

## COVER SHEET

### Cross-border trafficking in human beings: prevention and intervention strategies for reducing sexual exploitation

- Reviewers:
- Peter H. van der Laan, PhD  
Netherlands Institute for the Study of Crime and Law Enforcement (NSCR) & University of Amsterdam (UvA)  
Email: [PvanderLaan@nscr.nl](mailto:PvanderLaan@nscr.nl)
- Monika Smit, PhD  
Research and Documentation Centre Ministry of Justice (WODC)  
Email: [m.smit@minjus.nl](mailto:m.smit@minjus.nl)
- Inge Busschers, MSc  
Netherlands Institute for the Study of Crime and Law Enforcement (NSCR)  
Email: [IBusschers@nscr.nl](mailto:IBusschers@nscr.nl)
- Pauline Aarten, MSc  
Netherlands Institute for the Study of Crime and Law Enforcement (NSCR)  
Email: [PAarten@nscr.nl](mailto:PAarten@nscr.nl)
- Sources of Support: The Campbell Collaboration (C2) , Norway  
Ministry of Justice, the Netherlands
- Submitted: September 2009
- Re-submitted 1<sup>st</sup> time: April 2010
- Re-submitted 2<sup>nd</sup> time: July 2010

## 1. BACKGROUND FOR THE REVIEW

Over the years, growing attention has been given to the phenomenon of trafficking in human beings (THB). Human trafficking generally involves the use of force, fraud, or coercion to enslave people in situations that are exploitative and in many cases illegal and dangerous (GAO, 2007). The use of fraud, force, or coercion typically distinguishes THB from smuggling people. Victims of trafficking may be forced to work in prostitution, strip club dancing, sweatshops, agricultural businesses, and people's homes (GAO, 2007, Gervais, 2005; Kelly, 2005). Underage victims are forced to beg for money in cities, work in carpet shops and participate in pornography and sexual acts with adults. Furthermore, trafficking in children in the sports business, especially in soccer, is not uncommon (de Boer, 2002; David, 2005). Not all governments recognize trafficking as a problem. They may treat foreign trafficking victims as illegal immigrants and deport them back to their home countries, rather than protect them (GAO, 2007). However, in most countries, trafficking has been recognized as a national and international problem, and there is a widespread agreement for the need of a multilateral response on both levels (Laczko, 2005). The United Nations (UN) Protocol to prevent, suppress and punish trafficking in persons, especially women and children, supplementing the UN convention against Transnational Organized Crime (2000), stimulates anti-THB legislation and interventions in many countries all over the world. Furthermore, there have been a growing number of international conventions on human trafficking in the last decade as well as a vast increase in the number of publications on THB and on ways to prevent and suppress it (Kelly, 2005; Laczko, 2005).

Sexual exploitation is by far the most commonly identified form of THB, accounting for 79% of all cases, followed by forced labour with 18% (Chawla, Me & Pichon, 2009). A working paper of the International Labour Organization (ILO) supports this finding: 75% of the reported cases regard sexual exploitation (Belser, 2005). Still, caution must be given to these results due to the possible statistical bias, as will be mentioned below. Moreover, the fact that sexual exploitation is the most documented type of THB does not mean that there is an overall consistency in recognizing sexual exploitation. Organizations continue to face obstacles as they work on global and regional initiatives to combat trafficking (Barnitz, 2001). For example, governments disagree on whether there is a difference between 'forced' and 'voluntary' prostitution (GAO, 2007). Under-reported forms of exploitation are forced or bonded labour, domestic servitude and forced marriage, trafficking for the purpose of organ removal, and the exploitation of children in begging.

Much research has focused on the prevalence of THB, but no consensus has been reached on its incidence. In 2006, the United States Government estimated 600,000 to 800,000 persons being trafficked across international borders annually<sup>1</sup>. However, according to UN Children's Fund (UNICEF) and the ILO the number is much higher with approximately 2 million people being trafficked every year worldwide (Boonpala & Kane, 2002). With regard to registered victims, the numbers vary greatly as well. Italy, for example, accounts for a high number of reported victims in Europe<sup>2</sup>. In 2006, Italy reported 2143 victims of trafficking. The high number may possibly be the result of the extensive care for victims<sup>3</sup>. This can lead to a higher motivation for victims to

---

<sup>1</sup> In the US, cross border trafficking is defined as the trafficking of humans between countries. Trafficking across and within states is referred to as internal trafficking (GAO, 2006).

<sup>2</sup> International Seminar: Anti-trafficking actions and Human Rights based approach in South Asia: Outcomes and links with Europe. Final seminar of the Terre des hommes consortium project DDH/2—4/089-105, Brussels, 24<sup>th</sup>-25<sup>th</sup> February 2009. Comment of ms. Maria Grazia Giammarinaro, policy officer. DG JLS; Justice, Freedom and Security European Commission.

<sup>3</sup> All victims of trafficking in Italy are placed in social integration programmes and also receive police protection. See Commission Working Document. Evaluation and monitoring of the implementation of the EU Plan on best practices,

denounce. These estimates are questionable due to methodological weaknesses, gaps in data, the interpretations made and the numerous discrepancies found in studies (Cwikel & Hoban, 2005; GAO, 2006; Tyldum & Brunovskis, 2005; World Congress against CSEC, 2001). In the absence of reliable numbers, stereotypes are often seen as being true. In addition, pressure groups, such as social services, can influence the image of trafficking. The issue has been sensationalized and politicized (Brennan, 2005), resulting in policies that are built on rhetoric and ideology rather than on evidence (Vermeulen, 2007). In reaction, organizations have intensified the collection of statistics and policy data. Nevertheless, in all probability only a small percentage of human trafficking is registered leaving a high dark number in its prevalence (BNRM, 2007).

Research on THB has not only focused on its prevalence but also on trends and developments, and on facts about traffickers<sup>4</sup> in order to understand the phenomenon. This understanding of the depth, the breadth and the scope of the problem is needed before any initiatives towards prevention and suppression can be developed (Chawla et al., 2009; Surtees, 2008). Research on conviction has also been done, where statistics have shown an increase in the number of convictions. However, most convictions still take place in only a few countries. According to Chawla et al. (2009), who studied THB in Europe, Asia, Africa and America two out of every five countries (41%) do not report any convictions of THB and 14% of all countries have no data available at all. Possible explanations for the lack of registration are that some countries pay little or no attention towards the phenomenon or are poorly prepared and equipped for dealing with THB (Chawla et al., 2009). The level of attention given to THB seems to lead to higher statistics. As more is known on THB, more awareness to the phenomenon is given by the criminal justice system. Consequently, more cases of THB are registered which in turn leads to higher statistics. A rise in prevalence is, therefore, not necessarily only the result of an increase in THB cases.

Many activities to combat trafficking have been initiated by numerous supranational<sup>5</sup>, international as well as national organizations. In general, these organizations assess the phenomenon and develop initiatives based on their findings. These activities can be distinguished in preventive, suppressive and victim support interventions. The specific goals of these interventions can be raising awareness, providing education and employment, changing the legislation, prosecution of perpetrators and empowerment of victims. These interventions aim directly at the at-risk population, victims or perpetrators, while others are more indirect, trying to create more awareness among social workers and policy makers. Furthermore, initiatives can combine several goals and activities. For example, in 2007 Terre des Hommes started, together with partner NGOs, a project<sup>6</sup> in 12 countries to ‘contribute to the development of effective policies and practices against trafficking in especially children, safeguarding and promoting the rights of boys and girls in Southeast Asia, Southeast Europe and Latin America’ (Dottridge, 2010). This project uses a very extensive approach in preventing trafficking, involving four different components: a) capacity building of NGOs and media; b) awareness-raising and empowerment at local level; c) advocacy at national and regional level; and d) networking.

