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ABSTRACT

While awareness of human trafficking has increased in recent years, research suggests that more education is needed for first responders (e.g., law enforcement, fire and rescue, health care professionals, etc.) in order to give them more knowledge so they can better recognize occurrences of the crime and assist victims of human trafficking. Furthermore, previous research contends that data concerning the number of victims trafficked both worldwide and domestically is often exaggerated and lacks a scientific basis. The current research examines the number of human trafficking cases that have been documented in the state of Alabama. The study utilizes a mixed method approach to measure the perception that law enforcement officers in Alabama have regarding the issue of human trafficking, the amount of training received on the topic, and the number of cases investigated during 2014. The findings were then compared to findings from a previous study that examined similar issues in the state of Florida.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Human trafficking has been the recipient of local, national, and global attention throughout recent years. For example, in July of 2013, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) arrested two individuals who were suspected of trafficking three juveniles into the Birmingham, AL area for the purpose of sexual exploitation. These juveniles were between the ages of 13 to 17 (Gray, 2013). In 2013, pursuant to an international human trafficking investigation, Immigration and Customs Enforcement’s (ICE) Homeland Security Investigations (HSI) Agents and New Jersey State Agents arrested six individuals on human trafficking charges (Hoffman, 2013). In October of 2015, HSI arrested 29 people across 8 states, including Alabama, for their suspected involvement in human trafficking (ICE, 2015). This investigation resulted in the rescue of 15 potential human trafficking victims.

Examples of human trafficking victimization as illustrated in the aforementioned articles are seen all too frequently across the United States as well as other countries throughout the world. Human trafficking can be conducted covertly, and sometimes overtly, by individuals and organizations both domestically and internationally. The crime is committed throughout the country. As former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton acknowledged in a press release in 2009, human trafficking “flourishes in the shadows” (Clinton, 2009). If the statistics discussed below are accurate, the human trafficking offenders are usually successful in avoiding the detection and attention of law enforcement.
The definition of human trafficking can vary (Frye, 2009), as it can also differ between agencies, jurisdictions, states and scholars. For example, Ryf (2002) used a broad definition of trafficking and claimed it is the transporting people across international borders using either fraud or coercion. This definition would exclude offenders who traffic a person across state lines or within the same state. The Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) of 2000 identifies two types of human trafficking: sex trafficking and labor trafficking (Title 22 U.S. Code, Section 7102(9)). The TVPA states that a person is a victim of human trafficking if he or she is subjected to the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, or obtaining of a person for the purpose of a commercial sex act or if one is subjected to a severe form of human trafficking (Title 22 U.S. Code, Section 7102(15)). The TVPA defines a severe form of human trafficking as (A) sex trafficking in which a commercial sex act is induced by force, fraud, or coercion, or in which the person induced to perform such act has not attained 18 years of age; or (B) the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, or obtaining of a person for labor or services, through the use of force, fraud, or coercion for the purpose of subjection to involuntary servitude, peonage, debt bondage, or slavery (Title 22 U.S. Code, Section 7102(9)). Using the definition of the TVPA, one could be held criminally liable for trafficking someone across state lines or for trafficking someone within the same state. One could also be held criminally liable for human trafficking without transporting another person. This is to say that according to the definition, human trafficking also occurs when one harbors or recruits another individual to perform such acts.

It has been suggested that human trafficking is sometimes dismissed by the members of the general public as something that happens to someone else, somewhere else. For example, during a press conference in 2009 while Hillary Clinton was the Secretary of State, she indicated
that some people think the problem of human trafficking is “limited to other parts of the world” (Clinton, 2009). The truth, however, is that the crime occurs across the globe and “small town, USA” has hosted victims of this crime. This sentiment was expressed in the aforementioned press conference when Hillary Clinton summed up the scope of human trafficking by stating “…it occurs in every country, including the United States. Ryf (2002) contends that only a few people in the United States realize the severity of human trafficking and just how often it occurs in America. Most often, sex trafficking victims are found in places where neighbors and nearby residents believe the industry only exists in other countries and could never happen in their “own back yard.” This misconception was highlighted by Paul Daymond, a FBI spokesperson, when he emphasized the point that human trafficking is not necessarily somewhere else and that “it happens in our backyard.” Daymond went on to state that human trafficking “does happen in Birmingham” (Gray, 2013).

Wooditch, DuPont-Morales, and Hummer (2009) examined the ratio of human trafficking convictions compared to a country’s population as reported through the Trafficking in Person’s (TIP) Report by the U.S. Department of State. As illustrated in Figure 1, the TIP report used in the Wooditch et al. (2009) study shows the human trafficking convictions that occurred in 2006 across several countries. According to Figure 1, some of the countries have a higher human trafficking conviction rate per capita when compared to other countries. This high conviction rate could lead one to believe that subsequent interviews of victims would provide law enforcement a better understanding of the problems associated with human trafficking and assist with combating the crime.
Figure 1. Number of Human Trafficking Convictions per Country
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With all the attention placed on human trafficking in recent years, one would think law enforcement officers and other first responders would be better prepared to identify, disrupt, and ultimately dismantle human trafficking organizations. Now that human trafficking has been publicly denounced across the globe and particularly throughout the United States, law enforcement officials have begun to focus training and education on ways to respond and treat victims of the crime. This reactive approach can be helpful to victims. However, a proactive approach to the issues surrounding human trafficking could prevent the crime from occurring which would be more beneficial to both victims as well as would-be victims who have not yet been recruited, enticed, or forced into commercial sex acts or involuntary servitude.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Legal Background

The definition of human trafficking has already been discussed. The question then becomes, how did the TVPA of 2000 come to fruition? During the 1990’s, various nongovernmental organizations (NGO) and interest groups sought to raise awareness to federal policy makers about the issues of human trafficking (Stolz, 2005). Perhaps due to this increasing public awareness, the United States government took notice to the problem and decided more emphasis should be placed on the issue. In 1998, a presidential directive called for the President’s Interagency Council on Women (PICW) to create and design the United States policy on human trafficking. This was the first step to authoring and passing the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA). The TVPA was signed into law on October 16, 2000 by President Bill Clinton (Stolz, 2005; Ryf, 2002). The TVPA was ultimately codified into the United States Code and can be found, among other places, under Title 22 U.S. Codes 7101 and 7102. The TVPA was also adopted, very quickly, by the United Nations General Assembly on November 15, 2000 (Stolz, 2005). The TVPA was designed to focus on the three “P’s” of human trafficking: prosecution, protection, and prevention (Wooditch et al., 2009). Giampolo (2006) describes the TVPA as “the centerpiece of U.S. governmental efforts in combating human trafficking” (p.198).

Prior to the passage of the TVPA, those who maintained or transported women for the purpose of prostitution were charged under statutes that did not have the same level of punitive actions set forth by the TVPA (Wooditch et al., 2009). Title 18 U. S. Code, Section 2421, also
known as the Mann Act, prohibits one from transporting a person across state lines to engage in a commercial sex act. According to Stoltz (2007), the Mann Act did not fully cover the totality of offenses involved with human trafficking and it did very little to discourage traffickers. The TVPA expanded the Mann Act by defining the crime of human trafficking and listing the elements that constitute the crime.

The TVPA was also responsible for enhancing the penalties for convicted human trafficking offenders as well as providing for a range of new protections and benefits to assist victims of human trafficking. The TVPA criminalized the act and set into place possible lifetime prison terms for convicted offenders. It also set mandatory minimum sentences for offenders who are convicted of sex trafficking anyone under the age of 18. An additional sentencing enhancement is imposed on offenders who are convicted of sex trafficking anyone under the age of 14. Benefits provided to victims pursuant to the TVPA include health services and employment assistance (Ryf, 2000). One particular benefit the TVPA provides is an avenue for foreign born nationals who are unlawfully present in the United States to acquire a lawful status if he or she is deemed to be a victim of trafficking as defined by the TVPA and agrees to assist in an investigation into his or her trafficker.

