National Institute of Justice

Expert Working Group on Trafficking in Persons Research Meeting

April 24-25, 2014

Washington, D.C.

Foreword

For more than a decade, the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) has supported a broad portfolio of research aimed at better understanding trafficking in persons in the U.S. and improving the criminal justice system's response to it. The trafficking research that NIJ conducts and sponsors focuses on four goals. The first is to measure the incidence of trafficking in the United States, which includes numerous investments in prevalence studies and market analyses. The second is to detail the methods and operation of trafficking, which includes more in-depth research — on not just the perpetration of trafficking but also the perpetrators themselves. The third is to examine more closely the victims and survivors of trafficking, which focuses on the needs of victims and the identification of best practices for serving their needs. Last, NIJ seeks to identify evidence-based practices that combat trafficking effectively, which includes the examination of investigations, prosecutions, trials and related topics.

Over this time, NIJ has invested in numerous studies that have resulted in numerous advances in our knowledge of trafficking. For example, NIJ studies reveal that, in spite of recent efforts to expand it, training remains a central requirement for prosecutors, defense attorneys and judges at all levels of jurisprudence. Likewise, NIJ studies have concluded that the involvement of prosecutors early in a trafficking case increases its odds of success, defined as both rescued victims and arrested perpetrators. Finally, some studies revealed that there is a relatively low level of misreporting of trafficking cases at the state and local levels.

However, NIJ recognizes that it is not the only agency conducting research on trafficking in persons. To that end, in April of 2014, NIJ convened an expert working group of researchers, federal partners, law enforcement, prosecutors, victim service providers and advocates to explore the current state of human trafficking research, identify persistent challenges, brainstorm solutions, and discuss priority topics for future research. This meeting, summarized here, provided a snapshot of our progress to date.

Executive Summary

Definitions

The meeting opened with a robust and lively discussion about the various working definitions of human trafficking. It focused on the necessity of different definitions, their use in different sectors of the field, whether and how these definitions impact researchers' and criminal justice practitioners' approach to and understanding of human trafficking, and the importance of being educated about the differences in definitions used across disciplines. Although it is important to tailor terminology to specific audiences, many attendees agreed that it is also important to retain some consistency with legal definitions and that effort should be made to agree on at least some baseline definitional components to facilitate action and measurement in the field.

Ultimately, the working group had a number of concrete suggestions pertaining to definitions:

- Researchers and practitioners should use simple definitions.
- Get more of the basic information about trafficking into law review articles and other venues to educate judges, probation officers and others in the criminal justice system.
- Develop a typology of victimization that is constantly updated and distributed widely. Engage survivors to better refine changing definitions of victim and survivor.

Prevalence

Generating statistically sound estimates of the prevalence of human trafficking in the United States is one of the greatest challenges facing researchers; if resolved, it has the greatest potential to affect policy and practice in the U.S. Reliable estimates of human trafficking are important for nearly everything — from the allocation of limited criminal justice resources to the evaluation of prevention, intervention and victim services programs.

Three barriers hindering prevalence studies were discussed:

- The applicability of currently collected data to generating prevalence estimates.

- Data sharing arrangements between agencies and with researchers that struggle with how to balance privacy and safety protections, definitions, and issues surrounding those who collect data but who will not or cannot standardize it.

- The limitations of smaller county- or city-based data collections.

- These studies are rich and incredibly useful but expensive, and funds are scarce.

Several recommendations were discussed by the group:

- Adapt use of a census of survivors seeking services in a single 24-hour period throughout the United States, as pioneered by the domestic violence field. Although still biased toward those who self-report, this may provide a good prevalence estimation method.

- Embed researchers with anti-trafficking task forces. Networking, investments in social capital, and embedding with practitioners could help work through the politics and academic issues involved with data sharing.

- Produce data using newly developed tools such as the Trafficking Victim Identification Tool (TVIT) from the Vera Institute of Justice.

Victims and Survivors

This panel explored studies of victim services — especially how to responsibly incorporate survivors' experiences. This includes adding survivors' voices to policy, programs, and research and evaluation designs — and the provision of fair compensation for lending their expertise. Cautions were noted regarding (re)traumatization, recognition that victims are "more than their trafficking experience," and the need to provide translation and interpretation services for participants not proficient in English. Discussion extended to ways to expand or institutionalize opportunities for researchers and government employees to interact with survivors in a responsible way. Researchers should tread carefully when trying to generate large data sets about trafficking victims because the population is heterogeneous and the differences matter.

The experts had a number of suggestions for future research on victims:

- Consider systemic issues for survivors (e.g., whether the requirement to cooperate with law enforcement is a help or a hindrance).

- Examine the role of continued presence as an aid (or hurdle) in the recovery process.

- Determine the proper amount of time needed before expecting a victim to be able to contribute to an investigation.

- Study cultural aspects of victimization and how these inform services needed.
- Examine the factors impacting how receptive individuals are to receiving services
- Examine how receptive individuals are to people perceived to be with law enforcement.
- Evaluate more evidence-based practices for providing services and shelter to survivors.

Analogous Research Trajectories

Human trafficking research has been compared to other efforts to explore hidden populations, including violence against women and domestic violence research. This panel explored the validity of this analogy and discussed what trafficking researchers might learn from these and other fields, both from their successes and mistakes.

A number of specific issues were raised in which a comparative approach would be useful:

- **From the sexual assault community:**
  o Traumatic bonding and how minors abused at a young age may believe they cannot survive without their abuser.
  o Risk factors associated with becoming a perpetrator.
- **From the literature on intimate partner violence:** the means of control is used to keep abused partners (or trafficking victims) dependent on the perpetrator.
- **From the literature on illicit markets:** trafficking as a profit-oriented organized crime. Especially look at methods involving "following the money"[1] to understand and investigate human trafficking operations.
- **From methods used with prisoner re-entry programs:** why traffickers re-offend.

Prevention

Several themes were identified for future research on traffickers — such as the use of facilitators to intimidate victims after a trafficker's arrest, age, and especially the youth of many traffickers — and the process of establishing victim control.

---

[1] See, for example, Wheaton, E.M., E.J. Schauer and T.V. Galli, "Economics of Human Trafficking," *International Migration* 48(4) (2010): 114-141; Beare, M.E. (Ed.), *Critical Reflections on Transnational Organized Crime, Money Laundering, and Corruption,* University of Toronto Press, 2003; Naylor, R.T. *Wages of Crime: Black Markets, Illegal Finance, and the Underworld Economy,* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004.

Future research might provide information on how to better calibrate current prevention and deterrence programs and evaluate promising new programs, and identify strategies for shifting the cultural norms about sex, violence and power structures that facilitate trafficking.