Much is written about these initiatives, but some areas have been neglected. Knowledge on ‘what works’ is in particular limited. Most publications are primarily descriptive, for example

---

standards and procedures for combating and preventing trafficking in human beings. Commission of the European Communities. COM (2008) 657 final. Brussels, 17.10.2008.

<sup>4</sup> For instance, a disproportionately high number of women are involved in THB. They can be either victims or traffickers. This is important to note, especially in cases where former victims have become the perpetrators (Chawla et al., 2009).

<sup>5</sup> For example Terre des hommes, Save the children and UNICEF.

<sup>6</sup> Title of this project is Enhancing capacity to address trafficking in especially children from a human rights perspective in Southeast Asia, Southeast Europe and Latin America.

describing the hardship of or social assistance to victims. Others mainly aim at collecting trustworthy numbers to define the scale of the phenomenon (Kelly, 2005).

There has been relatively little independent<sup>7</sup> research that evaluates and assesses the effectiveness of counter trafficking policies, programmes, and various interventions (Chase & Statham, 2005; Laczko, 2005). This can be problematic since organizations evaluating their own initiative may have explicit or implicit political or practical agendas that could influence their conclusions - for instance by selecting or disposing of certain information (Vandekerckhove, 2003). It is possible that more or less weight is given to certain data due to the authority of certain key actors (Tyldum & Brunovskis, 2005). The individuals involved in human trafficking, whether they are the perpetrators or victims, are considered *hidden populations* where the size and boundaries remain unidentified (Laczko, 2005; Tyldum & Brunovskis, 2005). As human trafficking is illegal and mainly underground (BNRM, 2007; Boak, Boldosser & Biu, 2003) trustworthy data is difficult to collect resulting in conclusions that may be far from the truth. Deficient data tracking systems and methodologies for estimation and evaluation could increase the risk that programmes targeting this specific population will be inaccurate (Clawson, Williamson & Garrett, 2008; Kelly, 2002). Evaluation is important as evaluative knowledge on trafficking can be used to develop prevention techniques or policies (Dottridge, 2007a; Kelly, 2005). The United States Government Accountability Office reviewed documents of 23 U.S. Government funded anti-trafficking projects in Indonesia, Thailand and Mexico. It revealed that 21 of the 23 projects included one or more monitoring elements but only ten state how performance is measured. The majority lack a logic framework of monitoring that links activities to goals, indicators and targets (GAO, 2007). And even though the number of monitoring and evaluation studies is rising, it is believed that more scientific evaluation research is needed to ensure the effectiveness of the interventions developed, to help agencies achieve the results desired, and to enable more effective oversight and accountability (GAO, 2006).

Another frequently encountered restriction in the research on THB is the availability of only small samples. Often, this is due to the limited access to victims and perpetrators (Ennew, 2008; Laczko, 2005). Intrinsically, there is nothing wrong with small samples. If done sensitively a variety of methods can produce illuminating results. Nevertheless, often preference is given to a single method such as interviews or questionnaires, which are not considered appropriate in researching topics that are controversial or difficult to talk about. Furthermore, small amounts of data are sometimes pushed through numerical hoops that produce misleading results (Ennew, 2008)<sup>8</sup>. As a result, little (reliable) knowledge on effectiveness of interventions in this area is available (BNRM, 2007).

While evaluations of anti-trafficking interventions are scarce, such interventions seem to cause collateral damage (Boermans, 2009; Dottridge, 2007b; Limanowska, 2003). Anti-trafficking programmes can cause damage by putting restrictions (often unlawful) on young women's decisions to migrate or even to travel. For instance, refusal to issue a visa or to allow a young woman to enter the country is presented as an anti-trafficking measure (Limanowska, 2003).<sup>9</sup> In 2002, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights issued a series of recommended Principles

---

<sup>7</sup> Here, independent research regards research that is not carried out by the same organization that has developed or carried out the initiative in the first place.

<sup>8</sup> For example, data restricted to only one research method are used for analysis and percentages of a small, unrepresentative sample may be used by policy makers in designing programmes for the general population (Ennew, 2008).

<sup>9</sup> Victims may also experience damage by being held in a police cell or during interrogation, whereas cultural differences can further contribute to the deterioration of physical or medical conditions (Zimmerman et al., 2003).

and Guidelines<sup>10</sup>. The third principle states that anti-trafficking measures “*shall not adversely affect the human rights and dignity of persons, in particular the rights of those who have been trafficked...*” (p. 3) thereby aiming to protect victims of trafficking against (more) damage by interventions. Guideline 3 provides more detail on this point and urges governments, intergovernmental organizations and NGOs to monitor and evaluate “*the relationship between the intention of anti-trafficking laws, policies and interventions, and their real impact*” and to distinguish “*between measures which actually reduce trafficking and measures which may have the effect of transferring the problem from one place or group to another*” (p. 7). According to Dottridge (2007c), the High Commissioner’s Guidelines do not appear to have been heeded by many government agencies and NGO’s involved in anti-trafficking activities. Nine years have passed since the endorsement of the UN Trafficking Protocol but little is known about which interventions have been the most effective in preventing human trafficking, protecting victims and prosecuting traffickers (GAO, 2007).

## **2. OBJECTIVES OF THE REVIEW**

The background information yields a number of justifications for a Campbell Systematic Review on this topic. The growing attention to THB entails a demand for more information. The number of interventions to counter THB is rising, and many initiatives have been described. At the same time, the effectiveness of these programmes remains unknown.<sup>11</sup> However, the severity of the crime and the impact on its victims makes it of utmost importance to gain more insight into the working and effectiveness of anti-trafficking strategies<sup>12</sup> and interventions. Hence, the objectives of this systematic review are twofold. Firstly, this review will bring together and assess the available evidence on the effects of anti-THB strategies and interventions. This will contribute to the knowledge on anti-THB interventions and their effectiveness and will therefore provide information to policy makers. Secondly, this review will increase the knowledge about the strengths and weaknesses of research concerning anti-trafficking strategies and interventions that can stimulate future research and improve evaluations. Awareness will be raised on the need for more rigorous research designs that also shed light on possible collateral damage of interventions that otherwise may remain unknown due to insufficient and inadequate information (Dottridge, 2007c). This systematic review can fill the gap between what has been done and what has been learnt, in line with the views of Dottridge (2007a). He mentions that processes such as ‘institutional learning’, ‘sharing lessons learned’ and identifying ‘good practices’ are necessary. He states, “*In the case of every substantial initiative to prevent trafficking, therefore, it is important that it should be evaluated. Whenever possible, the lessons from the evaluation should be published or made available to others conducting similar work. The fastest way of circulating information of this sort at the moment is to put it on a website, ensuring the title mentions ‘evaluation’ or ‘impact assessment’ (of efforts to prevent child trafficking), so that this is picked up by Internet search engines*” (Dottridge, 2007a, p.66). Consequentially, this review aims at contributing to a more evidence-based approach in the prevention and suppression of cross border THB for the purpose of sexual exploitation.

---

<sup>10</sup> Principle 3 of the UN High Commissioner’s *Recommended Principles and Guidelines on Human Rights and Human Trafficking*, Addendum to the Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to the Economic and Social Council, UN document E/2002/68/Add.1, 20 May 2002, see: <http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Press/OHCHR%20Recommended%20Guidelines.pdf>.