**Challenges in Measuring the Extent of Human Trafficking**

Tyldum (2010) illustrated various pitfalls, challenges, and limitations on researching human trafficking and he gives several reasons why reported numbers of human trafficking victims can be skewed. Some evidence indicates that current research only loosely estimates the number of human trafficking victims and suggests that data from recent research focusing on human trafficking is unreliable (Tyldum, 2010; Rao and Presenti, 2012; Resendez, 2012; Kleemans, 2011). Tyldum claims current research data only “estimates” the number of human
trafficking victims, and he contends these numbers are not based on any scientific basis. For example, Resendez (2012) maintains that around 20,000 people are trafficked into the United States each year. However, George (2012) estimates nearly 50,000 women and children are trafficked into the United States each year for the purpose of sexual exploitation. Clearly, there is a vast discrepancy in these studies in respect to the number of trafficked victims. The question then becomes why does such a disparity exist?

One explanation for this disparity is research only estimates certain types of human trafficking or examines only certain victims of human trafficking. For instance, Resendez (2012) accounts for men, women and children (victims of human trafficking) who are trafficked not only for sexual exploitation, but also for labor exploitation (types of human trafficking). Despite this broader definition, the number of victims is far less than the numbers estimated by George (2012) which only accounts for women and children trafficked for sexual exploitation. Therefore, a study accounting for men, women, and children victims of sex trafficking and labor trafficking should have far higher numbers than a study only accounting for women and children victims of sex trafficking, not less. These conflicting results confirm the need for a more scientific approach to determining the actual number of victims of human trafficking.

Another reason for the disparity in the reported number of human trafficking victims can be attributed to the conceptual definitional inconsistencies of what constitutes a human trafficking victim. Tyldum (2010) maintains that one reason trafficking reports are skewed is because some researchers place victims of other crimes into the category of a human trafficking victim. For example, some research includes acts of prostitution as victims of human trafficking. While some prostitutes are also victims of human trafficking, broadening the conceptual definition of human trafficking to include victims of other crimes creates the possibility for
researchers to wrongfully and erroneously increase the number of human trafficking victims (Tyldum, 2010).

Rao and Presenti (2012) suggest that another contributing factor to the unreliable data is the fact that numbers are often based on small sample groups and then generalized to much larger groups. In addition, Vance (2011) states some government agencies exaggerate numbers of victims to create a sense of urgency, and Kleemans (2011) parallels this belief and maintains statistical data is motivated by various interests groups which use the data to promote their political agenda, even if the data is not backed by scientific research. For example, Vance (2011) acknowledges the U.S. Department of State’s report in 2002 that claimed 50,000 women and children were trafficked into the United States was exaggerated because the estimates were ultimately reduced to around 14,500 to 17,500 trafficked annually (Vance, 2011).

Another explanation for the disparity of reported human trafficking victims can be attributed to a tainted sampling population, meaning not all victims self-report. Modeling the aforementioned statement offered by Hillary Clinton, Ngwe and Oko (2012) agrees that human trafficking attempts to remain hidden and is “part of an underground economy”. They found trafficking victims are not always willing to report the crime. As discussed in the following section, trafficking victims are not always willing to cooperate with law enforcement officials in charge of the investigation (Ngwe & Oko, 2012). An important aspect of the TVPA is to encourage cooperation of the victim through a potential trial.

After examining reasons that the disparity in the reported number of human trafficking victims exist, the question then becomes how can one better examine the crime of human trafficking so that the inconsistencies in the reported numbers of victims can be reduced? Recent human trafficking research identifies several different approaches to studying this crime to...
provide better empirical results. For example, some studies examine the issues involved with identifying a victim of human trafficking and reasons he or she might be unwilling to cooperate with law enforcement (Hepburn and Simon, 2010; Helfferich, Kavemann, and Rabe, 2011). Other studies (George, 2012; Long, 2013; Loftus, 2011; Farrell et al., 2010) contend the best way to address human trafficking is through the better training of law enforcement officers and other first responders. Others (Hepburn and Simon, 2010; Parker and Skrmetti, 2013; Banovic and Bjelajac, 2012) examine reasons why someone might become a human trafficker and search for common human trafficker strategies.

**Uncooperative and Unidentified Victims**

Hepburn and Simon (2010) cite several reasons a victim would not want to cooperate with law enforcement. One major factor is fear of retribution from the trafficker. This retribution can occur to the victim directly, or to victim’s family. Another reason for lack of cooperation is the traffickers have brainwashed the victim that police officers are bad or corrupt. This causes the victim to create a sense of distrust towards law enforcement. Yet, another possible reason a victim may be hesitant to cooperate with law enforcement is because the law enforcement officer, whether intentionally or unintentionally, mistreats the victim. This can occur when the officer treats the victim as a criminal, such as a prostitute, rather than a victim. This would further confirm the victim’s brainwashed thoughts concerning the lack of help provided by law enforcement (Hepburn and Simon, 2010).

Helfferich, Kavemann, and Rabe (2011) further illustrated the victim’s unwillingness to cooperate with law enforcement. They focused on the victim’s unwillingness to provide law enforcement officers with a formal legal statement. In most cases, the cooperation of a victim providing a statement and testifying in court against an offender is necessary for a successful
prosecution. Helfferich et al. (2011) provides several reasons a trafficking victim may be hesitant to provide such a statement. A major contributing factor for victim’s not making a statement is based on the victim’s fear of police; a similar finding was found by Hepburn and Simon (2010). According to Helfferich et al. (2011), officers need to gain the trust of victims if a useful statement is to be forthcoming. Officers interacting with victims also need to empathize with the victim rather than threatening the victim or viewing them as prostitutes, illegal immigrants, or any other type of criminal. Officers should not assume victims have placed themselves into the prostitution situation voluntarily. This plays into another point of the study which is how officers need to recognize the victim as being a victim (Helfferich et al., 2011). Although this study has valid arguments and positions concerning the victims of human trafficking, it implies more training is needed for officers to understand how to identify and interact with the victim while failing to address the commonalities of traffickers.

Hepburn and Simon (2010) also describe another issue that attributes to human trafficking, the lack of regulation in the United States sex industry. Aside from prostitution, the study shows that pornography and strip clubs are not properly regulated. This allows strip clubs to pose as fronts for prostitution. According to Hepburn and Simon (2010), the under regulated industry of pornography is conducive for the use of trafficking victims. In the United States, nearly $10 billion per year is spent on adult entertainment (Hepburn & Simon, 2010).

One strategy implemented to locate trafficking victims was through the use of a 1-800 call center. In the early 2000’s, the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) funded a national call center to assist in identifying and locating human trafficking victims. Lange (2011) examined the success of this call center. Between the months of June of 2005 and November of 2007, the call center collected and examined the reports from incoming calls. During this time,
there were more than 6,000 calls answered at the center, but the average number of monthly calls decreased each year. Although the goal of the call center was to provide female sex trafficking victims an avenue to escape their captors by self-identifying themselves to the call center, only 1% of the calls taken concerned a possible sex trafficking victim.

The study did not list the number of rescued victims. However, as Lange (2011) points out, there were many obstacles the victims faced when utilizing the call center. These obstacles included personal threats made by the trafficker, language barriers, fear of deportation, confusion as to their location when the call was made, and lack of opportunities to make phone calls. Although it was possible for victims to be located and rescued through this call center, Lange (2011) argued the call center was not effective because immigrant victims have little understanding of their rights in the United States, and subsequently feel less inclined to pursue help through a 1-800 call center.

**Training First Responders**

Most research examined thus far has focused on victims and various techniques to locate and identify a victim of human trafficking rather than examining methods to identify offenders and dismantle trafficking organizations. The answer to preventing human trafficking that is advocated by some is to better train first responders, including law enforcement officials. George (2012) believed educating law enforcement officials and government agencies dealing with human trafficking is the first step in combating the issue. However, George claims the education needs to focus on what trafficking entails, and how to properly and appropriately identify a victim of trafficking (George, 2012). Long (2013) also suggests education can highlight common indicators of human trafficking and common areas in which it occurs. However, Long (2013) fails to distinguish particular areas in which education should focus. Long (2013) only mentions
that education is necessary to look for common indicators; this raises the question of whether or
not the education should focus on indicators of victims or indicators of offenders.

Loftus (2011) also stresses the importance of educating law enforcement officials in
human trafficking. Loftus lists three beneficial factors of educating law enforcement. First,
Loftus claims training will allow officers to discover other crimes related to trafficking. Second,
Loftus believes the education will allow officers to identify victims which will allow them to
offer benefits and services to the victims which are not available to unidentified victims. Finally,
educating the officers will provide them with knowledge on how to interact with a victim to
reach the ultimate goal of prosecuting the offender (Loftus, 2011).