Technology and Development

Practitioners are turning to technology to solve intractable problems ranging from data collection and data sharing to identification of traffickers. In addition to developing tools, often with private-sector partners, researchers are using technology to improve results.

One form of technology development involves the expanding analysis of online data to identify potential trafficking cases. Experts agreed that all parties are using chat rooms, message boards, social media and other internet-based means to connect with these illegal services for purchase or to recruit victims. Lessons may be learned from the development of tools for investigating child pornography and other exploitative crimes with an online element.

Research Questions

Inquiry into a number of research areas would support practitioners in the field, such as:

- **Business aspects of trafficking:** the intersection of trafficking and legitimate businesses — traffickers use hotels, legitimate businesses/supply chains in their operations, and whatever else sustains trafficking business operations.
- **Importance of strategic planning in trafficking research:** proactive identification of market trends in trafficking, reducing the demand, reducing the number of individuals at risk for victimization, and the intersection of race and human trafficking.

Definitions

The meeting opened with a robust discussion about the various working definitions of human trafficking, with a focus on the necessity of different definitions and their use in the field, and whether and how these definitions impact researchers' and criminal justice practitioners' approach to and understanding of human trafficking.

Definitions are tools that serve different purposes; therefore, we should expect to see varying definitions of human trafficking between and among researchers and practitioners. Although such variance is sometimes considered to be a weakness in the field, many at the meeting noted that no one definition is necessarily "better" than others. Although there is no need to agree on a one-size-fits-all definition for use across all disciplines — and it may be very appropriate for the language to differ in different fields — definitions should be consistent with the legal definitions used by practitioners and legislators for purposes of policy. Definitions also make sure that counted prevalence rates across disciplines are indeed counting the same things.[2]

For example, a fusion center conducted a study on the prevalence of human trafficking in its jurisdiction. The study involved surveying local police agencies to identify their recent cases of human trafficking. The initial responses indicated there were no cases in the jurisdiction. The fusion center then designed a new survey that did not use the words "human trafficking" but, rather, used language indicating human trafficking **behaviors** — terms used more often among law enforcement but consistent with the legal definition of trafficking — and the results were very different. This illustrates the importance of tailoring trafficking terminology to specific audiences and ensuring that communication reflects that audience's colloquial usage.

Although the attendees conceded that no agreed-upon, uniform definition of human trafficking would be likely by the end of this meeting, they noted that both researchers and practitioners must be educated about the difference in definitions used across disciplines, know the reasons those differences exist, and then mindfully interpret information relying on a different definition for their own use. Furthermore, efforts to agree on at least some baseline definitional components would facilitate action and measurement in the field. For example, while some important definitional differences have come about through the experiences of different types of victim service providers, the specific definitions used in prevalence research may affect law enforcement's ability or willingness to take results into consideration when the definition differs from the controlling legislation in that jurisdiction.

---

[2] Bales, Kevin, *Ending Slavery: How We Free Today's Slaves,* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2007; Choo, Kyungseok, Joon Oh Jang, and Kyungshick Choi, "Methodological and Ethical Challenges to Conducting Human Trafficking Studies: A Case Study of Korean Trafficking and Smuggling for Sexual Exploitation to the United States," *Women and Criminal Justice* 20(1/2) (2010): 167-185; Zhang, Sheldon, "Measuring Labor Trafficking: A Research Note," *Crime, Law, and Social Change* 58 (2012): 469-482.

Both researchers and practitioners bear the responsibility of educating the various components of the criminal justice system and victim service providers so that different definitions can be understood and mindfully applied. For example, prosecutors are working to inform judges of the various definitions of trafficking in use. They are attempting to give judges access to research that supports and explains these definitions, and how they fit with the legal statutes in question during a case. Practitioners are working to develop more common terminology for definitions of trafficking for law enforcement and other first responders to help them recognize and identify victims. In the Netherlands, judges have successfully been trained to recognize and understand instances of labor and sex trafficking, and the judges are now well-informed about and even specialized in hearing human trafficking cases.

One of the main reasons that disparities in definitions exist and are necessary is that it is difficult to precisely identify what constitutes "trafficking in persons" under the law. The term is defined differently by international treaties, by U.S. federal law and by various state laws, and there are also subtleties in the interpretation of those laws that add to the confusion. For researchers, definitions are critical; they form the foundation on which studies are based. For example, the phrase "force, fraud and coercion" (U.S. Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000) is critical to understanding the federal definition of trafficking in persons, because the phrase distinguishes trafficking from similar forms of criminality. These definitions are important not just for criminal prosecution but also for determining survivor eligibility for services because different service providers have different mandates: Some serve sex trafficking survivors only, some only minors, some only foreign nationals, some only U.S. citizens or documented immigrants, some only females, some LGBT, and some labor trafficking only; some serve domestic violence and sexual assault victims as well as trafficking survivors. If each type of service providers define human trafficking differently, coordinating services for a survivor can be very difficult.

Even though it seems simple, definitions are the most difficult element to articulate when designing a survey that seeks to capture the prevalence of human trafficking. **Force**, if defined narrowly as physical force exercised by a controller or trafficker, might unnecessarily exclude traffickers who use other means of control. Others in the discussion sought to broaden the

definition of trafficking to include those forced by circumstances to engage in survival sex or independent prostitution when they otherwise might not do so. These individuals are also in need of support services but, at this time, the legal definition of human trafficking requires a perpetrator, given the structure of criminal law. **Coercion**, if defined without understanding the breadth and creativity that traffickers use as means of control with their victims, may or may not account for such actions as traffickers withholding drugs from drug-addicted victims, or threats made that are truly specific to a given victim's vulnerabilities, depending on interpretation. Indeed, many of the experts agreed that what they see today is a more subtle form of coercion — less violent, more manipulative, more effective and harder to prove in court, although there was lively debate about where lines should be drawn in definitions and to what purposes they are applied (e.g., prosecution may need a more specific definition than that of a service provider focused on achieving wellness). Although much of the discussion focused on sex trafficking definitions, the experts noted that labor trafficking can be even harder to demonstrate — especially in terms of force, fraud and coercion —because at this time there has been less education of criminal justice actors and little in the way of research on labor trafficking.

Participants discussed the various contextual factors that also must be considered when exploring our understanding of "force, fraud and coercion." For example, in addition to what is represented in the legal framework, it is important to also consider community risk factors (e.g., runaway populations, poverty levels) and individual risk factors that may be exploited by traffickers, such as poverty or disability, or struggling to pay off a smuggling debt. Participants discussed the importance of investigating who is vulnerable, the indicators of this vulnerability and of victimization, and the necessary response with regard to prevention, identification, and education of vulnerable populations and victims about their rights and where to go for help.