<sup>11</sup> For example, at least 44 studies on human trafficking are added to the electronic library of Terre des homes in February 2009, and 82 in March 2009. None of these studies are evaluations of anti-trafficking measures.

<sup>12</sup> Strategy is collective term referring to multiple interventions.

The questions to be answered are the following:

1. What types of anti-THB strategies and interventions that have been accompanied by some form of empirical analysis can be distinguished?
2. Which of these analyses incorporate (quasi) experimental evaluations that are rigorous enough to determine the effect of these anti-THB strategies on preventing and suppressing THB?
3. What are the outcomes of these (quasi) experimental studies?

### 3. METHODS

#### **Criteria for inclusion and exclusion of studies in the review**

Studies will be included in this review based on the following criteria:

*Types of studies:* studies focusing on cross-border trafficking for the purpose of sexual exploitation will be collated. The focus will be on cross-border trafficking, because internal trafficking is not (yet) or just recently recognized in many countries. Cross-border trafficking is operationalized by following the definition of the United Nations Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations convention against Transnational Organized Crime (2000), which has been signed and ratified by more than 100 countries, making it the most widespread definition used. Article 3 (a) of this UN Protocol states that “*Trafficking in persons shall mean the recruitment, transportation, transfer, harboring or receipt of persons, by means of the threat or use of force or other forms of coercion, of abduction, of fraud, of deception, of the abuse of power or of a position of vulnerability or of the giving or receiving of payments or benefits to achieve the consent of a person having control over another person, for the purpose of exploitation. Exploitation shall include, at a minimum, the exploitation of the prostitution of others or other forms of sexual exploitation, forced labor or services, slavery or practices similar to slavery, servitude or the removal of organs*”.

This review will be limited to trafficking for prostitution or sexual exploitation, in any form there is. Trafficking for forced labor or services, slavery or practices similar to slavery, servitude or the removal of organs will be kept out of consideration for several reasons. Firstly, the line between trafficking for labour exploitation and terrible working conditions is thin (de Jonge van Ellemeet, 2007) making it difficult to define situations as one or the other. Secondly, there are few - if any - studies in the area of trafficking for the removal of organs. These practices were either not recognized, or not recognized as a form of trafficking until included in the UN protocol. Finally, these areas in human trafficking take place in different parts of society and have their own dynamics. Therefore, they should be studied as distinct topics.

In this review studies on anti-trafficking measures will be included that involve evaluations of strategies - (policies) and interventions - to prevent or suppress cross border trafficking for the purpose of sexual exploitation, targeting both individual perpetrators and criminal groups, as well as (possible) victims, for example by informing and educating. Policies or initiatives exclusively regarding victim assistance, the reintegration of victims and arrangements for legal status, will not be included.

An inclusion criterion that will be applied in the second stage of the review is that studies must report the effectiveness of initiatives, supported with numerical data. Studies considering *best practices* or *evidence-based practices* on how to counteract THB will be included in this review.

Descriptions of *good practices* based on field experiences but lacking any numerical data will be excluded.

*Participants:* there are no exclusion criteria regarding participants (i.e. evaluation research dealing with initiatives targeting perpetrators and criminal groups as well as vulnerable individuals and professionals in the field of anti-THB will be included).

*Publication:* eligible studies are either published - electronically or in print - or unpublished. Studies from the year 2000 and onwards are incorporated in the review. This year was chosen since it marks the UN Trafficking Protocol.

*Country of origin:* In principle, studies from any country all over the world will be included. However, due to limited resources and knowledge of a limited number of foreign languages within the research team, only those studies that have been written in Danish, Dutch, English, French, German, Italian, Norwegian, Spanish and Swedish will be reviewed.

*Methodological quality:* All empirical (numerical) evaluation studies with respect to anti-trafficking interventions and strategies will be included. They will be categorized according to the Maryland Scientific Methods Scale (SMS) (Sherman et al., 1998) in order to identify and assess the strength of the evidence (Sherman, Farrington, Welsh & MacKenzie, 2002). The five categories of studies distinguished in this scale are:

1. Post-test measure with no control or comparison groups
2. Pre- and post-test measure with no control or comparison groups
3. Pre- and post-test measure with control or comparison groups
4. Pre- and post-test measure with control or comparison groups and including a statistical control
5. Post-test measure with control or comparison groups and random selection to one of the two groups

According to Rossi, Lipsey and Freeman (2004), research on effectiveness of interventions should aim at least at a quasi-experimental design, corresponding with level 3 of the Scientific Methods Scale. This review strives to uphold this aim. However, we expect only a few studies - if any - with a design at this level.

### **Search strategy for identification of relevant studies**

Several strategies will be used to identify all studies - published or otherwise - that meet the criteria described above. This includes keyword search of computerized databases. Additionally (existing) contacts working in this area will be asked for relevant material. Articles, books, reports, and conference papers will be retrieved, and an Internet search will be done. Special attention will be given to search and collect relevant studies captured in the so-called grey literature<sup>13</sup>.

*1. Databases:* Computerized bibliography searches will be conducted using different electronic databases.<sup>14</sup> Keywords and wild card terms<sup>15</sup> that will be used will involve words that describe:

- the subject of study (e.g. human trafficking, sexual exploitation, anti-trafficking) AND
- the interventions and programmes of interest (intervention, prevention, programme) AND

---

<sup>13</sup> Grey literature consists of articles, documents, newsletters, reports and papers that cannot easily be found, are unpublished, or not available through traditional commercial publication channels (Weintraub, 2006).

<sup>14</sup> See Annex I: List of electronic databases.

<sup>15</sup> For example: 'sex\*', 'traffick\*' and 'evaluat\*'.

- research effectiveness (effect, evaluation, best practice)

These keywords have been constructed in a preliminary review of the literature focusing on anti-trafficking initiatives.<sup>16</sup> This search strategy is broad to be certain that all relevant material is included in the preliminary search. The keywords are to be present in the title, subtitle and/or abstract in order to be eligible for this review and will be used to search Internet sites, electronic databases and libraries.

2. *BNRM Library*: The Bureau of the (Dutch) National Reporter on Trafficking in Human Beings (BNRM) has a library with over 3,000 articles, books and reports related to human trafficking. Using their search engine (Reference Manager), all articles will be scanned for applicability by using the keywords.

3. *Existing contacts*: Staff of relevant organizations will be contacted to provide the reviewers with any published or unpublished study. In addition, other personal networks will be consulted such as policymakers, researchers and contacts at international and supranational organizations.

4. *Cross-referencing of bibliographies*: References in relevant review articles, primary studies and meta-analyses will be scanned for new leads. Only articles that contain the words listed in appendix II in the title or subtitle will be reviewed. To locate any grey literature, government reports as well as nongovernmental organization's reports, book chapters, policy documents, personal networks, and research organizations' websites will be cross-referenced.

5. *Internet searches*: Websites of NGOs (e.g. Terre des Hommes, UNICEF and CATW), professional associations and organizations involved in applied and policy research will be searched. For this purpose a list of related NGOs available at BNRM will be used and supplemented<sup>17</sup>. In addition, keyword searches will be conducted using search engines such as google.com.