The research referenced so far relates to that concerning victims and the discrepancies of
numbers in trafficking reports of victims. Some research, however, has focused on reasons law
enforcement has a difficult task identifying human trafficking. For example, Farrell, McDevitt,
and Fahy (2010) recognize problems law enforcement might encounter in locating and
identifying human trafficking. They acknowledge that identifying human trafficking cases is a
difficult task, primarily because victims are isolated and fear the police. Often times, police
officers unknowingly encounter a human trafficking victim, but misclassify the victim as a
suspect of another crime, such as prostitution. Another factor making it difficult to identify
trafficking victims can be a language barrier in cases where the victim is a foreign born national
and English is not their native language (Farrell et al., 2010). This language barrier can lead the
police officer to confuse the victim of trafficking as a suspect of illegal immigration.

Farrell et al. (2010) contends a better way to combat human trafficking is for police
agencies to take a more proactive approach to increase the training of officers so they can be
better equipped to identify human trafficking. Farrell et al. (2010) acknowledge that research is
lacking in certain areas. One particular area needing attention is the network(s) where offenders and victims operate. A second area in need of research is in reference to the roles offenders have in human trafficking organizations. The authors also maintain research is needed to better understand recruitment methods of victims (Farrell et al. 2010). Farrell et al. (2010) further state that more research is needed to allow for a better understanding of relationships between human trafficking and other organized crime. Although this study states the necessity of further research, it fails to address any commonalities of traffickers.

**Common Trafficking Strategies**

Shelley (2012) did just what Farrell et al. (2010) recommended - that is study the relationship between human trafficking and other organized crime, to wit, drug trafficking. Shelley (2012) concluded that drug trafficking and human trafficking intersect in many ways. Drugs assist in the recruitment, retention and exploitation of human trafficking victims. The drugs can lower the inhibitions of a victim making them more vulnerable and easier to persuade or coerce into performing sexual acts. As pointed out by Shelley, drugs give the trafficker an advantage of maximizing the exploitation of a victim. For example, a stimulant given to a victim will assist the victim in working longer hours (Shelley, 2012).

Some studies look at reasons why someone would become a trafficker. Emphasizing reasons why someone might become a trafficker should properly examine characteristics and techniques of a trafficker. One particular study that examines reasons someone would become a trafficker is the aforementioned Hepburn and Simon (2010) study. This study points out the lucrative amount of money that one can make through human trafficking. For example, if a trafficker has one victim that earns $500 per night, the trafficker could make over $180,000 in one year. The study contends traffickers are drawn into the business because of the low risk of
being detected and the high profit associated with each victim. Even if law enforcement officers are tipped off to the trafficker, it is difficult to prove the use of force or coercion from the trafficker (Hepburn and Simon, 2010).

Although recent research is lacking in areas of identifying common characteristics of traffickers, some research has focused on offender strategies. Parker and Skrmetti (2013) attempt to seek common trends of traffickers in their study, but the findings seem to show offender strategies, not characteristics or traits of the offender. The study accentuates methods used by domestic traffickers and claims they search for victims with vulnerabilities. Parker and Skrmetti (2013) claim traffickers believe the ideal victim is one who appears troubled with little or no self-esteem. This selection process can be in person or over the internet. If the trafficker has no other victims, he or she can sometimes attempt to start a “relationship” with the female and claim he or she has no money. Through a grooming process the trafficker can persuade the victim to engage in sexual favors for money so they can achieve their goals. Parker and Skrmetti (2013) then suggest the trafficker later reveals his/her true self to the victim, letting the victim know he/she has done this before and has other victims.

Banović and Bjelajac (2012) also examine offender strategies and state traffickers utilize different strategies to control victims. The study claims offenders often beat, torture, drug, and/or starve victims in order to obtain obedience. Disobedience has severe consequences and according to the study, offenders have various techniques to exploit the victim’s situation. These techniques include isolation, intimidation, and confiscation of passports and other documents. As reported by the Banović and Bjelajac (2012, p. 94) study, “…research conducted by the Counseling Centre for Alternative Prostitution in Portland, Oregon, USA, based on data and experience of women engaged in prostitution, reported that: a) 84% of women report that pimps
force them into prostitution.” Perhaps in this situation, a victim of prostitution could be included as a victim of trafficking. Again, this study does not strictly focus on traits and characteristics of trafficking offenders, but it does reference strategies of trafficking offenders.

Another study observing trafficking offender strategies is the aforementioned study conducted by Helfferich, Kavemann, and Rabe (2011). The authors claim certain strategies utilized by traffickers create major reasons for victims to choose not to make statements to law enforcement. For example, an offender strategy could be to threaten a family member of the victim which would discourage the victim to cooperate with law enforcement (Helfferich et al. 2011). Similar to other studies, the Helfferich et al. (2011) study attributes many techniques of control to a trafficking offender. Particularly, the offender uses violence to induce fear into the victim making them subdue to the offenders commands. Additional forms of control included restricting the victim to make any outside contacts, and not allowing the victim to leave alone (Helfferich et al. 2011). As previously mentioned, the Helfferich et al. (2011) study also states the offender not only threatens violence against the victim, but also against the family of the victim.

Hepburn and Simon (2010) contend a common trait of human trafficking is the use of excessive fees. These fees can include housing and transportation and is a way for the trafficker to enslave the victim. The study examined a case where women were smuggled into the United States from Mexico under the false pretense they would work as maids. Upon arrival, the traffickers stole their passports and informed them they would have to work as prostitutes to pay off their smuggling fees. The women were told they earned three dollars ($3) for each “client”, but the victims never saw any money. In addition, the traffickers would add fees for things such
as food and housing, further pushing the victims into debt (Hepburn and Simon, 2010). This technique assured the victims would never “repay” their debt to the trafficker.
CHAPTER 3
THE CURRENT STUDY

Tyldum (2010) suggests that the quantitative data on the number of human trafficking victims is merely an estimate with very little scientific credibility. Tyldum (2010) also asserts the best approach to better understand human trafficking is through qualitative research and believes the research of human trafficking should focus on the local arena of the researcher. Then, researchers from different areas can compare findings and search for overlapping patterns on a larger scale such as regionally or nationally. Furthermore, the majority of the aforementioned research asserts more human trafficking training is needed for law enforcement and first responders. The current project takes an approach as suggested by Tyldum and seeks to focus human trafficking research specific to the researcher’s local arena - specifically Alabama. The study uses a mixed methods approach and combines qualitative research, as Tyldum (2010) suggested, with quantitative research. Through the use of a modified survey from research conducted by Lanier et al. (2014), the study attempts to gain the perception of law enforcement officers across the state of Alabama and to determine if they feel ample training is given on the topic of human trafficking. After analyzing the data, the findings are compared to a similar study that was conducted in Florida (Lanier et al., 2014).
CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

Design and Procedure

This study utilized a mixed methods approach and sought both qualitative and quantitative measures to examine the issue of human trafficking as it relates to Alabama. The quantitative portion of the study was designed to measure the extent which law enforcement officers in Alabama have been trained in the realm of human trafficking, their perceptions of human trafficking, and their investigative experience with human trafficking. In order to measure these concepts, a questionnaire was administered online and the survey was titled the “Alabama Human Trafficking Questionnaire” (see Appendix A). The survey was distributed to the law enforcement officers that are on the Human Trafficking Task Forces for the Northern, Middle, and Southern Districts of Alabama. The aforementioned task forces are comprised of city, county, state, and federal law enforcement agencies as well as attorneys, non-governmental organization (NGO) personnel, as well as other volunteers who are not associated with any law enforcement entity. These task forces to which the survey was distributed were called The Northern District of Alabama Human Trafficking Task Force, the Middle District of Alabama Human Trafficking Task Force, and the Southern District of Alabama Human Trafficking Task Force respectively. Again, the law enforcement officers who completed this study’s survey were on a task force that strictly focuses on the crime of human trafficking.

The current design of the questionnaire was influenced by a previous study which was similar in nature and focused on human trafficking in Florida. The questions in the current study
focus on human trafficking issues in Alabama. The current study’s survey was modeled after a questionnaire utilized by Lanier, Farrell, and Bezuidenhout (2014) which focused on human trafficking issues in Florida. In the Lanier et al. (2014) study, law enforcement officials reviewed and revised the questionnaire to assure content validity. These same officers also revised answer formats and made the questionnaire easier to read and complete. Based on the efforts taken in this previous study to ascertain a valid and reliable questionnaire, the survey in the current study has face validity. The current survey questions were also reviewed by Dr. Mark M. Lanier to further assure the questionnaire has content validity.