The final discussion during this session was about the applicability of specific terms describing victims. Both practitioners and researchers noted that an individual may have been a victim of trafficking in the past (especially if he or she is younger than 18), but what happens later when the individual is a prostitute older than 18 and is no longer in the grasp of slavery (not to be confused with individuals who are 18 or older but still under the control of a trafficker)? Is the individual still a victim of trafficking if they have attained the age of majority? According to the

law, if there is a controller involved, yes. However, victimhood in the eyes of the law differs from victimhood status as defined by service providers, although some synergy is needed when the government is providing service referrals or when service providers file for government reimbursements. If the waters remain murky, then what are the factors that identify a victim of trafficking or a survivor, and at what point does a person move from victim to survivor status?

Such questions might appear academic in nature. However, both researchers and practitioners emphasized that answering these questions is vital to improving our understanding of what constitutes successful service provision, in terms of both completing the job and relating to how victims and survivors may identify themselves. For example, if a service provider or victim advocate is seeking to empower the individual, they will choose the term "survivor." Under which circumstances is each term used, and under which circumstances is uniformity most essential?

Ultimately, the working group had a number of concrete suggestions pertaining to definitions. First, the group felt that researchers and practitioners should use simple definitions. Second, the group felt there is a need to get more basic information about trafficking into law review articles and other venues to educate judges, probation officers and others in the criminal justice system. Third, a typology based on victimization cases needs to be developed that is constantly updated, perhaps in near-real time, and then is distributed widely to all communities making efforts to fight human trafficking (all components of law enforcement, service providers of all stripes, legislators, activists and the public). Part of this is engaging survivors to get a better grasp on definitions of victims and survivors, and how these definitions change over time. Life-course histories could also be helpful in this regard. One idea was to use concept mapping to show how trafficking researchers have defined trafficking across disciplines. This type of metadata study could also focus on how law enforcement and prosecutors define trafficking in investigations and in court, both in practice and when compared to the statutes in question. Farrell et al.'s 2012 study, "Identifying Challenges to Improve the Investigation and Prosecution of State and Local Human Trafficking Cases," is a first step in identifying these differences.

Prevalence

One of the most difficult problems both researchers and practitioners face is how to identify the prevalence of trafficking that occurs within a geographic area. Reliable estimates of human trafficking are important for nearly everything associated with trafficking — from the allocation of limited criminal justice resources to the evaluation of prevention, intervention and victim services programs. Yet, as one participant noted, prevalence is the "bright, shiny object with the gold-plated price tag."

Simply put, generating statistically sound estimates of the prevalence of human trafficking in the United States is one of the greatest challenges facing researchers; if resolved, it has the greatest potential to affect policy and practice in the U.S. A fair amount of controversy has always surrounded the issue of human trafficking. Some organizations strongly believe that we are only scratching the surface of victimization in the U.S., and others point to the lack of reliable prevalence estimates as a sign that victimization is overstated and, in some cases, unsubstantiated. Without solid estimates of prevalence, criminal justice practitioners (from law enforcement to victim service providers, and everyone in between) are left with mostly anecdotal evidence of trafficking in their jurisdictions. This makes it difficult for practitioners to appropriately allocate limited resources to the prevention and investigation of and response to human trafficking. The lack of reliable prevalence estimates also hampers policymakers' ability to justify the prioritization of human trafficking when generating legislation and appropriating funds.

First, the group explored the issues hindering our ability to conduct prevalence studies, and three barriers were discussed at length. The first barrier is the data that are currently collected and their applicability to prevalence studies. As with other crimes, there is no single mechanism for collecting data on human trafficking in the U.S.; researchers must seek data from multiple sources, each of which bring promise and caution. One obvious source of data for prevalence studies is law enforcement. However, as some participants noted, police are only beginning to be trained to identify trafficking cases correctly and to enter human trafficking data into systems such as the Uniform Crime Reporting Program. Many other participants were cautious about using law enforcement as data sources for prevalence studies because agencies tend to be

reactive, not proactive, so they capture the occurrence of only a portion of trafficking, mainly from victim self-reports, depending on the jurisdiction. Furthermore, law enforcement must be trained to enter data properly; this represents a constant challenge due to frequent changes in personnel.

Another source of data is prosecutors' offices or cases adjudicated through the courts, which present similar challenges. For example, plea agreements frequently throw out human trafficking charges in favor of others because these crimes are more difficult to prove. One study of human trafficking in 12 U.S. counties found that 69 percent of identified trafficking cases were prosecuted, but only a small number of them were prosecuted as trafficking, and most were charged as compelling prostitution at the state level. However, data on indictments may be useful when checking the robustness of prevalence estimates.

 A second barrier to prevalence studies lies in the sharing of data between agencies and with researchers — or, more accurately, the lack of data-sharing arrangements — which is more of a social, political or territorial issue than a technocratic or technological one. Assembling data across government agencies is very challenging because agencies use different definitions, different criteria (or variables), different thresholds for actual versus potential victims of trafficking, and so on. Moreover, it is very difficult to match data sets across these agencies because of the restrictions on storing personal identity information and confidentiality practices undertaken for victims' and survivors' safety and protection. Therefore, the crux of the problem is how researchers can balance privacy and safety protections, definitions, and the issues surrounding those agencies and researchers who collect data but who will not or cannot standardize it.

The third barrier is methodological in nature. Given the absence of centralized data collection mechanisms, the best way to move forward with prevalence studies appears, so far, to be through smaller, more focused data collections. Some are county- or city-based; for example, Sheldon Zhang studied undocumented migrant workers in San Diego County,[3] 28 percent of whom were

---

[3] Zhang, Sheldon X., *Looking for a Hidden Population: Trafficking of Migrant Laborers in San Diego County:* San Diego State University, CA, 2012.

trafficking victims. Others seek to collect prevalence data for states; for instance, Tennessee conducted a prevalence study with Vanderbilt University to establish a baseline in the state. Two years later, a study conducted by the Georgia Bureau of Investigation (GBI) developed a similar baseline, although this study evolved into an analysis of how the problem is being addressed at the state and local levels.

Although these studies are useful for the geographical regions they examine, they also raise two issues. The first issue is that prevalence studies of smaller areas (e.g., cities, counties) are expensive, and funds supporting human trafficking research are scarce. On the other hand, the greatest benefit of these studies is their scientific generalizability; that is, smaller studies might be representative of a larger segment of the population and allow for more grounded estimates of the statewide or national prevalence of trafficking. This raises the second issue — how to reduce the statistical errors associated with this "bottom-up" approach to prevalence. Many experts at the meeting noted that this was one of the most significant gaps in prevalence studies and that more attention should be focused on the bias that exists in data sources. For example, researchers need to examine cases that were prosecuted and learn more about cases in the same community that were not investigated or prosecuted, along with the reasons. These data could potentially be obtained from service providers, referencing clients that chose not to involve law enforcement in their case management plan, for whatever reason, but this would still leave out cases of individuals who never sought or received help from an organized entity. However, focusing on these multipliers will certainly yield more accurate bottom-up estimates of human trafficking in the future.