### **Description of methods used in primary research**

Initially, the authors will search for evaluation studies individually but systematically by applying the inclusion criteria. Studies on all programmes and interventions designed to counter THB for the purpose of sexual exploitation accompanied by some form of outcome evaluation will be included. Whether evaluations are carried out by independent evaluators or by organizations involved in designing or performing initiatives will be accounted for. An overview will be made of all studies containing any (combination) of the relevant key words in their title, subtitle and/or abstract. A short summary will be given of each study to allow the authors to keep track of its value for the systematic review. When a final overview of all studies is compiled, the second stage will start where the authors will select the studies relevant for the review by examining full-texts. Studies that include numerical evidence will be listed. The third and final stage consists of selecting studies that evaluate interventions using an evaluation design of level 2 or higher of the SMS. Jointly, a consensus will be reached on which studies are applicable for this review.

A first glance at the present literature shows that the trend in evaluating and monitoring interventions in the field of trafficking is limited but expanding. However, structured studies on effectiveness, as we know for example from juvenile justice reviews<sup>18</sup>, are not present. So far, around 20 studies have been found that initially meet the criteria for this systematic review. Many

---

<sup>16</sup> See Annex II: List of keywords.

<sup>17</sup> See Annex III: List of relevant websites.

<sup>18</sup> See for example Lipsey, Landenberger & Wilson (2007) and Tolan, Henry, Schoenry & Bass (2008). These studies can be found at the online Campbell Collaboration library: [www.campbellcollaboration.org](http://www.campbellcollaboration.org)

of these concern evaluations by the same organizations that carried out or initiated the intervention. In addition, most interventions focus on raising awareness on THB, using campaigns to reach the goal. Effectiveness is measured by using questionnaires and interviews on the knowledge and satisfaction on the information campaigns. Consequently, these studies are descriptive rather than causal, containing only pre-test and/or post-test measurements. So far, no randomized controlled trials (RCTs) were found, nor any study of level 3 or 4 of the SMS.

### **Criteria for determination of independent findings**

This systematic review will examine outcomes related to the effectiveness of anti-THB interventions. It is expected that studies may include different types of strategies or different study samples. Strategy and sample differences are taken into account in order to examine their respective impact. If several independent samples are presented in a single publication these samples and their outcomes are treated separately.

### **Details of study coding categories**

A preliminary coding sheet has been developed for this review<sup>19</sup>. This sheet covers a series of key aspects of the study, such as research design, methodological quality and outcome measures. Furthermore, characteristics of the intervention will be coded such as the type of intervention, the population it is aiming at and the procedures used. At least two researchers will code all studies resulting from the initial screening independently. The principal researchers will resolve coding differences.

### **Statistical procedures and conventions**

Effect sizes will be calculated using generally accepted standardized measures (Lipsey & Wilson, 2001; Rosenthal, 1991). These calculated effect sizes will help determine whether studies have found positive, negative or no effects. If possible – that is if we find eligible studies - meta-analytical approaches required to combine studies will be used (Lipsey & Wilson, 2001).

### **Qualitative studies**

It is expected that due to the limited number of adequate evaluations, if any, and its descriptive nature, at best descriptive statistics can be calculated on the nature of the intervention, logical framework, evaluation methods and reported outcomes. These results will be discussed separately as they do not include effect sizes. Instead, a narrative review will be made on these studies to highlight the current landscape of evidence on the evaluations of anti-trafficking interventions. This narrative review will also give insight in the critical research areas, gaps in the evaluation studies and the problems that are associated with doing research on THB.

## **4 TIME FRAME**

The authors intend to present the *systematic review of strategies and interventions to counter cross border trafficking in human beings for the purpose of sexual exploitation* by early 2010. To reach this stage, the following actions have been proposed including start- and end dates:

---

<sup>19</sup> See Annex IV: Coding Sheet.

<i>Action</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>End</i>
Review protocol	February 2009	April 2010
Re-submitted protocol 1 <sup>st</sup> time	April 2010	-
Re-submitted protocol 2 <sup>nd</sup> time	July 2010	-
Searching for published and unpublished studies	February 2009	June 2009
Pilot testing of inclusion criteria	April 2009	May 2009
Relevance assessments	June 2009	January 2010
Extraction of data from research reports	January 2010	April 2010
Analysis	October 2009	May 2010
Preparation of report	January 2010	May 2010
Writing report	June 2010	August 2010

## **5 PLANS FOR UPDATING THE REVIEW**

This review will be updated every five years to include new evaluation studies on anti-THB initiatives in any country. A couple of years will be needed for researchers to take note of this review and allow them to evaluate the effectiveness of such interventions.

## **6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

We would like to thank the Campbell Collaboration (C2) in Norway for their financial support. We are also grateful for the support given by the BNRM and WODC by allowing us to search through the library, to make use of their personal contacts and help in any way possible to make available the information needed for this systematic review. Furthermore, we would like to thank Peter van der Voort from the Netherlands Institute for the Study of Crime and Law Enforcement (NSCR) for his expertise in searching relevant studies.

## **7. STATEMENT CONCERNING CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

There is no conflict of interest present. The Bureau of the (Dutch) National Rapporteur on Trafficking in Human Beings (BNRM) and the Research and Documentation Centre (WODC) are not directly involved in policy development on human trafficking.

## **8. REFERENCES**

Barnitz, L. (2001). Effectively responding to the commercial sexual exploitation of children: a comprehensive approach to prevention, protection and reintegration services. *Child welfare*

- journal. Special Issue: International issues in child welfare, 80(5), 597-610.*
- Belser, P. (2005). *Forced Labour and Human Trafficking: Estimating the Profits*. Geneva: International Labour Office.
- Boak, A., Boldosser, A., & Biu, O. (2003). *Smooth Flight: Guide to Preventing Youth Trafficking*. New York, USA: International Organization for Adolescents.
- Boer, J. de (2002). De handel in jeugdige voetballers in Nederland. *Justitiële Verkenningen, 3*, 32- 45.
- Boermans, B. (2009). *Uitgebuit en in de bak! Slachtoffers van mensenhandel in vreemdelingendetentie*. Amsterdam: Bonded Labour in Nederland (BLinN).
- Boonpala, P., & Kane, J. (2002). *Unbearable to the human heart: Childtrafficking and action to eliminate it*. Geneva: International Labour Organization.
- Brennan, D. (2005) Methodological Challenges in Research with Trafficked Persons: Tales from the Field. *International Migration, 43*, 1/2, 35-54.
- Chase, E. & Statham, J. (2005). Commercial and sexual exploitation of children and young people in the UK – a review. *Child Abuse Review, 14(1)*, 4-25.
- Chawla, S., Me, A., & Pichon, T. le (2009). *Global report on trafficking in persons. Human trafficking a crime that shames us all*. United Nations Global Initiative to Fight Human Trafficking (UN.GIFT).
- Clawson, H. J., Williamson, E., & Garrett, A. (2008). *Improving data to combat human trafficking*. USA: ICF International.
- Cwikel, J. & Hoban, E. (2005). Contentious issues in research on trafficked women working in the sex industry: study designs, ethics and methodology. *Journal of Sex Research, 42(4)*, 306-316.
- David, P. (2005). *Human rights in youth sports. A critical review of children's rights in competitive sports*. Oxon: Routeledge.
- Dottridge, M. (2007a). *A handbook on planning projects to prevent child trafficking*. Lausanne: International Federation Terre des hommes.
- Dottridge, M. (2007b). *Collateral Damage. The impact of anti-trafficking measures on human rights around the world*. Bangkok: Global Alliance against Trafficking in Women.
- Dottridge, M. (2007c). *Measuring Responses to Trafficking in Human Beings in the European Union: an Assessment Manual*. Brussels: Consultancy for Directorate-General Justice, Freedom and Security, European Commission.
- Dottridge, M. (2010). *In pursuit of good practice in response to child trafficking: Experiences from Latin America, Southeast Europe and Southeast Asia*. Terre des Hommes International Federation and Stichting Terre des Hommes Netherlands.
- Ennew, J. (2008). *Exploitation of children in prostitution*. Thematic paper. Bangkok.
- Gervais, C. (2005). *Report on promising practices for the prevention of human trafficking*. Canada: National Crime Prevention Centre, Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness.
- Jonge van Ellemeet, de H. (2007). Slecht werkgeverschap of 'moderne slavernij'; handhaving van een nader af te bakenen verbod. *Justitiële Verkenningen, 7*, 107-119.
- Kelly, L. (2002). *Journeys of Jeopardy: A review of research on trafficking in women and children in Europe*. London: Child and Woman Abuse Studies Unit, University of North London.
- Kelly, L. (2005). "You can find anything you want": A critical reflection on research on trafficking in persons within and into Europe. *International Migration, 43(1/2)*, 235-265.
- Laczko, F. (2005). Data and Research on Human Trafficking. *International Migration, 43(1/2)*, 5-16.
- Limanowska, B. (2003). *Women's human rights and elimination of all forms of violence against women and girls as defined in the Beijing Platform for Action and the outcome documents of*