The Alabama Human Trafficking Questionnaire has a total of 45 questions including closed-ended questions, open-ended questions, and Likert-scaled questions, while the Florida instrument had a total of 58 questions which also included closed-ended questions, open-ended questions, and Likert-scaled questions. The first section of the survey contained ten background questions. The first several questions in Section 1 measure demographics of the respondents (gender, employment, official title, etc.). The next questions in Section 1 were used to measure the size of the department for which the respondents worked (geographical area, if the department is city, state, or federal). Section 1 also asked if the department has a special unit to handle illegal immigrants, non-citizens, and others who are unlawfully present in the United States. The last question in Section 1 asks if the department has a special unit devoted to dealing with vice crimes.

Section 2 of the survey contains 29 questions regarding the extent that the respondent thinks human trafficking is a concern or problem for the agency for whom he/she works. The first few questions of Section 2 asks questions which measure the number of human trafficking cases the agency has come across in the past year. This was followed by 22 Likert-scaled
questions measuring the officer’s perception that certain crimes create for his or her agency. The last four questions in Section 2 ask the respondent if his/her agency has ever received special funding to combat human trafficking, if victims are more likely to be trafficked into or out of his/her area, which form of human trafficking is more prevalent in his/her area, and the unit most likely to respond to and address a human trafficking issue in his/her area. The remaining questions addressed the respondents perception on the problem of human trafficking as it pertains to their respective law enforcement agency.

The third section of the survey contains 5 open-ended questions. These questions ask about special problems caused by human trafficking in the respondent’s area, significant case examples, the method of transportation utilized to move the victim, the manner in which human trafficking cases come to the attention of the respondent’s agency, and the countries from which most trafficking victims come. Section 4 of the survey consisted of one open-ended question allowing the respondent to expand on or address anything omitted from the questionnaire that he/she felt could contribute to the study.

After receiving the completed questionnaires from the various law enforcement agencies throughout Alabama, the data was analyzed. The data was then compared to the findings from the aforementioned study conducted in Florida (Lanier, et al., 2014). It should be noted that the Lanier et al. (2014) study examined the human trafficking issues in Florida and also contained findings from the Republic of South Africa. The findings from Alabama were compared to both the findings from Florida and the findings from the Republic of South Africa.

Population and Sample

The participants in this study included law enforcement officers, prosecutors, non-governmental agencies, other law enforcement volunteers, and two (2) of whom were not
involved in law enforcement in any way. The two participants with no law enforcement affiliation failed to answer any of the relevant questions that were used in the statistical data below. This is to say that the tables referenced in this study show the perceptions of those with law enforcement functions and the statistical data used in this study was disaggregated from the views of those with no law enforcement affiliation.

All of the respondents were employed and/or resided in the state of Alabama. The law enforcement respondents consisted of officers from city, county, state, and federal agencies. The responding agencies represented the entire state of Alabama, although few respondents were from the Southern District of Alabama. Everyone who participated in the survey was at least 19 years old. Furthermore, the respondents varied in the amount of time served in their current position which ranged from less than 1 year of service to 35 years of service. Respondents also consisted of both males and females. In an effort to maintain the participant’s privacy, the survey was administered via the World Wide Web (www) and allowed the participants to complete it through an internet survey hosted by the program Qualtrics©. This program was also instrumental in maintaining the participant’s privacy. This online self-administered questionnaire provided the participants the flexibility to take the survey in the privacy of his her home or office. Furthermore, the questionnaire was distributed by the Alabama Fusion Center (which is described below).

Collection of Data

The questionnaire was distributed to the Human Trafficking Task Forces in the Northern, Middle, and Southern Districts of Alabama via e-mail. The option to administer the survey online was influenced by several factors. First, administering the survey questionnaire via the internet seemed to be the most economical approach to having the survey distributed. Second,
online surveys provide an easy way for participants to complete and submit the questionnaire when compared to completing and submitting paper copies. Finally, the researchers sought to administer the survey online as they believed and hoped the internet survey would result in a higher response rate than other traditional methods might provide since respondents are accustomed to completing survey’s in this format.

In summary, the Alabama Fusion Center was responsible for distributing the questionnaires. The Alabama Fusion Center is a resource used to assist law enforcement agencies in Alabama to investigate crimes in their respective areas. The Alabama Fusion Center is capable of sending information to any and all office heads of law enforcement agencies throughout Alabama to include city, county, state, and federal offices as well as select task force offices. This study utilized the Alabama Fusion Center in hopes of obtaining a higher response rate from the various law enforcement agencies receiving the questionnaire. After the survey expired in Qualtrics®, the data was exported from Qualtrics® and downloaded into SPSS® (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) version 16.
CHAPTER 5

QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

After the data was collected and imported into SPSS®, several quantitative measures were analyzed in an effort to determine the general perception that law enforcement officers in Alabama have towards the issue of Human Trafficking. Particularly, the study examined the amount of training officers received in the realm of human trafficking in an attempt to determine whether or not officers felt this training was adequate. Quantitative steps were also taken to determine if law enforcement agencies in Alabama received special funding to combat the crime of human trafficking, and whether officers felt victims were more likely to be trafficked into or out of the state. The open ended questions on the survey allowed examination of candid remarks from law enforcement officers concerning the methods of transportation used to move victims to and from the state, the types of cases that have been prosecuted in Alabama, the various ways human trafficking cases come to the attention of law enforcement offices, the countries from which victims most often come to Alabama, and special problems that human trafficking has caused for the officer’s area of responsibility.

Findings

A total of 148 surveys were distributed to the aforementioned task forces. Of those distributed, 63 were completed and returned, for a response rate of 43%. Prior to the survey expiring in Qualtrics®, the Alabama Fusion Center issued a reminder to the members of all the task forces about the survey and requested those members who had not yet completed the survey to do so.
Demographics

Section 1 of the survey contained several questions pertaining to demographic information of the officer and/or the agency for which the officer worked as illustrated in Table 1. All respondents ($n=63$) answered the question pertaining to gender, and the majority of the respondents were male (63.5%, $n=40$). Because the survey was distributed to Human Trafficking Task Forces across Alabama, professions other than law enforcement were able to respond. Most of the respondents (73%, $n=46$) indicated he or she was a law enforcement official, and more than half of the respondents (60.3%, $n=38$) had at least 10 years of experience in his or her profession. A large percentage of the responding agencies (60.7%, $n=34$) indicated they covered an area that is at least 76 square miles, whereas only 12.5% ($n=7$) of the responding agencies were responsible for a small area of 25 square miles or less. Nearly half of the respondents were employed by a municipality or city (43.3%, $n=26$). One-third of the respondents indicated they worked for a federal entity ($n=20$), and only 8.3% worked for the state of Alabama ($n=5$). The remaining 15% ($n=9$) of respondents worked for a county within the state. Only 37.3% ($n=59$) of the responding agencies had a specialized unit to address vice crimes, and only 28.8% ($n=59$) had a unit to deal with undocumented citizens.
Table 1. Demographic Statistics-Alabama

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Group %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 to 21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecutor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographic Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25 Square Miles</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-75 Square Miles</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-124 Square Miles</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125-174 Square Miles</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;174 Square Miles</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perceptions of Human Trafficking Variables

Table 2 reveals the respondents perception of human trafficking as it relates to his/her agency, the community, the politicians, and the media, with the responses distributed across the respondents geographical area of responsibility and the type of department for which the respondents worked. The respondent’s geographical area was determined by the number of square miles the respondent covers. A rural area consisted of a town less than 25 square miles, a small town was between 25 square miles and 74 square miles, a medium sized town covered an area between 75 square miles and 99 square miles, and an urban area covered an area of 100 square miles or more. Table 2 lists these geographical areas by R, S, M, and U respectively. The type of department delineates if the respondent is employed by a city, county, state, or federal entity.