Throughout the discussion, the attendees offered a number of concrete suggestions and examples to help the research community move past these barriers. For example, some experts noted that similar problems — such as a lack of centralized, high-quality data — hindered prevalence studies of domestic violence. One innovation that allowed these studies to move past the barriers was the use of a one-day census of survivors. This census documents the number of individuals who sought services for domestic violence in a single 24-hour period throughout the U.S. by collecting data from service providers nationwide. The census also records the types of services requested and the number of service requests that were unmet because of a lack of resources. The

census provides training for service providers and also trains staff of juvenile delinquency programs and other hard-to-reach communities to identify victims. Although this model is not perfect, trafficking researchers might be able to adapt it for their purposes, as long as there is an acknowledgment that the model also misses trafficking victims who do not self-report.

Another solution offered by experts that could help solve the problem of data sharing across agencies is to embed researchers with anti-trafficking task forces. These task forces often have a consistent commitment from community, law enforcement and social service agencies. One expert noted that their research team attended the task force meeting every month, which created a level of trust with participating agencies. As a result, the agencies agreed to share their data with the research team, which in turn led to a human trafficking data node that provided trusted information to the area for training, such as for judges. The experts suggested that networking, investments in social capital, and having a research cohort embedded with practitioners could help work through the politics and academic issues of data sharing.

Finally, some experts noted that the research community does not have to work only with existing data sets and might seek to collect new data. The researchers noted a number of tools they have used for other types of projects and that might be useful for human trafficking prevalence studies. One such tool is the Trafficking Victim Identification Tool (TVIT), developed and tested by the Vera Institute of Justice to capture both sex and labor trafficking, which NIJ published in June 2014. Others noted the need to examine indictments and other court records more closely to correct for the bias inherent in court judgments. These and other approaches should be used in the field to document the context and to correct for some of the problems with previously used data sets.

Victims and Survivors

One of the most important areas of research focuses on the needs of trafficking victims and how best to meet them. Increasingly, researchers are reaching out to survivors to ensure that their insights are incorporated into all forms of responses to trafficking. This panel explored what is needed to move studies of victim services forward as well as exploring how to responsibly incorporate survivors' experiences into our knowledge of trafficking.

An emerging issue for researchers — and one that dominated the discussion in this session — was the need to improve the incorporation of first-person experiences into the study of trafficking victimization, including the addition of survivors' voices to policy, programs, and research and evaluation designs. Many experts at the meeting noted that if the goal of research on victims and survivors of trafficking is to understand their experiences, the research community needs to include their voices. For example, in 2014, the Office for Victims of Crime hosted a survivor forum that included a diverse group of 19 survivors. The survivors said they wanted researchers and others to engage them mindfully whenever practical, such as in the development of a survey instrument or in the review of an approach to program evaluations. The experts noted that such participatory research is about more than simply giving a voice to these populations. Survivors who have decided to support research, and understand its implications for victim services during the course of their recovery, can advise on more effective research designs — to reach and identify victims, give victim responses a context, explain the trauma that results from trafficking, and assist others in their recovery — and be fairly compensated for doing so.

Some attendees expressed caution during the session, particularly with regard to victim (re)traumatization. First, the experts stressed the need to protect victims and survivors as they participate in research and acknowledged that victims and survivors alike need time to recover. Second, experts noted that victims are "more than their trafficking experience"; therefore, researchers should ensure that victims' dignity and agency are protected in the data-gathering process. Third, it is easier to conduct research when survivors and victims are proficient in English, but researchers need to include those who are not proficient in English and provide translation and interpretation services. Fourth, experts agreed that victims and survivors should receive compensation for the time they spend participating in research projects. One expert noted that a friend of hers who is a victim of trafficking is often asked to share her story but, most often, is not offered compensation. Researchers need to realize that the issue of compensation is one of respecting survivors' time and expertise.

Finally, some researchers noted that even though they would welcome and encourage the opportunity to work with victims and survivors, they are unsure about how to contact them. This

led to a discussion about ways to expand or institutionalize opportunities for researchers and government employees to interact with victims and survivors in a responsible way.

Overall, the potential to tap the experiences of survivors and enhance our knowledge of human trafficking is increasing. For example, one participant discussed a survey that relied on survivor input; it was administered through 15 service providers across the country. The primary purpose of the survey was to learn how the internet is being used to find victims of trafficking; it also asked victims if they wanted help and, if so, what kind. Respondents most often wanted help in escaping from their perpetrator and in accessing mental health services. When respondents were asked if anyone reached out to them to offer help, 80 percent said no. This shows that various types of professionals need to identify victims and offer help on the victims' terms, not through predetermined definitions and processes that may not be helpful or responsive to actual victims' needs.

Another topic of discussion during this session was the collection of data from victims of trafficking. One expert cautioned researchers to tread carefully when trying to generate large data sets because the victim population is very heterogeneous, and the differences matter. For example, testing of an instrument developed to gather data from victims included those from 40 different countries in the data set. Also, experts noted that, in some cases, information about victims is not being collected in a representative way. For example, because funding is so limited, projects tend to focus on major metropolitan areas at the expense of more rural jurisdictions because there are more cases and victims in those regions.

A number of experts were quick to note that the conversation about victims of trafficking almost exclusively tends to focus on victims of sex trafficking, but the research community — and criminal justice practitioners — must not forget victims of labor trafficking. For example, what happens to exploited migrant workers who are not identified as victims of trafficking and who do not want to disclose their experiences for fear of being deported or losing their jobs? Some experts noted that they have interviewed victims of labor trafficking who did not know their rights in destination countries. Moreover, the needs of victims of labor trafficking are separate and distinct from needs of victims of sex trafficking. For example, one study showed that victims

of labor trafficking did not want therapy; instead, they wanted to stay in the country of destination and obtain gainful employment.

Shifting gears, the service providers who attended the meeting discussed the areas in which research could support and inform their work. Beyond assessing necessary services and service provision models (see "Evaluations" later), researchers and practitioners expressed a need for more training in helpful language, techniques and best practices for working with individuals that have experienced the kind of trauma that is specific to trafficking. Service providers stated that research from different perspectives and across different fields (including domestic violence, medical, social services and others) would yield a more comprehensive sense of the needs of trafficking victims. Finally, these experts acknowledged the need to build trust before researchers can work with victims, but they also noted that victims sometimes start to obtain help through the process of participating in research studies. In these settings, trust between researchers and trafficking victims can be established incrementally in parallel with providing victim services.