- the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly*. New York: United Nations 3 - 14 March 2003.
- Lipsey, M. W. & Wilson, D. B. (2001). *Practical meta-analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bureau Nationaal Rapporteur Mensenhandel (2007). *Mensenhandel - Vijfde rapportage van de nationaal rapporteur*. Den Haag: BNRM.
- Rosenthal, R. (1991). Meta-analytic procedures for social research. *Applied Social Research Methods Series 6*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Rossi, P. H., Lipsey, M. W., & Freeman, H. E. (2004). *Evaluation: a systematic approach*. London: Sage publications.
- Sherman, L., Gottfredson, D., MacKenzie, D., Eck, J., Reuter, P., & Bushway, S. (1998). *Preventing Crime: What works, What Doesn't, What's Promising*. U.S.: Department of Justice.
- Sherman, L.W., Farrington, D.P., Welsh, B.C. and MacKenzie, D.L. (Eds.), (2002). *Evidence based crime prevention*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Surtees, R. (2008). Traffickers and trafficking in Southern and Eastern Europe: Considering the other side of human trafficking. *European Journal of Criminology*, 5(1), 39-68.
- Tyldum, G. & Brunovskis, A. (2005). Describing the unobserved: methodological challenges in empirical studies on human trafficking. *International Migration*, 43(1/2), 17-34.
- United Nations (2000). *Protocol to prevent, suppress and punish trafficking in persons, especially women and children supplementing the United Nations Convention against transnational organized crime*. Retrieved February 20, 2009, from:  
[http://www.uncjin.org/Documents/Conventions/dcatoc/final\\_documents\\_2/convention\\_%20traff\\_eng.pdf](http://www.uncjin.org/Documents/Conventions/dcatoc/final_documents_2/convention_%20traff_eng.pdf).
- UN High Commissioner (2002). *Recommended Principles and Guidelines on Human Rights and Human Trafficking*. Addendum to the Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to the Economic and Social Council, UN document E/2002/68/Add.1. Retrieved April 5, 2009 from:  
<http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Press/OHCHR%20Recommended%20Guidelines.pdf>.
- United States Government Accountability Office (GAO) (2006). *Human Trafficking. Better Data, Strategy and Reporting Needed to Enhance U.S. Antitrafficking Efforts Abroad*. Report to the Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary and the Chairman, Committee on International Relations, House of Representatives. GAO-06-825.
- United States Government Accountability Office (GAO) (2007). *Human Trafficking. Monitoring and Evaluation of International Projects Are Limited, but Experts Suggest Improvement*. Report to Congressional Requesters. GAO-07-1034.
- Vandekerckhove, W. (2003). Ethische problemen van en voor NGO's in de strijd tegen mensenhandel. In W. Vandekerckhove (ed.), *NGO's in de strijd tegen mensenhandel: humanitaire motieven, repressieve middelen?* Antwerpen: EPO.
- Vermeulen, G. (2007) *The long road from rhetoric to evidence on trafficking in human beings: About research efforts to prepare proper EU monitoring on the matter*. Measuring Human Trafficking. New York: Springer.
- Weintraub, I. (2006). *The role of grey literature in the sciences*. Brooklyn College Library. Retrieved March 30, 2009 from  
<http://academic.brooklyn.cuny.edu/library/access/greyliter.htm>.
- World Congress against Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children (2001). *Theme paper Yokohama Conference. Trafficking in children for sexual purposes: An analytical review*. Yokohama.
- Zimmerman, C., Yun, K., Shvab, I., Watts, C., Trappolin, L., Treppete, M., Bimbi, F., Adams, B., Jiraporn, S., Beci, L., Albrecht, M., Bindel, J., & Regan, L. (2003). *The health risks and consequences of trafficking in women and adolescents. Findings from a European*

*study*. London: London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine (LSHTM).

**ANNEX I: LIST OF ELECTRONIC DATABASES**

<b>DATABASE</b>	<b>LAST SEARCHED</b>	<b>HITS</b>
Abstracts in Anthropology	March 2009	0/5
Academic Search Premier	March 2009	4/15
		1/6
American Bibliography of Slavic and East European Studies	March 2009	1
Annual reviews	March 2009	0
AnthroSource	April 2009	0
Arts and humanities citation index	April 2009	0
Boekmanstichting	April 2009	0
Business Source Premier	March 2009	0
Catalogus University of Amsterdam	April 2009	0
Digital academic repository UvA-DARE	April 2009	0
EconLit	April 2009	0
Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek	April 2009	0
Esmerald fulltext	March 2009	0
Internationaal Instituut voor Sociale Geschiedenis	April 2009	0
JSTOR	March 2009	0
Lexis Nexis Academic NL	April 2009	0/140
MetaPress	March 2009	1
Online contents	April 2009	1
Periodicals archive online	March 2009	0
Periodicals index online	April 2009	0
PiCarta	March 2009	1
Project MUSE	March 2009	0
PubMed	March 2009	0
Sage journals online	March 2009	3
Science Direct	March 2009	0
SpringerLink	March 2009	2
Sociological Abstracts	March 2009	3
Web of Science	March 2009	5
World wide political science abstracts	March 2009	3

Other databases that will be searched are:

1. ASLIB
2. Australian Criminology Database (CINCH)
3. Bibliography of Nordic Criminology
4. Caredata (social work)
5. Cochrane Controlled Trials Register
6. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews
7. CrimDoc (European)
8. Criminal Justice Abstracts
9. Campbell Collaboration Reviews of Intervention and Policy Effects (C2-RIPE)
10. C2-SPECTR (a trials register of the Campbell Collaboration, covering sociology, psychology, education and criminology)
11. Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effectiveness (DARE)
12. ACORN (Vanderbilt University library book search)
13. Education-line
14. Elsevier Science Direct
15. ERIC / International ERIC (Educational Resources Information Clearinghouse)
16. ESRC Funded Research (REGARD)
17. Google, Google Scholar and Google Books
18. GPO Monthly Catalog (MOCAT)
19. HMSO publications (Home Office Research Studies)
20. National Criminal Justice Research Service
21. The National Institute for Clinical Excellence (NICE)
22. NHS EED
23. Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) database of problem-oriented policing examples (POPNet)
24. POPLINE
25. ProQuest Social Sciences Index
26. PsychInfo/PsychLit
27. Psyn dex (a German database of psychological publications)
28. SIGLE (System for Information on Grey Literature in Europe)
29. Social Sciences Citation Index (Social SciSearch)
30. Social Science Electronic Data Library
31. Social Science Research Network
32. Social Sciences Abstracts
33. UK National Health Service NRR (National Research Register)
34. UNESCO (UNESDO and UNESBIB)
35. Wiley InterScience
36. World Bank Documents
37. WorldCat