As Table 2 illustrates, nearly half of the respondents perceive human trafficking as a high area of concern, regardless of the size of the city they cover (45.1%, n=51) or the department type for which they are employed (44.4%, n=54). Conversely, law enforcement officers believe the community has a low level of concern for human trafficking. When the respondent’s perception was examined across the geographic area covered, 53.8% (n=52) indicated the community’s concern of human trafficking is low. Similarly, 54.5% (n=55) of the respondents answers when examined across the type of the department for which they are employed indicated a low level of concern from the community. Interestingly, 51.9% (n=52) of the respondents believe the media has a low interest in human trafficking when examined across geographical area, and 54.5% (n=55) indicated a low level of media concern when examined across department type. When examining the responses across geographical area, only 21.2% (n=52) believed politicians have a high concern for human trafficking. Likewise, when examined by
department type, only 20% of the respondents felt that politicians have a high level of concern for human trafficking.

Table 2. Human Trafficking Concern-Alabama

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEOGRAPHICAL AREA</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>n=7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent's Perception of HT Problem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Community Concern</td>
<td>n=7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Political Concern</td>
<td>n=7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Media Concern</td>
<td>n=7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows the mean scores for all of the perception variables and summarizes the foregoing information. Particularly, it illustrates that law enforcement officers feel that they have a higher sense of concern with the crime of human trafficking in their respective areas than the community, the politicians, or the media. With all the media attention that human trafficking has gathered over recent years, it is worth mentioning that the respondent’s in Alabama only had a mean reported value of 3.78 for media concern, which was the lowest amongst all reported means.
Table 3. Mean Scores for the Relevant Variables-Alabama

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEOGRAPHICAL AREA</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement Concern with HT</td>
<td>n=54</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>2.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Concern with HT</td>
<td>n=55</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>2.628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Concern with HT</td>
<td>n=55</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>2.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Concern with HT</td>
<td>n=55</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>2.713</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ability to Combat Human Trafficking**

Table 4 reflects the respondent’s agency ability to combat the crime of human trafficking. This ability was measured through three separate variables. First, the respondent’s perception on his/her department’s level of commitment to address the crime of human trafficking was measured. Next, the amount of human trafficking training the respondent has received on human trafficking was measured. Finally, the respondent’s perception about his or her department’s level of understanding the definition and elements of the crime of human trafficking were measured. The responses were measured and then categorized into low, medium, or high; the responses were then examined after they were distributed across the respondent’s geographical area of responsibility and the level of the respondents department.

The majority of the respondents indicated that their respective department was highly committed to address the human trafficking. In fact, 62% (n=50) of the respondents stated their department was highly committed to address the crime when examined across geographical area, which is nearly identical to the responses examined across the department type (62.3%, n=53). Based on these responses, the respective agencies are highly committed to address human trafficking, but it appears law enforcement departments across Alabama are lacking in training and understanding of the crime. For example, when the responses were examined across the geographical area, over half of the respondents (51.9%, n=52) indicated the personnel in his or
her office had a low level of understanding the definition of human trafficking. Likewise, when the responses were examined across one’s type of department, 54.5% (n=55) of the respondents indicated his or her respective department’s personnel had a low understanding of human trafficking.

A lack of understanding could be attributed to a lack of training. For example, only 25.5% (n=51) of the respondents ranging from rural towns to urban cities revealed their department has received a high amount of human trafficking training with 19.6% (n=10) of those coming from an urban city. This indicates that most of the training is giving to officers in urban cities. When examined across the level of department, 24.5% (n=53) of the respondents stated their department has received a high level of human trafficking training with 15.1% (n=8) of those responses coming from federal agents. This suggests that federal agencies are receiving most of the training. Again, this lack of training appears to be a direct cause for respondent’s low level of knowledge on human trafficking.

Table 4. Perceived Ability to Combat Human Trafficking-Alabama

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEOGRAPHICAL AREA</th>
<th>LEVEL OF DEPARTMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Personnel’s Understanding of HT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>n=7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.60%</td>
<td>71.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.60%</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>n=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.80%</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>GEOGRAPHICAL AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Training Received on HT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>n=6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.70%</td>
<td>46.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.70%</td>
<td>38.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>n=6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.70%</td>
<td>15.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commitment to Address HT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMITMENT TO ADDRESS HT</th>
<th>GEOGRAPHICAL AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>n=6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>42.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>n=6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>35.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perception of HT cases in Alabama

When asked, only 49% (n=53) of the respondents indicated that undocumented citizens pose a high level of problems in their respective jurisdictions, but 79.2% (n=53) of the respondents indicated there is a high relationship between undocumented citizens and human trafficking. Likewise, 64.5% (n=31) of the respondents believed that human trafficking victims come from some country other than the United States. Respondents also revealed that they believe victims are more likely to be trafficked into Alabama instead of out of Alabama (67.9%, n=53), and 60.4% (n=53) believe sex trafficking is more common than labor trafficking in Alabama.

Even with the high percentage rates listed above, 76.5% (n=47) of the respondents stated that his or her office only received five (5) calls or less concerning human trafficking throughout the previous year. The respondents also expressed that there is a need for special funding to address the crime in Alabama. In fact, 77.4% (n=53) of the respondents stated there is a high need for such funding, even though only 9.6% (n=52) stated his or her department has received special funding to combat human trafficking. Furthermore, only 35.3% (n=51) of the respondents indicated their office has a human trafficking unit to address such a crime, and 15.7% stated the department’s patrol unit would handle any calls for human trafficking.

Comparison of Current Study to Florida Study

The Florida study that the current project was modeled after (Lanier et al., 2014) distributed a similar survey to all 67 Sheriff Departments across the state. Of those surveys distributed, 54 were completed and returned for a response rate of 80.6%. The departments that responded provided a true representation of the state with regards to the size of the department, the geographical area covered by the department, and other characteristics measured in the
current study. Most of the respondents completing the Florida survey were male (92.6%) with over 13 years of law enforcement experience (94.4%). Table 5 shows the descriptive statistics for the Florida study (Lanier et al., 2014).

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics-Florida

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Group %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;18</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographic Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># of Sworn Officers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-500</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 500</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was not a single respondent in the Florida study that claimed human trafficking was a high concern for the sheriff’s department. In fact, when examined across geographic area, 76% of the respondents perceived the human trafficking problem to be of low concern. This is totally opposite of the results obtained in Alabama. When examined across geographic area, only 26% of the respondents in Alabama considered human trafficking to be of low concern as perceived by law enforcement. Whereas 0% of the Florida respondents felt the sheriff’s
department perceived human trafficking to be a high concern, 46% of the respondents in the current study indicated that law enforcement in Alabama perceive human trafficking to be a high concern. Table 6 shows the perceived level of human trafficking concern in Florida as it relates to the respondent’s department, community, politics, and media.

It is worth noting that the Florida study’s mean reported value for law enforcement concern of human trafficking was the lowest reported mean score of all the variables measured. In contrast, the Alabama study’s mean reported value for the law enforcement concern of human trafficking was the highest reported mean score of all variables measured. Table 7 reflects the mean scores for all of the perception variables as they relate to the Florida study.

There are a few possible reasons that might explain the discrepancies between the Florida and Alabama study. First, only sheriffs were surveyed in Florida. If only the Alabama county law enforcement officers were examined, the reported numbers would be similar. For example, only 37.5% (n=3) of the county law enforcement officers who completed the Alabama survey viewed human trafficking as a high concern. The remaining 62.5% (n=5) of county officers viewed the crime as a low to medium concern. The other issue to consider when viewing the reported numbers between the two states is the time difference. It is possible that sheriffs in Florida have become more aware of the human trafficking crime since they completed the surveys in 2010. It is important to remember that the Alabama respondents completed the survey in 2015.
Table 6. Human Trafficking Concern-Florida

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sheriff Perception of HT Problem</th>
<th>&lt; 20</th>
<th>21-100</th>
<th>101-500</th>
<th>&gt; 500</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>n=8</td>
<td>n=6</td>
<td>n=35</td>
<td>n=54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>66.70%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>75.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.30%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>31.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Community Concern</th>
<th>&lt; 20</th>
<th>21-100</th>
<th>101-500</th>
<th>&gt; 500</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>n=7</td>
<td>n=7</td>
<td>n=35</td>
<td>n=54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>66.70%</td>
<td>81.80%</td>
<td>66.70%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>64.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>16.70%</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
<td>33.30%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>31.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>16.70%</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Political Concern</th>
<th>&lt; 20</th>
<th>21-100</th>
<th>101-500</th>
<th>&gt; 500</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>n=7</td>
<td>n=7</td>
<td>n=35</td>
<td>n=54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>83.30%</td>
<td>63.60%</td>
<td>59.30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>55.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>16.70%</td>
<td>18.20%</td>
<td>25.90%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>31.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>16.70%</td>
<td>18.20%</td>
<td>14.80%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Media Concern</th>
<th>&lt; 20</th>
<th>21-100</th>
<th>101-500</th>
<th>&gt; 500</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>n=8</td>
<td>n=7</td>
<td>n=34</td>
<td>n=54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>81.80%</td>
<td>73.10%</td>
<td>27.30%</td>
<td>63.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>33.30%</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
<td>19.20%</td>
<td>63.60%</td>
<td>27.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>16.70%</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
<td>9.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Mean Scores for the Relevant Variables-Florida

