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ABSTRACT

GABRIELLE CLARISE BARRIENTOS: Collaborations of Hope: Network Theory and the Assessment of Anti-human Trafficking Nonprofits’ Relationships

(Under the Direction of Dr. Melissa Bass)

My research utilizes network theory to assess nonprofits’ relationships in the anti-human trafficking sector. I explore nonprofit relationships with other anti-human trafficking nonprofits and governmental agencies through a survey I developed and administered to anti-human trafficking nonprofits and coalitions. I selected all survey recipients because of their focus on addressing human trafficking. Out of 50 organizations, 16 participated in the survey. I found that all of these organizations collaborated with other nonprofits and all but one with government. All organizations valued nonprofit collaboration and all but one valued government collaboration. The majority of organizations valued both collaborations equally, which suggests that network theory applies to nonprofits in this sector.
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Chapter I: Introduction

Human trafficking is considered to be one of the most prominent crimes in the world. Recognized as a criminal activity in more than 150 countries, human trafficking is estimated to exploit more than 26 million children and adults today, according to the 2013 Trafficking In Persons Report (US Department of State 7). Although the term “human trafficking” implies the movement of persons, this illegal activity ultimately constitutes the extraction of labor from a person through force, fraud, or coercion. Human trafficking utilizes emotional manipulation and physical force to entrap its victims before subjecting them to various forms of servitude and further abuse.

Human trafficking uses a variety of catalysts, ranging from victims’ parents to complete strangers, to find its victims and then entraps them by preying upon their vulnerabilities. While human trafficking operates and affects its victims in a variety of ways, all victims of human trafficking feel trapped and few escape from their traffickers or their work. Because human trafficking ultimately strips people of their free will, it is often referred to as modern slavery. (For an official list of definitions see Appendix A)

Human traffickers profit by reducing their victims’ value to the work that they produce. Victims of human trafficking work as forced laborers in positions ranging from household maids to manual labors in agricultural plantations, or more notoriously in the commercial sex industry. Furthermore, this crime occurs throughout the world in various levels of visibility.
Depending on countries’ awareness of the crime and enforcement of their laws, human trafficking can range from being a blatant activity to being nearly impossible to detect. Like most countries, the United States is not immune to human trafficking.

1.2 Human Trafficking in the United States:

The United States is considered to be a human trafficking “source, transit, and destination country” (Congressional Research Service 15). While experts agree that human trafficking occurs throughout the United States, the estimated number of victims affected by human trafficking remains contested. Given the nature of human trafficking, the number of people that it victimizes is difficult to calculate.

In 1999, Amy O’Neill Richard from the Center for the Study of Intelligence estimated that between 45,000 to 50,000 women and children are trafficked into the United States annually (Richard iii). More recently, the Congressional Research Service estimated that as many as 17,500 people are trafficked into the United States annually (Siskin & Wyler i). Other experts estimate that the largest human trafficking victim population in the United States is American children, affecting between 100,000 to 300,000 children annually (Siskin et al 16).

While the exact number of human trafficking victims is unknown, experts agree that human trafficking exploits both U.S. citizens and foreign nationals and occurs in every state (Human Smuggling and Trafficking Center 2). As a response to the increasing awareness of human trafficking in the United States
the number of nonprofits focused in this area of interest has grown. Today almost all states have organizations to combat human trafficking and provide victim services. Often these organizations work alongside local, state, and federal governments to help detect cases of human trafficking and provide services for rescued victims.

Two examples of such organizations are Breaking Free and Advocates For Freedom. These nonprofits participated in my survey and showcase the differences in organizational sizes and focuses within the anti-human trafficking sector.

Breaking Free represents one of the larger nonprofits in my study. Founded in 1996, Breaking Free focuses on sex trafficking and prostitution. This nonprofit agency has been helping women and girls in Minnesota for the last 18 years. Breaking Free is composed of both volunteers and paid employees. It utilizes advocacy and provides direct services such as housing and education to help between 400-500 women and girls escape sexual exploitation and prostitution annually. Since its foundation, Breaking Free has served over 5,000 clients. Breaking Free also reaches out to community leaders and communities as a whole to educate the public about sexual exploitation of women and girls, to expose violence against women, and to reduce the demand that drives sex trafficking. Breaking Free accomplishes its goals by collaborating with direct service providers, churches, and local, state, and federal governmental agencies.
Advocates For Freedom is a faith-based anti-human trafficking nonprofit located on the Mississippi Gulf Coast. Advocates For Freedom operates entirely on a volunteer basis and provides services for victims of labor trafficking and sex trafficking. The nonprofit works with local enforcement, businesses, government agencies, educators, medical professionals, nonprofits and faith communities to spread awareness of human trafficking. In addition to promoting human trafficking awareness, Advocates For Freedom assists human trafficking victims by helping them find shelter and protection. This nonprofit provides services for approximately 30 victims each year.

1.3 Research:

I utilize network theory to assess anti-human trafficking nonprofits’ relationships. Furthermore, I developed and administered a survey as a means for assessing these nonprofits. The research question behind this study asks to what extent anti-human trafficking nonprofits collaborate with other organizations and governmental agencies, and if these collaborations affect the nonprofit’s ability to accomplish its organizational goals. Currently little research exists which focuses on the collaborative nature of anti-human trafficking nonprofit organizations with other nonprofits or governmental agencies. Given that current anti-human trafficking efforts involve the participation of both governmental and private sectors, my research focuses on the role of anti-human trafficking nonprofit organizations. It seeks to understand how these nonprofits relate to other nonprofits and governmental
agencies and if these relations affect a nonprofit’s success in accomplishing the nonprofit’s goals.

To begin understanding nonprofit relations, I designed a web-based survey specifically for anti-human trafficking nonprofits in the United States. The initial part of the survey asks nonprofits to identify how they combat human trafficking by stating their goals and the types of services they provide for survivors of human trafficking. The survey then seeks to understand what kinds of organizations the anti-human trafficking nonprofits like to work with or if nonprofits prefer to work independently. Essentially the research seeks to determine if anti-human trafficking nonprofits prefer to work alone, with other nonprofits (either within or outside of the anti-human trafficking sector), or with government agencies. The survey asks the nonprofits to specify the number and types of organizations they work with as well as the extent of their collaboration. Ultimately the survey aims to understand if nonprofits that collaborate with governmental agencies are more, less, or equally successful in achieving their goals when compared to nonprofits that operate primarily with other nonprofits.

The findings from my research indicate that there is no clear preference for anti-human trafficking organizations to collaborate with nonprofits or governmental agencies. Rather the majority of organizations indicate collaborating equally with nonprofits and governmental agencies. Within governmental agency collaboration, organizations prefer to collaborate with law enforcement at local, state, and national levels. Among nonprofits, the
only type of nonprofit that all organizations report working with was other human trafficking nonprofits. The organizations reveal a general desire over to collaborate with multiple organizations, both private and public. These findings reinforce the application of network theory to coalitions and nonprofits within the anti-human trafficking sector and illustrate how anti-human trafficking organizations in my data sample desire to participate in extensive networks with both other nonprofits and governmental agencies.

I begin my research by reviewing the available literature regarding network theory. This literature includes the scope and profits of the human trafficking market, the struggles within the nonprofit anti-human trafficking sector, and types of possible nonprofit-governmental collaborations. I then discuss the methodology in which I conducted my research, including how I selected anti-trafficking organizations, my survey development and administration process, and the limitations of my research. I then present my survey data, which includes information regarding the types of nonprofit collaborations, effects of these collaborations, frequency of communication with outside organizations, perceived helpfulness and hurtfulness from collaborations, and preferred collaborations. Lastly, I discuss the findings of my data and present recommendations for future research.
2. Chapter II: Literature Review

I begin my literature review by academically contextualizing my research on American anti-human trafficking nonprofits’ relations within the framework of network theory. I then explore the role of human trafficking abroad and its markets across the world to understand the role of anti-human trafficking nonprofits within the United States. Furthermore, I explore the diversity within the realm of anti-human trafficking nonprofits, such as faith-based and secular nonprofits, and the types of challenges that result from these nonprofits working in the same sector. Lastly, I explain the relations existing between anti-human trafficking nonprofits and governmental agencies. The literature reviewed in this section pertains to my research by providing a context for the scope of human trafficking, the profits generated from human trafficking as a market sector, the diversity within existing anti-human trafficking profits, and anti-human trafficking nonprofit relations with other nonprofits and governments.

2.1 Network Theory

Networks are defined by Göktuğ Morçöl and Aaron Wachhaus in their 2009 article, “Network and Complexity Theories: A Comparison and Prospects for a Synthesis,” as “a relatively stable and complex pattern of relationships among multiple interdependent and self-organizing elements…which also constitutes a self-organizing system as a whole”
(Morçöl and Wachhaus 44). Furthermore, network researchers recognize networks as stable and dynamic systems that continually change (Morçöl et al 46, 48). Networks are also described in reactionary terms as “emergent” and “self-organizing.” As Aaron Wachhaus describes in his 2012 article, “Anarchy as a Model for Network Governance,” networks can emerge from “repeated interactions among actors,” due to “anticipated payoffs of mutual support,” or around a “catalytic event” (35). Unlike hierarchies, these “self-creating, interactive, and deregulated networks...just happen” (Wachhaus 35).

Network theory is further explained by authors Kimberley Isett, Ines Mergel, Kelly LeRoux, Pamela Mischen and Karl Rethermeyer in their 2008 article entitled “Networks in Public Administration Scholarship: Understanding Where We are and Where We Need to Go.” The authors connect public administration’s recent paradigm shift, from New Public Management to New Public Governance, to the introduction of network theory. Network theory involves the switch from formal, vertical, hierarchical relationships to multifaceted, horizontal, and nonhierarchical network relations (Isett et al 159, Wachhaus 35). While hierarchies have both clearly understood, unchanging, vertical relationships and centralized authorities, decentralized networks do not have this rigid structure or “sense of organizational ‘place.’” Networks are then considered more flexible, dynamic, and better equipped for change than hierarchies (Wachhaus 35).

However, Morçöl and Wachhaus note that network and hierarchical forms of organizations are not necessarily exclusive but “coexist, often within
each other” (48). Some experts even hold that “networks must incorporate vertical elements of hierarchies into flatter network structures in order to function effectively” (Wachhaus 34).

Isett, Mergel, LeRoux, Mischen, and Rethermeyer note that specific types of networks exist within network theory such as Collaborative Networks. These networks are “collections of government agencies, nonprofits, and for-profits that work together to provide a public good, service or ‘value’ when a single public agency is unable to create the good or service on its own and/or the private sector is unable or unwilling to provide the goods or services in the desired quantities” (158). Collaborative Networks can be “formal and orchestrated by a public manager” or “emergent, self-organizing, and ad hoc” (Isett et al 158).

My research builds upon these articles and utilizes network theory to assess anti-human trafficking nonprofits’ relationships. Through my survey data, I demonstrate how anti-human trafficking nonprofits are moving away from hierarchical vertical relationships to multifaceted horizontal networks.

2.2 Human Trafficking: Scope and Profits

Patrick Besler’s 2005 article, “Forced Labour and Human Trafficking: Estimating the Profits,” analyzes the economic aspect and magnitude of the forced labor industry. Besler accepts data presented by the International Labor Organization (ILO), which estimates that the forced labor industry is comprised of 12.3 million people, 1.4 million of whom are in the commercial sex industry. The annual global profits resulting from commercial sexual...
exploitation alone were found to be $33.9 billion, with $15.4 billion from industrialized countries and $27.8 billion associated directly with commercial sex trafficking (14).

Forced labor was estimated to produce an annual $44.3 billion in profits, with $31.6 billion resulting from the exploitation of trafficked victims. While these statistics appear large at first glance, Besler argues that the data are conservative estimations because the figure assumes that human traffickers are earning less than $400 per month per victim (14).

“Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children In the U.S., Canada and Mexico Executive Summary,” written in 2001 by Richard J. Estes and Neil Alan Weiner, argues that child sexual exploitation (CSE) is a consequence of globalization, internationalization, and free trade. Contributing factors of CSE include the presence of pre-existing adult “markets,” and the sexual behavior of unattached and transient males including there in the military, seasonal workers, truckers, motorcycle gangs, and conventioneers (6).

