Outcomes used in Modern Slavery and Human Trafficking Interventions

A Rapid Review of Qualitative Studies
Introduction

The aim of the Modern Slavery Core Outcome Set Project is to identify priority outcomes to be reported across interventions that aim to support the recovery, healing and reintegration of survivors of modern slavery.

We know that survivors of modern slavery experience serious and long-term health, social, and economic consequences. But, high quality evidence is lacking about how policies and services can intervene effectively to support recovery, healing and reintegration. Comparing the effectiveness of interventions requires that the measurement of outcomes is standardised. Yet currently, there is no consensus on the definition and measurement of recovery, healing or reintegration outcomes for survivors of human trafficking and modern slavery. Building a consensus is vital. The development of a Modern Slavery Core Outcome Set (MS-COS) will enable this, providing a minimum set of standard and measurable outcomes that should be reported across interventions that aim to support survivor recovery, healing and reintegration.

In order to develop the MS-COS, our project has two phases. The first phase is generative in nature, generating a long list of outcomes and sorting these into a taxonomy or schema. To do this we have undertaken rapid reviews of the literature, analysed secondary qualitative data, collected primary data, and run two stakeholder workshops. This short report outlines our findings from the second rapid review undertaken.

What we did

We wanted to understand the benefits and harms of post-trafficking services from the perspectives of survivors of human trafficking. In particular, we investigated views around psychological and social interventions.

To answer our questions, we searched for relevant academic research papers since 2000. Papers needed to be qualitative studies that explored the service provision experiences of adult survivors. Studies could use any qualitative methods, including interviews or focus group discussions. We only accepted papers that used the Palermo Protocol definition of trafficking. We searched the following electronic databases: EMBASE, MEDLINE, HMIC and PsycINFO. We also conducted reference list screening and forward citation tracking.

From the 1877 records, we found 18 studies were relevant to our aims.
This table summarises the characteristics of each of the 18 studies we included in our review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAD AUTHOR</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>STUDY COUNTRY</th>
<th>SAMPLE SIZE</th>
<th>MEN (N)</th>
<th>WOMEN (N)</th>
<th>NATIONALITIES &amp; ETHNICITIES</th>
<th>EXPLOITATION TYPES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Castaner</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mexican, Central American</td>
<td>Sex trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumeey</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>African American, Arab American, Latinx</td>
<td>Sex Trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balfour</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ghanaian</td>
<td>Domestic Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da Silva</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Sex Trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doyle</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Pakistani, South African, Indian, Filipino, Kenyan, Nigerian, Malawian</td>
<td>Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hispanic, Caucasian, African American, Dutch Canadian, Native American</td>
<td>Sex Trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodge</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Latin American, Asian</td>
<td>Labour Sex trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orme</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hispanic, Caucasian</td>
<td>Sex Trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viergever</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>African, Eastern European, Asian, Middle Eastern</td>
<td>Sex trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopper</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>African American, Caucasian, Hispanic</td>
<td>Sex Trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruijn</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Caucasian, African American</td>
<td>Sex trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eldridge</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Caucasian, Hispanic</td>
<td>Sex Trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajaram</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Caucasian, African American, Hispanic</td>
<td>Sex trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahal</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td>Sex Trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCrory</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Caucasian, African American, Hispanic, Asian</td>
<td>Sex trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Caucasian, African American, Caribbean, Romanian</td>
<td>Sex Trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busch-Armendariz</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>Sex trafficking Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westebbe</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Labour Sex Trafficking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What we found

Overview of the studies

Studies were largely conducted with female survivors, with only three working with male trafficking survivors (e.g., Hopper et al. 2018).

The majority of studies (16 of 18) involved survivors of sex trafficking, with studies mostly conducted in one country, the United States (12 of 18). This suggests a heavy geographical skew, limited exploration of male survivors’ needs, and an underrepresentation of labour trafficking.

Outcomes

Analysis of these studies followed a stepped approach, which involved first extracting direct quotes from participants. Following this, author interpretations of these quotes were extracted. These were then used to determine similarities and differences across studies.

This process was continuously revised until we generated four categories around service provision.

1. Personal Desired Outcomes from Aftercare Provision

Outcomes desired by survivors including independence and agency, stability, greater self-efficacy, identity formation, and safety.

2. Qualities Displayed by Service providers

Centering on the importance of non-judgmental, compassionate, and empowering approaches and authenticity from services.

3. Recommendations for Services

Emphasizing the need for aftercare provision to provide holistic, trafficking-specific, and long-term care support.

4. Facets of Service Provision

Highlighting the resources, activities, and psychological support needed for post-trafficking support, and focusing on preparing for a life beyond immediate aftercare.
To our knowledge, this is the first synthesis of qualitative research exploring survivors’ desired outcomes and expectations of post-trafficking service provision. This research can inform practice and policy initiatives, by identifying how current service provision can offer a standard of care that aligns with what survivors desire.

Outcomes identified in this rapid review have been fed into a master list of outcomes from the other review, interviews, and our exploratory workshops. This master list of outcomes provides the foundation for the e-Delphi exercise where stakeholders will vote on a core outcomes set.

We have addressed the gaps suggested by this review in our project by conducting supplementary interviews with male survivors and survivors of labour trafficking.
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