**ANNEX II: LIST OF KEY WORDS**

<b>LANGUAGE</b>	<b>TOPIC</b>	<b>RESEARCH</b>	<b>INTERVENTION</b>
<b>DANISH</b>	menneskehandel	intervention	evaluering
	seksuel udnyttelse	politik	effektivitet
	udnyttelse	Strategi	følge
	sexindustrien	tilgang	resultater
	tvungen arbejdskraft	hensigt	værker
	bekæmpelse af menneskehandel	Program	analysere
	prostitution		vurdering
<b>DUTCH</b>	Mensenhandel	Interventie	Evaluatie
	Handel in mensen	Programma	Effect
	Seksuele uitbuiting	Beleid	Effectiviteit
	Uitbuiting	Strategie	Resultaat
	Seksindustrie	Aanpak	Resultaten
	Gedwongen arbeid	Plan	Werkt
	Anti mensenhandel		Analyse
	Prostitutie		Beoordeling
<b>ENGLISH</b>	Human trafficking	Intervention	Effect
	THB	Suppression	Evaluation
	Sexual exploitation	Prevention	Effectiveness
	Trafficking	Policy	Empirical
	Sexual purpose	Strategy	Assessment
	Forced labour	Programme	Works
	Sex industry	Repression	Analysis
	Anti-trafficking	Deterrence	Assess
	Prostitution	Guidelines	Evaluate
		Approach	Best practice
<b>FRENCH</b>	Trafic humain	Intervention	Effet
	Trafic d'êtres humains	Suppression	Evaluation
	Commerce sexuel	Prévention	Efficacité, performance
	trafic	Règles	
	A but sexuel	Stratégie	Evaluation, appréciation
	Travail forcé	Programme	Travaux
	Industrie du sexe	Répression	Analyse
	Anti-trafic	Dissuasion	Evaluer
	Prostitution	Guide, ligne directrice	Evaluer, constater, estimer, apprécier
		Approche	
<b>GERMAN</b>	Menschenhandel	Intervention	Bewertung
	Sexuelle Ausbeutung	Programm	Wirkung
	Ausbeutung	Politik	Wirksamkeit
	Sex-Industrie	Strategie	Ergebnis
	Zwangsarbeit	Unterdrückung	Ergebnisse

Protocol Human Trafficking

	Bekämpfung des Menschenhandels		empirische
	Prostitution		
<b>ITALIAN</b>	Traffico	Intervento	Esito
	Sfruttamento sessuale	Soppressione	Risultato
	Sfruttamento	Prevenzione	Valutazione
	Industria del sesso	Politica	Efficacia
	Lavoro forzato	Strategia	Empirica
	Anti-traffico	Programma	Analisi
	Scopo sessuale	Repressione	
	Prostituzione	Dissuasione	
		Linee guida	
	Metodo		
<b>NORWEGIAN</b>	smugling	intervensjon	Effekt
	handel med mennesker	undertrykkelse	Evalueringen
	seksuell utnytting	forebygging	effektivitet
	utnytting	politikk	empiriske
	sex industrien	strategi	vurdering
	tvungen arbeidskraft	program	hva som fungerer
	anti-smugling	Retningslinjene	Analysen
	prostitusjon	Avskrekking	vurdere
<b>SPANISH</b>	La tratta di esseri umani	Intervención	Efecto
	La explotación sexual	Represión	Resultado
	Tráfico	Prevención	Eficacia
	Fin sexual	Política	Empírico
	El trabajo forzoso	Estrategia	Análisis
	industria del sexo	Programa	Evaluar
	Lucha contra la trata (contra la trata de personas)	Disuasión	
		Directrices	
<b>SWEDISH</b>	Människohandel	Intervention	utvärdering
	sexuellt utnyttjande	Program	Effekt
	Utnyttjande	Politik	effektivitet
	Sexindustrin	Strategi	Resultat
	Tvångsarbete mot människohandel	närma sig	Resultat
	Prostitution	Projekt	Verk
			Analys
			Värdering

### ANNEX III: LIST OF (POSSIBLY) RELEVANT WEBSITES

1. [www.kinderbescherming.nl](http://www.kinderbescherming.nl)
2. [www.odccp.org](http://www.odccp.org)
3. [www.unicri.it](http://www.unicri.it)
4. [www.stakes.fi/sexviolence/stop1report.pdf](http://www.stakes.fi/sexviolence/stop1report.pdf)
5. [www.childwatch.uio.nl/cwi/projects/indicators/prostitution/index.html](http://www.childwatch.uio.nl/cwi/projects/indicators/prostitution/index.html)
6. [www.usdoj.gov](http://www.usdoj.gov)
7. [www.usinfo.state.gov/topical/global/traffic](http://www.usinfo.state.gov/topical/global/traffic)
8. [www.wodc.nl](http://www.wodc.nl)
9. [www.minjus.nl](http://www.minjus.nl)
10. [www.minbuza.nl](http://www.minbuza.nl)
11. [www.senaat.be](http://www.senaat.be)
12. [www.diversiteit.be](http://www.diversiteit.be)
13. [www.openbaarministerie.nl](http://www.openbaarministerie.nl)
14. [www.doubletstraat.nl](http://www.doubletstraat.nl)\*<sup>20</sup>
15. [www.parlement.nl](http://www.parlement.nl)
16. [www.minvws.nl](http://www.minvws.nl)
17. [www.overheid.nl/op/index.html](http://www.overheid.nl/op/index.html) \*
18. [www.state.gov](http://www.state.gov) (US State Department)
19. [www.aic.gov.au](http://www.aic.gov.au) (Australian Institute of Criminology)
20. <http://europa.eu.int>
21. [www.rechtspraak.nl](http://www.rechtspraak.nl)
22. [www.sdu.nl](http://www.sdu.nl)
23. [www.sdu.nl/uitg/jurisprudentie/index.html](http://www.sdu.nl/uitg/jurisprudentie/index.html)
24. <http://kapis.www.wkap.nl/jrnltochtm> (European Journal of crime, criminal law and criminal justice)\*
25. [www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/policerspubs1.html](http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/policerspubs1.html)
26. [www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/trafficking.pdf](http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/trafficking.pdf) (=article)
27. [www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij/international/traffsum.html](http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij/international/traffsum.html)
28. [www.victims-of-trafficking.org](http://www.victims-of-trafficking.org)
29. [www.sais-jhu.edu/protectionproject/index.html](http://www.sais-jhu.edu/protectionproject/index.html)
30. [www.rutgersnissogroep.nl](http://www.rutgersnissogroep.nl)
31. <http://www.tldb.net> (Transnational Law Database)
32. [www.international.metropolis.net](http://www.international.metropolis.net)
33. [www.imes.uva.nl](http://www.imes.uva.nl) (Institute for Migration and Ethnic Studies, UvA)
34. [www.swc-cfc.gc.ca](http://www.swc-cfc.gc.ca) (Status of Women Canada)
35. [http://citd.scar.utoronto.ca/mhso/trafficking\\_women.html](http://citd.scar.utoronto.ca/mhso/trafficking_women.html)
36. [www.seksueelkindermisbruik.nl](http://www.seksueelkindermisbruik.nl)\*
37. [www.femmigration.com](http://www.femmigration.com)\*
38. [www.enmp.org](http://www.enmp.org)\*
39. [www.pitononline.nl](http://www.pitononline.nl) \*
40. [www.prostitutie.nl](http://www.prostitutie.nl)
41. [www.pic-amsterdam.nl](http://www.pic-amsterdam.nl)
42. [www.enmp.org](http://www.enmp.org)
43. [www.sim.nl](http://www.sim.nl) (niet relevant)
44. <http://training.itcilo.it/ils>. (document)
45. [www.lover-boy.nl](http://www.lover-boy.nl)