The study found that the majority of pimps in the U.S., at least fifty percent, operate at a strictly local level, fifteen percent of the pimps operated in regional or nationwide networks, and ten percent are tied into international sex crime networks (16). Members of this last group actively participate in the international trafficking of children and are therefore considered to be human traffickers. These international traffickers target both American children and children from other countries. Determining factors of a child’s CSE were age,
nationality, and the profit potential associated with the type of exploitative activity. The study found that organized crime does not typically target children younger than age nine. Children older than twelve are considered to be prime targets of sexual exploitation. The majority of these victims are runaways and homeless youth and so they are especially vulnerable to becoming entrapped in sexual trafficking by organized crime units (17).

The study uses data from the U.S. State Department’s Bureau of Intelligence and Research which estimates that 17,000 youth, ages seventeen and younger, are smuggled into the United States annually. According to the study, at least half of these children’s smuggling experience involves commercial sexual trafficking. A portion of the children who cross the Canadian and Mexican-U.S. borders work in bars, clubs, and other sexually oriented nightspots in border communities. Younger children are often preyed upon by pedophiles and become involved in pornography or other sex exchanges.

These articles contribute to my research by explaining the scope and markets associated with international and domestic human trafficking. Seeing that a substantial amount of human trafficking occurs in the United States and in other industrialized countries, the efforts to combat human trafficking by governmental and private sectors becomes all the more relevant. Thus, these articles solidify the importance of understanding how network theory applies to anti-human trafficking NGOs and governmental agencies. By using network theory as a lens, I hope to better understand what types of
organizational relationships are important to anti-human trafficking nonprofits so that they can best address human trafficking.

2.3 Nonprofit Struggles within the Anti-Human Trafficcking Sector:

In “Contested Bodies: Sex Trafficking NGOs and Transnational Politics,” Amy Foerster discusses the relations and conflicts between nonprofits (2009). Foerster focuses on faith based organizations (FBOs) and secular non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and the tension between the two types of organizations. Besides competing for resources, the organizations differ in how they combat trafficking. Furthermore, they can become so entrenched in the process of securing funding and support for their organizations that they undermine their missions.

Foerster states, “In some cases, inter-organizational competition lessens organizational effectiveness as multiple non-state actors jockey and compete with one another to attain access to a population targeted for assistance. This can result in a lack of coordination, a duplication of efforts and, sometimes, the admission of unqualified or inexperienced actors into the field” (154). Furthermore, Forester discusses how NGOs, especially FBOs, may seek what they view as “best” for victims without consulting victims. Forester challenges the focus of American NGOs and suggests that FBOs often misrepresent victims (163). Forester explains that the worldviews of the nonprofits affect their approach to addressing human trafficking. These worldviews, especially between FBOs and secular NGOs, may contradict one another and be a source of tension among nonprofits. This, coupled with
competition for limited resources, such as financial and volunteer support as well as media attention, can cause further areas of tension between or among anti-human trafficking nonprofits. Additionally, the article questions if anti-trafficking NGOs create freedom of travelling barriers for women and prevent them from international travel, because of the procedures implemented to prevent sex trafficking.

Similarly, Estes and Weiner in their 2001 article, “Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children In the U.S., Canada and Mexico,” found that NGOs in the United States designed to prevent child sexual exploitation (CSE) encounter weaknesses such as uncoordinated and nonintegrated activities, a lack of communication with other NGOs, and a duplication of efforts. The study also found that sexually exploited boys and minorities, difficult-to-handle street youth, and street youth with serious mental illnesses are frequently under represented by NGOs (29).

2.4 Nonprofit relationships with government agencies:

This section concentrates on nonprofits’ relationships with government agencies. I use two key works, the article “Government-nonprofit Relations in Comparative Perspective: Evolution, Themes and New Directions” and the book, *Nonprofits & Government Collaboration and Conflict*, to discuss at length the different methods in which nonprofits can operate with or against government. These practices include working independently, supplementary, complimentary, and controversially with government agencies. These government-nonprofit relationship practices reinforce my utilization of
network theory by indicating that nonprofit-government networks can be hierarchical and horizontal to different extents, depending on surrounding factors such as initiator of relationship and nonprofit approach to government.

Jennifer Brinkerhoff and Derick Brinkerhoff’s 2002 article entitled “Government-nonprofit Relations in Comparative Perspective: Evolution, Themes and New Directions,” discusses in two parts the motivations and tensions in government-nonprofit relations. The first part of the article summarizes government-non-profit relationships and reviews governance models and their incorporation of nonprofits. It discusses the complex, chaotic, and ill-defined nature of government-nonprofit relations. It also discusses the need for more research to establish a comprehensive theory that describes the complexity of government-nonprofit relations or integrates various concepts.

Jennifer Brinkerhoff and Derick Brinkerhoff state that the need for nonprofits is growing because governments are unable to solve societal problems alone (4). The authors introduce the concept of a “framework of governance” paradigm. This paradigm can be found where “market forces are relied upon to solve most societal problems, and therefore pushes for a lean, efficient government whose main role is to support private and voluntary action with a minimum of regulation and interference” (5). This paradigm usually includes efforts to increase government transparency and responsiveness, create more effective policies, and deliver maximal high-quality services to the public. The paper discusses the public nature of
nonprofits and how the importance of this role continues to increase. The article also notes that nonprofits in the United States are instrumental because of their ability to address specialized needs in specific communities.

Brinkerhoff - Brinkerhoff suggest that government and nonprofit relations are a result of “sector failures” which include “market and contract failures, government failures, voluntary failure and even political failure” (5). These types of relations include repression, rivalry and competition as well as cooperation, complementarity, and collaboration. The authors cite Dennis Young for distinguishing three alternative views about government-nonprofit relations. Young states that A) nonprofits can operate independently as supplements to government, B) they can work as compliments to the government in a partnership relationship, or C) they can become engaged in adversarial relationship of mutual accountability with the government (7).

Furthermore, Young argues that the type of the nonprofit typically determines the nature of the relationship, along with which party initiates the relationship. “Traditional nonprofits” are associated with positive government relations, because work in accordance with the government to secure funding for research or similar initiatives. Meanwhile, more “radical” nonprofits typically experience a more adverse relation with the government because of their tendency to challenge different aspects of the government. The article states that relations, if initiated by the government, are “top-down” whereas when relations are initiated by nonprofits the relationship is “bottom-up” (Brinkerhoff et al 11).
The article concludes that the diverse motivations of nonprofits to engage the government assure that relations will take many forms. The relations between government and nonprofits may be driven by philosophy, values, what nonprofits seek from the government, or the desire for possible government importation of nonprofits’ missions. Likewise, governments may establish relations to extend service delivery or efficiently use public resources.

The identification of new and evolving trends includes the influence of information technology on organizational structures and processes, the rise of supranational spheres of government-nonprofit interaction, the continuing tension between cooperation and identity maintenance, and simultaneous global lesson sharing and an emphasis on local-level problem solving, where non-profits are thought to maintain continuity and redefine the community.

This article relates to my thesis by examining possible nonprofit-government relationships and reinforcing my application of network theory to nonprofits. The article illustrates how the initiator of the relationship and type of nonprofit are factors that determine the relationship’s success; this reinforces the co-existence of hierarchal and horizontal networks within network theory.

In *Nonprofits & Government Collaboration and Conflict*, Elizabeth Boris and Eugene Steuerle (2006) explore these types of relationships. The authors use various strands of economic theory to suggest that nonprofits and governments relate to each other in supplementary, complementary, or
adversarial manners (39). While these three perspectives are “by no means exclusive,” they are considered to be the most common manifestations of nonprofit and government relations. Though these three views tend to frame “nonprofit-government relations as if nonprofits and government are distinct entities,” the boundaries between nonprofits and government responsibilities often become blurred (41).

According to the supplementary model, the purpose of nonprofits is to facilitate a supply of public goods that the public demands and the government does not satisfy (39). This perspective believes that nonprofits “provide collective goods on a voluntary basis” (41). The complementary perspective views nonprofits and governments as “engaged primarily in a partnership or contractual relationship” so that the government finances the public services that nonprofits deliver (43). Lastly, the adversarial perspective views nonprofits and governments as competitors in “policy making and service delivery” (Boris et al 46).

According to the text, state governments have a direct impact on nonprofits because these governments regulate them, exempt them from major taxes, and use them as “vehicles to deliver publicly funded services” (Boris et al 182). State governments regulate nonprofits through the common law, laws based from tradition and precedent, and statutory law, laws resulting directly from legislation (Boris et al 182).

The article and book presented in this section suggest network theory as the coexistence of hierarchical and horizontal forms of organizations by
exemplifying how nonprofit-government relations are hierarchical when initiated by government agencies and are horizontal when initiated by nonprofits. My research builds on the concepts presented in this section by connecting nonprofit collaborations to network theory and presenting examples of how anti-human trafficking nonprofits are utilizing network theory to accomplish their goals.
3. Chapter III: Methodology

As the literature review indicated, human trafficking within the United States is a significant problem. While many organizations have risen up and become involved in combatting this injustice, very little available information regarding these types of organizations exists. Furthermore, information regarding anti-human trafficking nonprofits relations with other nonprofits or governmental agencies is nearly nonexistent. As a means of bridging this gap of knowledge, I chose to gather my own data from these nonprofits and better understand how they work with one another through administering a survey. To do so, I had to identify organizations to survey, develop the survey instrument, and administer it.

3.1 Selecting the Organizations:

I began the process of creating a purposive sample of anti-human trafficking nonprofits to survey by consulting the website of an established and highly respected anti-human trafficking nonprofit: the Polaris Project. This organization was founded in 2002 and is now considered to be one of the leading organizations against human trafficking. The Polaris Project works closely with local and national governments across the United States and in 2007 was selected by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to operate the National Human Trafficking Resource Center’s Emergency
Hotline. It also provides client services, policy advocacy, training and technical assistance, fellowship programs, and global programs. Due to its reputation and reach, I chose to use the Polaris Project as a base point for finding other anti-human trafficking organizations.

Included in the resource index of the Polaris Project’s online website is an interactive map\(^1\) of the United States, which acts as a networking device for organizations related to human trafficking. Users can select a state and immediately view the human trafficking laws, data regarding calls from the state to the NHTRC, and a list of anti-human trafficking resource organizations located within the state. Additionally, below the interactive map is a completed list of states in alphabetic order. Each page contains a list of state’s human trafficking organizations and contact information, complete with links to each organization’s website. I used this tool to find anti-human trafficking organizations in all states.

A deciding factor when selecting organizations for my survey was the organization’s focus on human trafficking. Instead of selecting organizations, such as homeless shelters, which provided assistance to human trafficking victims as a means of reaching a goal distant from human trafficking, I only selected organizations that actively work in the human trafficking realm. These explicitly anti-human trafficking organizations used terms such as “human trafficking”, “sex slavery,” and “forced labor” either directly within their mission statement or within their self-descriptions on their websites.

\(^1\) [http://www.polarisproject.org/state-map](http://www.polarisproject.org/state-map)
After I finished using the Polaris Project’s interactive map, I had created a list of 50 anti-human trafficking organizations throughout the United States to survey. While this list primarily consisted of anti-human trafficking nonprofit organizations, it also included several anti-human trafficking coalitions. Unlike nonprofit organizations, coalitions consist of multiple entities and partnerships centered on a common goal. For human trafficking focused coalitions, members of the coalition may be specifically anti-trafficking nonprofits or organizations loosely related to the goal, such as homeless shelters that provide temporary housing for trafficking victims. I decided to include anti-human trafficking coalitions in my data sample because of coalitions’ explicit use of networking to accomplish their goals. I made this decision after speaking with Laura Martin, project manager at the McLean Institute for Public Service and Community Engagement, who has experience in both administering surveys and working with anti-human trafficking organizations. She advised including coalitions in my data sample as an alternative means for gauging nonprofit and community involvement against human trafficking.