From the researchers' perspective, a series of concerns arose that could negatively affect or delay research on and with victims. First, researchers know they need to work through "gatekeepers" to gain access to victims; however, the gatekeepers do not always understand the value of research, even if it is for the provision of victim services. One expert noted that they gained access to victims only because of their decades of experience in social services; this individual was concerned that less experienced yet equally worthy researchers might not obtain such access. A way around this barrier is to provide funds so researchers and practitioners can work together to build research-to-practice models, engendering a collaborative approach that would lead to evidence-based practices. Second, researchers are concerned that their peers may not realize the difficulties in conducting this sort of work. A researcher noted that the field of anthropology has done community-based action research and the resulting literature often makes it sound easy, but it is far from it. The experts therefore called for white papers on trafficking methodology and the associated challenges to consider when adopting these methodologies.

Finally, some time was spent examining the usefulness of qualitative research, especially ethnographic work with victims. It is time-consuming to obtain access to victims and to conduct

interviews (e.g., one expert noted that it took 18 months to interview 43 women). Yet, these studies are powerful because they begin to tell the story of those who are being exploited or trafficked. The same expert noted that the women who were interviewed (all of whom were involved in prostitution) told the expert that they did not seek services because they were afraid their children would be taken from them; however, they did seek help escaping the life of prostitution.

The experts had a number of suggestions for future research on victims:

1. Consider the systemic issues for survivors (e.g., whether the requirement to cooperate with law enforcement is a help or a hindrance).
2. More closely examine the role of continued presence as an aid (or hurdle) in the recovery process.
3. Determine the proper amount of time needed before expecting a victim to be able to contribute to an investigation.
4. Conduct studies on the cultural aspects of victimization and how a victim's culture informs services needed (e.g., can the victim safely and productively return home, or must they build a new life elsewhere due to the stigma associated with victimization?).
5. More closely examine the factors impacting how receptive the individuals are to receiving services.
6. More closely examine how receptive the individuals are to people they perceive to be with law enforcement or the state.
7. Develop more evidence-based practices in providing services and shelter to the survivors of human trafficking.

Analogous Research Trajectories

Some commentators have compared human trafficking research to the efforts made to explore other hidden populations. Examples of potential analogies include violence against women and domestic violence research efforts. This panel explored the validity of this analogy and discussed what trafficking researchers might learn from decades of research and advocacy in these and analogous fields.

The panel was an overwhelming success, demonstrating that both the research and practitioner communities can draw many lessons from the work others have done in parallel areas, such as domestic violence and sexual assault, a field whose providers often serve trafficking victims as well, especially in underserved areas of the country. The experts also felt it might be valuable to think about how to avoid mistakes that have been made in other fields of study. Also of particular importance was a comment that acknowledged that existing methodologies and frameworks cannot simply be replicated because the sex trafficking survivor population is significantly different in trauma, victimization, service needs, and pathways out of exploitation.

Throughout the discussion, participants noted analogies between trafficking and the work conducted to understand and help resolve a number of social issues. Similar to trafficking, victims in some of these areas are outside the mainstream in education and workforce development. Likewise, in areas such as domestic violence, it might be useful to examine research and practice designed to prevent injuries and death and to develop scales for risk assessments of trafficking. Another potential source of knowledge is prisoner re-entry programs, which could help explain why traffickers re-offend and how to prevent it.

The field of behavioral economics was also discussed. These economists are studying predictable irrationality, and in some of their studies they have observed men responding to pornography. The studies reported that although the men enjoyed it, at the same time they had negative feelings about it. Behavioral economics can therefore help understand trafficking as a business (e.g., economic drivers to trafficking) and also clarify how to incentivize or deter certain behaviors. Similarly, some experts noted that the growth of the study of brain behavior and other neurological or biological responses to certain crimes and conditions may be informative.

Although the discussion covered a variety of analogous issues and research communities, a number of very specific issues were also raised in which a comparative approach would be useful. For example, the field could learn more about the nature of traumatic bonding from the sexual assault community. Studies have shown that minors who were abused at a young age may believe they cannot survive without the person who is abusing them. This is similar to trafficking

victims who have been controlled by their traffickers for months or even years and have been conditioned not to trust other people.

The second area that would benefit from a comparative approach is in understanding the risk factors associated with becoming a perpetrator of trafficking as either a buyer or an exploiter. As one expert noted, to better examine the continuum of various roles in perpetration (e.g., buyer, exploiter, facilitator), the research community could model similar studies from other domains that have mapped out the likelihood of perpetration in specific roles through such factors as race, sex/gender, victimization history, perpetration history and others. Specifically, researchers have learned more about the perpetration of sexual violence through studies of sexual assault, and trafficking researchers could begin by applying what is already known from previous research on the perpetration of sexual violence (e.g., victimization history, attitudes about rape, early sex initiation, hostile attitudes toward women, use of alcohol/drugs to take advantage of victims). Research on the perpetration of child sexual abuse could also show how grooming and manipulation techniques apply to trafficking. Finally, because some recruiters and exploiters lure victims through intimate manipulation (e.g., acting as though they are the victim's boyfriend), it would be useful to see what researchers can draw from the literature on intimate partner violence. Intimate partner violence includes emotional abuse, sexual assault, physical violence and tactics used to keep abused partners dependent on the perpetrator, such as control over finances, protection, or threatening loved ones.

Some experts noted that other forms of illicit markets are interesting from a comparative point of view. Because traffickers are motivated by making money, examining the research and practice on the perpetration of organized crime, especially those advocating the need to "follow the money,"[4] might be a useful way of advancing efforts against human trafficking. For example, one expert discussed an investigation in Spain and other parts of Europe that started as a money laundering case but soon led to the discovery of human trafficking networks. Another expert

---

[4] See, for example, Wheaton, E.M., E.J. Schauer and T.V. Galli, "Economics of Human Trafficking," *International Migration* 48 (4) (2010): 114-141; Beare, M.E. (Ed.), *Critical Reflections on Transnational Organized Crime, Money Laundering, and Corruption.* University of Toronto Press, 2003; Naylor, R.T., *Wages of Crime: Black Markets, Illegal Finance, and the Underworld Economy*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004.

noted that educating consumers on the social impact of their behavior could help reduce the demand for trafficking. The expert noted that some campaigns have been more successful than others (such as the blood diamond campaign), but what is important to learn from these earlier efforts is how best to dissuade behavior because of its adverse effects on society. In other words, how do you develop the citizen consumer in an effective way?