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GEOGRAPHICAL AREA</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT SIZE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern with HT</td>
<td>n=54</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Concern</td>
<td>n=54</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Concern</td>
<td>n=54</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Concern</td>
<td>n=54</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview of Retired Police Detective

In February of 2016, Retired Police Detective (Det.) Richard Strickland agreed to be interviewed about human trafficking. Det. Strickland worked for the Pelham, Alabama Police Department (PPD) for 25 years before retiring. During his time there, he worked many different assignments and worked for several different units. His final seven years on the police force, Det. Strickland was assigned to the Investigations Unit for PPD and he was also assigned to the Homeland Security Investigations (HSI) Office of the Assistant Special Agent in Charge (ASAC) in Birmingham, Alabama as a Task Force Officer (TFO). Since his retirement in June of 2012, Det. Strickland has maintained close contact with many law enforcement officials. Det. Strickland was the lead investigator for many crimes to include sex abuse cases, car burglary cases, gang cases, and human trafficking cases. The interview was focused on Det. Strickland’s expertise in human trafficking and human trafficking investigations.

Federal Human Trafficking Case

Det. Strickland stated he first became involved in human trafficking investigations in September of 2009 when he received a phone call from the Florence, Alabama Police Department (FPD) requesting assistance on a prostitution case. According to FPD Officers, the female prostitute was only 15 years-old and had stated her pimp had been driving her around for two (2) weeks to have sex with various men who would pay the pimp anywhere from $30.00 to $50.00. In fact, the victim admitted to having sex with four (4) unknown men at a trailer
moments before the traffic stop where police encountered her and her pimp. Det. Strickland stated that the FPD Officers felt like the pimp, later identified as Manuel Zelaya, should face charges more severe than promoting prostitution and asked if Det. Strickland could possibly pursue federal human trafficking charges since he was a TFO with HSI. It should be noted that the state of Alabama did not have a human trafficking statute at this time.

Det. Strickland, with assistance from HSI Agents, agreed to assist FPD Officers and determine if any federal statutes had been violated. Personnel from the Alabama Department of Human Resources (DHR) interviewed the juvenile victim. The victim stated she was living in Mexico when a male befriended her and later became her boyfriend. A few weeks later, the boyfriend persuaded her to move to Atlanta, Georgia in order to have a better life. He informed the victim she could work as a waitress or maid and that he would work in construction. The victim agreed and the two of them started their journey to America. The victim and her boyfriend entered into the United States illegally and finally made it to Atlanta, Georgia after being arrested and returned to Mexico by the U.S. Border Patrol one time.

Upon arriving in Atlanta, the boyfriend informed the victim that she would not be a maid or waitress; rather she would work as a prostitute for him. Initially, the victim refused and attempted to leave the boyfriend. At this time, he began to physically abuse her. Even when she was under this physical duress, she refused to work as a prostitute. Only after this pimp—he was no longer a boyfriend-threatened to kill the victim’s infant child did she surrender to his demands and begin to prostitute. She was taken to several brothels all over the Atlanta area over a month period. Then she was taken to Auburn, Alabama where she was forced to prostitute at many more brothels over the course of a month. This victim was unsure of the exact number of brothels to which she was taken. It should be noted that Det. Strickland was unable to provide an
exact number of brothels the victims was forced to service between Georgia and Alabama. The pimp then took her back to Atlanta where he continued to sell her body to numerous men on a daily basis. Ultimately, the victim was able to abscond from this pimp and seek help. Unfortunately, the pimp had vacated his home and brothels before police could secure a warrant to search his house or a warrant for his arrest.

After escaping the torturous environment of the human trafficking world, Det. Strickland stated the victim proceeded to Auburn, Alabama where she worked as a waitress. She was unable to earn enough money to live comfortably and decided to return to the prostitution business to increase her income. While she was being pimped in Atlanta, Georgia, another female had given her a phone number that belonged to a pimp that worked in the Florence, Alabama area. This pimp was reported to be a nice guy. Ultimately, the victim called this pimp-Manuel Zelaya-and asked if she could work for him. He agreed. Zelaya and the victim made arrangements for him to drive to Auburn, pick her up, and return to Florence where she would begin prostituting for him. During the interview with DHR, the victim stated she had serviced around 50 men while working for Zelaya over a 2 week period. She also confirmed that each man paid Zelaya anywhere from $30.00 to $50.00. During the time she spent with Zelaya, the victim stated that he questioned her several times about her age. She always claimed she was 19 years-old, but Zelaya expressed his doubts saying she only looked about 17 years-old.

Det. Strickland stated that during the initial traffic stop where Zelaya and the victim were encountered, someone called the cell phone belonging to Zelaya asking for the young girl. He also claimed that the officer who made the traffic stop noted that Zelaya would not allow the victim to answer any questions. For example, when the officer asked her for her name, Zelaya answered for her. Another clue that could have been easily dismissed as non-criminal activity by
the officer was the fact that the female provided a date-of birth that would have made her 30 years-old at the time. Zelaya and the victim attempted to act as if they were involved in a romantic relationship with one another. Det. Strickland claims that these factors are only a few indicators that are given in human trafficking training classes. For example, Det. Strickland stated that anytime a female is not allowed to answer for herself during a traffic stop should indicate to the officer that something is not right. Det. Strickland said that little to no training on human trafficking had been given in Alabama when this Zelaya case originated, and it is fortunate the FPD Officers were aware that something larger was occurring than just prostitution.

When asked about the outcome of the case, Det. Strickland stated that Zelaya was charged in federal court on multiple violations. Although Det. Strickland could not remember all charges filed against Zelaya, he was certain that Zelaya was charged with sex trafficking of a minor. The case went to court and Zelaya was convicted on all counts, including the human trafficking charge. Although the government argued for a heavy sentence based on the fact that Zelaya played a significant role in having the victim raped by approximately 50 men over a 2-week period, the judge sentenced Zelaya to 188 months (15 years and 6 months) in the custody of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons.

**State Human Trafficking Case**

In October of 2011, Det. Strickland initiated a joint investigation with HSI into an individual residing in Pelham, Alabama identified Petronilio Mendoza after receiving reports that he was operating an “out-call” prostitution business. Det. Strickland stated that Mendoza did not utilize his residence as a brothel, but claimed he would transport the females to various places—this is why his operation was considered an “out-call” service. Det. Strickland stated that by the
time this investigation was complete, the state of Alabama had enacted a state statute prohibiting human trafficking.

For the following several months, Det. Strickland and other officers conducted surveillance of Mendoza and noted his movements. Officers noticed a pattern. Particularly, it appeared that Mendoza would have a new female working for him every week, and it seemed this new female would start on each Monday. When the new female started, the female from the previous week would move onto a different brothel. Ultimately, officers began following Mendoza on Monday mornings and realized that he typically would drive to Atlanta, Georgia, pick up a girl, and then return to Pelham, Alabama. Upon his return, Mendoza would drive the female to various trailers, apartments, houses, and hotels where she would stay anywhere from 15 minutes to 1 hour.

Not long into the investigation, Det. Strickland began having an officer stop Mendoza for traffic violations. During these traffic stops, the officer was able to identify the female that was with Mendoza. Ultimately, Mendoza was stopped approximately five (5) times during the investigation for various traffic violations. During each traffic stop, Mendoza provided a different name to the officer even though several of the stops were made by the same officer. One particular traffic stop was initiated by an officer with the Hoover, Alabama Police Department (HPD). The officer obtained the name of Mendoza and the female that was with him that night. The following night, this female was at an apartment complex in Hoover, Alabama with Mendoza and was working as a prostitute for him. She decided she no longer wanted to prostitute and flagged down a police officer for help. Coincidentally, the officer that stopped to help her was the same officer from the previous night. She informed the officer that Mendoza
was making her prostitute and that she no longer wanted to do it. The officer took the female to a
safe house that night.