After carefully reviewing all of the organizations on the Polaris Project’s interactive map webpage and exploring the organizations’ websites to better understand their goals and focus, I constructed a detailed list of my 50 chosen anti-organizations. The list includes a brief description of each organization and their contact information. (See Appendix B)

3.2 Survey development:
Before beginning the process of creating a survey, I utilized research databases such as EBSCOhost (Academic Search) and JSTOR to try to find existing surveys designed to gauge non-profit organizations’ collaboration practices. Despite several searches, I was unable to find these types of surveys. Without an existing survey to draw questions from, I referred to William Foddy’s *Constructing Questions for Interviews and Questionnaires: Theories and Practice in Social Research* (1994) before constructing the questions for my survey.

After I drafted the survey questions, I implemented the Delphi method for creating my survey by consulting Dr. Melissa Bass and Dr. Joseph Holland in the Department of Public Policy Leadership to review them for clarity and focus. The survey questions were then edited and reviewed by Laura Martin. I then entered the survey questions and response options into the survey website Qualtrics (See Appendix C for a complete list of survey questions and answers. After consulting Dr. Bass, I elected to make all the questions in the survey forced-response so that all questions would be answered and to prevent a gap in the data collected.) As a final step, I sent the survey to Susie Harvill, Director and founder of Mississippi’s premier anti-human trafficking nonprofit Advocates for Freedom, who had agreed to take the survey and provide feedback on the clarity and relevance of the questions and response options. After refining the survey based on her feedback, I prepared the survey for administration.
3.3 Survey Administration Process:

Before contacting anti-trafficking organizations, I drafted an informative email message and script for phone calls about the nature of my research and my survey. (To see the scripts used see Appendix D) Once Dr. Bass approved these scripts, I began contacting organizations. When possible I called organizations and briefly explained the purpose of my survey and asked for a specific person within the organization to send the survey to. When organizations did not have a listed number, I contacted the organization through email. Two weeks after I contacted the organizations, I followed up with phone calls and emails containing the survey link.

I began the process of contacting organizations in November and continued following up with organizations until December 19. Of the 50 organizations, I was unable to contact 2 due to their security provisions. In order to protect their clients and employees, most of the organizations exercised varying security measures. The most protected organizations provided no contact information or created barriers for contacting organizational personnel. For example, one organization provided a general phone number on their website but required that the caller know their desired party’s extension number in order to speak to a person. Because I did not have access to a person’s extension number, and the answering service of the office was electronic, I was unable to speak with a person within this organization.

I sent the 48 remaining organizations the informative email regarding my research, which contained a link to the survey and a one-week survey
submission request deadline. Thirty-two of these organizations did not participate in the survey. Of these 32, I was able to contact 20 by phone and explain my research before administering the survey and unable to contact 12 by phone. The survey had a 26% response rate. Sixteen organizations participated in the survey, and 13 completed it. The organizations’ survey response rates were lower than I anticipated and so I decided to keep the survey link open as long as possible. It remained open until 16, February.

3.4 Limitations

Though I spent a lot of time trying to contact organizations and encourage nonprofits to take my survey, it nevertheless had a low response rate, with only 16 of the 50 organizations participating in the survey. This may be due in part to the fact that I administered the survey as an undergraduate student without any direct connection to the anti-human trafficking nonprofit sector. If it had been administered through a large think-tank or an established nonprofit such as the Polaris Project, the response rate would have probably been higher.

The survey also featured 33 questions, with all of the answers being in a force-response formation. I realize that the survey was lengthy and when combined with the force-response answers, could have deterred organizations from participating in it.
4. Chapter IV: Findings

Of the 50 anti-human trafficking organizations contacted, 16 organizations began the web-based survey and 13 organizations completed it. The organizations that participated in the survey were from various geographic regions, but more southeastern states were represented in the data, compared to other regions. Twelve surveys were taken by nonprofits and the remaining four were taken by anti-human trafficking coalitions. (Like nonprofits, coalitions organize around a cause. However, coalitions are umbrella organizations that can consist of nonprofits and other organizations.) The survey data revealed an unexpectedly large range of organizational size and number of human trafficking victims served either directly or indirectly. Though the organizations differed in these ways, the majority of organizations revealed remarkably similar responses in the types of services that they provided, the nature of their relations with other nonprofits, and the nature of their relations with governmental agencies. For example, the data collected from the survey results is broken into three sections: the characteristics of anti-human trafficking organizations, their relationships, and outcomes of their relationships.
4.1 Characteristics of Survey Participants:

Of the organizations that participated in the survey, four were coalitions and 12 were nonprofit organizations. Six of these organizations were state organizations, four were national, three were local, and three local international as the figure below indicates.

![Figure 1: Which term best describes your organization?](image)

Some of these organizations reported operating purely on a volunteer basis while others reported supporting as many as one hundred paid employees. Similarly, the number of human trafficking victims aided by these organizations within the past two years varied from 5 to more than 10,000. However, not all of the organizations that participated in the survey were direct service providers for human trafficking victims.

A total of 11 states were represented by the organizations that took the survey, with more than half located in the southeastern region (six of the 11 states). The states represented by organizations were Arizona, California,
Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Ohio, Oregon, Minnesota, Mississippi, North Carolina, and Tennessee. The figure below indicates the organizations that did and did not respond to the survey, with the organizations that responded represented by a green “X” and the ones that did not represented by a red “X.”

Figure 2: Geographic Region of Anti-human Trafficking Organizations.

\[\text{Map located at http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:US_map_-_states-ca.png}\]
Size of Organizational Workforce:

Organizations were asked the approximate number of daily volunteers and paid employees working for the organization. Their responses are illustrated in the table below according to organizational numbers because they anonymously participated in the survey.
Figure 4: Organizational Number of Daily Volunteers and Paid Employees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization:</th>
<th>Volunteers:</th>
<th>Employees:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15 - 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 – 100s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:</td>
<td>About 10</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:</td>
<td>Only volunteers</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizational Services:

(No one service was offered by all organizations.) The most common service provided was “Educating the public through speaking engagements/campaigns,” with 88% of organizations offering this service.
The second most common service provided was “Promoting anti-trafficking legislation or advocacy,” with 75% organizations selecting this answer. The least common service reported was “Permanent victim housing,” which was provided by 25% of organizations. The figure below illustrates the types of services provided by all of the anti-trafficking organizations.

Figure 4: Which of the following services does your organization provide? Select all that apply.

Organizations had the option to select the types of services they provided from a list of choices and also to input additional services. The services recounted by organizations were numerous and diverse in substance. A total of 25 responses were added by organizations and included services designed specifically for youth, rehabilitation, human trafficking prevention, direct needs, and legal services.

Services designed specifically for youth:

- Training in schools
- Education and groups for at-risk youth
- Onsite schools for victims
Rehabilitation services:

- Life skills development
- Providing certified life coaches in the area of anti-human trafficking
- Social entrepreneurship
- Service coordination for victims

Prevention services:

- Community engagement
- Street outreach
- Leadership training

Direct needs services included providing:

- Case management for victims
- Hygiene packages
- Access to a food shelf
- HIV testing, vouchers
- Transportation for victims

Legal services for victims:

- Prosecuting human traffickers
- Expert testimony in courts
- Providing public defenders for human trafficking victims

Other services:

- Drop in center
- Blue Ribbon Campaign

After completing this part of the survey 3 of the 16 organizations chose to stop proceeding with the survey, thereby altering the data sample to 13 organizations for the remaining survey questions.
4.2 Relationships:

Collaboration with Nonprofits:

According to the data sample, 85% of organizations work with other state nonprofits, 77% work with other local and national nonprofits, and 46% work with other international nonprofits. Two organizations reported working with as few as 10 nonprofits while another reported working with more than 200.

Four organizations reported that nonprofits provide them with services between 2-3 times a year, 3 organizations were provided with services 2-3 times a month, 2 organizations were provided services once a month, 2 organizations were provided services between 2-3 times a week, and 1 organization stated that nonprofits provided them services daily. (See the figure below for a graphic representation of the data)

Figure 5: Within the last two years, how often have nonprofits provided services (such as publicity or funding) for your organization?

More than half, 54%, of the organizations surveyed reported working with other nonprofits daily, and 15% of organizations worked with them
monthly. Other organizations reported working with nonprofits 2-3 times a year, 2-3 times a month, weekly, or 2-3 times a week.

Figure 6: Within the last two years, how often has your organization worked with other nonprofits?

Types of Nonprofit Collaborations:

All organizations reported working with other anti-human trafficking nonprofits. This number was closely followed by 85% of organizations that stated that they worked with abuse shelters, homeless shelters, and counseling nonprofits. Seventy-five percent of organizations worked with rehabilitation nonprofits, 69% collaborated with medical and legal nonprofits, 62% with poverty-focused and food pantry nonprofits, 46% with career preparatory nonprofits.

In addition to these types of collaborations, organizations were given the option to list other nonprofits with which they worked. Included in this list were:

- Domestic violence
- Juvenile justice
- Behavioral health
- Youth residential treatment facilities
• Crisis centers
• Youth crisis centers

Figure 7: What types of nonprofits does your organization work with? Select all that apply.

In order to understand if nonprofits work primarily with other anti-human trafficking nonprofits or if they work primarily with nonprofits within other disciplines, the organizations were asked to specify the amount of anti-human trafficking nonprofits that they collaborated with. As the figure below indicates, the data sample revealed that most organizations collaborate primarily with nonprofits outside of the human trafficking sector. Four organizations reported that anti-human trafficking nonprofit collaborations represented 10% or less of their total nonprofit collaborations, four reported that these collaborations represented 11-25% of their nonprofit collaborations, one reported that anti-human trafficking nonprofit collaborations represented 26-50% of total nonprofit collaborations, two reported that anti-human trafficking nonprofits represented 51-75% of collaborations, and two reported that anti-human trafficking nonprofits represented 76-100% of collaborations.
Types of Nonprofit Partnerships:

When asked “how” organizations partner with nonprofits, 77% of the organizations reported working with nonprofits by co-hosting events, providing public speakers for one another, providing complimentary services (such as victim rescue and victim home placement), exchanging data, and publicizing for each other. Providing service referrals to other nonprofits was done by 85% of organizations surveyed.

Once again, organizations chose to add additional responses to this question. The answers added here include documentary information, coordinating with the local anti-human trafficking coalition, task force, in service training, and serving as the primary victim service provider for local Human Trafficking enforcement task force.
Figure 9: How does your organization work with other nonprofits? Select all that apply.

Types of Services Provided for Nonprofits:

When organizations were asked about the types of services they provide for other nonprofits, 69% of organizations reported providing publicity, 54% provide volunteers, 31% provide grants or funding, 31% provide research, 31% provide building space meetings, and 8% provide medical examinations or services, 23% provide physical labor, and 15% provide legal services.

Figure 10: What services does your organization provide for other nonprofits?
Additional responses from the organizations surveyed include co-hosting events, shelter, referrals, comprehensive case management services, training, mentorship, awareness, educational events, and advising services.

Services Outside Nonprofits Provide for the Organizations:

When asked what types of services nonprofits provide for their own organizations, the organizations’ answers revealed more variety than the previous responses. Eighty-five percent of organizations stated that nonprofits provided them with publicity, 54% were provided building space for their meeting or events; and 54% were provided volunteers. Additionally, 46% were provided grants or funding, 46% received medical examinations and services. Thirty-eight percent of nonprofits were provided legal services and 23% were provided research.

The additional responses added by the organizations included nonprofits providing media coverage, law enforcement partnership, collaborative advocacy/coalition activities, counseling, advocacy, event notification, job training and hiring, case notification, and data notification.
Communication with Nonprofits:

Organizations were asked about the means and frequency of communication they practiced with other nonprofits. When asked about the frequency with which organizations email other nonprofits, two do this monthly, one between 2-3 times a month, two once a week, and six email nonprofits daily.

Similarly, two organizations stated that they use phone calls to communicate with other nonprofits 2-3 times a year. Three make phone calls 2-3 times a month, three 2-3 times a week, and five organizations spoke with other nonprofits daily.

Scheduled meetings were used less frequently than email and phone calls, with two organizations meeting with other nonprofits 2-3 times a year, five meeting 2-3 times a month, four having weekly meetings, and two meeting 2-3 times a week.
Figure 12: In the past two years, approximately how often has your organization communicated with other nonprofits through the following means?