The third area the experts explored was prevention strategies. A number of experts noted that some ideas drawn from sexual violence, intimate partner violence, child maltreatment and other related areas could be integrated into current or ongoing prevention programs to address trafficking without creating entirely new programs. For example, focus trafficking prevention efforts on those who are identified as being at risk for other forms of victimization, including but not limited to homeless youth, previously abused youth, and those detained in youth detention facilities. As well, continue to focus efforts in industries poised to spot human trafficking in the course of their daily work, such as the work going on in the hotel and transportation industries. A notable example is Truckers Against Trafficking, who have taken on the issue of sex trafficking occurring in truck stops in a passionate and comprehensive manner that is an example for other industries to follow.

The experts also noted that these comparable areas offer lessons for researchers and practitioners regarding the needs of the criminal justice system to better handle cases of trafficking. One conversation focused on the courts, where a major challenge is to help judges understand why some trafficking victims escape and others do not. Judges appear to have a good handle on why this occurs in intimate partner violence cases; this could be instructive for practitioners and researchers seeking to educate the bench regarding the same issue in human trafficking. Another example is legislation in California that addresses psychological coercion as it pertains to human trafficking; this legislation was inspired, in part, from research and media coverage of battered women. Others noted that, in the 1970s, police handled domestic violence cases by telling the violent husband to get out of the house to "cool off" and then go back home. Clearly, police have better responses to domestic violence situations today, demonstrating how effective criminal justice responses can evolve over time.

A number of conversations arose regarding possible parallels between trafficking and other forms of service provision. For example, child welfare advocates have focused on three standards for victim care: safety, permanence and well-being. This approach could be helpful in informing a more long-term approach to trafficking victim stabilization. Support services for refugees have recognized that mental health is determined by many points along a trajectory that clinical treatment cannot always address. Therefore, the community and families need to provide a certain level of stability. Experts also discussed the notion of resilience as applied in analogous fields and noted the importance of leveraging resilience through victim services.

However, the experts noted that it is important to understand the limits of drawing parallels in these areas. For example, although services to victims of domestic violence and human trafficking are sometimes provided in the same settings, each group has distinct needs. Human trafficking survivors may be eligible for different services than domestic violence survivors are, although both are eligible for similar case management services. Also, the services that human trafficking survivors are eligible for vary between U.S. citizen survivors and foreign national survivors; the latter must also contend with immigration and achieving continued presence status (e.g., T visa or U visa certification). In addition, available services and resources vary widely by state and locality and may not be available to all classes of victims. For example, male victims, LGBTQ victims, and undocumented victims are typically underserved or outright refused by many victim service providers, leaving law enforcement with little choice but to arrest some individuals if they are in need of shelter — and creating a host of other problems and trust issues in the process.

Prevention

This panel focused on who the traffickers are, how they operate, and how best to prevent trafficking, including the reduction of demand. The discussion addressed the evolving notion of preventing trafficking at the community level.

The group opened with a discussion of traffickers, identifying some themes that may be ripe for future research. First, experts discussed traffickers' use of facilitators to intimidate victims after a trafficker's arrest, thus decreasing the likelihood of victim testimony in trial. Second, experts

discussed the age of traffickers and the fact that many practitioners were seeing "very young" offenders. Experts mentioned that, although there are many discussions of identifying at-risk youth and helping them to avoid becoming victims of trafficking, little attention has been paid to understanding how to prevent vulnerable and at-risk youth from becoming trafficking perpetrators, and to the social factors that impact this development.[5] Third, experts discussed the need for greater understanding of how traffickers establish control over victims; for example, offenders' use of randomized violence to maintain control, where victims were made to withstand increasingly violent and frequent abuse.

Experts then turned their attention to specific prevention strategies. Practitioners and researchers shared their experiences and discussed how future research might either provide more information to better calibrate these programs or evaluate the programs to identify promising practices to be shared. For example, one expert discussed how their research team was trying to develop both an upstream strategy and a downstream strategy for prevention: Researchers examined victim experiences six to 12 months prior to being trafficked and were able to generate five reports from different cities that outlined the risk factors for entering a trafficking situation (i.e., the upstream prevention model). The research team then examined how service providers, law enforcement and other community organizations were responding to trafficking as well as attempting to measure the prevalence of trafficking in these cities. The downstream prevention model focuses on improving identification and provision of services, such as improving ways to search for and handle runaway youth. Another aspect involves educating professionals, such as students in nursing, criminal justice, law and other disciplines, about trafficking.

The experts examined a number of different ways that prevention programs have been used. For example, one of the topics discussed was how to shift cultural norms. Community awareness programs are helping change the way many practitioners and community members view victims and how they address the demand for trafficking. However, from a deterrence perspective, it is still not clear what deters the purchasing of commercial sex from victims of trafficking. Some

---

[5] For one recent study that does examine this issue, see Raphael, Jody, and Brenda Meyers-Powell, "From Victims to Victimizers: Interviews with 25 Ex-Pimps in Chicago," Schiller DuCanto & Fleck Family Law Center of DePaul (MN) University College of Law, 2010.

sex buyers are deterred by criminal justice outcomes, whereas others are inhibited by knowledge about the harm that trafficking causes. Another expert discussed the use of a relationship violence model that focuses on masculinity components as a way to discourage violence. Others pointed to successful community programs that researchers could study (and evaluate) to draw lessons for other communities. For example, an adaptation of the INTERVENE screening tool was developed and implemented in coordination with the Department of Juvenile Services in Maryland. Within the first six months, the screening tool identified 34 sex trafficking victims who were arrested for crimes other than prostitution, and another 100+ adolescents, mostly minors at risk for becoming sex trafficking victims. Another example: in Atlanta, youth participate in the Voices program for 8 weeks, which teaches the youth how to protect themselves if approached by a potential trafficker. For labor trafficking, experts brought up the recent implementation of codes of conduct which industries can sign on to, which ensures that trafficking does not occur in connection with any of their lines of production. Finally, one expert discussed the recent development and upcoming deployment of a curriculum on trafficking in primary and secondary schools.

Technology and Development

Practitioners are turning to technology to solve intractable problems, ranging from the collection of data to the identification of traffickers. In addition to developing tools, researchers are using technology to improve their results. This panel explored the state of the art of technology as applied to trafficking and explored where the development agenda should focus next.

The group noted that researchers have worked with the private sector to develop technologies that target sex trafficking. One form of technology development involves using the expansion of online data to identify potential trafficking cases. Experts agreed that all parties are using chat rooms, message boards, social media and other internet-based means to connect with these illegal services to purchase or to recruit victims — this online information can be collected for research as well as criminal investigations. One expert discussed a project that looks at online classified advertisements for adult services and gathers text, price and other data from huge numbers of posts — close to 58,000 every three months. The amount of data is almost too much

to comprehend, but a computer can perform analyses through keyword searches and other techniques to determine which ads are more likely to be connected to a trafficking victim.