As the investigation was nearing an end, Det. Strickland was able to obtain warrants on
Mendoza for providing various names to police officers during traffic stops. After the warrants
were in hand, Det. Strickland followed Mendoza to Atlanta, Georgia one Monday morning and
watched him pick up a female before returning to Pelham, Alabama. Later that night, Det.
Strickland followed Mendoza and the female to a trailer park in Pelham, Alabama. About 5
minutes after Mendoza arrived at the trailer, Det. Strickland approached him and informed him
there was an outstanding warrant for his arrest. He then obtained permission from the occupants
of the trailer to enter the residence. Inside, Det. Strickland found the female that had just arrived
from Atlanta, Georgia prostituting herself. In fact, there was a line of four men waiting to be
serviced. The female was taken to the Pelham Police Jail for an interview. Mendoza was arrested
and also taken to the jail where he was later interviewed.

During the interview, Mendoza admitted he had been in the business of transporting
prostitutes around the metropolitan Birmingham area for the past 2 years. He also admitted he
usually would pick up a female from the Atlanta, Georgia area and bring her back to the
Birmingham, Alabama area where she would work for him as a prostitute. Det. Strickland then
showed Mendoza the pictures of the various females that were obtained during the numerous
traffic stops throughout the investigation. Mendoza remembered each female and was able to tell
from where in Atlanta, Georgia each one came. When asked about the female that absconded
from him in Hoover, Mendoza stated that her husband makes her prostitute against her accord.
He maintained that she was working for him voluntarily and that he would never make someone
prostitute if they did not want to. In his mind, it was acceptable that the victim was being forced
or coerced to prostitute by her husband, but Mendoza believed he was innocent because he was not the one making her do it even when she was working for him.

Det. Strickland had someone contact the U.S. Attorney’s Office to pursue federal human trafficking charges. However, the U.S. Attorney’s Office declined because the victim could no longer be located. Subsequently, Det. Strickland charged Mendoza on the state charge of human trafficking. Mendoza later pled guilty to the charge. He was sentenced to serve 15 years in the custody of the Alabama Department of Corrections, split with time served. He was then deported to Mexico. According to Det. Strickland, this was the first state conviction for the crime of human trafficking.

**Detective Strickland’s Perception of Human Trafficking in Alabama**

Det. Strickland stressed the importance that current law enforcement officers should view the crime of human trafficking with a high area of concern. He stated that there is a need for more human trafficking training throughout the state of Alabama. When asked, Det. Strickland stated that federal agencies or departments—such as the Department of Justice and the Department of Homeland Security—should provide training opportunities for officers in smaller towns to attend. He also stated that he believes these federal entities should provide funding to train officers in an attempt to combat the crime. Only then can departments create a specialized unit to strictly investigate the crime effectively.
CHAPTER 7
DISCUSSION AND LIMITATIONS

Discussion

As previously mentioned, Loftus (2011) and George (2012) maintain that educating law enforcement officers is the first step to combat the crime. Farrell et al. (2010) suggested that police agencies should increase the training of officers so they can be better equipped to identify human trafficking. The results of this research support the position that more human trafficking training is needed for law enforcement officers in Alabama. The need for training was expressed not only by officers who completed the questionnaire, but it was also suggested by Detective Strickland during his interview. Particularly, Det. Strickland stated that there is a need for more human trafficking training throughout the state of Alabama. He suggested that this training be implemented into the academy classes for new recruits, and he also stated that advanced training needs to be offered for veteran officers.

The findings also support other conclusions. First, there is an apparent difference between the perceived threat of human trafficking between officers in Alabama and Florida. Whereas the average Alabama response to the perceived threat of human trafficking was in the medium category, Floridians seemed to believe the perceived threat of the crime is low. This discrepancy could be a result that the Alabama survey was answered by law enforcement officers employed by city, county, state, and federal entities whereas the Florida survey was only answered by county law enforcement officials (sheriffs and/or deputies). This is to say that it is plausible that
sheriff deputies do not encounter human trafficking cases as often as city, state, and federal law enforcement officials do, which leads to the departments perceiving the threat in a low regard.

Another possible explanation in the discrepancy in the reported numbers from each state is that Sheriffs can be persuaded to enforce specific laws more than other laws based on the political climate at any given time. This is to say that crime rates, poverty levels, and prostitution vary in each state, and Sheriff’s Deputies in Florida could possibly be focused on other crimes than human trafficking. There is also a time difference between the two respective studies. The Florida study was conducted in 2010 whereas the Alabama study was conducted in 2014. It is possible that the law enforcement perception in Florida regarding human trafficking changed during that four-year time period. This is to say that Sheriff’s in Florida might have received some training and became aware of the human trafficking problem since the conclusion of the aforementioned study. The Alabama study revealed that law enforcement officers in the state view human trafficking as a high area of concern. This view was also supported by Det. Strickland. Although Det. Strickland did not give his opinion on the scope and magnitude of the crime in Alabama, he stated that human trafficking is very real and that it occurs in Alabama more than most Alabamians realize. He stressed the importance that current law enforcement officers should view the crime as a high area of concern.

Another conclusion that is supported by the findings is the fact that law enforcement officers in Alabama are committed to address the issues of human trafficking even though they are not adequately trained and do not fully understand the crime. Whereas the majority of the respondents expressed a medium to high level of commitment to combat the crime of human trafficking, over half of the respondents indicated that they have a low level of comprehending it. The majority of the respondents also indicated a low to medium level of training received in the
realm of human trafficking. The issue then becomes that officers are unprepared to combat human trafficking, regardless of their commitment to do so. This alone exposes the fact that more human trafficking training is needed for law enforcement officers across Alabama.

Det. Strickland agrees with the findings from the survey mentioned above. He expressed his belief that every law enforcement agency across the state stands ready to combat the issue, regardless of the amount of training their department receives. Particularly, Det. Strickland stated that when he retired from the Pelham Police Department, he felt the department was highly committed to combating the crime and rescuing victims. However, his main concern was that officers were trying to combat a problem with which they have very little understanding. He attributes this lack of understanding to a lack of training. For example, Det. Strickland claimed his knowledge of human trafficking only increased as he began investigating instances of the crime in his city and he never received any specialized training on the issue. He did suggest that more training has been offered since his retirement, but he is unsure.

Det. Strickland’s views seem to be consistent with the findings of the quantitative portion of this study. Particularly, his lack of training mirrors the answers given by 75.5% (n=53) of the respondents who felt that they did not receive a high level of training on the issue. Just like with these respondents, Det. Strickland insinuated this lack of training was the reason he had very little understanding of the crime and was forced to learn about it during an active investigation. Even with little training on the issue, Det. Strickland maintained that his department was, and still is, highly committed to combat the crime, just as the 62% (n=50) of the respondents answered in the quantitative portion of this study.
Limitations and Recommendations

While the overall response rate of the Alabama Human Trafficking Questionnaire was moderate, it is important to note that the respondents were a fair representation of the state of Alabama, both geographically and based on the level of the department for which they were employed. Some of the respondents, however, were volunteers with no affiliation to any law enforcement entity. Although every effort was taken to assure the responses examined were only those provided by law enforcement officers, future studies should verify that only the targeted population receives the survey questions.

There are also other limitations to this study. The first is that there was only one state surveyed (Alabama) pursuant to this study. The results obtained from Alabama cannot be generalized to the entire country. The other limitation to the study is that the results are inclusive to a specific time period. As officers evolve and training is enhanced, the results could change over several years. However, this study appears to be a good foundation for future studies.
CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

As this study has shown, the gathering and reporting of accurate data on the exact magnitude of human trafficking appears to be difficult. The potentially overwhelming question then becomes how someone can solve a problem if those attempting to find a resolution to the problem are unable to truly and accurately identify the size and scope of the problem itself? The passing of the TVPA in 2000 was a move in the right direction to bring awareness of human trafficking to the public and to create harsher penalties for those convicted of the crime; however, it seems like little has been done to since then to accurately quantify the extent of the problem. By broadening the scope of human trafficking through expanding the definition, is it possible that society has limited the way in which someone can accurately measure the extent of the crime?