Effects of nonprofit collaboration:

At this point in the survey, organizations were asked to identify if and how their organization had been affected by their collaborations with other nonprofit organizations. All 13 organizations reported that they had experienced an increase of success in accomplishing their missions’ goals. Of the 13, 12 stated that their organization had increased in visibility and community support, 10 experienced an increase in volunteer support, and eight reported an increase of financial support.
Figure 13: How has collaboration with other nonprofits affected your organization's visibility and community support?

Governmental Relations:

When asked if the organizations have worked with any governmental agencies in the past two years, only one organization stated that they had not. The other 12 organizations had done so. As the survey was designed with skip logic, the organization not working with the government bypassed the following questions on governmental relations, thereby changing the data sample to 12 respondents.

Relations with Local Governmental Agencies:

All organizations reported working with law enforcement, 83% worked with educational/training agencies and local mental health services, and 58% worked with a local public health agency.

State Agencies:

All organizations reported working with state law enforcement and 83% worked with a state human services agency. Additional response from organizations include the State Police Academy, the Governor’s Office for...
Children and Families, State Department of Mental Health, and state
addiction, health, job, and family services.

National Agencies:

All organizations worked with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, 67% worked with Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), 50% with Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS), and 50% with the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR).

Additionally, organizations independently reported working with the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Labor, the U.S. Attorney’s General Office, the Traumatic Brain Injury Services (TBI) within the Department of Human Services, and the Office for Victims of Crime.

Funding from Governmental Agencies:

Organizations were asked if they received any governmental funding within the last two years: 75% reported receiving funds.

Communication with Local, State, and National Agencies:

The communications between organizations and different levels of government revealed similar patterns. Regarding local government agencies, one organization stated communicating annually, two stated communicating monthly, six weekly, and three daily. One organization reported communicating with state agencies annually, five organizations communicated with state agencies monthly, five organizations communicated with agencies weekly, and one organization reported meeting with state agencies daily. Three organizations reported communicating with national
governmental agencies annually, three monthly, five weekly, and one organization reported communicating with national governmental agencies daily.

Figure 14: In the last two years, how often has your organization communicated with governmental agencies?

Communication Frequency with Governmental Agencies:

When organizations were asked how frequently they communicated with governmental agencies by email, two organizations reported emailing governmental agencies weekly, four emailed 2-3 times a week, and three emailed daily. Regarding phone calls with governmental agencies, three organizations made calls 2-3 times a month, two weekly, three 2-3 times a week, and two daily. One organization meets with governmental agencies 2-3 times a year, 2 meet with governmental agencies 2-3 times a month, and three do this weekly.
4.3 Outcomes of Relationships:

Nonprofit Collaboration Helpfulness:

Organizations were given the statement, “Collaborating with other nonprofits helps your organization by” and asked to complete it. Below are their responses, which can be divided into three themes: lessening the burden of costs, increasing nonprofits’ strengths, and providing more high-quality services.

Lessing the burden of costs:

- Working together on a project or conference by splitting the up front cost, extra workers, contacts and networking to bring more attendance and strength to the cause.
- Providing critical services we could not otherwise afford
- We believe that collaboration is of the utmost importance. It encourages wise spending and eliminates the duplication of efforts. It also provides a strong front as we combat the same issue from all sides.
- Mobilizing community members. Spreading our mission and influence. Financial support through training and mentorship fees.
- Providing resources for victims of human trafficking.
Increasing nonprofits’ strength:

- ---- was founded as a coalition. Our voices are stronger together for advocacy projects. The demand for services for human trafficking is so high that we need to pool our resources.
- Being able to tackle the issue of Human Trafficking on multiple sides. This is a huge crisis; no one organization can do it alone. Each nonprofit has its own fit and together all doing our specific fit we can set out to end Human Trafficking once and for all.
- Our community has developed a continuum of care for trafficking survivors, ranging from the point of exit from trafficking to long-term stabilization. Filling all of the needed services requires collaboration. Coalition provides unified voice in advocacy.
- Better outreach to Oregonians.
- Increasing communication and coordination.

Providing more high-quality services:

- Promoting awareness of local trafficking-related issues, fostering comprehensive care for clients ensuring ongoing support for local anti-human trafficking efforts, etc.
- Provides unity and a better host of services for victims and survivors.
- Informing one another and providing referrals to one another.

Governmental Collaboration Helpfulness:

Organizations were given a phrase that stated, “Collaboration with governmental agencies is helpful to your organization by,” and were asked to complete the statement. Their answers indicated a variety of responses.

Organizations’ responses:

- Information sharing, establishing credibility, enacting social change
- Building relationship[s] of trust and understand[ing] of how an NGO can work in the public to bring the two together to solve a
case. We learn from each other and grow stronger in solving the problem.

• Coming together for a common goal and having more influence by collaborating with governmental agencies.
• Identifying victims of trafficking, building state capacity to identify and link survivors to services, investigating and prosecuting cases.
• Identify victims and get them to a safe environment and have laws passed to better serve victims and those working with victims
• Provides funding.
• Increasing funding sources and capacity for [our] cases and programs.
• Government agencies help us achieve our goals of serving survivors: they provide client referrals and resources
• Providing referrals and a system of care. Funding through state agencies contracts for watchful care.
• Providing critical services only provided by government – medical, paramedics, law enforcement
• Reaching more people who need our services, whether clients or to train first responders and law enforcement.
• Bringing individual traffickers to justice, assisting in care of victims.

How Governmental Collaboration is Hurtful:

Organizations were given the statement, “Collaborating with governmental agencies is hurtful to your organization by” and then asked to fill in the last part.

The organizations’ responses included:

• No comment
• N/A
• Not applicable; collaboration with government agencies is not hurtful to our organization
• Working with governmental agencies has not been hurtful to our organization.
• Different points of view
• Conflict of interests – their interest [is] in prosecutions and our interest of the victim
• They are a very private group and tend to be hesitant about trusting outsiders.
• When you do not talk you do not solve the problem. The public will see much more than law enforcement. If trust is not built when information comes up it will not be shared.

Perceived Governmental Helpfulness:

When organizations were asked to identify how helpful each layer of government is to their organization, seven stated that local government was essential, four that it was helpful, and one that it was neither helpful nor unhelpful. Regarding state government’s helpfulness, eight organizations reported that state government was essential and four identified it as helpful. National governmental agencies were viewed by eight organizations as essential, by one organization as very helpful, by two as organizations as helpful, and by one organization as neither helpful nor unhelpful.

Figure 16: How does your organization view the following governmental agencies helpfulness?

Effects of Governmental Collaboration:
When asked how the organizations were affected by governmental collaboration, all 12 organizations stated that their visibility and success in accomplishing their missions’ goals increased. Similarly, 11 organizations reported an increase in community support and nine organizations reported an increase of volunteer support.

Figure 17: How has collaboration with governmental agencies affected your organization's visibility and community support?

![Graph showing increased, decreased, and no change for visibility, community support, volunteer support, success in accomplishing mission's goals, financial support.]

Types of Preferred Collaborations:

Organizations were asked if they collaborated primarily with nonprofits, governmental agencies, neither, or both equally and then for the purpose behind this decision.

One organization, 8% of all organizations, selected working primarily with governmental agencies. The organization preferred governmental collaborations because of “funding, immigration services, [and] benefits.”
Three organizations, 23% of the data sample, selected working primarily with nonprofit organizations. Their reasons for this collaboration preference are as follows:

- More nonprofit agencies are involved in providing services to the population we serve.
- We have a strong networking program and nonprofits contact us for guidance.
- My volunteers are not certified/qualified to help with victims. Their sole duty is outreach and education.

The remaining nine organizations, 69% of the data sample, selected working equally with nonprofits and governmental agencies. Their reasons for this choice are below.

- We need both sides of the table and it is our goal to be a partner to with both
- We need both to accomplish our goals
- It allows us all to share information and effectively fight child sex trafficking from a myriad of angles.
- We help each other.
- They each have their own fit and can bring support to victims in their own way. We want victims to capitalize on both so that the greatest impact for victims can be accomplished
- Uniting service providers and governmental agencies is key when ending the issue of human trafficking. They must be united to accomplish our goal
- All are needed in an comprehensive HT response
- Because they have resources we lack
- Because we are a governmental agency and we leverage each other’s resources, and because nonprofits are necessary to the work we do
5. Chapter V: Discussion

The types of relationships practiced by anti-human trafficking organizations revealed similarities to researcher’s descriptions of network theory. These attributes include relatively stable complex relationships, interdependency between organizations, repeated interactions, anticipated payoffs, and dynamic networks that may catalyze from an event. Similarly, the types of difficulties that researchers associate with anti-human trafficking nonprofits were experienced by organizations within the data sample. These difficulties include inter-organizational competition for limited resources such as funding, volunteer support, and media attention. These findings indicate that network theory can be applied to the anti-human trafficking nonprofit sector.

1.1 Network theory:

Morçöl and Wachhaus define networks as “relatively stable” and “complex” patterns of relationships among interdependent self-organizing elements. I argue that the anti-human trafficking organizations’ within my data sample resemble this description because of how they interact with other nonprofits. For example, almost all of the organizations I surveyed, 77%, collaborate with other nonprofits through co-hosting events, providing public speakers, providing complimentary services for human trafficking survivors,
exchanging data, and publicizing for other nonprofits. Additionally, 85% of organizations provide service referrals to other nonprofits. Organizations also demonstrated maintaining relatively stable and complex relationships with other nonprofits through collaborating to provide documentary information, coordinating with local anti-human trafficking coalition, forming a task force, facilitating in service training, and serving as the primary victim service provider for a local Human Trafficking enforcement task force. Likewise, most organizations work in conjunction with government agencies by providing temporary housing for human trafficking survivors. Morçöl and Wachhaus describe network theory as interdependent, self-organizing elements that culminate in complex and widespread relationships. This also encapsulates the manners in which anti-human trafficking organizations operate. However, this not the only example in which nonprofits operate within network theory.

The authors also stated that networks can evolve from repeated interactions or from anticipated payoffs of mutual support. My data indicates that nonprofits frequently interact with other organizations, and that the use of network theory may promote organizational success. For example, 12 of 13 organizations reported working with other nonprofits at least once a month. Likewise, seven of 13 reported working with other nonprofits daily. Additionally, all but one organization reported communicating with government agencies at least 2-3 times a month. Additionally, many organizations reported frequently receiving benefits from interacting with
other organizations. For example, nine of 13 organizations reported receiving services from other organizations at least once a month. These benefits include publicity, additional volunteers, building space for meetings or events, and financial support such as grants or funding. These frequent interactions with other nonprofits and government agencies resemble Morçöl and Wachhaus’ description of network theory. Organizations also indicated that they benefit from these frequent interactions.

Almost all organizations associated nonprofit and governmental collaboration with increased financial support, visibility, community support, volunteer support, and success in accomplishing their missions’ goals. In fact, eight of 13 organizations associated increased financial support with nonprofit collaboration and 11 of 12 with government collaboration. Twelve of 13 organizations associated increased visibility with nonprofit collaboration and all organizations associated it with government collaboration. Twelve of 13 organizations associated increased community support with nonprofit collaboration and 11 of 12 organizations associated it with government collaboration. Ten of 13 organizations associated increased volunteer support with nonprofit collaboration and nine of 12 with government collaboration. Lastly, all organizations associated nonprofit and government collaboration with success in accomplishing their mission’s goals. Those that did not report an increase in these types of outcomes reported no change. Furthermore, no organizations associated decreased financial support, visibility, community
support, volunteer support, or success in accomplishing their missions’ goals with nonprofit or government collaboration.

Specific benefits were associated government collaboration such as funding. Nine of the 12 organizations within the data sample reported receiving government funding. Other benefits associated with government collaborations included access to critical government services such as medical or law enforcement, enhanced ability to “identify victims,” investigate cases, prosecute perpetrators of human trafficking, and participate in information sharing. Because most organizations benefit from government and nonprofit collaborations, the research indicates that Morçöl and Wachhaus’ description of network theory can be extended to the anti-human trafficking sector.

Furthermore Morçöl and Wachhaus describe networks as dynamic systems. The organizations within my data sample are dynamic because of the large amount of diverse organizations that they work with. The organizations surveyed partnered with 10 to more than 200 other nonprofits. All 13 organizations work with at least 10 other nonprofits, and seven work with 50 or more other nonprofits.