Another area of technology development is in forensic analysis. Researchers are developing tools that allow officers to collect information that experts can then analyze. For example, one research project is examining how to identify someone online and make a connection with them in physical space. Other projects are trying to advance facial recognition and a host of other evidence processing technologies.

Practitioners are also considering ways in which technology can help them respond to human trafficking in the field. One useful idea is the creation of trusted data networks, which would aid in the sharing of trafficking data between agencies. The participants agreed that no fully automated technology could supplant humans in identifying trafficking cases online, but many technologies could help analysts sort information to make their jobs more efficient. Another idea involves technologies that could help law enforcement identify trafficking cases. A third is to help practitioners address clandestine communication technologies such as Snapshot. Finally, an expert mentioned that they were examining legal codes on trafficking on a state-by-state basis to examine whether statutes effectively account for the use of the internet to perpetrate these crimes.

That said, some barriers remain before technology development can have a significant impact on practice. For one, researchers and practitioners noted that many people require specific training or remain resistant to using technology. Likewise, many law enforcement agencies do not have sufficient technology to begin with; therefore, both equipment upgrades and training would be required to employ the software being developed. Another barrier is a general lack of knowledge about the internet, even though Thorn estimates that as many as 70 percent of sex trafficking victims are now sold online.[6] One expert noted that some police departments are still not familiar with Backpage and similar websites.

---

[6] See http://www.wearethorn.org/child-trafficking-statistics for a great intro to the pervasiveness of internet use to facilitate sex trafficking.

In spite of the limitations, the group noted that the intersection between technology and trafficking was ripe for further exploration. One idea was to leverage some of the lessons learned from the investigations of online child pornography, a related subset of crimes, noting that its evolution from paper to the internet to the "dark web" was one that trafficking experts might learn from. Others wondered whether studies might examine the level to which traffickers are as tech savvy as those in the pornography and other illicit sectors online.[7] A third idea was to exploit hash data and PhotoDNA for evidence in trafficking cases. Fourth, experts noted that technology could help corroborate victims' testimony by using data from chat rooms and text messages.

Lastly, it is important to note that this is not limited to sex trafficking. Online advertisements and social media communications are routinely used for labor trafficking recruitment, and law enforcement frequently uses forensic IT in human trafficking investigations because of all the traceable activity happening online.

Evaluations

NIJ has sponsored a number of evaluations of promising practices for fighting human trafficking and providing services to its victims. This panel explored some of the most promising practices that need further evaluation as well as best practices for evaluating efforts to reduce demand.

The panel first discussed why evaluations are necessary. One expert said they are conducted so the community can demonstrate that it is using the most effective tools possible to fight trafficking. Whether the question arises from legislators, the public or others, at some point in time someone will want to know "what works." Evaluations are the key to answering this question with empirical and unbiased evidence, although current evaluations often fail to measure a baseline prior to program launch.[8] In one example, a researcher noted that the community mapped the literature on juvenile sex offenders and found that those who were

---

[7] Practitioners know that they are; see websites for NCMEC, the FBI and Thorn. The traffickers have been operating in that space for quite some time. Law enforcement is on top of this — research must catch up.

[8] See generally Gallagher, Anne T., and Rebecca Surtees, "Measuring the Success of Counter Trafficking Interventions in the Criminal Justice Sector: Who Decides — and How," *Anti-Trafficking Review* 1 (2012): 1.

mandated to treatment were not getting better. That study led to changes in how programs are reviewed, and today this community has effective programs that are regularly evaluated.

Another topic of discussion was how best to conduct evaluations from a methodological point of view. Implementation science provides strong guidance on using an intervention and applying it in a new context while maintaining its external validity. The experts noted that randomized controlled trials (RCTs), generally considered the most unbiased approach to evaluating programs, might be challenging and may not actually detect effects in trafficking victim services. Additionally, service providers have been known to reject, on ethical and moral grounds, the idea of identifying a trafficking victim and not providing services — necessitating the use of other evaluation designs. Other experts noted there are well-established programs where RCTs could be justified, while still others noted that there are other options; for example, the concept of using the best available evidence as opposed to using the more rigorous (but more difficult to achieve) RCTs. In the end, one of the most important elements might not be the original methodology but its replication across time and place that ensures rigorous results.

Throughout the discussion about methodology, experts noted that there were some critical barriers to producing scientifically rigorous evaluations. One barrier was the inability to come to an agreement on a definition of "success."[9] What are the long-term outcomes from the victim's perspective that allow researchers to measure proximal indicators of success? Most experts agreed that there is never going to be a single measure of success, but that more work is needed to develop accepted measures of success in the provision of victim services. This is another area where researchers might look to the domestic violence field for lessons learned. A similar discussion arose concerning prosecution and the judicial outcome of cases. Rescue of a human being must be factored into the definition of success, but the number of arrests and prosecutions under the human trafficking statute alone cannot be used as a litmus test, and neither can simple removal of a victim regardless of circumstances. For example, a minor prosecuted, convicted and sentenced for prostitution may have been "rescued" from their trafficker for the moment, but is that really the outcome the victim desires, and is it conducive to permanently leaving the situation?

---

[9] Ibid.

Finally, the experts noted that one of the most important missing pieces for these studies is the lack of longitudinal data. They noted that most advances in fields of study happen because of longitudinal research, even though it is well-known that longitudinal studies are expensive and organizations are often loathe to wait the amount of time needed for impact because of reporting requirements and demands of their funding sources.

The remainder of the discussion focused on what researchers should evaluate. Experts agreed that all anti-trafficking programs and efforts can and should be evaluated. For example, over the past decade many laws have been passed, but it is not known if these laws are having an effect on the problems and, if so, how. Therefore, studies are now ongoing to evaluate state legislation and specific provisions within those laws that are the most effective. The studies will evaluate not only the prosecutions under these laws but also the types of evidence necessary for successful prosecution.

Prevention efforts must also be evaluated. Many activities are designed to change behaviors but their success remains unknown. For example, when law enforcement, medical professionals, case workers and others are trained, the training programs should have a baseline and post-test measure of knowledge obtained and employed. The same is true for awareness campaigns designed to shape public opinion in the United States. Such efforts should have a baseline assessment that examines Americans' attitudes toward trafficking and then provides a way to discover how best to influence opinion. In fact, a current NIJ-sponsored project is doing just that — including experiments in a survey instrument to examine the way people think about an issue and how those thoughts may change depending on specific messaging.

Research Questions

The experts suggested a number of questions that researchers should explore in their support of practitioners in the field.

1. One area is to learn more about the **business aspects of trafficking**; for example, the intersection of trafficking and legitimate businesses such as hotels. Finding out more

about how traffickers use legitimate businesses and their supply chains to further their operations or increase profits could help motivate CEOs to put anti-trafficking practices in place. It could also help improve consumer awareness. Others felt that researchers should look at more systemic or market-specific research, such as the research on corruption, to find out what else sustains trafficking in persons.