---

<sup>20</sup> \* Currently unavailable

46. [www.projetotrama.org.br](http://www.projetotrama.org.br)
47. <http://www.sctnow.org>
48. <http://www.helenbamber.org>
49. <http://www.recht.nl/internetvoorjuristen/sites/>
50. [www.lastradainternational.org](http://www.lastradainternational.org)
51. <http://www.courtsni.gov.uk/en-GB/Services/Support+to+Victim+and+Witnesses/>
52. [www.childtrafficking.com](http://www.childtrafficking.com)
53. [www.mensenhandel.nl](http://www.mensenhandel.nl)
54. <http://www.steunpunthuiselijkgeweld.nl>
55. <http://www.slachtofferhulp.nl/>
56. <http://www.stoploverboys.nu>
57. <http://www.interapy.nl/digihulp>
58. <http://www.stophetraffik.nl>
59. <http://www.cridoc.net> Child Right Information & Documentation Centre.
60. <http://www.stichtingstade.nl>
61. <http://www.bewareofloverboys.nl>
62. <http://www.shop-den Haag.nl>
63. <http://www.jip.org>
64. [www.vng.nl/smartsite.dws?ID=37114](http://www.vng.nl/smartsite.dws?ID=37114)
65. <http://www.humantraffickingsearch.net>
66. <http://www.unicri.it>
67. <http://www.businesstravellers.org>
68. <http://www.unicri.it/wwd/trafficking/minors/index.php>
69. <http://www.businesstravellers.org>
70. <http://www.oiji.org>
71. <http://www.vrouwenhandel.punt.nl> \*
72. <http://www.jeugdprostitutie.nu>
73. <http://www.meldmisdadanoniem.nl>
74. <http://www.acf.hss.gov> (United States Department of Health and Human Services)
75. <http://www.sexworkeurope.org>
76. <http://www.rvr.org>
77. <http://www.napoweb.nl>
78. <http://www.ilegaalkind.nl>
79. <http://www.hetccv.nl>
80. <http://mensenhandel.blogspot.com>
81. <http://www.humantrafficking.org>

**Relevant NGO sites:**

1. [www.ecpat.nl](http://www.ecpat.nl)
2. [www.ecpat.com](http://www.ecpat.com)
3. [www.cbg.nl](http://www.cbg.nl)
4. [www.law.uu.nl/sim](http://www.law.uu.nl/sim)
5. [www.transact.nl](http://www.transact.nl) (TransAct)
6. <http://www.uri.edu> (University of Rhode Island)
7. <http://www.hrlawgroup.org>
8. <http://www.un.com> (United Nations) \*
9. <http://www.un.org> (United Nations)
10. <http://www.unifem.org> (United Nations Development Fund for Women)
11. <http://www.whrnet.org> -> moved to [www.awid.org](http://www.awid.org) (Women's Human Rights, nu Association of Women's Rights In Development)

11. <http://www.e-quality.nl>
12. <http://www.procentret.dk> \*
13. <http://www.antislavery.org>
14. <http://www1.umn.edu/humanrts/iwraw/index.html> (The International Women's Rights Action Watch)
15. <http://www.womenwagingpeace.net> moved to [www.huntalternatives.org](http://www.huntalternatives.org)
16. <http://www.iom.int>
17. [www.opvang.nl](http://www.opvang.nl)
18. [www.thehungersite.com](http://www.thehungersite.com)
19. [www.rodedraad.nl](http://www.rodedraad.nl)

## **ANNEX IV: CODING SHEET**

### **REFERENCE INFORMATION**

1. Document ID: \_ \_ \_
2. Name of coder \_\_\_\_\_
3. Date of coding: \_ \_ / \_ \_ / \_ \_ \_ \_
4. Last name and initials of author(s): \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
5. Study Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
6. Date of publication: \_ \_ \_ \_
7. Journal name, volume and issue \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
8. Publication type:
  - a. Book (chapter)
  - b. Journal article
  - c. Report
    - i. NGO
    - ii. International/supranational organization
    - iii. Police
    - iv. Government (state/local)
    - v. Government (federal)
  - d. Unpublished paper
  - e. Thesis or Dissertation
  - f. Conference paper
  - g. Other: \_\_\_\_\_
9. The document was written in [language]: \_\_\_\_\_
10. Role of evaluator/author in the programme (if more than one, check the highest on the list):  
[Note: This item focuses on the role of the research team working on the evaluation regardless of whether they are all listed as authors.]
  - a. Evaluator delivered intervention

- b. Evaluator was involved in the planning, controlling, or supervising the intervention, or the evaluator was the designer of the intervention
- c. Evaluator was influential in service setting but no direct role in delivering, controlling, or supervision
- d. Evaluator was independent of service setting and intervention; research role only
- e. Unknown
- f. Not applicable

**INTERVENTION CHARACTERISTICS**

11. Brief description of the intervention: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

12. Did the intervention focus on a specific form of exploitation?
- a. Sexual exploitation
  - b. Labour exploitation
  - c. Organ removal
  - d. Combination of: \_\_\_\_\_
  - d. Other: \_\_\_\_\_
  - f. Unknown

13. Which of the following intermediate goals were explicitly mentioned as means to reach the ultimate goal (countering THB):
- a. Awareness-raising and education
  - b. Policy development
  - c. Legislation
  - c. (increased) Prosecution
  - e. Employment
  - f. Empowerment
  - g. Demand reduction
  - h. Other: \_\_\_\_\_
  - i. Unknown

j. Not applicable

14. What methods were used in the intervention?

a. Skills training

b. Meetings

c. Conference(s)

d. Campaigns

e. Repression

f. Other: \_\_\_\_\_

g. Unknown

h. Not applicable

15. Materials used: \_\_\_\_\_

16. Describe the population the intervention aims at:

a. Vulnerable groups

b. Perpetrators

c. Potential perpetrators

d. Victims of trafficking

e. Social workers

f. Judicial authorities

g. Policy makers

h. Legislators

i. Police

j. Other: \_\_\_\_\_

[Answers e to j, proceed to question 26]

17. What is the unit for the intervention?

a. Unit goals: Individual / Group / 99 / NA

i. Group size \_\_\_\_\_

b. Unit methods: Individual / Group / 99 / NA

i. Group size \_\_\_\_\_

18. The target group of the intervention:

a. Exclusively adults

b. Exclusively juveniles

c. Mainly adults

d. Mainly juveniles

e. Mixed group

- f. Unknown
- g. Not applicable

19. The age range of the targeted population in the intervention: \_\_\_\_\_

20. The gender of the targeted population in the intervention:

- a. Only females
- b. Only males
- c. Females and Males
- d. Unknown
- e. Not applicable