Organizations work with a variety of other nonprofits to meet both the physical and emotional needs of human trafficking victims. Although all organizations reported collaborating with anti-human trafficking nonprofits, most organizations primarily work with other types of nonprofits. For example, eight of the 13 organizations reported that anti-human trafficking nonprofits compose no more than 25% of their total nonprofit collaborations.
Additionally, organizations frequently reported collaborating with abuse shelters, homeless shelters, rehabilitation centers, counseling centers, legal services, medical services, and other human trafficking oriented nonprofits. Most organizations work with multiple levels of government. For example, all but one organization reported working with local, state, and national law enforcement agencies. Most organizations also work with local government education agencies, local mental health services, and state human services agencies. I argue these anti-human trafficking organizations participate in dynamic networks because of the large amount of diverse organizations that they collaborate with. Ultimately, these organizations participate in dynamic networks so that they can best serve human trafficking survivors.

Similarly, Morçöl and Wachhaus describe networks as dynamic systems that can evolve around a catalytic event. Although human trafficking is not an instantaneous event, it nevertheless catalyzes the organizations to work together and participate in networks. Once again, a description of network theory extends to anti-human trafficking organizations. The organizations themselves reiterated this concept when asked about the strengths resulting from collaboration. They indicated that human trafficking is responsible for the formation and maintenance of these relationships within the human trafficking sector. One organization stated that government agencies and other nonprofits “each have their own fit and can bring support to victims in their own way. We want to capitalize on both so that the greatest
impact for victims can be accomplished,” this statement demonstrates how human trafficking brings organizations together so that they can best help survivors. Because the threat of human trafficking catalyzes organizations within the nonprofit sector to collaborate with a diverse group of organizations, the data meet Morçöl and Wachhaus’ description of network theory.

Isset, Mergel, LeRoux, Mischen, and Rethermeyer describe Collaborative Networks as “collections of government agencies and nonprofits” that work in unison to provide public goods or services when neither the public nor private sector is able to provide these goods or services alone. The organizations I surveyed meet this description because they work with other organizations and government agencies to provide public services such as promoting anti-trafficking legislation or advocacy, educating the public about human trafficking, conducting victim rescue operations, providing housing for survivors, and providing counseling for human trafficking survivors.

1.2 Nonprofit Struggles within the Anti-human Trafficking Sector:

Amy Foerster discusses tensions between anti-human trafficking faith-based organizations and secular non-governmental organizations such as competition for limited resources including funding, volunteer support, and media attention. According to Foerster, inter-organizational competition can result in a lessening of organizational effectiveness, a lack of coordination, and duplication of efforts. Similarly, Estes and Weiner stated that NGOs
designed to address child sexual exploitation also face uncoordinated and nonintegrated activities, duplication of efforts, and lapses in communication. Although about half of the data sample did not associate any disadvantages with collaborations or chose to not identify them, almost half of organizations briefly described the types of difficulties that can arise from collaborating with other nonprofits and with government agencies.

These difficulties were similar to the ones that Foerster, Estes, and Weiner described. For example, organizations stated that nonprofit collaboration “creates competition,” that “nonprofits are always competing for funds,” that their organization’s name and mission have been “misused for others to raise funds or promote policies,” and that some organizations “are out for self-gain instead of what is best for the clients.”

1.3 Nonprofit relationships with government agencies:

Jennifer Brinkerhoff and Derick Brinkerhoff cite Dennis Young’s three types of nonprofit-government collaborations that include nonprofits acting as government supplements, complementing government through partnership relations, and acting adversely to government. Similarly, Elizabeth Boris and Eugene Steuerle describe supplementary, complementary, and adversarial nonprofit-government relationships. According to the authors, nonprofits have supplementary relationships they when help to facilitate the supply of public goods that the government does not satisfy. Nonprofits
engaged in complementary relationships work in a contractual partnership and receive government funds.

The organizations within the data sample indicated working both supplementary and complementary with the government. Organizations provide supplementary services such as temporary and permanent victim housing, conduct victim rescue operations, legal services, and job readiness programs for survivors. Additionally, most organizations work complementary with the government and receive government funding to provide services to human trafficking victims.

My data indicate that researcher’s description of network theory applies to anti-human trafficking organizations. Attributes within network theory such as relatively stable complex relationships, interdependency between organizations, repeated interactions, anticipated payoffs, and dynamic networks that may catalyze from an event also exist within the nonprofit sector. Similarly, difficulties that researchers associate with anti-human trafficking nonprofits, such as inter-organizational competition for funding, volunteer support, and media attention, were reflected within my survey data. Overall, these findings indicate that network theory extends to the anti-human trafficking nonprofit sector.
6. Chapter Six: Conclusion

Human trafficking is a grave problem in countries around the world, and also within the United States. As the magnitude of this problem becomes more transparent, the efforts to combat it must likewise increase. The efforts of both private and governmental organizations dedicated to this cause have recently become more apparent. However, sufficient analytical knowledge regarding how these organizations work independently and together simply does not exist. In order to avoid duplication of efforts, to prevent human trafficking through education and public awareness, and to provide better and more access to comprehensive care for victims, private and public anti-human trafficking organizations need to continue communicating and collaborating with each other.

Contrary to my initial expectations, my data sample indicates that organizations in this field are open to and even desire having relationships with other nonprofits and with governmental agencies. In fact, perceived organizational success in increased visibility, funding, community support, volunteer support, and in organizations’ accomplishment of their goals was reported by the majority of organizations to correlate with both nonprofit and governmental collaborations. All organizations reported working with other human trafficking nonprofits. Out of the organizations with existing
governmental collaborations, all organizations reported working with local, state, and national law enforcement agencies.

While all organizations within my data sample reported working with other nonprofits and all but one reported working with governmental agencies, there was not a clear indication of organizations preferring either government or nonprofit partnerships. Though slightly more organizations preferred working with nonprofits to governmental agencies when asked directly, organizations indicated that governmental collaboration is slightly more helpful to their organization in terms of financial support.

My findings support the ideas within network theory. The data supports this theory by illustrating how organizations work closely with multiple nonprofits within and outside of the human trafficking sector, and with governmental agencies. More specifically, my findings indicate just how necessary organizational relationships with nonprofits and governmental agencies are to nonprofits within this area of interest. While these findings begin to reveal both the diversity and similarities of anti-human trafficking organizations, much remains to be learned about the depths and reaches of these types of collaborations.

6.1 Future Research: Survey Changes

If I were to expand on my research in the future, I would improve it through making various changes. First, I would not include coalitions among the surveyed organizations because a coalition-less data sample would better
reflect nonprofit beliefs and practices. Given the collaborative purpose of coalitions, I think that nonprofit tensions and problems would be more visible and easy to isolate if only nonprofits were surveyed. However because nonprofits can receive many beneficial network connections and support from involvement in a coalition, I would ask if the nonprofit was involved in one or more coalitions and what benefits and drawbacks they experience as coalition members.

Second, since more than half of the organizations reported working with other nonprofits daily, but only 8% of organizations reported receiving services daily, I would ask how often nonprofits provided services for other nonprofits. Knowing this information would also shed light on how closely these organizations work together, mainly if they communicate daily or if they are actually working in tandem on a daily basis.

Third, I would rework the communication questions so that the communication questions for both nonprofits and governments were identical and could better reflect how frequently these organizations collaborate with each other. By doing so, I believe that I could better understand if nonprofits communicate more frequently with the government or with other nonprofits. This would serve as another measure of nonprofit collaboration depth.

Lastly, I would include focus groups to provide qualitative information on nonprofit collaborations. I believe that a series of focus groups would make leaders of nonprofits more likely to discuss areas of possible tensions and struggles within the nonprofit sector. Since leaders would have the option of
explaining and justifying collaboration struggles, they may also be more willing to discuss those areas of tension in person than through an impersonal online survey. Speaking with nonprofit personnel would also aid in determining how policy makers are helping or impeding nonprofits’ efforts in this field, and if and what kind of policy changes are need to occur to better detect and protect human trafficking victims.

6.2 Future Research: In General

Faith Based Organizations:

Future research exploring US anti-human trafficking organizations would benefit from understanding the presence and involvement of faith-based organizations (FBOs). Through my own research I discovered that several nonprofits were FBOs. Future research should seek to understand the number of active anti-human trafficking FBOs and how these organizations fit in the anti-human trafficking landscape. More specifically, do FBOs constitute the minority or majority of anti-human trafficking nonprofits, and are they likely or unlikely to collaborate with non-FBOs?

Focus of Victim Populations:

Given that human trafficking in the United States is almost synonymous with sex trafficking, future research in this field should examine just how closely these two concepts are linked. Research should indicate the number of anti-human nonprofits that exist to address sex trafficking. Additionally, researched focused on organizations that address other specific human trafficking victim populations such as children, women, girls, foreign
nationals, and even domestic victims is needed. Given that human trafficking can occur in a variety of ways and affect a multitude of victims, research is needed to determine if organizations account for the diversity of human trafficking victims when targeting specific human trafficking victim groups. Do organizations exist to detect all types of potential human trafficking victims or only the victims that match a preconceived notion of human trafficking?

6.3 Policy Recommendations:

Given that all anti-human trafficking organizations within my data sample, that work with governmental agencies, work with law enforcement, I believe that establishing a bridge between the nonprofit and government sector may be beneficial to the anti-human trafficking realm overall. The example of the Polaris Project operating the government’s national human trafficking crisis hotline is the perfectly illustrates an obtainable and yet ideal version of nonprofit-government collaboration. While it is not feasible for all or even half of anti-human trafficking organizations to work this closely with governmental agencies, the partnership indicates that collaboration between the government and nonprofits is beneficial and obtainable. I believe that policy makers should make the opportunities for nonprofit-governmental collaboration more accessible to nonprofits.

6.4 Conclusion:

The findings from my research indicate that nonprofits in the anti-human trafficking sector are using networks to accomplish their goals,
because these organizations do not operate in strictly hierarchical structures
but in vast networks with both government agencies and other nonprofits. My
data indicates that researchers’ descriptions of network theory also describe
how anti-human trafficking organizations work with other organizations.
While the data sample expressed both advantages and disadvantages from
both types of collaboration, neither government nor nonprofit collaboration
was preferable above the other. Still much remains to be studied in anti-
human trafficking nonprofits such as differences between secular NGOs and
FBOs, nonprofits’ focus on specific victim populations such as women,
children, foreign nationals, and sex trafficking.

As human trafficking remains a threat to the lives of millions of people
around the world within the United States, the need for public and private
anti-human trafficking organizational efforts will remain. Networks prove
both academically and realistically to aid organizations in this effort by
allowing organizations to pool resources, strengthen efforts, and aid larger
amounts of people. My research affirms the existence of networks within the
anti-trafficking nonprofit sector and indicates the many different ways in
which these nonprofits can work with other organizations to best combat
human trafficking.
APPENDICES
Appendix A: Definitions

Because human trafficking is an encompassing subject that can be defined in numerous ways, the definitions provided in the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 will be used when referring to the terms coercion, commercial sex act, involuntary servitude and sex trafficking. Therefore coercion will be defined as

(A) threats of serious harm to or physical restraint against any person; (B) any scheme, plan, or pattern intended to cause a person to believe that failure to perform an act would result in serious harm to or physical restraint against any person; or (C) the abuse or threatened abuse of the legal process.

Commercial sex act will refer to “any sex act on account of which anything of value is given to or received by any person.”

Involuntary servitude includes

a condition of servitude induced by means of—

(A) any scheme, plan, or pattern intended to cause a person to believe that, if the person did not enter into or continue in such condition, that person or another person would suffer serious harm or physical restraint; or

(B) the abuse or threatened abuse of the legal process. (1469)
Severe forms of trafficking in persons will mean

(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.