2. The experts also emphasized the importance of **strategic planning around the future of trafficking research** and the identification of **trends in directions that different types of trafficking enterprises and markets** are moving so that research can become less reactive than it is currently. They noted that almost all of the work researchers and practitioners conduct consists of reacting to offenses and offenders; as a result, most time is spent dealing with past offenses. The experts felt that more work is needed on future-focused topics, such as determining how to reduce the number of potential victims, reducing the demand for trafficking, and enacting prosecution and enforcement reforms that improve anti-trafficking efforts in the future.

3. Finally, the experts discussed the **intersections between race and human trafficking**. One practitioner noted that in the Los Angeles area 92 percent of girls who are arrested on prostitution charges are African American. Although the impact of race and other associated factors on key issues (such as victimization, demand, willingness to exploit by trafficker or end-buyer, and differing treatment of victims within the criminal justice system or by service providers) will differ in various geographic areas, more research is needed to unpack this directly and to better inform effective laws and enforcement mechanisms. Due to time constraints, discussion in this area was limited during the meeting, but NIJ recognizes the importance of this phenomenon and the need for greater research into it.

<div align="center">

APPENDIX: EXPERT WORKING GROUP AGENDA

Research and Evaluation on Human Trafficking

An Expert Working Group

April 24-25, 2014

</div>

Over the past decade, researchers have made considerable progress in improving our understanding of human trafficking in the United States. Studies are increasingly deploying cutting-edge methods and identifying new sources of data to tackle complex questions. Yet, despite all this progress, barriers continue to present significant obstacles to building our knowledge of human trafficking. This two-day working group will tackle important questions concerning the future direction of human trafficking research.

Thursday, April 24th

8:00 a.m.   **Registration**

8:30 a.m.   **Opening of the Meeting**

Greg Ridgeway, Acting Director, National Institute of Justice
Karol V. Mason, Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs

8:40 a.m.   **Welcoming Remarks**

Valerie Jarrett, Senior Advisor to the President

9:00 a.m.   **BREAK**

9:15 a.m.   **Charge to the Group**

In gathering together a group of respected researchers and practitioners, this expert working group has an opportunity to set the future agenda for trafficking research. In this opening session, the chairs of the Committee on Data and Research for the Senior Policy Operating Group will set the goals for the group.

Discussants: **John T. Picarelli, National Institute of Justice**
                        Amy O'Neill-Richard, U.S. Department of State

9:30 a.m.   **Topic 1: Definitions in the Field**

Scholars, lawmakers, practitioners, governments and international organizations employ overlapping definitions of human trafficking. The task for this panel is to come to some agreement on how to employ definitions in the field that instill high

levels of confidence in the results of research. Consensus on this issue ensures the research community will arrive at improved results, such as more accurate human trafficking measures and victim identification tools.

Discussants: **Sheldon Zhang, San Diego State University**
Theresa Segovia, U.S. Department of Justice

10:30 a.m.   **BREAK**

11:00 a.m.   **Topic 2: Prevalence and Measurement**

One of the most vexing problems facing researchers is how to pinpoint the amount of trafficking occurring in a geographical area. Rigorous estimates of human trafficking are important for most everything associated with trafficking—from the allocation of victim resources to the evaluation of intervention programs. Yet prevalence remains the bright shiny object with the gold plated price tag. This discussion will identify promising approaches to measuring prevalence and what is needed to deploy these tools in the future.

Discussants: **Meredith Dank, Urban Institute**
Meredith Bailey, Georgia Bureau of Investigation

12:15 p.m.   **LUNCH ON YOUR OWN**

1:30 p.m.   **Topic 3: Victims and Survivors**

One of the most important areas of research focuses on the needs of trafficking victims. Increasingly, researchers are turning to survivors to ensure their insights are incorporated into all forms of responses to trafficking. This panel will explore what is needed to move studies of victims services forward as well as how to incorporate survivor stories into our knowledge of trafficking.

Discussants: **Kristina Rose, Office for Victims of Crime**
Laura Simich, Vera Institute of Justice

3:00 p.m.   **BREAK**

3:30 p.m.   **Topic 4: Analogous Research Trajectories**

Some commentators have compared human trafficking research to the efforts others have made to explore hidden populations. Examples of potential analogies include violence against women and domestic violence research efforts. This panel will explore the validity of this analogy and conclude what trafficking researchers might learn from the decades of research and advocacy in these analogous fields.

Discussants: **Claire Renzetti, University of Kentucky**
Jack McDevitt, Northeastern University

5:00 p.m.   **END OF THURSDAY SCHEDULE**

Friday, April 25th

8:30 a.m.   **Panel 5: Prevention, Operation and Demand**

A frequent topic asked of researchers is to improve our understanding how traffickers operate. How does someone first enter trafficking? How do traffickers learn? What do traffickers do with their earnings? This panel will explore these questions alongside the equally important question of how to reduce demand. When addressing both questions, the discussion will speak to preventing trafficking at the community level.

Discussants: **James McBride, Clearwater (FL) Police Department**
Michael Shively, Abt Associates

10:00 a.m.   **BREAK**

10:30 a.m.   **Panel 6: Technology and Development**

Practitioners are turning to technology to solve intractable problems ranging from the collection of data to the identification of traffickers. But alongside the development of tools, researchers are themselves employing technology in order to improve their results. This panel will explore the state of the art when it comes to technology and trafficking and explore where the development agenda should focus next.

Discussants: **Mark Latonero, University of Southern California**
Artur Dubrawski, Carnegie Mellon University

12:00 p.m.   **LUNCH ON YOUR OWN**

1:30 p.m.   **Panel 7: Evaluations of Promising Practices**

Accompanying research studies of trafficking are projects designed to tell us "what works" when it comes to preventing and reducing trafficking. NIJ has sponsored a number of evaluations of promising practices for fighting trafficking and providing services to victims. This panel will explore some of the most promising practices in need of evaluation, and will include a discussion of how to evaluate efforts to reduce the demand for trafficking.

Discussants: **Deborah Gibbs, RTI International**

Vanessa Bouché, Texas Christian University

3:00 p.m.   **BREAK**

3:30 p.m.   **Panel 8: Research Questions**

This session will explore the most important questions that remain with regards to human trafficking in the U.S. from the perspective of the practitioner. What are the most significant gaps in our knowledge, and what studies could have the most dramatic impact on those responding to human trafficking? What are the prospective barriers facing the research community in answering these questions?

Discussants: **Amy Farrell, Northeastern University**
                   Bill Woolf, Fairfax County (VA) Police Department

5:00 p.m.   **CLOSE OF EXPERT WORKING GROUP**