Regardless of the difficulties researchers have in gathering accurate data, the lack of training can also pose a hurdle in an officer’s ability to identify a possible human trafficking scenario which further complicates the gathering of reliable and valid data. The answer to solving the human trafficking issue that many have advocated for, including some respondents in this study, is to increase the amount of training that is provided to law enforcement officers. However, the training topic raises several more questions.

One particular question posed by offering more training is simple, is there any data indicating the type of human trafficking training that would be most useful to law enforcement officers? As previously stated, law enforcement officials recently began focusing training and
education on ways to respond and treat victims of the crime. This reactive approach to assisting victims does very little to prevent the crime or educate officers on ways to identify the crime.

Another interesting question to be addressed is to determine the best time in an officer’s career to implement human trafficking training. As Det. Strickland suggested, the training could be introduced in a basic academy class so the officer becomes aware of the problem very early in the policing career. Other officers might feel that the training should be reserved for seasoned officers who are detectives or investigators.

A third issue to consider when addressing training is to determine the most cost effective method in which to train officers. Although many have advocated for specialized funding to address training issues, few have stated what the funding source should be. Furthermore, who should receive the training? Many of those advocating for extensive training have failed to indicate if the training should be directed at federal, state, or local officers. Perhaps it is the difficulties of gathering reliable data on human trafficking that creates an issue for administrators to prioritize training.

Even with these thought provoking questions, one thing remains constant, and that is the findings of the current research provide convincing evidence that law enforcement officers, at least in the states of Alabama and Florida, are in need of more training on the issues surrounding human trafficking. It is up to researchers and government administrators to determine the areas of human trafficking that needs to be addressed in the training. It is also up to the researchers and administrators to determine the best time to implement the training and how the training should be funded.

As indicated by previous studies, the adequate training of law enforcement officers and other first responders is the first step society should take in an effort to bring light on this crime.
that thrives in the shadows. Given the seriousness of the crime of human trafficking, focused training would be beneficial not only to first responders and law enforcement officials, but also to help with the overall goal of combating the crime. This is to say that more training will lead to more people being able to understand the crime, identify when the crime is occurring, assist victims of the crime, and eventually disrupt these criminal organizations that are preying on the vulnerable. The adequate training of law enforcement officers is the first step society should take to bring light to this crime that thrives in the shadows.
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Alabama Human Trafficking Questionnaire

The Department of Criminal Justice at the University of Alabama is conducting an Alabama state-wide study on human trafficking. Your department/office has been specially selected to participate in the survey portion of the study. Your voluntary cooperation is vital and is greatly appreciated. By completing the survey you indicate your voluntary cooperation.

The following survey will ask various questions about several things to include the area in which you work, your outlook on human trafficking, and other crimes associated with human trafficking. The survey should only take about 10 to 15 minutes to complete.

The Trafficking and Violence Protection Act (TVPA) defines a victim of trafficking as: (A) sex trafficking in which a commercial sex act is induced by force, fraud, or coercion, or in which the person induced to perform such act has not attained 18 years of age; or (B) the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, or obtaining of a person for labor or services, through the use of force, fraud, or coercion for the purpose of subjection to involuntary servitude, peonage, debt bondage, or slavery.

This questionnaire will assist in addressing the social problem of human trafficking in Alabama from the view of those assigned to combat the crime. Simply circle the response that you feel is most accurate. PLEASE TRY TO ANSWER AS HONESTLY AS POSSIBLE. We also urge you to try and answer all the questions to enable us to make accurate calculations and comparisons of the collected data. We are trying to determine the extent of the problem.

Although the questions are to gather information concerning human trafficking, we understand that some questions might seem sensitive. We will not ask for any identifying information, and we assure you the survey is confidential. Your voluntary cooperation is vital and is greatly appreciated. By completing the survey you indicate your voluntary cooperation.

The data will be used to help develop police and public policy to better deal with the problem. All the study results will be readily available to all interested parties. If you have any questions or need help completing the form, please contact Daniel McKenzie at dhmckenzie1@crimson.ua.edu.
The questionnaire is divided into 4 sections. Section 1 focuses on your individual and your agency’s demographic information. Section 2 focuses on the specific perceptions you have about this phenomenon. Section 3 is open-ended and addresses general crime issues. In Section 4 you have the opportunity to voice any aspect that we have omitted in the questionnaire.

Section 1: Demographical information of the reporting official

1. Are you male or female? Male Female
2. In what capacity are you employed?
3. How many years have you been so employed? _________
4. How many years have you been employed in your current position in Alabama? ______
5. What is your official title? _______________
6. In what city is your office located?
7. How large of a geographical area does your office cover?
8. Is your office considered:
   a. City b. County c. State d. Federal
9. Does your office have a special unit to deal with “undocumented citizens” (this refers to illegal immigrants, non-citizens, and others who are not legal residents)?
10. Do you have a special unit to deal with vice crimes?

Section 2: Perception with regard to Human Trafficking Scale

11. How many complaints or leads has your office received over the past year concerning human trafficking? _________
12. How many human trafficking cases has your office examined over the past year?
13. How many human trafficking cases has your office referred for or accepted for prosecution (For NGO’s, how many cases has your office assisted with) over the past year?
On a scale of 1 to 10 (with 1 being none and 10 the highest)

14. How much of a problem has human trafficking been in your area?
   (None) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (High)

15. How would you rate your office personnel understanding (definition and prosecution) of human trafficking?
   (None) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (High)

16. What is your office’s level of commitment to deal with human trafficking?
   (None) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (High)

17. What is the level of community concern with human trafficking in your area?
   (None) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (High)

18. What is the level of political concern regarding human trafficking in your area?
   (None) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (High)

19. What is the level of media concern with human trafficking in your area?
   (None) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (High)

20. In your jurisdiction, how great a problem is created by “undocumented citizens” (this refers to illegal immigrants, non-citizens, and others who are not legal residents)?
   (None) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (High)

21. In your jurisdiction, how great a problem is created by undocumented citizens and prostitution?
   (None) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (High)

22. In your jurisdiction, how great a problem is created by undocumented citizens and car jackings?
   (None) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (High)

23. In your jurisdiction, how great a problem is created by undocumented citizens and domestic (household) labor?
   (None) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (High)

24. In your jurisdiction, how great a problem is created by undocumented citizens and drug use?
   (None) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (High)

25. In your jurisdiction, how great a problem is created by undocumented citizens and drug selling?
   (None) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (High)

26. In your jurisdiction, how great a problem is created by undocumented citizens and HIV/AIDS?
   (None) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (High)
27. In your jurisdiction, how great a problem is created by undocumented citizens and homelessness?
   (None) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (High)

28. In your jurisdiction, if an undocumented citizen is found to be engaged in prostitution, how likely is it that he/she would be arrested and prosecuted?
   (None) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (High)

29. In your jurisdiction, if an undocumented citizen is found to be engaged in prostitution, how likely is it that he/she would be given a physical or health screening?
   (None) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (High)

30. How much training do prosecutors in your office receive on human trafficking?
   (None) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (High)

31. How highly do you rank the value of local non-government organizations (NGO's)?
   (None) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (High)

32. How much need is there for special funding to deal with human trafficking?
   (None) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (High)

33. How would you rate the level of cooperation between local, state and federal authorities regarding human trafficking?
   (None) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (High)

34. How great a role does local business/industry play in human trafficking in your area?
   (None) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (High)

35. Do you think a relationship exists between undocumented citizens and human trafficking?
   (None) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (High)

36. Has your office ever received special funding to address human trafficking?
   a. Yes   b. No   c. Unsure

37. Are victims more likely to be trafficked into or out of your area?
   a. Into   b. Out   c. Unsure

38. Which form of trafficking is more prevalent in your area?
   a. Labor   b. Sex workers   c. Other _________

39. Which special unit would most likely address human trafficking issues?
   a. Human Trafficking Unit   b. Vice   c. Drug   d. Regular patrol

Section 3: Perception with regard to crime and the involvement of trafficked individuals
40. Can you describe any special problems human trafficking has presented for your community? (Use the back if you require additional room or attach a separate sheet).

41. Have you ever prosecuted any significant human trafficking cases you can describe?

42. Can you describe how the victims were transported during trafficking?

43. How do trafficking cases most often come to the attention of your office?

44. From what countries do trafficking victims most often come?

Section 4: General comment

45. Please discuss anything we have omitted in this research that can contribute to the study.

Thank you for your contribution
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