’s level of distress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Force</th>
<th>Fraud</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Coercion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Force</th>
<th>Fraud</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Coercion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 19, 20, 23, 25</td>
<td>4, 18, 22</td>
<td>2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 24, 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work/ Profession</th>
<th>Work/ Profession</th>
<th>Work/ Profession</th>
<th>Work/ Profession</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Force</td>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29, 30</td>
<td>31, 32, 33</td>
<td>27, 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immigrant</th>
<th>Immigrant</th>
<th>Immigrant</th>
<th>Immigrant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Force</td>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38,</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35, 36, 37, 39, 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Force</td>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Force</th>
<th>Fraud</th>
<th>Coercion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force</td>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 8, 16, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 24, 26</td>
<td>10, 22</td>
<td>21, 22</td>
<td>7, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/Profession</td>
<td>Work/Profession</td>
<td>Work/Profession</td>
<td>Work/Profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force</td>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29, 30</td>
<td>31, 32, 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>Immigrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force</td>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58, 59, 34</td>
<td>55, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 0, 41, 42, 43</td>
<td>6, 3, 13, 10, 0, 1</td>
<td>6, 3, 13, 10, 0, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force</td>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40, 47, 48</td>
<td>49, 50, 52, 53, 55</td>
<td>51, 54, 56</td>
<td>51, 54, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploitation</td>
<td>Exploitation</td>
<td>Exploitation</td>
<td>Exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force</td>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Force</td>
<td>Total Fraud</td>
<td>Total Coercion</td>
<td>Total Number of Endorsements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, 13, 13</td>
<td>4, 8, 3</td>
<td>3, 13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total:

6, 4, 3

0 = not HT any other number human trafficking

Force X Fraud X Coercion, if you get a 0 in any score you can conclude this is not a case of human trafficking with the exception of victims younger than 18.
## Possible categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible categories</th>
<th>Number of potential items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/Profession</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Potential Endorsements (see note) 45

Note: If the client did not disclose having a history of trauma, subtract one from the total of potential endorsements.
If the client does not disclose having a history in the family of neglect, abuse, or alcoholism, subtract one from the total of potential endorsements.
If the client does not disclose having a history of drug or alcohol abuse or addiction, subtract one from the total of potential endorsements.

General number of endorsements \( \frac{7}{20} \times 100 = \)
Work/Profession number of endorsements \( \frac{2}{7} \times 100 = \)
Immigration number of endorsements \( \frac{0}{7} \times 100 = \)
Disability number of endorsements \( \frac{3}{5} \times 100 = \)
Sexual orientation number of endorsements \( \frac{0}{3} \times 100 = \)
Socio-economic status number of endorsements \( \frac{1}{7} \times 100 = \)
Total number of items endorsed 13
Total number of endorsed items: 13
Total number of potential endorsements: 45
\[ \times 100 = \text{_______} \] This represents the percentage of human trafficking exploitation excerpted from the person's vulnerabilities.
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