Lastly sex trafficking will mean “the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, or obtaining of a person for the purpose of a commercial sex act (1470).”
Appendix B: Organizations Contacted

1) ALERT – Arizona League To End Regional Trafficking

The Arizona League to End Regional Trafficking (ALERT) is a program of the International Rescue Committee that was created in February 2003 through a grant awarded by the US Department of Justice, Office for Victims of Crime. ALERT partners with law enforcement, faith-based communities, non-profit organizations, social service agencies, attorneys and concerned citizens. ALERT helps victims of trafficking by providing: food and shelter; medical care; mental health counseling; immigration assistance; legal assistance; language interpretation; case management; and other culturally appropriate services throughout the state of Arizona. Through education, outreach, community training, advocacy and a variety of programs and services, ALERT strives to end the suffering and dehumanization of victims of human trafficking. The International Rescue Committee’s Anti-Trafficking Programs serve victims and survivors of human trafficking by providing access to protection, empowerment, stability, and self-sufficiency through comprehensive case management, advocacy, education, collaboration, and capacity building. The IRC has dedicated anti-trafficking programs in Miami, Phoenix, and Seattle and all twenty-two of IRC’s US Program Offices have the ability to provide services to victims and survivors of human trafficking.

info@traffickingaz.org
Supervisor: 602-761-9179

2) California Against Slavery:

Who Are We: California Against Slavery (CAS) is a non-profit, non-partisan human rights organization. We want to make human trafficking the riskiest criminal business in California. 

OUR MISSION: To defend the freedom of every child, woman and man by empowering the people of California to fulfill our obligation to stop human trafficking.

OUR GOAL: To improve policies and laws to ensure justice and protection for trafficking victims
To provide a platform for survivors of human trafficking to share their stories

- Every person has an inherent dignity which our society and laws must uphold and protect.
• Human trafficking is a crime against human dignity and a deprivation of basic human and civil rights. Allowing any form of slavery to exist severely impacts our society and communities. It is a problem that concerns us all.

3) H.E.A.T: (California)
   5 components of are:
   Community Education and Collaboration
   Law Enforcement Training, Intelligence Sharing, and Coordination
   Prosecution of Offenders
   Engage and Enlist Policy Makers, Legislators & Community
   Decision Makers
   Coordinated Delivery of Essential CSEC Services For Stabilization
   Maya: watch coordinator
   Number:
   Email: BAHC@acgov.org

4) CAST (Coalition to Abolish Slavery & Trafficking)
   (California)
   Mission: To assist persons trafficked for the purpose of forced labor and slavery-like practices and to work toward ending all instances of such human rights violations.
   Name: Sabrina
   Email: Sabrina@castla.org
   Phone: (213) 365-1906
   info@castla.org

5) Children of the Night (California)
   Mission Statement: Children of the Night is a privately funded non-profit organization established in 1979 and dedicated to rescuing America’s children from the ravages of prostitution.
   President: llee@childrenofthenight.org
   (818) 908-4474 x125
   Director of Case Management:
   mbecerra@childrenofthenight.org

6) LCHT – Laboratory to Combat Human Trafficking (Colorado)
   Our Mission
   To compel data-driven actions to end human trafficking by conducting research, training professionals and first responders, and educating the public.
   Our Vision
To create an informed social change movement to end human trafficking.
  Phone: 303 – 295-0451
  Email: info@combathumantraficking.org

7) Florida Coalition Against Human Trafficking (FCAHT)
  Mission: to improve and provide outreach and service to victims of human trafficking throughout the State of Florida by developing support programs, networking, coalition building, training service delivery, and referrals to victims in need.
  Office Phone: (727) 442-3064
  fcahtoffice@gmail.com

8) B.E.S.T. (Building Empowerment by Stopping Human Trafficking)
   - Florida
     We hold these truths to be self-evident:
     ▪ That human trafficking and sexual exploitation are unacceptable realities for a 21st century America.
     ▪ That by bringing together all the right people, we can put a stop to this vicious practice.
     ▪ That all people have the right to freedom – to choose their lives and have the opportunity to fulfill on those choices.
   By incorporating all of these strategies, B.E.S.T.™ hopes to mobilize the most possible resources to combat trafficking nationally and internationally. To learn more about B.E.S.T.™ and to find out how to become more involved, please explore our website.
     Rosie.johnson@beststophumantraficking.org
     Rosie
     Phone: 305-728-5218
     www.beststoptrafficking.org

9) Wellspring Living (Georgia)
  Apart from our four restoration programs in Atlanta GA, we also invest in other cities and organizations who share our desire to see trafficking prevented, justice served, and lives restored.
  We launched The White Umbrella campaign in 2012 as a vehicle to bring awareness and teaching to multiple cities across the nation. As awareness of sexual exploitation increases, more and more organizations are rising up.

  We are proud to have launched the Wellspring Living Training Institute as a support to start up non-profits, local businesses, churches, and individuals.
  Phone: 770-631-8888
  Paul Bowley: pbowley@wellspringliving.org
info@wellspringliving.org  http://www.wellspringliving.org

10) Street Grace (Georgia)
   About: Street Grace is a faith-based organization leading churches, community organizations and individual volunteers on a comprehensive path to end domestic minor sex trafficking (DMST) in Metro Atlanta and throughout the United States.
   Office: (678) 809-2111
   Amy@streetgrace.org

11) Pacific Alliance to Stop Slavery (PASS)
   Hawaii (Honolulu)
   The Pacific Alliance to Stop Slavery (PASS), is a Hawaii-based not-for-profit 501(c)3 whose mission is to stop Human-Trafficking in Hawaii and the Pacific. PASS provides services and advocacy for survivors of Human-Trafficking, education and training on the identification of victims of Human-Trafficking, and public awareness and prevention education for the greater community.
   PASS works holistically to combat Human-Trafficking, building alliances with public interest legal services, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), churches, non-profit community organizations, domestic violence shelters, educational institutions, and law enforcement.
   PASS is a firmly abolitionist alliance committed to ending human trafficking, the modern-day form of slavery, and is primarily concerned with helping the survivors of sex-trafficking while advocating for the strict prosecution of pimps and "johns."
   Phone: 808-343-5056
   Email: info@traffickjamming.org

12) Chicago Alliance Against Sexual Exploitation (CAASE)
   Illinois
   Vision: CAASE envisions a community free from all forms of sexual exploitation, including sexual assault and the commercial sex trade.
   Mission: CAASE addresses the culture, institutions, and individuals that perpetrate, profit from, or support sexual exploitation. Our work includes prevention, policy reform, community engagement, and legal services.
   Phone: 773-244-2230
   info@caase.org
   Lynne Johnson  Director of Policy and Advocacy  773-244-2230
   X5 lynne@caase.org
   Karen Beilstein  Office Manager  773-244-2230  X7
13) Latinas Unidas por un Nuevo Amanecer (LUNA)  
Iowa  
**Mission** Our mission is to empower, educate, and advocate for victims/survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault in our community, so that they may build futures free from violence.  
Phone: 515-271-5060  
(No email)

14) Veronica’s Voice  
Missouri  
Mission: To end commercial sexual exploitation in the United States  
**OFFICE:** (816) 483-7101  
[safecenter@veronicasvoice.org](mailto:safecenter@veronicasvoice.org)  
[http://www.veronicasvoice.org](http://www.veronicasvoice.org)

15) Partnership Against the Trafficking of Humans (PATH)  
Kentucky  
P.A.T.H. is a victim-centered partnership of professional and community organizations devoted to the Prevention of human trafficking through education and training; Protecting victims through rescue and holistic services; and ensuring the Prosecution of traffickers through legal advocacy.  
Vision: Helping people find pathways to freedom together.  
Partnership Against the Trafficking of Humans (PATH) is an organizational synergy of agencies and individuals committed to anti-trafficking efforts on local, national, and international levels. PATH’s vision include creating relevant research to assist in combating trafficking at various levels; supporting local trafficking service development, implementation, and sustainability; fundraising for anti-trafficking projects within PATH or partner agencies; and providing training, awareness, and victim advocacy.  
[http://www.pathnky.org/contact-us.html](http://www.pathnky.org/contact-us.html)  
(No Contact Information)

16) Trafficking Hope (Louisiana)  
**Trafficking Hope’s** focus is to promote public awareness, to educate, and to provide safe housing for victims of human trafficking. Hope House of LA is the first long term care facility in LA for victims of human trafficking.  
Phone: 225-819-0000
Email: info@traffickinghope.org
Traffickinghope.org

17) Eden House (Louisiana)
Eden House is a two-year residential program for women who have been commercially and sexually exploited.
http://edenhouseenola.org/contact-2/
No contact information

18) Freedom House (Michigan)
Our Mission:
Freedom House is a temporary home for survivors of persecution from around the world seeking legal shelter in the United States and Canada. Our mission is to uphold a fundamental American principle, one inscribed on the base of the Statue of Liberty, of providing safety for those "yearning to breathe free."
In 2012, we became a partner in the Northern Tier Anti-Trafficking Consortium servicing victims of human trafficking.
Phone: 313.964.4320 phone
Email: info@freedomhousedetroit.org
Executive Director - Deborah A. Drennan, ext. 11
ddrennan@freedomhousedetroit.org

19) Instituted for Trafficked, Exploited, and Missing Persons (ITEMP)
Minnesota

Atkinson founded the Institute for Trafficked, Exploited, & Missing Persons (ITEMP) in 2001 as a means for raising public awareness and social action against contemporary slavery and human trafficking. Since then, ITEMP has experienced tremendous growth and professional and public acceptance.
Now an international coalition of volunteers and professionals, ITEMP raises social awareness throughout the United States, Central America, Southeast Asia, and Europe, conducts field research on human trafficking, and develops prevention, protection of victims, and prosecution of aggressors programs worldwide.
Phone: 952-544-1670
Email: Director@ITEMP.ORG

20) Breaking Free
Minnesota
Breaking Free helps an average of 400-500 women and girls escape systems of prostitution and sexual exploitation through advocacy, direct services, housing, and education.
At Breaking Free, we understand sex trafficking as a vicious cycle of violence, abuse, incarceration, and addiction. Repeated experiences of violence undermine women and girls' capacities to avoid further victimization. Sexual exploitation distorts the lives of women and girls, destroys families, and undermines the fabric of our communities. In order to break the cycle, we must first recognize sex trafficking/prostitution as a form of violence against women.

Phone: 651.645.6557
breakingfree@breakingfree.net

21) Civil Society
   Minnesota
   We are a Minnesota based non-profit organization that offers legal and social services to victims of trafficking, sexual assault and abuse.
   Phone: 651-291-8810
   Email: office@civilsocietyhelps.org

22) Advocates for Freedom
   Mississippi
   Advocates For Freedom (AFF) is a faith-based organization dedicated to ending the exploitation, sale and enslavement of men, women and children. We provide resources, education and training to bring awareness about human trafficking.
   Office Phone: 228.806.3492
   affstopht@gmail.com

23) The Wesley House
   Mississippi
   Wesley House helps underprivileged, neglected, and abused persons through Christian relief, educational opportunities, child abuse prevention, sexual assault crisis intervention, community welfare and social services, helping people learn to help themselves.
   No contact information
   wesleyhousemeridian.org

24) Veronica's Voice
   (Missouri)
   Mission: To end commercial sexual exploitation in the United States
   Phone: (816) 483-7101
   safecenter@veronicasvoice.org

25) The Central Missouri Stop Human Trafficking Coalition (CMSHTC)
Missouri

The Central Missouri Stop Human Trafficking Coalition exists to... end and prevent forced labor and sexual exploitation of innocent children, women, and men. Through advocacy, active engagement in community collaboration and education, we seek to identify victims, expose traffickers and users, promote slave-free practices, and support survivors of human trafficking on their journey towards wholeness.

We envision communities free of modern-day slavery.

CMSHTC is a multi-sector coalition committed to the end of the modern-day slave trade. CMSHTC is made up of members of the community and representatives of different organizations: local and federal law enforcement, social-service providers, faith-based organizations, students, educators, health-care providers, and others.

(866) 590-5959
Email: help@stophumantraffickingmo.com

(Difference between nonprofits and coalitions???) Incorporate Coalition even though it’s not a nonprofit???) Keep this in consideration)

26) New Mexico Organized Against Trafficking Humans (NM-OATH)

New Mexico

Mission: New Mexico Organized Against Trafficking Humans (NM-OATH) pursues the following mission through "Healthy World," the NM-OATH Information Center:
- to educate New Mexico communities about the pervasiveness of the human trafficking epidemic,
- to increase public awareness and identification of local cases,
- to provide empowerment tools aimed at preventing victimization,
- to promote effective rights-based responses to instances of modern slavery,
& to foster both non-governmental and governmental partnerships in joint action against human trafficking.