21. The ethnicity of the targeted population in the intervention: \_\_\_\_\_

22. The predominant socio-economic background of targeted population:

- a. Low income
- b. Middle income
- c. High income
- d. Unknown
- e. Not applicable

23. Additional target group characteristics: \_\_\_\_\_

24. Timeframe (duration) of intervention: \_\_\_\_\_

25. Geographical context of intervention:

a. Local:

Country: \_\_\_\_\_

City: \_\_\_\_\_

b. National:

Country: \_\_\_\_\_

26. Where was the intervention primarily located?

- a. Urban area
- b. Rural area
- c. Combination of urban and rural areas
- d. Unknown
- e. Not applicable

27. What was the setting of the intervention?

- a. School
- b. Community
- c. Offices

- d. Retail
  - e. Industrial
  - f. Agricultural
  - g. Human services (jails, courts, hospitals)
  - h. Other: \_\_\_\_\_
  - i. Unknown
  - j. Not applicable
28. Organization with primary responsibility for operating and maintaining this intervention:
- a. School
  - b. Social services
  - c. Faith-based organisations
  - d. NGO's
  - e. Police
  - f. Prosecutor offices
  - f. Government (national/local): \_\_\_\_\_
  - g. Other: \_\_\_\_\_
  - h. Unknown
  - i. Not applicable
29. Was the intervention used in multiple sites? YES / NO / 99 / NA
- a. If yes, was the population targeted similar to other sites YES / NO / 99 / NA

**STUDY CHARACTERISTICS**

30. Does the study meet the following inclusion criteria:
- a. The study is an evaluation of an anti-trafficking initiative YES / NO / 99
  - b. The study focuses on cross-border trafficking for the purpose of sexual exploitation \_\_\_\_\_ YES / NO / 99
  - c. The study focuses on interventions that prevent and/or suppress cross-border trafficking for the purpose of sexual exploitation \_\_\_\_\_ YES / NO / 99
  - d. The study defines cross-border trafficking according the UN protocol YES / NO / 99

**EVALUATION**

**Experimental group:**

31. Date of data collection: \_\_\_\_\_
32. City, region, province of data collection: \_\_\_\_\_

33. Country of data collection: \_\_\_\_\_
34. The target group of the evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_
35. The age range of the targeted population in the evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_
36. The gender of the targeted population in the evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_
37. The ethnicity of the targeted population in the evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_
38. The predominant socio-economic background of included population: \_\_\_\_\_
39. Additional target group characteristics: \_\_\_\_\_
40. Timeframe (duration) of evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_
41. Geographical context of evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_
42. Where was the intervention primarily located? \_\_\_\_\_
43. What was the setting of the evaluation of intervention? \_\_\_\_\_

**Control/ comparison group:**

44. Date of data collection: \_\_\_\_\_
45. City, region, province of data collection: \_\_\_\_\_
46. Country of data collection: \_\_\_\_\_
47. The target group of the evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_
48. The age range of the control/ comparison group in the evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_
49. The gender of the control/ comparison group in the evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_
50. The ethnicity of the control/ comparison group in the evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_
51. The predominant socio-economic background of included population: \_\_\_\_\_
52. Additional target group characteristics: \_\_\_\_\_
53. Timeframe (duration) of evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_
54. Geographical context of evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_
55. Where was the intervention primarily located? \_\_\_\_\_
56. What was the setting of the evaluation of intervention? \_\_\_\_\_

**METHODOLOGY**

57. Research design
- |  |               |
|--|---------------|
| a. Pre- and post-test measure  | YES / NO / 99 |
| b. Pre- and post-test measure with control or comparison groups                                      | YES / NO / 99 |
| c. Pre- and post-test measure with control or comparison groups and including a statistical control  | YES / NO / 99 |
| d. Post-test measure with control or comparison groups and random selection to one of the two groups | YES / NO / 99 |

- e. Other: \_\_\_\_\_
58. How were subjects assigned to their conditions?
- a. Random
  - b. Random through matching pairs
  - c. Quasi-random (alternative cases)
  - d. Other: \_\_\_\_\_
  - e. Unknown
  - f. Not applicable
59. Which, if any, of the following baseline/background characteristics were matched on or statistically controlled for?
- a. Age YES / NO
  - b. Race/ethnicity YES / NO
  - c. Income YES / NO
  - d. Other: \_\_\_\_\_
  - e. Unknown
  - f. Not applicable
60. Was attrition discussed in the study? YES / NO / NA
- If yes, to what extent has attrition been described in the study: \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
61. Any other biases encountered: YES / NO / NA
- If yes, to what extent do studies mention any kind of potential and actual bias: \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
62. Methods used to collect the data:
- a. Interviews, number of: \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Questionnaires, number of: \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Official statistics
  - d. Registration
  - e. Other: \_\_\_\_\_
  - f. Unknown
  - g. Not applicable
- Extra information: \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
63. Which outcomes were measured? \_\_\_\_\_

**OUTCOME MEASURES**

64. Was a standardized effect size reported? YES / NO

65. If yes, what was the effect size? \_\_\_\_\_

66. If no, is there data available to calculate an effect size? YES / NO

67. Type of data effect size can be calculated from:

a. Means and standard deviations

- Experiment group *M* \_\_\_\_\_

- Control group *M* \_\_\_\_\_

- Experiment group *SD* \_\_\_\_\_

- Control group *SD* \_\_\_\_\_

b. *t*-value or *F*-value \_\_\_\_\_

c. Chi-square (df = 1) \_\_\_\_\_

d. Frequencies or proportions

- *n* of experiment group with a successful outcome \_\_\_\_\_

- *n* of control group with a successful outcome \_\_\_\_\_

- Proportion of experiment group with a successful outcome \_\_\_\_\_

- Proportion of control group with a successful outcome \_\_\_\_\_

e. Other \_\_\_\_\_

68. Pre-test and post-test measures:

	Experimental	Control
<b>Pre-test</b>		
Mean		
SD		
N		
<b>Post-test</b>		
Mean		
SD		
N		

69. Raw difference favours:

a. Experiment group

b. Control group

- c. Neither (exactly equal)
- d. Unknown
- e. Not applicable

70. Were statistically significant differences reported between the control and treatment group?

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. Unknown
- d. Not applicable

71. Was there a follow-up of the intervention?

YES / NO / 99 / NA

- a. If no, why not? \_\_\_\_\_
- b. If yes, what were their findings? \_\_\_\_\_

**QUALITY ASSESSMENT**

72. Is the quality of the data collected assessed in this document?

YES / NO / 99 / NA

73. Are any concerns expressed in the document about the quality of the data? YES / NO / 99 / NA

74. If yes, explain \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**ELIGIBILITY STATUS**

75. Eligibility status:

- \_\_\_ Eligible
- \_\_\_ Not eligible
- \_\_\_ Relevant review

76. Date eligibility determined: \_\_/\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_

77. Reasons:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

78. For which question is the study eligible?

- \_\_\_ Question1 (studies with some form of empirical evidence)
- \_\_\_ Question 2 (studies with (quasi) experimental evaluations)
- \_\_\_ Question 3 (outcomes of (quasi) experimental evaluations)
- \_\_\_ None of the above

**EXTRA**

79. Do the publications refer to any additional references that are relevant to the review?

a. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

b. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

c. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

d. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

e. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

80. Any other relevant information that is missing in the coding sheet, but important to study:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_