Phone: (575) 630-0015
Email: healthyworld@nm-oath.org

27) RELEASE – Restore Everyone’s Liberty Everywhere Abolish Slavery and Exploitation

New Mexico

Mission: To establish a statewide abolitionist movement in New Mexico that prevents human trafficking, protects the current
victims, and prosecutes the offenders.

What I Do:
Facilitate meetings with social providers to form and implement services to human trafficking victims.
Meet with elected and government officials to promote, and create policies such as divergence programs for patronizing prostitutes (john school), strip club regulations, and statutes with tougher punishments.
Train the public on how they can assist on the war against human trafficking.
Publish editorials that encourages citizens and government officials to end human trafficking.
Mail anti-human trafficking books to convicted offenders of human trafficking in prison.
Email (founder) david@releaseglobal.org

28) GEMS – Girls Educational and Mentoring Services
New York
Girls Educational and Mentoring Services’ (GEMS) mission is to empower girls and young women, ages 12–24, who have experienced commercial sexual exploitation and domestic trafficking to exit the commercial sex industry and develop to their full potential. GEMS is committed to ending commercial sexual exploitation and domestic trafficking of children by changing individual lives, transforming public perception, and revolutionizing the systems and policies that impact sexually exploited youth.
GEMS’ vision is to end the commercial exploitation and trafficking of children.
Phone: (212) 926-8089
Email: rlloydasst@gems-girs.org

29) Restore
New York
Mission: Restore NYC’s mission is to end sex trafficking in New York and restore the well-being and independence of foreign-national survivors. Working to this end, we:
- Deliver complete care, addressing physical, emotional and spiritual needs.
- Provide community and safe, long-term housing.
- Empower survivors when they cooperate with law enforcement.
- Increase awareness and understanding in the greater community.
  Advocate for effective policies and legislation.
Phone: 212.840.8484
http://restorenyc.org
30) NCCAHT - North Carolina Coalition Against Human Trafficking
North Carolina
- Established in 2004 as a collaboration between the NC Attorney General’s Office, NCCASA, and several other organizations, the North Carolina Coalition Against Human Trafficking (NCCAHT) is a group of professionals from multiple fields (including law enforcement, legal services, social services, policy, etc.) that works to raise awareness about human trafficking across North Carolina, support efforts to prosecute traffickers, and identify and assist victims.
- Phone: 919-871-1015
- Email: nccaht@nccasa.org

31) World Relief
We practice principles of transformational development to empower local churches in the United States and around the world so they can serve the vulnerable in their communities. With initiatives in education, health, child development, agriculture, food security, anti-trafficking, immigrant services, micro-enterprise, disaster response and refugee resettlement, we work holistically with the local church to stand for the sick, the widow, the orphan, the alien, the displaced, the devastated, the marginalized, and the disenfranchised.
**Phone:** 443.451.1900 or 800.535.5433
**Email:** worldrelief@wr.org

32) Collaborative to End Human Trafficking
Phone: 440-356-2254
Email: collaborative_initiative@yahoo.com
[www.clevelandcatholiccharities.org](http://www.clevelandcatholiccharities.org)

33) Rescue and Restore Coalition
Ohio
The Central Ohio Rescue and Restore Coalition is the 21st of its kind to be established in the United States under the guidance of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to assist victims of human trafficking; rescuing victims through increased public and law enforcement awareness and restoring lives through social service support. Since its inception in July 2007, the coalition has grown to include over 90 members, comprised of both concerned citizens and those who represent social services, faith-based, medical and law enforcement organizations. The Coalition's work is focused in five area committees:
- Public Awareness
- Social Services
- Law Enforcement
Legislation
Demand Reduction
Numbers: Michelle: 614-437-2149
Trish: 614-358-2614
Christina: 614-358-2629
Samantha: 614-358-2630

Coalition
34) Grace Haven, Inc.
Ohio
Gracehaven was founded in 2008 to address the huge need for rehabilitation for victims of domestic minor sex trafficking or, as it is also known, commercial sexual exploitation of children. Gracehaven realized there was a demand for services for victims of commercial sexual exploitation. We began our organization to provide a residential group home for girls under the age of 18 who are survivors, to raise awareness, to train social service providers, and to provide outreach and comprehensive case management to victims.
Phone: 614 886 7011
Executive Director: Megan at mcrawford@gracehaven.me.

35) Second Chance
Ohio
Second Chance Mission: To offer supportive services to women and youth affected by or at risk for involvement in sex trafficking or commercial sexual exploitation, as they reclaim lives of choice.
To raise community awareness about the issues of sex trafficking and the commercial sexual exploitation of children and to work diligently to end the exploitation and victimization of women and youth.
To advocate with women and youth throughout the country to secure and provide resources for treatment and services for victims of sex trafficking and exploitation
No contact information – email or phone number

36) Coalition – End Slavery Cincinnati
Ohio
End Slavery Cincinnati will train, educate, and reach out to the community to create 100% awareness in the greater Cincinnati area as to the reality and presence of human trafficking.
End Slavery Cincinnati will advocate for each individual survivor of human trafficking, as well as all potential victims of human trafficking, to have full access to all legal, social service, and rehabilitation/recovery resources.
End Slavery Cincinnati will provide the greater Cincinnati area with a cohesive referral network for potential human trafficking cases and victims requiring follow-up or further assistance.
Erin Meyer – Coalition Manager Office Phone: 513-762-5658 Email: Erin.Meyer@use.salvationarmy.org

37) DaySpring Villa
Oklahoma
DaySpring Villa will continue to be the model for providing shelter, comprehensive services, goals-based programs, and unbiased care in a protective, faith-based environment to transform the lives of battered women and their children and adult sexual trafficking victims.
Through communications, public relations and timely news distribution, we will create a higher awareness of domestic violence and sexual trafficking in cities, towns and communities throughout Oklahoma and among our youth population to end the cycle of violence early and decrease the potential for victims of domestic violence and sexual trafficking.
We will work tirelessly to become the official voice of battered and sexually trafficked women and children by communicating the positive impact of our organization throughout the state of Oklahoma.
Phone: 918.245.4075.
Email: mail@dayspringvilla.com

38) Oregonians Against Human Trafficking – OATH
Oregon
Mission: To prevent the exploitation of men, women and youth, by educating and promoting practical community engagement by Oregonians in order to end the tragedy of trafficking.
Phone: (Oregon Oath Business) 503-793-9221
Deputy Keith Bickford
Email: OregonOATH@gmail.com
Is this a nonprofit?* Is a nonprofit – but not technically – deputy sheriff who created it.

39) Dawn’s Place
Pennsylvania
Dawn’s Place is unique in that our program helps both foreign born and American women who have been victimized by Commercial Sexual Exploitation (CSE), commonly known as "sex trafficking" or slavery.
Dawn’s Place proactively supports women affected by commercial sexual exploitation (CSE) and its abuse by providing services to women, raising awareness through education, and generating prevention, public policy reform and community collaborations. Because we believe that CSE is a violation of human rights and the most extreme form of domestic violence, Dawn’s Place works to improve the lives of women trapped by, or
at risk for CSE, by providing housing, trauma recovery services, vocational training and other services.
Phone: 215-849-2396
Email: info@ahomefordawn.org

40) The Project to End Human Trafficking
Pennsylvania
Mission Statement: is to work toward the elimination of trafficking in persons, especially women and children trafficked for the purpose of sexual exploitation.
Activities through which the mission is actualized include:
- Educating the general public, both in the United States and abroad, on the regional, national, and international scope of trafficking, forced labor, and in particular sexual exploitation.
- Conducting research pertaining specifically to the trafficking of women and children including documenting specific cases, contributing causes, regional public policy, and the psychosocial implications of trafficking.
- Advocating for the provision of mental health services and other psychosocial reintegration support for victims of trafficking.
- Collaborating with organizations working to eradicate human trafficking, including non-governmental organizations, governmental agencies, and grassroots advocacy groups.
Phone: 412-578-6478
Email: info@endhumantrafficking.org

41) Doctors at War (against trafficking world wide)
Tennessee
Doctors at War provides medical treatment to combat the abuses suffered by human trafficking victims.
We are fighting human trafficking in many ways including connecting doctors and other healthcare professionals with those who are involved in the front lines of this fight, and giving them the opportunity to make a difference. We are working with safe houses worldwide involved in the rescue and restoration of survivors.
Their ultimate goal is in reintegrating these individuals back into society as emotionally whole and healed individuals, carrying the tools to become self sufficient and to not fall prey to this type of exploitation again. We will provide primary and specialty medical care to those who have been rescued from bondage, and offer technical, emotional and financial support for both those doing the restoration work and those who have been rescued out of unthinkable circumstances.
Phone: 1-888-552-8927
Email: info@doctorsatwar.org

42) Community Coalition Against Human Trafficking
Tennessee

Our Goals
Provide collaborative space for anti-trafficking work to flourish.
Raise overall awareness about the issue of human trafficking.
Facilitate training and equipping of first responders to human trafficking.
Assist in the restoration of victims of human trafficking.

Phone: 865.236.1046
Email: info@ccaht.org
Coalition

43) End Slavery
The mission of End Slavery Tennessee is to create a slave-free Tennessee and holistically restore survivors of human trafficking.

Our Vision: End Slavery Tennessee works to provide victims and their advocates a single point of contact to in-house services and service providers that restore victims to wholeness. We also work to make systemic changes that create a culture of freedom in our state.ery Tennessee

Phone: 615-806-6899

44) Second Life Chattanooga
Tennessee
Mission: Second Life of Chattanooga creates awareness that drives action through collaborative relationships with like-minded organizations and individuals in order to end human sex trafficking in Greater Chattanooga/Southeast Tennessee.
Second Life of Chattanooga is a project fund of Community Foundation of Greater Chattanooga. Your donations to Second Life of Chattanooga are fully tax-deductible

Email: contact@secondlifechattanooga.org
Phone: 423-994-4857

45) Free For Life
Tennessee

Our Mission: At Free for Life International we partner with organizations and individuals globally to meet the needs of trafficking survivors and those who are considered to be in high risk of being trafficked. We partner by providing financial, emotional and spiritual support.

Phone: 1-888-335-8835

Email: info@freeforlifeintl.org

46) A Bridge of Hope
Tennessee

Our mission is to empower people to empower themselves.
~ Restoring Lives, Rebuilding Hope for those who have been abused, trafficked, incarcerated, or in need of direction.
Phone: (901) 487-6577
Email: buildingbridgestogether@yahoo.com
Website: www.ABridgeofHope.org

47) Courtney's House
Virginia
An All-Encompassing Approach:
At Courtney's House we know firsthand that diminishing sex trafficking not only involves a relentless pursuit to rescue each victim, but widespread public awareness of this pressing issue. Recovery is an all-encompassing journey from proper need assessment, intense individual and group therapy and counseling, parental support, and an overall determination on the part of the survivor towards a hopeful future.
At Courtney's House every survivor of sex trafficking can receive survivor-focused, trauma-informed, holistic services. Staff survivors help these youth find and recover their own voices, thus enabling them to pass on their own keys to success.
Phone: 202-525-1426
No email

47) Gray Haven
Virginia
The Gray Haven Project operates Central Virginia’s first non-residential program specifically designed to meet the needs of human trafficking survivors. We recognize that the nature of human trafficking is complex and requires a comprehensive array of restorative services. The philosophy of our model is based on a view that each survivor is different, has unique needs, and will need supportive services that are designed to address all levels of needs whether short-term, intermediate, or long-term.
Our hope is that any survivor that comes into our program will ultimately experience restoration and the ability to live free and empowered. We are here and our doors will always be open regardless where they are on their journey. What we aim for is restored dignity, self-worth, and the opportunity for a hopeful future.
Email: info@thegrayhaven.org
Phone: 804.592.6550

48) VBJI – Virginia Beach Justice Initiative
Virginia
Our mission is to bring an end to the issue of sex trafficking by empowering the residents of Virginia Beach and surrounding cities through education and awareness, advocacy and prevention campaigns. We partner with credible organizations that are
involved in the work of eradicating sex trafficking and bringing restoration to former victims.
Phone: at 1-877-227-2321
Email: info@vbji.org
vb.justice@gmail.com

49) Franciscan Peacemakers
Our mission is to reach out to women, men, and children who engage in prostitution on the streets of Milwaukee. We do this by being a consistent presence in neighborhoods where prostitution is occurring. We minister by offering a simple bag lunch, personal care items, and an invitation to leave the streets behind.
Phone: 414-559-5761 (Deacon Steve Przedpelski)
Email: sprzedpel@gmail.com

50) Polaris Project
Washington DC
Polaris Project is committed to combating human trafficking and modern-day slavery, and to strengthening the anti-trafficking movement through a comprehensive approach.
Tel: 202-745-1001
Email: info@polarisproject.org
Appendix C: Survey Questions

Name of Nonprofit: __________________________

Nonprofit’s Mission Statement:
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

SECTION A: Nonprofit Description

Which term best describes your nonprofit organization? Check one from each row.

☐ Local        ☐ National  ☐ International  ☐
Other____________

☐ Faith-based  ☐ Nonreligious  ☐ Other____________

Approximately, how many people are paid to work for your organization?
☐ None – the organization consists of volunteers only
☐ 1-5 paid staff
☐ 6-10 paid staff
☐ 11-15 paid staff
☐ 16+ paid staff __________(Enter number)

Approximately, how many volunteers arrive daily to work for your organization?
☐ No daily volunteers
☐ 1-5
☐ 6-10
☐ 11-15
☐ 16+ ________ (enter number)

Approximately, how many human trafficking victims does your organization provide services for annually?
☐ Less than 10
☐ 11-20
☐ 21-30
☐ 31-50
Which of the following services regarding human trafficking does your organization provide? Select all that apply.

- Victims rescue operations
- Raise awareness through academia
- Educate the public through speaking engagements or campaigns
- Permanent housing for victims
- Temporary housing for victims
- Human trafficking prevention
- Legal services for victims
- Anti-trafficking legislation or advocacy
- Medical services for victims
- ESL services for victims
- Counseling for victims
- Rehabilitation for victims
- Job readiness
- Translation
- Fundraising
- Other__________
- Other__________
- Other__________
- Other__________

Section B: Nonprofit relations

In any way, does your organization work with other nonprofit organizations?

- Yes
- No

If no, continue to section C.
If yes, continue answering the following questions.

In which of the following ways does your organization work with other nonprofit organizations? Check all that apply.

- Host events together
- Provide public speakers for each other
- Complimentary services (example: victim rescue and victim home placement)
- Referral to other services/organizations
- Receive data
☐ Exchange data
☐ Contribute data
☐ Publicize for each other
☐ Other____________________________________________________
☐ Other____________________________________________________
☐ Other____________________________________________________

Is your organization a member of a coalition?
☐ Yes ☐ No

(Skip logic)
If yes, what type of coalition is your organization a member of?
☐ Anti-trafficking ☐ Legal Services ☐ Abuse help/prevention ☐ Homeless
☐ Other_________ ☐ Other_________

COMMUNICATION WITH OTHER NONPROFITS:

Does your organization use email as a form of communication with other nonprofits?
☐ Yes ☐ No

(Skip logic) Within the last two years, how often does your organization use email to communicate with other nonprofit organizations?
☐ Daily ☐ Weekly ☐ Monthly ☐ Every few months ☐ Yearly

How important is communicating through email with other nonprofits to your organization?
☐ No importance ☐ Little importance ☐ Neither important or unimportant
☐ Somewhat important ☐ Very important

Does your organization communicate with other nonprofit organizations through phone calls?
☐ Yes ☐ No

(Skip Logic) Within the last two years, how often does your organization communicate through phone calls with other nonprofit organizations?
☐ Daily ☐ Weekly ☐ Monthly ☐ Every few months ☐ Yearly
How important is communicating through phone calls with other nonprofits to your organization?
☐ No importance □ Little importance □ Neither important or unimportant
□ Somewhat important □ Very important □ Essential

In the past two years, has your organization participated in scheduled meetings with other organizations?
☐ Yes □ No
(Skip Logic) How often has your organization participated in meetings with other nonprofit organizations?
□ Daily □ Weekly □ Monthly □ Every few months □ Yearly

How important has communicating through formal meetings with other nonprofits been to your organization?
☐ No importance □ Little importance □ Neither important or unimportant
□ Somewhat important □ Very important □ Essential

SERVICES GAINED FROM COLLABORATION

What types of nonprofits does your organization work with? Check all that apply.
□ Human trafficking
□ Safe Shelters (abuse)
□ Homeless shelters
□ Food distribution centers and food pantries
□ Rehabilitation
□ Medical
□ Career preparatory
□ Counseling
□ Poverty focused
□ Legal services
□ Other _____________
□ Other _____________
□ Other _____________

How would you classify the nonprofits that your organization works with? Check all that apply.
□ International □ National □ Local □ Faith based □ Non-religious
Do other nonprofits provide services for your organization (such as grant money, publicity, etc.)?
   ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unsure

(Skip Logic)

If yes, what types of services do other nonprofits provide for your organization? Check all that apply.

☐ Grants and funding   ☐ Publicity   ☐ Building space for meetings or events   ☐ Physical labor   ☐ Volunteers for your organization   ☐ Research
☐ Legal Services   ☐ Other ____________________________
☐ Other ____________________________
☐ Other ____________________________

Within the last two years, how often have other nonprofits provided services for your organization?
☐ Daily ☐ Weekly ☐ Monthly ☐ Yearly ☐ Annually

**TYPES OF NONPROFIT COLLABORATION:**

How does your organization view collaboration with similar goal oriented nonprofit organizations? Check only one.

☐ Undesirable
☐ Indifferent
☐ Desirable
☐ Very Desirable
☐ Essential

In regards to fulfilling your organization's mission statement, how helpful is collaboration with similar goal-oriented nonprofits? Check only one.

☐ Not helpful
☐ Somewhat Helpful
☐ Helpful
☐ Very helpful
☐ Essential

*Please select your answer and complete the following sentence:
Collaborating with similar goal-oriented nonprofits is ☐ helpful/☐ unhelpful because______________________________

How does your organization view collaboration with local nonprofits?
☐ Undesirable
☐ Somewhat undesirable
☐ Indifferent
☐ Somewhat desirable
☐ Desirable
☐ Very Desirable
☐ Essential

*Please select your answer and complete the following sentence:
Collaborating with local nonprofits is ☐ helpful/ ☐ unhelpful
because_________________________________________________________________________

How does your organization view collaboration with national nonprofit organizations?
☐ Undesirable
☐ Somewhat undesirable
☐ Indifferent
☐ Somewhat desirable
☐ Desirable
☐ Very Desirable
☐ Essential

*Please select your answer and complete the following sentence:
Collaborating with national nonprofits is ☐ helpful/ ☐ unhelpful
because_________________________________________________________________________________

How does your organization view collaboration with international nonprofit organizations?
☐ Undesirable
☐ Somewhat undesirable
☐ Indifferent
☐ Somewhat desirable
☐ Desirable
☐ Very Desirable
☐ Essential

*Please select your answer and complete the following sentence:
Collaborating with international nonprofits is ☐ helpful/ ☐ unhelpful
because_________________________________________________________________________________
How does your organization view collaboration with faith-based nonprofits?
☐ Undesirable
☐ Somewhat undesirable
☐ Indifferent
☐ Somewhat desirable
☐ Desirable
☐ Very Desirable

*Please select your answer and complete the following sentence:
Collaborating with faith-based nonprofits is □ helpful/□ unhelpful because_____________________________________________________

How does your organization view collaboration with nonreligious nonprofit organizations?
☐ Undesirable
☐ Somewhat undesirable
☐ Indifferent
☐ Somewhat desirable
☐ Desirable
☐ Very Desirable

*Please select your answer and complete the following sentence:
Collaborating with nonreligious nonprofits is □ helpful/□ unhelpful because_____________________________________________________

**SCOPE OF COLLABORATION:**

Approximately, how many nonprofits does your organization work with?
☐ 1-3
☐ 4-5
☐ 6-10
☐ 11-15
☐ 16+_________(enter number)

Out of these, approximately what percent are also anti-human trafficking nonprofits? Check one.
☐ 10% or less
☐ 11-25%
☐ 26-50%
☐ 51-75%
☐ 76-100%

Has collaboration with other nonprofits affected your organization?
☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Unsure

If yes, how has collaboration with other nonprofits affected your organization? Check all that apply.

☐ Increased visibility of your organization
☐ Increased community support for your organization
☐ Increased financial support for your organization
☐ Increased volunteer support for your organization
☐ Increased volume of success in accomplishing the goals of your mission statement
☐ Decreased visibility of your organization
☐ Decreased community support for your organization
☐ Decreased financial support for your organization
☐ Decreased volunteer support for your organization
☐ Decreased volume of success in accomplishing the goals of your mission statement
☐ Other________________________________________
☐ Other________________________________________
☐ Other________________________________________

SECTION C: Governmental Relations

In the past two years, has your organization worked with governmental agencies?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Unsure

(Skip Logic) Has your organization worked with local governmental agencies?
☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Unsure

(Skip Logic) Which of the following does your organization work with?
☐ Counselors (Department of youth services)  ☐ Social workers
☐ Local law enforcement
☐ Other________________  ☐ Other________________  ☐
Other________________

Does your organization work with state governmental agencies?
□ Yes □ No □ Unsure
(Skip Logic)
If yes, which of the following does your organization work with?
☐ State human services agency ☐ State level law enforcement ☐ State criminal justice agencies ☐ Other______________ □ Other______________

Does your organization work with federal governmental agencies?
□ Yes □ No □ Unsure

If yes, which of the following agencies does your organization work with? Check all that apply.
☐ Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)
☐ Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE)
☐ Department of Homeland Security (DHS)
☐ Citizen and Immigration Services (CIS)
☐ Office of Refugee Resettlement (OSHA)
Other______________
Other______________
Other______________

How helpful was working with these governmental agencies to your organization?
□ Unhelpful
□ Neither helpful or unhelpful
□ Helpful
□ Very Helpful
□ Essential

How often does your organization communicate through phone calls or emails with these governmental agencies?
□ Daily
□ Weekly
□ Monthly
□ Annually
□ Never
□ Other________

How often does your organization participate in meetings with these governmental agencies?
□ Daily
□ Weekly
□ Monthly
□ Annually
□ Never
☐ Other________

In the past two years, has your organization received governmental services?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unsure

(Skip Logic) How often has your organization received governmental services?
☐ Daily ☐ Weekly ☐ Monthly ☐ Yearly

What types of services has your organization received from governmental agencies?
☐ Grants or funding
☐ Legal services for victims
☐ Publicity
☐ Counseling
☐ Social Work
Appendix D: Scripts For Contacting Organizations

Script for Emailing Organizations:

To whom it May Concern,

My name is Gabrielle Barrientos and I am an Honor's College undergraduate student at the University of Mississippi. I am writing my honor's thesis on how anti-human trafficking nonprofits operate with other organizations and governmental agencies. I found your organization through the Polaris Project and have selected your organization to participate in a web-based survey I specifically designed for anti-human trafficking nonprofits. I've included the link to the survey below. Completing this survey should take between ten and twelve minutes.

Please note that your survey’s answers will be anonymous. Should you choose to participate, I will send you the results of my study. Your participation is vital not only to my project, to the goal of helping to produce policy that can better support the anti-trafficking movement.

I am conducting this research under the supervision of Dr. Melissa Bass, assistant professor of Public Policy Leadership. If you have any questions regarding my project or the survey please do not hesitate to contact Dr. Bass or myself.

It would be very helpful to my progress if you could complete the survey by Friday, 10 January. Please click on the link below to start the survey: http://uofmississippi.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_6FoDYdpCi1srnLv

Thank you for your participation and for your dedication to this movement.

Sincerely,
Gabrielle Barrientos

Script for Calling Organizations:

Hi, my name is Gabrielle Barrientos and I am a student conducting research through the honor’s college at the University of Mississippi. I have selected your organization to participate in a web-based survey for nonprofits organizations in the anti-human trafficking sector. The survey should take around ten minutes to complete. To prevent it from getting lost, I’d like to send it to a specific person within your organization, preferably your organization’s director. Could I have the email address and a contact phone number for your nonprofit’s director or other qualified personnel? Thank you for your dedication to combat human trafficking in the United States.
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